Program-Level Assessment: Annual Report

Program: Doctoral	Department: Philosophy
Degree or Certificate Level: PhD	College/School: CAS
Date (Month/Year): 9/21	Primary Assessment Contact: Scott Ragland
In what year was the data upon which this report is based collected? AY 20-21	
In what year was the program's assessment plan most recently reviewed/updated? 2015	

1. Student Learning Outcomes

Which of the program's student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle?

The ones in the far left column of the below rubric:

Learning Outcome	Fails to Meet Expectations (0 pts)	Meets Expectations 1 pt	Exceeds Expectations 2 pts
1. Assess relevant literature or scholarly contributions in philosophy.	Student fails to address essential relevant literature or fails to assess such literature.	Student addresses all essential relevant literature and assesses it.	Student's assessment of relevant literature i(r)0.7siETBc 10 thinformation uncovered in extensive research to generate a novel thesis that advances the state of the discussion on the chosen topic. The dissertation has strong potential to be mined for future publications, whether
			The thesis of the dissertation is a "game changer" likely to be highly influential in the field.
		articles or books.	
4. Articulate arguments or explanations to a disciplinary or professional audience in	clearly articulate arguments in a professional manner, or the student cannot defend such arguments in conversation at the defense.	The dissertation professionally articulates arguments and the student can further defend his or her position at the oral defense.	The dissertation's arguments are unusually powerful or novel, or the student's oral defense of them is unusually strong.
5. Evidence scholarly and/or professional integrity in the field of study.	Dissertation contains plagiarism or shoddy citation methods, and/or the student cannot properly defend it orally.	Dissertation is entirely the student's own work and all sources are clearly cited.	Citation and bibliography are unusually thorough, so as to be especially helpful in understanding the relevant field.

2. Assessment Methods: Artifacts of Student Learning

Which artifacts of student learning were used to determine if students achieved the outcome(s)? Please identify the course(s) in which these artifacts were collected. Clarify if any such courses were offered a) online, b) at the Madrid campus,

> <u>What we learned about the assessment process</u>: Too many faculty are not completing the assessment forms, so that our data are less robust than they could be. Most committees had three members, and one had four, so there would have been 37 responses if we had full participation. Instead there were 23 responses—a faculty participation rate of 62%. This is better than the prior year (when we had just over 50% faculty participation), but still far from ideal.

6. **Closing the Loop: Dissemination and Use of <u>Current</u> Assessment Findings**
    A. When and how did your program faculty share and discuss these results and findings from this cycle of assessment?

    > The philosophy department will discuss this report (and the below recommended change to the evaluation process) at a faculty meeting in October or November of 2021.

    B. How specifically have you decided to use these findings to improve teaching and learning in your program? For example, perhaps you've initiated one or more of the following: