

Introduction

Purpose

An effective program review supports continuous quality improvement to enhance student learning outcomes and, ultimately, increase student achievement rates. Program review aims to be a sustainable process that reviews, discusses, and analyzes current practices. The purpose is to encourage program reflection, and to ensure that program planning is related to goals at the institutional and course levels.

Process

Foothill College academic programs that lead to an A.A./A.S. or Certificate(s), or are part of a specialized pathway, such as ESL, Developmental English and Math My Way are reviewed annually, with an in-depth review occurring on a three-year cycle. The specialized pathways may be included as part of the program review for the department, or may be done as a separate document if they are not part of a department that offers a degree or certificate. Faculty and staff in contributing departments will participate in the process. Deans provide feedback upon completion of the template and will forward the program review on to the next stage of the process, including prioritization at the Vice Presidential level, and at OPC and PaRC.

Annual review will address five core areas, and include a place for comments for the faculty and the dean or director.

1. Data and trend analysis
2. Outcomes assessment
3. Program goals and rationale
4. Program resources and support
5. Program strengths/opportunities for improvement
6. Dean's comments/reflection/next steps

2012-2013 Submission Deadline:

- Program review documents are due to Dean by December 14 for completion of Section 6.
- Dean completes section 6 and returns documents to program review team by January 7, 2013.
- Program review documents are due to the Office of Instruction by January 18, 2013.

Foothill College Program Review Cycle:

To see which template your department is scheduled to complete, check the Program Review Schedule: <http://foothill.edu/staff/irs/programplans/2012-2013/12-13-prog-rev-schedule.pdf>

Questions?

Contact: Office of Instruction and Institutional Research (650) 949-7240

Website: <http://foothill.edu/staff/irs/programplans/index.php>

Basic Program Information

Department Name: Philosophy

Program Mission(s): The mission of the Philosophy Department is to provide students with a disciplined introduction to the history of philosophy, as well as a clear understanding of the fundamental categories of philosophic discourse. Since philosophy is the origin and foundation of most academic subjects, a strong background in philosophy is useful, not just for philosophy majors, but for students in all disciplines. The Philosophy department endeavors to provide these foundations, particularly in the areas of logic and critical reasoning. In addition to providing students with a philosophic education, the department is dedicated to providing transfer students with the logical, analytical and critical reasoning necessary for success in university study

Program Review team members:

Name	Department	Position
Brian Tapia	Philosophy	Professor

Total number of Full Time Faculty:	1
Total number of Part Time Faculty:	5

Existing Classified positions:0
Example: Administrative Assistant I
Example: Program Coordinator

Programs* covered by this review

Program Name	Program Type (A.S., C.A., Pathway, etc.)	Units**
Philosophy	A.A.	90

*If you have a supporting program or pathway in your area for which you will be making resource requests, please analyze it within this program review. For example, ESLL, Math My Way, etc. You will only need to address those data elements that apply.

**Certificates of 27 or more units must be state approved (transcriptable). A Certificate of Achievement is state approved (transcriptable).

Section 1. Data and Trend Analysis

1.1. Program Data:

Data will be posted on <http://foothill.edu/staff/irs/programplans/programreviewdata.php> for all measures except non-transcriptable completion. Please attach all applicable data sheets to the final Program Review document submitted to your Dean. You may use the boxes below to manually copy data if desired.

Transcriptable Programs	2010-2011	2011-2012	% Change
Example: A.A.	2	4	+200%
Example: Certificate of Achievement			

Please provide any non-transcriptable completion data you have available. Institutional Research does not track this data.

Non-Transcriptable Program	2010-2011	2011-2012	% Change
Example: Career Certificate			

1.2 Department Data

Dimension	2010-2011	2011-2012	% Change
Enrollment	1421	1459	3%
Productivity (Goal: 546)	590	581	-2%
Success	71%	66%	-5%
Full-time FTEF	29%	29%	
Part-time FTEF	65%	65%	

Department Course Data (Attach data provided by IR or manually complete chart below)

Course	2010-2011			2011-2012		
	Enroll.	Prod.	Success	Enroll.	Prod.	Success
Ex. ART 1	See attached					
Ex. ART 2						

1.3 Using the data and prompts, provide a short, concise narrative analysis of the following indicators.

1. Enrollment trends over the last two years: Is the enrollment in your program holding steady, or is there a noticeable increase or decline? Please comment on the data and analyze the trends.

Enrollment trends seem to be holding steady. There was a slight increase (3%) in enrollment, with a slight decrease (-2%) in productivity. This is consistent with the directive to increase enrollment and reduced emphasis on productivity.

2. Completion Rates (Has the number of students completing degrees/certificates held steady, or increased or declined in the last two years? Please comment on the data and analyze the trends.

- a. AA, AS, AA-T, AS-T, Certificates of Achievement

There have always been relatively few AA degrees given in philosophy. Students who focus on philosophy as a course of study are usually unconcerned with AA degrees. Philosophy students are far more concerned for transfer to a 4-year institution. We are hoping to increase the number of degrees awarded when the philosophy TMC is in place and a transfer degree is made available.

- b. Local, non-State approved certificates- Certificates less than 27 units: All certificates less than 27 units without state approval should be reviewed carefully to determine if the certificate provides a tangible occupational benefit to the student, such as a job or promotion or higher salary, and documentation should be attached.

N/A

3. Productivity: Please analyze the productivity trends in your program and explain factors that affect your productivity, i.e. GE students, seat count/facilities/accreditation restrictions. For reference, the college productivity goal is 546.

While productivity did decrease by 2% (590 to 581), this number represents a very modest decrease. The administrative instructions seemed to focus less on productivity this year due to budgeting concerns. We are holding steady above the college productivity goal.

4. Course Offerings: (Comment on the frequency, variety, demand, pre-requisites.) Review the enrollment trends by course. Are there particular courses that are not getting the enrollment or are regularly cancelled due to low enrollment?)

Some of the enrollment trend data for philosophy is not very useful. Several of our courses are not taught on a yearly basis. This results in a course that is taught in 2010-2011, but not in 2011-2012 showing a 100% decrease. Also, some of the courses have changed in terms of the number of sections. Philosophy 4, 24 and 25 are steadily increasing in enrollment. Courses in the 20 series are holding steady despite data showing 20a and 20b having -100% enrollment. The courses were not taught in 2011-2012. However, they are being taught this year and enrollment seems to be holding steady. We are continuing to watch trends in 1, 7 and 50.

- a. Please comment on the data from any online course offerings.

Enrollment is up for our online courses (22%), but due to an increase in part time load the productivity is unchanged

5. Curriculum and Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)

- a. Comment on the currency of your curriculum, i.e. are all Course Outline of Record (CORs) reviewed for Title 5 compliance at least every three years and do all prerequisites, co-requisites and advisories undergo content review at that time? If not, what is your action plan for bringing your curriculum into compliance?

Philosophy courses are regularly checked for compliance and this process is ongoing.

- b. Comment on any recent developments in your discipline which might require modification of existing curriculum and/or the development of new curriculum?
We seem very close to the current draft of the state-wide transfer model curriculum. However, should there be a need we will alter or add courses in order to align philosophy offerings with the statewide transfer pattern.
 - c. Discuss how the student learning outcomes in your courses relate to the program learning outcomes and to the college mission.
Student learning outcomes in the courses are all oriented to key concepts that lead to an understanding of the historical, conceptual and logical aspects of philosophy that form the basis of our program outcome goals. These goals in turn contribute to the college goal of life long learning and provides a relevant transfer curriculum for our students.
 - d. As a division, how do you ensure that all faculty are teaching to the COR and SLOs?
We make sure that new adjuncts are aware of the COR and SLOs and report regularly. We also conduct regular evaluations of faculty.
6. Basic Skills Programs (if applicable). For more information about the Core Mission of Basic Skills, see the Basic Skills Workgroup website: <http://foothill.edu/president/basicskills.php>
 - a. Please discuss current outcomes or initiatives related to this core mission.
 7. Transfer Programs (if applicable). For more information about the Core Mission of Transfer, see the Transfer Workgroup website: <http://foothill.edu/president/transfer.php>
 - a. Please discuss current outcomes or initiatives related to this core mission.
We continue to offer only courses that transfer either through IGETC or the CSU GE transfer pattern. This year our goal is to develop a transfer degree in conjunction with the state-wide transfer curriculum.
 8. Workforce/Career Technical Education Programs (if applicable). For more information about the Core Mission of Workforce, see the Workforce Workgroup website: <http://foothill.edu/president/workforce.php>
 - a. Please discuss current outcomes or initiatives related to this core mission.
 - b. Please attach minutes from your advisory board meeting(s).
 9. Student Equity: Foothill-De Anza Community College District Board policy and California state guidelines require that each California community college submit a report on the college's progress in achieving equity in five specific areas: access, course completion, ESLL and basic skills completion, degree and certificate completion, and transfer. For the latest draft of the Student Equity Report, please see the ESMP website: <http://foothill.edu/staff/irs/ESMP/index.php>
 - a. To better inform the Student Equity efforts at Foothill College, please comment on any current outcomes or initiatives related to increasing outreach, retention and student success of underrepresented students in your program.

Section 2. Learning Outcomes Assessment Summary
--

2.1. Attach 2011-2012 Program Level – Four Column Report for PL-SLO Assessment from TracDat, please contact the Office of Instruction to assist you with this step if needed.

See attached sheets.

2.2 Attach 2011-2012 Course-Level – Four Column Report for CL-SLO Assessment from TracDat

See attached sheets.

Section 2 Continued: SLO Assessment and Reflection

2.3 Please provide observations and reflection below.

2.3.a Course-Level SLO

1. What findings can be gathered from the Course Level Assessments?

Course level assessments indicate that SLOs are effectively being achieved.

2. What curricular changes or review do the data suggest in order for students to be more successful in completing the program?

No curricular changes seem warranted on the basis of SLO data.

3. How well do the CL-SLOs reflect the knowledge, skills, and abilities students need in order to succeed in this program?

The reflect the general aspects of what is needed to succeed in the program.

4. How has assessment of course-level student learning outcomes led to improvement in student learning in the program?

In some instances, SLOs have indicated more detail-oriented approaches to certain concepts, as well as increased reinforcement of difficult ideas.

5. If your program has other outcomes assessments at the course level, comment on the findings.

2.3.b Program-Level SLO

1. What summative findings can be gathered from the Program Level Assessments?

Findings indicate that students who study philosophy at Foothill College are prepared both in content and logic skills for transfer to a bachelors program in Philosophy. This is further reinforced by reports of student success after transfer. This year alone, we have two former philosophy majors graduating from UC philosophy programs. One is applying to Graduate programs in philosophy, the other is applying to law school.

2. How has assessment of program-level student learning outcomes led to certificate/degree program improvements?

Improvements to the program are ongoing. What the outcomes demonstrate is that these continuous improvements to course content and pedagogy have been successful.

3. If your program has other outcomes assessments at the program level, comment on the findings.

Section 3: Program Goals and Rationale

Program goals should be broad issues and concerns that incorporate some sort of measurable action and should connect to Foothill’s core missions, [Educational & Strategic Master Plan \(ESMP\)](#), the division plan, and SLOs.

3.1 Previous Program Goals from last academic year

Goal	Original Timeline	Actions Taken	Status/Modifications
1 Additional full-time faculty	By 2013	Proposed position to division and was approved.	Due to budget constraints, this goal will depend upon a variety of economic factors.
2 Ethics bowl funding	ongoing	Due to budget constraints, this was not set as a priority.	Looking into alternative forms of funding.
3			

3.2 New Goals: Goals can be multi-year (in Section 4 you will detail resources needed)

Goal	Timeline (long/short-term)	How will this goal improve student success or respond to other key college initiatives	Action Steps
1 Expand course offerings.	Within the next 3 years we propose to rewrite existing course in aesthetics, as well as write new course in Philosophy of Science and technology.	These courses will help increase enrollment in philosophy and provide relevant courses for transfer philosophy majors and students in related disciplines.	Department Chair has proposed a PDL plan that would focus on this goal. This will include course work in art, science and philosophy.
2 Transfer degree.	1 year	This will help to align the AA in philosophy with transfer aspirations that most	5 courses have been submitted for C-ID approval. We are waiting for the Transfer

		philosophy students have.	degree guidelines to be published and then we will submit a Transfer AA for approval.
3			

Section 4: Program Resources and Support

4.1 Using the tables below, summarize your program’s unfunded resource requests. Refer to the Operations Planning Committee website: <http://foothill.edu/president/operations.php> for current guiding principles, rubrics and resource allocation information.

Full Time Faculty and/or Staff Positions

Position	\$ Amount variable	Related Goal from Table in section 3.2 and/or rationale
Full time faculty member		
Another Full-time position	Variable full time salary.	Another full-time professor would allow us to grow as a department and broaden our offerings. It would also allow us to have an increased presence on campus which increases access for students. It would also allow for a richer learning outcome process.

Unbudgeted Reassigned Time (calculate by % reassign time x salary/benefits of FT)

Position	\$ Amount	Related Goal from Table in section 3.2 and/or rationale

One-time B Budget Augmentation

Description	\$ Amount	Related Goal from Table in section 3.2 and/or rationale

Ongoing B Budget Augmentation

B Budget FOAP	\$ Amount	Related Goal from Table in section 3.2 and/or rationale

Facilities and Equipment

Facilities/Equipment Description	\$ Amount	Related Goal from Table in section 3.2 and/or rationale

Section 5: Program Strengths/Opportunities for Improvement

5.1 Address the concerns or recommendations that were made in prior program review cycles. We have recently hired some new adjunct professors and this has made a big difference in our ability to offer quality instruction in a broad range of philosophy courses.

5.2 What statements of concern have been raised in the course of conducting the program review by faculty, administrators, students, or by any member of the program review team regarding overall program viability?

Our main area of concern is that with only one full-time philosophy professor, we are limited in the full-time presence on campus. With another full-timer, we could have a richer evaluative process, program review would be more collaborative and dialectical and we could bring a broader range of expertise to our course outlines of record.

5.3 After reviewing the data, what strengths or positive trends would you like to highlight about your program?

We have been steadily improving over the last 5 years in our enrollment. Courses which were previously offered only once every two years can now be offered every year and in some cases more than once a year. We will continue to grow and expand our offerings in the years to come.

Section 6: Feedback and Follow Up
--

This section is for the Dean to provide feedback.

6.1 Strengths and successes of the program as evidenced by the data and analysis:

Under the leadership of the current department chair and only full-time faculty member, the Philosophy Department has grown steadily over the last five years and continues to seek new ways to serve students and improve course offerings. The program has submitted five courses for CI-D approval and recently the college was notified that two courses were approved and the remaining are expected to be approved as well. The program is in the process of developing an AA-T degree and this could provide opportunities for the many transfer students who take classes in the program to receive a degree upon leaving the college. The department has done a good job of creating and assessing SLOs and based on those assessments it has made changes to curriculum.

6.2 Areas of concern, if any:

No areas of concern.

6.3 Recommendations for improvement:

The program has requested a new full-time position and a review of the data suggests it is warranted given there is only one full-time instructor serving a large number of students. The BSS division has ranked the position and it will go forward as part of the division resource allocation process. The department is looking at new classes it could add including a philosophy of science and technology, which could be very relevant to students in many disciplines, including STEM and biology and allied health careers, and it should follow through on this plan.

6.4 Recommended next steps:

Proceed as planned on program review schedule

Further review/Out of cycle in-depth review

Upon completion of section 6, the Program Review should be returned to department faculty and staff for review, then submitted to Instruction and Institutional Research for public posting. See timeline on page 1.

Unit Course Assessment Report - Four Column

Foothill College

Mission Statement: A well-educated population being essential to sustaining and enhancing a democratic society, Foothill College commits itself to providing access to outstanding educational opportunities for all of our students. Whether through basic skills, career preparation, lifelong learning, or transfer, the members of the Foothill College community are dedicated to the achievement of learning and to the success of our students. We affirm that our unwavering dedication to this mission is critical to the prosperity of our community, our state, our nation, and the global community to which all people are members.

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Target / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 1 - CRITICAL THINKING & WRITING - SLO 1 - Identification of premises and conclusions - Identify and distinguish the constituent parts of an argument (premises and conclusion) within a persuasive text or speech. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Short media analysis essays to augment critical writing skills. Students will start reading newspapers and journals more actively and cite examples of informal fallacies and ambiguous statements found in these publications.</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Essay/Journal</p>	<p>09/21/2012 - While students initially have great difficulty with this task once it is applied pieces that are not specifically designed for teaching purpose, i.e., editorials, arguments in magazines, by the end of the term most students have a strong handle on different processes and guides to finding the conclusion and premises within material that is not written in a clear strict argument format.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Reporting Year: 2011-2012</p> <hr/> <p>12/14/2011 - Assessment scores consistently indicate that students have a solid grasp of this material.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Reporting Year: 2010-2011</p> <p>Resource Request: A textbook that literally can take a student step-by- step through the various elements of critical thinking and writing.</p>	
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 1 - CRITICAL THINKING & WRITING - SLO 2 - Identification of common logical fallacies - Evaluate persuasive text or speech through the identification of common logical fallacies. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Discussion forum in a more active manner, by rewarding students who pose good questions/issues that are relevant to this course.</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Discussion/Participation</p>	<p>12/14/2011 - While this material takes a more concerted effort, I am pleasantly surprised that with practice most do very well. Assessments show that this part of the course is quite challenging because certain rules have to be memorized in order to gain mastery of this subject matter.</p>	

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Target / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
<p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Target: Identification of fallacies in newspapers and journals.</p>	<p>Result: Target Met Reporting Year: 2010-2011</p>	
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 11 - INTRODUCTION TO THE PHILOSOPHY OF ART - SLO 1 - major aesthetic theories - To identify major aesthetic theories, defined both in terms of individual thinkers (Plato, Aristotle) and schools of thought (Marxism, structuralism, etc.) (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>			
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 11 - INTRODUCTION TO THE PHILOSOPHY OF ART - SLO 2 - critical analysis using aesthetic theories - To be able to use aesthetic theories to critically analyze works of art. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>			
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 2 - INTRODUCTION TO SOCIAL & POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY - SLO 1 - Political theories of major philosophers - Identify significant political theories held by major philosophers (ex. Plato, Aristotle, Hobbes, Hegel etc.) and/or philosophic schools of thought. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Discussion, comparing and contrasting philosophers. Assessment Method Type: Discussion/Participation</p>	<p>12/14/2011 - The majority of students do very well with this. Much discussion is devoted to comparing and contrasting the various positions. A small portion of students seem to have trouble with distinguishing one philosopher from another. However, with the amount of discussion and review dedicated to this issue and the amount of review done in class, i suspect this confusion has more to do with poor preparation.</p> <p>Result: Target Met Reporting Year: 2010-2011</p>	<p>12/14/2011 - Develop more reading response assignments that could provide incentive under-motivated students.</p> <hr/>

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Target / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 2 - INTRODUCTION TO SOCIAL & POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY - SLO 2 - evaluation of historically important philosophical arguments - Explain and evaluate historically important philosophical arguments regarding aspects of political theory. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: A series of short reflective essays, evaluation of contemporary perspectives using political theory upon which they are based.</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Essay/Journal</p>	<p>09/21/2012 - Students are able, by the end of the term, to identify the foundational assumptions and the arguments which follow from these assumptions regarding issues such as private property, the social contract, justification for government, the role of government, and institutional structures in relationship to issues of justice. Students are also able to identify key figures within these debates such as Plato, Hobbes, Locke, Marx, Nozick, Rawls, and Mill.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Reporting Year: 2011-2012</p>	
		<p>12/14/2011 - Most students were able to do this at a satisfactory or better level. The most difficult thing for students in this course is overcoming their own perspective on politics. These common perspectives (right or left, conservative or liberal) are usually oversimplified versions of political theory that leave out things like justification complex arguments.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Reporting Year: 2010-2011</p>	
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 20A - HISTORY OF WESTERN PHILOSOPHY FROM SOCRATES THROUGH ST. THOMAS - SLO 1 - identification of significant theories - Identify significant theories held by major philosophers and/or philosophic schools of thought from the ancient through medieval periods. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Periodic quizzes</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Exam - Course Test/Quiz</p>	<p>01/25/2013 - Students were very successful in identifying the distinct theories of the major philosophers of this period. The class average was 85%. This is to be expected in a class where roughly 75% of the students had taken at least one philosophy course. However, even among the students who were new to the study of philosophy, the success rate was very good</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Reporting Year: 2012-2013</p>	

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Target / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
		<p>12/14/2011 - Most students were consistently able to answer questions with a 90% average or better. This is due to extensive preparation and review. Furthermore, considerable time was spent discussing the progression of the various theories regarding early ontological theory.</p> <p>Result: Target Met Reporting Year: 2010-2011</p>	<p>12/14/2011 - Perhaps more periodic quizzes to encourage studying among the few under-performing students.</p> <hr/>
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 20A - HISTORY OF WESTERN PHILOSOPHY FROM SOCRATES THROUGH ST. THOMAS - SLO 2 - evaluation of historically important philosophical arguments - Explain and evaluate historically important philosophical arguments from ancient through medieval period. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Discussions of the different intellectual concerns during this period</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Discussion/Participation</p>	<p>01/25/2013 - Around 20% of the students could reasonably discuss the arguments under consideration and explain them with an acceptable degree of accuracy. Among this lowest group, the evaluation never really went beyond my own as presented in lecture. 80% of the class were able to not only identify and evaluate the arguments being made, but were able to level compelling criticisms of the theories themselves that went well beyond what was presented in lecture. In a few cases, the students even critiqued the professor's assessment of the argument as presented in lecture.</p> <p>Result: Target Met Reporting Year: 2012-2013</p> <p>12/14/2011 - While this is usually the hardest part of this course, students did remarkably well on this. This is due to extensive discussions of the different intellectual concerns during this period. This historical context allows students to better explain and evaluate the arguments.</p> <p>Result: Target Met Reporting Year: 2010-2011</p>	<p>12/14/2011 - Continue to improve and facilitate discussions of historical context.</p> <hr/>

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Target / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 20B - HISTORY OF WESTERN PHILOSOPHY FROM THE RENAISSANCE THROUGH KANT - SLO 1 - identification of significant theories - Identify significant theories held by major philosophers and/or philosophic schools of thought from the ancient through medieval periods. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Reading questions. Assessment Method Type: Exam - Course Test/Quiz</p>	<p>12/14/2011 - The class average was 87%, with philosophy majors scoring mostly perfect scores. The material for the course is very difficult, ranging from early natural philosophy (astrophysics) to complex ontological theory. The class average is high, however it could be improved with more concentrated discussions on more difficult aspects. † Though exceeding difficult at times, the content of this course is fixed by the history it is intended to examine. The course is IGETC transferable with present content. Philosophy majors who have transferred to 4-year institutions have reported that the course, though difficult helped them to be conversant in the philosophy of the period. Result: Target Met Reporting Year: 2010-2011</p>	<p>12/14/2011 - Continue to move slowly through difficult philosophers and in some cases indicate key points repeatedly through out lecture to keep students on track. Find a way to make 3 instead of 2 exams to break up the load.</p>
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 20B - HISTORY OF WESTERN PHILOSOPHY FROM THE RENAISSANCE THROUGH KANT - SLO 2 - evaluation of historically important philosophical arguments - Explain and evaluate historically important philosophical arguments from ancient through medieval period. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Evaluate arguments. Assessment Method Type: Essay/Journal</p>	<p>12/14/2011 - While philosophy majors perform well on this, those who are taking the course for GE have a bit more difficulty. The difficulty arises from the fact that taken out of historical context, the arguments are based in relatively arcane assumptions (ex. Aristotelian physics). Result: Target Met Reporting Year: 2010-2011</p>	<p>12/14/2011 - Again, not much can be done with the content without making the course less valuable to philosophy majors and sacrificing its status as a serious college course. Make a continued effort at drawing some connections between contemporary world view and the assumptions consistent with the period.</p>
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 20C - CONTEMPORARY PHILOSOPHY: 19TH & 20TH CENTURY THOUGHT - SLO 1 - identification of significant theories - Identify significant theories held by major philosophers and/or philosophic schools of thought from the 19th century to the present.</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Test/Quiz Assessment Method Type: Exam - Course Test/Quiz</p>	<p>09/20/2012 - Students continue to do well in identifying and explaining theories and concepts in this course. Despite the extreme difficulty of some the thinkers in the course, students seem to consistently rise to the challenge. It may also be the case that students in 20c have a particular interest in philosophy.</p>	

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Target / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
<p>(Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p> <p>Start Date: 09/20/2012</p> <p>End Date: 09/25/2015</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>		<p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Reporting Year: 2011-2012</p> <hr/> <p>12/14/2011 - Students performed very well despite the very difficult material. The course was heavily populated with philosophy majors and at least one visiting Phd candidate, so the results on the assessment were very good. However, there were 4 students who performed very low. The course is an IGETC transferable course and thus the content needs to be consistent with university study. To mitigate this, more time was spent on more difficult philosophical systems (Hegel).</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Reporting Year: 2010-2011</p>	<p>12/14/2011 - Perhaps more small group discussions would help those students that don't have more of an aptitude. However, these tend to be more time consuming and would limit the number of important philosophers covered. More frequent reading responses can spark discussion and focus student attention on key concerns.</p> <hr/>
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 20C - CONTEMPORARY PHILOSOPHY: 19TH & 20TH CENTURY THOUGHT - SLO 2 - evaluation of historically important philosophical arguments - Explain and evaluate historically important philosophical arguments from ancient through medieval period. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Essay</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Essay/Journal</p>	<p>12/14/2011 - The results for this were quite good. The arguments in this course are so complex that considerable time was spent outlining the premises and conclusion.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Reporting Year: 2010-2011</p>	<p>12/14/2011 - Continue thorough outlining of arguments.</p> <hr/>
<p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>			
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 24 - COMPARATIVE WORLD RELIGIONS: EAST - SLO 1 - Eastern religion concept identification - Identify significant concepts, figures and religious thinkers from the eastern religions (Hinduism, Buddhism, Confucianism Taoism, Chan, Zen etc.) (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Final Exam</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Exam - Course Test/Quiz</p>	<p>12/14/2011 - The majority of students do better than 90%. This is due to a three tiered approach (reading, lecture and discussion) as well as consistent review. Students also seem to recognize ideas better when the issues can be applied to their own life.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Reporting Year: 2010-2011</p>	<p>12/14/2011 - More inclusion of discussion time where students can discuss how the issues are relevant to their life. Continuation of reflective analysis essays. This allows students to analyze ideas and then apply them. Perhaps more video from religious figures. Currently liberal use of internet sources and DVD are employed. However, more</p>

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Target / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
<p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>			<p>current videos could be used at the media center.</p>
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 24 - COMPARATIVE WORLD RELIGIONS: EAST - SLO 2 - identification of eastern religion concepts - Identify and explain historically important religious concepts from the eastern religions. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Essays Assessment Method Type: Essay/Journal</p>	<p>09/20/2012 - Reflection essays reveal a very high level of understanding of religious concepts. This is even true of students that seem to struggle with more detail oriented concerns in the course. For example, in the story of the Buddha, they may not remember the names of people, places, dates etc. However in the reflection essays the same students seem very able to reflect meaningfully on subjects like the importance of mindfulness or non-attachment.</p> <p>Result: Target Met Reporting Year: 2011-2012</p> <hr/> <p>12/14/2011 - Students are successful in this, however there are often more difficulty in explaining the concepts. As with many new and culturally unfamiliar concepts, it is easier to identify the idea than it is to explain. Students who are most successful seem to use my examples rather than develop their own.</p> <p>Result: Target Met Reporting Year: 2010-2011</p>	<p>12/14/2011 - More emphasis on drawing out reflective examples from them. Perhaps more assignments that draw out reflection on key points in the reading. There are already two papers that focus on this point, however there may be room for smaller reading responses.</p>
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 25 - COMPARATIVE WORLD RELIGIONS: WEST - SLO 1 - Identification of Western religion concepts - Identify significant concepts, figures and religious thinkers (ex. Moses, Zoroaster, Jesus, Muhammad etc.) from the Western religious traditions. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Quizzes Assessment Method Type: Exam - Course Test/Quiz</p>	<p>01/12/2013 - 75% of the students earned an A and mastered the subject material successfully. Another 20% received the grade of a B or C and therefore performed well enough to pass the class in an average or above average. I am happy with the results.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p>	

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Target / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
<p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>		<p>Reporting Year: 2012-2013</p> <p>GE/IL-SLO Reflection: I found that students felt they would be able to distinguish the different historical and sociopolitical origins of the world's religions with more ease when I put a brief outline at the beginnings of my lectures of the major figures and themes to be covered each session.</p> <hr/> <p>12/14/2011 - Students would be able to identify key figures with more ease when I put a brief outline at the beginnings of my lectures of the major figures and themes to be covered each session.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Reporting Year: 2010-2011</p>	<p>12/14/2011 - More time for the students to interact with the instructor to ask questions and clarify issues. on scheduled chat room times for students to come together and chat with me and with one another.</p> <hr/>
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 25 - COMPARATIVE WORLD RELIGIONS: WEST - SLO 2 - Western religious figures and theories - Explain and evaluate historically important Western religious figures and theories. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Essays</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Essay/Journal</p>	<p>01/12/2013 - 76% of students received an A in this course and therefore successfully mastered this material. Another 21% received a B or a C. I have no reason to believe that the few students who received D's and F's did so because of difficulty with the material or how it was presented.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Reporting Year: 2012-2013</p> <p>GE/IL-SLO Reflection: I have added subtitles in bold in my lectures to help students identify and analyze basic theological beliefs and rituals, such as the role of women play in the religion, the role of each religion in modern America, and its core concepts.</p> <hr/> <p>09/20/2012 - There has been marked improvement for this outcome. This is attributed to the increased interaction between students and</p>	

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Target / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
		<p>professor and also between students. The essays reflect ideas that are shared during the discussion sessions. Students seem to learn a great deal from each other during these discussions.</p> <p>Result: Target Met Reporting Year: 2011-2012</p>	
		<p>12/14/2011 - Some students had difficulty with this aspect of the course. As mentioned in the reflection for SLO #2 more interaction would serve to alleviate this problem in online courses such as this.</p> <p>Result: Target Met Reporting Year: 2010-2011</p>	<p>12/14/2011 - I will be instituting from now on scheduled chat room times for students to come together and chat with me and with one another. I gave this a trial in May and invited a guest scholar and I received a lot of good feedback and many more students showed up than expected. This served as confirmation that this was a real need.</p>
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 30 - INTRODUCTION TO CRITICAL THINKING - SLO 1 - Identification of premises and conclusions - Identify and distinguish the constituent parts of an argument (premises and conclusion) within a persuasive text or speech. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Paper focused on arguments and non-arguments Assessment Method Type: Essay/Journal</p>	<p>12/14/2011 - My most important findings from the data were how many students, even those who had previous degrees, have difficulty at the beginning of the class being able to distinguish an argument from a non-argument, and being able to pick out the conclusion from the premises. Students did improve over the term, but in class exercises were more important to learning this than merely explaining the definitions.</p> <p>Result: Target Met Reporting Year: 2010-2011</p>	<p>12/14/2011 - More time will be spent on assignments that engage students to find and identify arguments from newspapers, magazines, ads, web, etc. Continue focus on papers that engage students to be able to identify the argument in a passage, and then ask them to respond to the passage by presenting their own argument.</p>
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 30 - INTRODUCTION TO CRITICAL THINKING - SLO 2 - Identification of common logical fallacies - Evaluate persuasive text or speech through the identification of common</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Quiz Assessment Method Type: Exam - Course Test/Quiz</p>	<p>01/25/2013 - The average score on the fallacies section on the final exam was around 73%. Taking out the lowest score (which was significantly lower than the rest of the batch –</p>	

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Target / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
<p>logical fallacies. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>		<p>20%), however, the average came out to about 78%.</p> <p>Students were strong in identifying fallacies of relevance, including ad hominem, appeal to pity, appeal to fear, appeal ignorance, and appeal to tradition. The fallacies that students had the most difficulty identifying were begging the question, straw man, and some inductive fallacies such as false cause. In addition, students often confused amphiboly with equivocation as well as composition with division.</p> <p>I would like to see improvement. In the future, I intend to spend more time covering the commonly missed fallacies. This includes offering more examples of passages that commit these fallacies. I also intend to assign more homework exercises that focus on identifying these fallacies.</p> <p>Result: Target Met Reporting Year: 2012-2013</p>	
		<p>12/14/2011 - Students, even those with degrees, had difficulty with fallacies in the beginning. There is a tendency for the students to not understand that informal fallacies are often generated by context. So, for example, after teaching students about statistical fallacies, students often want to assume that any argument that contains statistics must be fallacious. Continued work in this area does help students to begin to recognize that picking out fallacies requires thinking about the content presented.</p> <p>Result: Target Met Reporting Year: 2010-2011</p>	<p>12/14/2011 - Having students focus on explaining why an argument is fallacious as opposed to merely identifying name of the fallacy helps students focus on what is really wrong with the argument as opposed to just labeling the argument without comprehension.</p> <hr/>

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Target / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 30 - INTRODUCTION TO CRITICAL THINKING - Identify argument - Determine if a given passage contains an argument (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p> <p>Assessment Cycles: End of Academic Year</p> <p>Start Date: 09/01/2012</p> <p>End Date: 01/01/2016</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Students were given passages on the first exam and were required to determine whether the passage contained an argument.</p> <p>Target: Class average should be above 75% and would be preferably higher.</p>	<p>01/25/2013 - The average score on this portion of the first exam was 90 percent. Students showed that they could with regularity determine whether a short passage contained an argument. This included distinguishing arguments from explanations, illustrations, and mere opinions. Student performance remained strong even with the longer and more complex passages. These results were consistent with what was observed in the classroom. For the most part, during class discussion, students were very good at discerning whether a passage contained an argument.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Reporting Year: 2012-2013</p>	
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 30 - INTRODUCTION TO CRITICAL THINKING - evaluate arguments for soundness or cogency. - Evaluate the soundness of a deductive argument and evaluate the cogency of an inductive argument. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p> <p>Assessment Cycles: End of Academic Year</p> <p>Start Date: 09/01/2012</p> <p>End Date: 01/01/2016</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Students are given short passages and asked to determine whether the argument was sound (for deductive arguments) or cogent (for inductive arguments). Students are given a 2-page article and were asked to determine whether the argument was cogent.</p> <p>Target: 75% or better of the class should be able to evaluate arguments as to cogency or soundness.</p>	<p>01/25/2013 - For the shorter passages on the first exam, students excelled at determining whether the argument in the passage was sound or cogent. The average score was roughly 92 percent. These results show that students had a solid grasp of the concepts of soundness and cogency. For the most part, in addition, they were able to give an explanation for their response. Again, these results were consistent with what was observed in the classroom. Students showed a proficiency on homework exercises and class discussion at discerning whether an argument was sound or cogent.</p> <p>For the 2-page article on the final exam, however, students were less proficient. On this part of the final exam, the average score was 85 percent. In my view, the lower score does not reflect a lack of understanding of the concepts of soundness and cogency. Rather, the lower score reflects a</p>	

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Target / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
		<p>difficulty in completing the prior steps for determining the soundness or cogency of a lengthy argument that needs to be standardized in premise-conclusion form. Students faced difficulty in identifying subarguments, premises, and conclusions in the 2 page article.</p> <p>In future courses, I intend to give more in-class and homework exercises on standardizing arguments. I will also spend more time dissecting longer articles such as those found in short newspaper articles and magazines. For this class, I spent about 2 days on standardizing arguments. However, I think 3-4 days is more appropriate. Assigning more (or different) homework assignments on standardizing arguments is also a possibility.</p> <p>Result: Target Met Reporting Year: 2012-2013</p>	
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 30 - INTRODUCTION TO CRITICAL THINKING - Argumentative essay. - Write a composition presenting a well-reasoned argument defending a position on a controversial issue. The paper will include and overcome counter-arguments. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p> <p>Assessment Cycles: End of Academic Year</p> <p>Start Date: 09/01/2012</p> <p>End Date: 01/01/2016</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Students were required to submit a 5-6 page paper defending a position on the death penalty. Students were required to take a position on the issue, support their position using arguments, and address at least one counterargument.</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Essay/Journal</p> <p>Target: The class average should be above 75%.</p>	<p>01/25/2013 - The average score on the paper was around 85%. All students showed a proficiency in outlining the issue and stating a position. All papers offered a strong thesis statement that took a clear side on the issue.</p> <p>Students also showed a strong ability to address a counterargument. Their refutations of counterarguments were often forceful and persuasive. However, I would like to see students spend more time detailing the counterargument before refuting it. Most students simply mentioned in a few sentences the counterargument and the proceeded to refute it. I would like students to focus more attention on laying out the counterargument in all its detail and nuance. In future classes, I will emphasize the importance of doing this.</p>	

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Target / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
		<p>Also, I would like to see better organization of paragraphs. Many students articulated several important and forceful points in their papers. However, often times, these points were presented together in a jumbled, unfocused paragraph. I will spend more time on paragraph structure in future classes.</p> <p>Overall, despite these areas for improvement, students showed a strong ability to write an argumentative paper, especially in light of the limited time they had to write and their limited knowledge of the issue. (We read two articles on the death penalty.) Their papers generally came across as persuasive – and could have been even more so had they be better organized.</p> <p>Result: Target Met Reporting Year: 2012-2013</p>	
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 4 - INTRODUCTION TO PHILOSOPHY - SLO 1 - identification of significant theories - Identify significant theories held by major philosophers (ex. Plato, Descartes, Hume, Sartre etc.)and/or philosophic schools of thought (ex. ontological dualism, materialism idealism etc.) (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Discussion/Participation Assessment Method Type: Discussion/Participation</p>	<p>09/20/2012 - A strong majority of students continue to display a strong willingness to participate in class discussion regarding the philosophic theories under consideration. This is particularly true for the issues of free will and theology. The more complex epistemic considerations tends to elicit less discussion. In future quarters, it may prove effective to determine if the reluctance has to do with the difficulty of material in epistemology section or the fact that we tend to deal with the issue at the end of the quarter.</p> <p>Result: Target Met Reporting Year: 2011-2012</p>	

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Target / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
		<p>12/14/2011 - here has been significant improvement due to changes in lecture presentations. Problem areas from previous assessments have been given more attention and supplemented with extra material (ex. handouts with isolated argumentative structures).</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Reporting Year: 2010-2011</p>	
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 4 - INTRODUCTION TO PHILOSOPHY - SLO 2 - evaluation of historically important philosophical arguments - Explain and evaluate historically important philosophical arguments. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Discussion/Participation</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Discussion/Participation</p>	<p>12/14/2011 - There has been good improvement on this outcome. This is most likely due to spending more time on historical placement of philosophical ideas and arguments.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Reporting Year: 2010-2011</p>	
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 56 - SPECIAL PROJECTS IN PHILOSOPHY - Proficiency in relevant concepts. - Students will demonstrate proficiency in concepts relevant to the special project subject matter as determined by professor and student. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p> <p>Start Date: 11/29/2011</p> <p>End Date: 11/30/2015</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>			
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 56 - SPECIAL PROJECTS IN PHILOSOPHY - Critical analysis - Students will be able to critically analyze arguments relevant to the material to be determined by student and teacher. (Created By Department -</p>			

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Target / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
Philosophy (PHIL)) Start Date: 11/30/2011 End Date: 11/30/2015 Course-Level SLO Status: Active			
Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 56X - SPECIAL PROJECTS IN PHILOSOPHY - Proficiency in conepts. - Students will demonstrate proficiency in concepts relevant to the special project subject matter as determined by professor and student. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL)) Start Date: 11/30/2011 End Date: 11/30/2015 Course-Level SLO Status: Active			
Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 56X - SPECIAL PROJECTS IN PHILOSOPHY - Critical analysis - Students will be able to critically analyze arguments relevant to the material to be determined by student and teacher. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL)) Start Date: 11/30/2011 End Date: 11/30/2015 Course-Level SLO Status: Active			
Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 56Y - SPECIAL PROJECTS IN PHILOSOPHY - Proficiency in concepts - Students will demonstrate proficiency in concepts relevant to the special project subject matter as determined by professor and student. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))			

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Target / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
<p>Start Date: 11/30/2011</p> <p>End Date: 11/30/2015</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>			
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 56Y - SPECIAL PROJECTS IN PHILOSOPHY - Critical analysis - Students will be able to critically analyze arguments relevant to the material to be determined by student and teacher. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p> <p>Start Date: 11/30/2011</p> <p>End Date: 11/30/2015</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>			
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 56Z - SPECIAL PROJECTS IN PHILOSOPHY - Proficiency in concepts - Students will demonstrate proficiency in concepts relevant to the special project subject matter as determined by professor and student. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p> <p>Start Date: 11/30/2011</p> <p>End Date: 11/30/2015</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>			
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 56Z - SPECIAL PROJECTS IN PHILOSOPHY - Critical analysis - Students will be able to critically analyze arguments relevant to the material to be determined by student and teacher. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p> <p>Start Date:</p>			

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Target / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
<p>11/30/2011 End Date: 11/30/2015 Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>			
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 7 - INTRODUCTION TO SYMBOLIC LOGIC - SLO 1 - deductive arguments - Determine whether a deductive argument is valid or invalid. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL)) Start Date: 09/20/2012 End Date: 09/22/2016 Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Analysis of deductive arguments using symbolic representation. Assessment Method Type: Exam - Course Test/Quiz Target: Ideally all students should be able to determine validity of symbolized arguments by the end of the quarter.</p>	<p>09/21/2012 - Students are very successful in determining whether or not an argument is valid or invalid. By the end of the term there are very students that make any mistakes as it relates to determining validity. Result: Target Met Reporting Year: 2011-2012</p>	
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 7 - INTRODUCTION TO SYMBOLIC LOGIC - SLO 2 - symbolic form - Successfully translate real language arguments into symbolic form. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL)) Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>			
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 8 - ETHICS - SLO 1 - Ethical theories - Identify and explain major ethical theories. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL)) Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Quizzes for each new ethical theory Assessment Method Type: Exam - Course Test/Quiz</p>	<p>12/14/2011 - 90% of the students tested were able to explain these concepts with a high to moderate degree of accuracy. This is considerably better than the previous quarter where only 60% were able to accurately explain these concepts. This is due to increased emphasis on class discussion of the concepts in question with steady reinforcement. This is important due to the relative importance of these concepts in the later part of the course. Result: Target Met Reporting Year: 2011-2012</p>	<p>12/14/2011 - The inclusion of a very short introduction to logical problems that are likely to arise in the section under discussion. Currently these logical issues are discussed in the context of the articles under consideration. Upon review, it may be more effective to teach simplified examples of certain logical problems, in particular, Fallacies of presumption need to be emphasized. The supplemental logic primer could be in the form of collaborative learning exercises. This could even</p>

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Target / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
			<p>take the form of a game to off-set the drudgery of analyzing abstracted logical concepts.</p> <hr/> <p>12/14/2011 - Minor improvements to existing quizzes, continuation of the increased discussion around these topics.</p> <hr/>
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 8 - ETHICS - SLO 2 - Ethical arguments - Analyze and evaluate ethical arguments regarding contemporary social issues. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Quiz</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Exam - Course Test/Quiz</p>	<p>12/14/2011 - The answers received seem to suggest a lack of interest in less controversial social issues like global hunger and issues of economic justice in general. Perhaps it is the case that such issues presume a familiarity that only a fraction of the students have. These suggests changes to issues that are more familiar. Students tend to do best with issue that are familiar and are taken to a new level of disciplined analysis. When background in economic or political theory have to be introduced, the interest tends to be more limited.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Reporting Year: 2010-2011</p>	<p>12/14/2011 - Revision of the course reader to include issues of contemporary concern (terrorism and interrogation, drug policy including medical marijuana, paternalism regarding smoking etc.)</p> <hr/>