

Course Assessment Report
Washtenaw Community College

Discipline	Course Number	Title
Philosophy (new)	101	PHL 101 01/03/2023- Introduction to Philosophy
College	Division	Department
Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences	Humanities, Language & the Arts	Humanities
Faculty Preparer		Charles Johnson
Date of Last Filed Assessment Report		02/04/2017

I. Review previous assessment reports submitted for this course and provide the following information.

1. Was this course previously assessed and if so, when?

Yes Fall 2019

2. Briefly describe the results of previous assessment report(s).

The standard of success was achieved for the first outcome, but not the second.

3. Briefly describe the Action Plan/Intended Changes from the previous report(s), when and how changes were implemented.

Emphasis was placed on the evaluation of arguments during class instruction.
--

II. Assessment Results per Student Learning Outcome

Outcome 1: Identify major figures and concepts from the discipline of philosophy.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Departmentally designed instrument where students will be asked to identify figures and concepts.
 - Assessment Date: Fall 2019
 - Course section(s)/other population: 3 sections selected at random
 - Number students to be assessed: approximately 90

- How the assessment will be scored: A departmentally designed rubric using a scale of 0-3.
- Standard of success to be used for this assessment: An average of 2.1 for each learning outcome.
- Who will score and analyze the data: Data will be blind-scored by full-time faculty in the Humanities Department.

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
2022		

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
305	118

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

We constructed a sample involving DL, on-campus, and virtual sections. Unfortunately, we did not receive data from the virtual section.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

Students were assessed from these sections based on their being present when the assessment was administered.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

Students were given a quiz where they were asked to match major figures and concepts with their appropriate definitions. The quizzes were evaluated on a 1-4 scale with the standard of success being 70% scoring 3 or above.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: Yes

106 out of the 118 students (89.8%) assessed scored 3 or above.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

All sections scored above the standard of success, but the on-campus section scored the lowest at just 72.2%. The DL sections all scored much higher. It may be that the online format encourages more memorization and retention of concepts.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

Though the standard was achieved throughout, we will reinforce central concepts in on-campus instruction.

Outcome 2: Evaluate positions and/or arguments from the discipline of philosophy.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Departmentally designed instrument where students will be asked to evaluate an argument or position using central topics.
 - Assessment Date: Fall 2019
 - Course section(s)/other population: 3 sections selected at random
 - Number students to be assessed: approximately 90
 - How the assessment will be scored: A departmentally designed rubric using a scale of 0-3.
 - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: An average of 2.1 for each learning outcome.
 - Who will score and analyze the data: Data will be blind-scored by full-time faculty in the Humanities Department.

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
2022		

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
305	132

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

We constructed a sample which included DL, on-campus, and virtual sections. Unfortunately, no data was received from the virtual section.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

Students were assessed from these sections based on being present when the instrument was administered.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

Students were given essay questions where they were asked to evaluate arguments and apply central concepts. Their written responses were evaluated on a scale of 1-4 with the standard of success being 70% of students scoring 3 or above.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: Yes

98 out of 132 students scored 3 or above (74.2%).

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

Again the standard of success was achieved, but this time the on-campus section scored the highest at 95%. This is not surprising as the on-campus format allows students more opportunity to witness, and participate in, the evaluation of arguments in real time.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

We will try to modify discussion board assignments in online sections to better model the on-campus experience.

III. Course Summary and Intended Changes Based on Assessment Results

1. Based on the previous report's Intended Change(s) identified in Section I above, please discuss how effective the changes were in improving student learning.

We did have success in terms of raising student performance in evaluating arguments. We will work now to improve student performance in this area in online sections.

2. Describe your overall impression of how this course is meeting the needs of students. Did the assessment process bring to light anything about student achievement of learning outcomes that surprised you?

The difference between the online and on-campus sections with regard to the first outcome was surprising. It does seem that the online format encourages memorization and retention of concepts, whereas the on-campus format does a better job in terms of students becoming proficient in evaluating philosophical arguments and positions.

3. Describe when and how this information, including the action plan, was or will be shared with Departmental Faculty.

The results will be shared with faculty at the next department meeting.

- 4.

Intended Change(s)

Intended Change	Description of the change	Rationale	Implementation Date
Outcome Language	Will change #1 to Outcome-related exam questions	The previous assessment tool used averages rather than a baseline standard.	2022
Course Materials (e.g. textbooks, handouts, on-line ancillaries)	Modify discussion board assignments in online sections	We believe this will better model the on-campus experience.	2022
Course Materials (e.g. textbooks, handouts, on-line ancillaries)	Reinforce central concepts in on-campus instruction	Continuous Improvement	2022

5. Is there anything that you would like to mention that was not already captured?

6.

III. Attached Files

[Data and Instruments](#)

Faculty/Preparer:	Charles Johnson	Date: 01/03/2023
Department Chair:	Elisabeth Thoburn	Date: 01/09/2023
Dean:	Scott Britten	Date: 01/19/2023
Assessment Committee Chair:	Shawn Deron	Date: 02/10/2023

Course Assessment Report
Washtenaw Community College

Discipline	Course Number	Title
Philosophy (new)	101	PHL 101 01/09/2020- Introduction to Philosophy
Division	Department	Faculty Preparer
Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences	Humanities, Languages & the Arts	Charles Johnson
Date of Last Filed Assessment Report	02/04/2017	

I. Review previous assessment reports submitted for this course and provide the following information.

1. Was this course previously assessed and if so, when?

Yes

Fall 2017

2. Briefly describe the results of previous assessment report(s).

The standard of success was achieved with the first outcome. The standard was not achieved with the second.

3. Briefly describe the Action Plan/Intended Changes from the previous report(s), when and how changes were implemented.

More work was done to emphasize the evaluation of arguments and positions both in writing and orally during classroom discussion.

II. Assessment Results per Student Learning Outcome

Outcome 1: Identify major figures and concepts from the discipline of philosophy.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Departmentally designed instrument where students will be asked to identify figures and concepts.
 - Assessment Date: Fall 2019
 - Course section(s)/other population: 3 sections selected at random
 - Number students to be assessed: approximately 90

- How the assessment will be scored: A departmentally designed rubric using a scale of 0-3.
- Standard of success to be used for this assessment: An average of 2.1 for each learning outcome.
- Who will score and analyze the data: Data will be blind-scored by full-time faculty in the Humanities Department.

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
	94

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

The assessment was done Fall 2019. Two on-campus sections (01 and 03) were assessed along with all online sections. The total number of students enrolled was 119. The number assessed for this outcome was 94. This reflects those present to participate in the assessment activity.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

On campus and online sections were selected. No evening sections were offered.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

The students were given a matching instrument to test their knowledge of concepts and central figures. The instrument was blind-scored by department faculty.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: Yes

The instrument was scored on a scale of 1-4. The standard of success was for 70% of students to score 3 or above. For this outcome 66 out of 94 scored 3 or above for a total of 70.2% of students.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

The online students did very well with this outcome. 50 out of 62 (80.6%) scored 3 or above.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

The students did very well overall with identifying central concepts and figures. Faculty will continue to emphasize these central concepts.

Outcome 2: Evaluate positions and/or arguments from the discipline of philosophy.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Departmentally designed instrument where students will be asked to evaluate an argument or position using central topics.
 - Assessment Date: Fall 2019
 - Course section(s)/other population: 3 sections selected at random
 - Number students to be assessed: approximately 90
 - How the assessment will be scored: A departmentally designed rubric using a scale of 0-3.
 - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: An average of 2.1 for each learning outcome.
 - Who will score and analyze the data: Data will be blind-scored by full-time faculty in the Humanities Department.

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

The assessment was done in the Fall of 2019. Two on-campus sections (01 and 03) as well as all online sections were selected. 119 students were enrolled in these sections. 101 participated in the assessment of this outcome. This number reflects those present at the time the assessment was administered.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

On-campus and online sections were selected. No evening sections were offered.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

The students were given an essay question where they were asked to evaluate a philosophical position or argument. Responses were scored on a scale of 1-4. The responses were blind-scored by department faculty.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: No

The standard of success was for 70% of the students to score 3 or above. For this assessment 63 out of 101 scored 3 or higher for a total of 62.3% of students.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

Virtually all students engaged in evaluation of the argument or position presented. In this sense, their writing was on point or relevant to the question provided.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

Students were still incomplete in their evaluations. This is again a skill we must continue to develop within the classroom. Greater emphasis will be placed on having students not just initiate evaluations but also provide more detail or support.

III. Course Summary and Intended Changes Based on Assessment Results

1. Based on the previous report's Intended Change(s) identified in Section I above, please discuss how effective the changes were in improving student learning.

In the previous assessment students also fell short with the second outcome. We as faculty are still having difficulty getting students to provide complete evaluations of philosophical arguments or positions. This is a complex skill, so the idea that students are struggling in this area is not surprising.

2. Describe your overall impression of how this course is meeting the needs of students. Did the assessment process bring to light anything about student achievement of learning outcomes that surprised you?

The course is doing well in the area of getting students to be aware of central concepts. We must continue to work in getting students to provide complete evaluations of arguments and positions.

3. Describe when and how this information, including the action plan, was or will be shared with Departmental Faculty.

The assessment results will be shared with faculty at the next department meeting.

- 4.

Intended Change(s)

Intended Change	Description of the change	Rationale	Implementation Date
Course Materials (e.g. textbooks, handouts, on-line ancillaries)	Greater emphasis will be placed on having students provide more detail or support in their evaluations (Outcome 2).	In the current assessment, students were incomplete in their evaluations. This skill needs to continue to be developed in the classroom.	2020

5. Is there anything that you would like to mention that was not already captured?

6.

III. Attached Files

[Assessment Rubric and Data](#)

Faculty/Preparer: Charles Johnson **Date:** 01/09/2020
Department Chair: Jill Jepsen **Date:** 01/24/2020
Dean: Scott Britten **Date:** 01/27/2020
Assessment Committee Chair: Shawn Deron **Date:** 03/02/2020

Course Assessment Report
Washtenaw Community College

Discipline	Course Number	Title
Philosophy	101	PHL 101 01/04/2017- Introduction to Philosophy
Division	Department	Faculty Preparer
Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences	Humanities	Charles Johnson
Date of Last Filed Assessment Report		

I. Assessment Results per Student Learning Outcome

Outcome 1: Identify major figures and concepts from the discipline of philosophy.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Departmentally designed instrument where students will be asked to identify figures and concepts.
 - Assessment Date: Fall 2019
 - Course section(s)/other population: 3 sections selected at random
 - Number students to be assessed: approximately 90
 - How the assessment will be scored: A departmentally designed rubric using a scale of 0-3.
 - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: An average of 2.1 for each learning outcome.
 - Who will score and analyze the data: Data will be blind-scored by full-time faculty in the Humanities Department.

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
2016		

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
284	132

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

Six sections were selected to be assessed. The three online selections plus three on-campus sections selected at random. There were 167 students in these sections. The 132 assessed is based on those present to participate at the time the assessment was administered.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

As stated above, all three online sections were assessed. The on-campus sections were morning and afternoon. No evening or mixed mode sections were offered. The extension was not assessed.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

For a description of the instrument and how it was scored see attached. The instrument was administered in class imbedded in quiz and/or exam assignments.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: Yes

The outcome is assessed on a scale of 0-3. The standard of success is an overall average of 2.1 for the outcome. The average for the assessment was 2.5, so the standard of success was achieved

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

The students did an excellent job of identifying central figures and concepts.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

Based on the evidence gathered, no change is required in this area.

Outcome 2: Evaluate positions and/or arguments from the discipline of philosophy.

- Assessment Plan

- Assessment Tool: Departmentally designed instrument where students will be asked to evaluate an argument or position using central topics.
- Assessment Date: Fall 2019
- Course section(s)/other population: 3 sections selected at random
- Number students to be assessed: approximately 90
- How the assessment will be scored: A departmentally designed rubric using a scale of 0-3.
- Standard of success to be used for this assessment: An average of 2.1 for each learning outcome.
- Who will score and analyze the data: Data will be blind-scored by full-time faculty in the Humanities Department.

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
2016		

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
284	125

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

Six sections were selected to be assessed. The three online selections plus three on-campus sections selected at random. There were 167 students in these sections. The 125 assessed is based on those present to participate at the time the assessment was administered.
--

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

All three online sections were assessed. The on-campus sections were morning and afternoon. No evening or mixed mode sections were offered. The extension site section was not assessed.
--

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

For a description of the instrument and how it was scored see attached. The instrument was administered in class imbedded in quiz and/or exam assignments.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: No

The responses were evaluated on a scale of 0-3. The standard of success is an overall average of 2.1. The average for the assessment was 1.75, so the standard of success was not achieved.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

The students did well in terms of identifying the different elements of the questions provided and responding to each element.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

The student responses generally lacked adequate explanation. For example, with the first question in which the students were asked to resolve a moral dilemma using the theories of Kant and Mill, the students did not provide enough explanation as to how these different theories approach moral decision-making. More work will need to be done helping the students to expand on their reasoning in written and oral responses.

II. Course Summary and Action Plans Based on Assessment Results

1. Describe your overall impression of how this course is meeting the needs of students. Did the assessment process bring to light anything about student achievement of learning outcomes that surprised you?

As with previous assessments, the students did best in terms of concept/figure identification. The students had greater difficulty with the written response questions which has been the case with previous assessments, though this is the first time the standard was not reached in this area. As stated previously, greater attention will be paid to helping the students to state their reasoning in both written and oral responses.

2. Describe when and how this information, including the action plan, was or will be shared with Departmental Faculty.

The results of the assessment will be shared at the next departmental meeting.

- 3.

Intended Change(s)

Intended Change	Description of the change	Rationale	Implementation Date
No changes intended.			

4. Is there anything that you would like to mention that was not already captured?

5.

III. Attached Files

[Assessment Prompts and Data Summary](#)

Faculty/Preparer: Charles Johnson **Date:** 01/04/2017

Department Chair: Allison Fournier **Date:** 01/05/2017

Dean: Kristin Good **Date:** 01/06/2017

Assessment Committee Chair: Ruth Walsh **Date:** 02/01/2017

**Course Assessment Report
Washtenaw Community College**

Discipline	Course Number	Title
Philosophy	101	PHL 101 01/27/2014- Introduction to Philosophy
Division	Department	Faculty Preparer
Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences	Humanities	Charles Johnson
Date of Last Filed Assessment Report		

I. Assessment Results per Student Learning Outcome

Outcome 1: Identify major figures and concepts from the discipline of philosophy.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Departmentally designed instrument where students will be asked to identify figures and concepts.
 - Assessment Date: Fall 2013
 - Course section(s)/other population: 3 sections selected at random
 - Number students to be assessed: approximately 90
 - How the assessment will be scored: A departmentally designed rubric using a scale of 0-3.
 - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: An average of 2.1 for each learning outcome.
 - Who will score and analyze the data: Data will be blind-scored by full-time faculty in the Humanities Department.

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
2013		

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
312	67

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled,

please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

Eleven sections of PHL 101 were offered in the fall 2013 semester (7 on campus sections, 3 DL, and 1 extension class). Of these eleven sections offered, three were selected for the assessment. These three consisted of two on-campus sections and one DL section. The total enrollment for these sections was 82 students. The assessment was administered in two parts on different days. 67 students participated in the first part of the assessment for Outcome 1. 58 students participated in the second part for Outcome 2.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

On campus students were selected for the assessment based on their being present to participate on the days it was administered. DL students were selected based on those who participated in the assignments linked to the assessment.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

For the first outcome, students were provided a matching instrument asking them to connect major figures and concepts to their appropriate descriptions or definitions. There were six questions provided. The scoring was as follows:

0 = Matches none correctly
1 = Matches one or two correctly
2 = Matches three or four correctly
3 = Matches five or six correctly

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: Yes

The standard of success was defined as an overall average of 2.1 for each outcome. For Outcome #1, the average was 2.31.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength

in student achievement of this learning outcome.

Students achieved the standard of success. Student performance with this outcome has been consistently strong.
--

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

Given the consistent performance of students on this outcome, no changes are proposed at this time.

Outcome 2: Evaluate positions and/or arguments from the discipline of philosophy.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Departmentally designed instrument where students will be asked to identify figures and concepts.
 - Assessment Date: Fall 2013
 - Course section(s)/other population: 3 sections selected at random
 - Number students to be assessed: approximately 90
 - How the assessment will be scored: A departmentally designed rubric using a scale of 0-3.
 - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: An average of 2.1 for each learning outcome.
 - Who will score and analyze the data: Data will be blind-scored by full-time faculty in the Humanities Department.

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
2013		

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
312	58

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

Eleven sections of PHL 101 were offered in the fall 2013 semester (7 on campus sections, 3 DL, and 1 extension class). Of these eleven sections offered, three were selected for the assessment. These three consisted of two on-campus sections and one DL section. The total enrollment for these sections was 82 students. The assessment was administered in two parts on different days. 67 students participated in the first part of the assessment for Outcome 1. 58 students participated in the second part for Outcome 2.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

On campus students were selected for the assessment based on their being present to participate the days it was administered. DL students were selected based on those who participated in the assignments linked to the assessment.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

Students were provided an essay question asking them to analyze a philosophical position or argument. Their responses were evaluated as follows:

0 = Does not describe or evaluate the position/argument correctly.

1 = Describes correctly but does not evaluate.

2 = Describes correctly with incomplete evaluation

3 = Describes correctly with complete evaluation

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: Yes

The standard of success was defined as an overall average of 2.1 for each outcome. For Outcome #2, the average was 2.19.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

Students improved in this area from the previous assessment. As such, the standard of success was now achieved.

- Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

Student performance for this outcome still lags behind the first. As such, emphasis will continue to be placed on having students participate in activities that involve the evaluation of arguments and/or positions.

II. Course Summary and Action Plans Based on Assessment Results

- Describe your overall impression of how this course is meeting the needs of students. Did the assessment process bring to light anything about student achievement of learning outcomes that surprised you?

Students improved in their performance for both outcomes from the previous assessment. For Outcome 1, the average went from 2.21 to 2.31. For Outcome 2, the average went from 1.97 to 2.19. The improvement for Outcome 2 is especially significant in that it brought the average above the standard of success. In the previous assessment, the standard of success was not reached for the outcome. This suggests the move to emphasize assignments that promote the evaluation of arguments and positions is having a beneficial result. This strategy will thus be continued.

- Describe when and how this information, including the action plan, was or will be shared with Departmental Faculty.

Emphasis will continue to be placed on having students evaluate the positions and arguments addressed in class. Full-time faculty will work with part-time instructors to be sure that assignments are properly structured so as to give students practice and feedback with evaluation. This emphasis will be discussed at the next departmental meeting.

- Intended Change(s)

Intended Change	Description of the change	Rationale	Implementation Date
No changes intended.			

- Is there anything that you would like to mention that was not already captured?
-

III. Attached Files

Instrument and Data

Faculty/Preparer: Charles Johnson **Date:** 01/27/2014
Department Chair: Allison Fournier **Date:** 02/07/2014
Dean: Dena Blair **Date:** 02/10/2014
Assessment Committee Chair: Michelle Garey **Date:** 03/02/2014