**2012-2013 CLASS FACT Assessment Year End Report, June, 2013**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Program Name(s)** | **FACT Faculty Fellow** | **Department Chair** |
| **Philosophy** | **Jennifer Eagan** | **Chris Moreman** |

[NOTE: Items A, B, C, and D are identical to your Page 2 on your Annual Report for CAPR. Please simply cut and paste from there. Item E is unique to the CLASS FACT Project.]

**A. Program Student Learning Outcomes**

|  |
| --- |
| 1) Philosophy majors will be able to write clear, academically rigorous, argumentative essays.  2) Philosophy majors will be able to read complex texts, create original arguments, analyze the arguments of others, and express these criticisms orally and in writing.   3) Philosophy majors will demonstrate knowledge of philosophical and/or religious traditions, their relevant concepts, theories, methods, and historical contexts.  4) Philosophy majors will develop their capacities for ethical decision-making, Socratic humility, openness to the ideas of others, reflective self-awareness, and a life-long curiosity about big questions.   5) Philosophy majors will cultivate an appreciation for a diversity of ideas and values across time and for human difference in areas such as: religion, culture, ethnicity, race, class, sexuality, and gender. |

**B. Program Student Learning Outcome(s) Assessed**

|  |
| --- |
| PLO#1: Philosophy majors will be able to write clear, academically rigorous, argumentative essays. |

**C. Summary of Assessment Process**

|  |
| --- |
| At the time when they file for graduation (two quarters prior to graduation) Philosophy majors will submit three electronic samples of their written work to their major portfolio on Blackboard. Students will choose their samples in consultation with their faculty advisors.   These portfolios will be evaluated by a committee of department faculty based on a rubric developed by the faculty that reflects a selection of the program’s Student Learning Outcomes. The rubric may change to measure different SLOs.  Faculty will review the results of the portfolio evaluations, discuss their findings, and make decisions that may impact future writing assignments in major courses.  During the Spring 2010, Dr. Jennifer Eagan taught PHIL 4606 Seminar in Philosophy, an open topic class which she taught as a seminar in academic writing. Twelve Philosophy majors took this class and developed writing portfolios within the scope of this class.   In Fall 2012, the Philosophy faculty developed a rubric designed to evaluate SLO#1 “Philosophy majors will be able to write clear, academically rigorous, argumentative essays.” This rubric elaborates in detail what the faculty in the program think the essential elements of SLO#1 are.  Two papers from each of the twelve majors were evaluated using the rubric, using 6 criteria rating each on a scale of 5 high – 0 low. Each paper was evaluated by two of four faculty members participating in the project. |

**D. Summary of Assessment Results**

|  |
| --- |
| On the whole, our majors write pretty well and generally satisfy SLO #1 to our satisfaction.  Criteria Average Across All Papers Context and Purpose of the Paper 4.13 Content Development 3.56 Writing in the Discipline 3.49 Sources and Evidence 3.15 Logic, Thesis Development, and Organization 3.86 Control of Syntax, Mechanics, and Style 4.10  Our lowest score for any criteria in the use of sources and evidence. This is certainly an area for growth, though the papers were diverse in style and stemmed from different prompts, which may account for the lack of source citation in some of the student’s papers. We also judged another area for improvement in the content and substance within the disciplines of Philosophy and Religious Studies.  In terms of individual majors, the range of scores (for two papers with two scores each) was between 118 and 70 (with the next lowest score an 70) out of 120.   Another thing that we learned is that we have differing opinions on how to rank papers according to the criteria, likely stemming from our difference areas of expertise and fields of study.  Closing the Loop: The Philosophy faculty is still looking at and analyzing this data. We may choose to alter or revise the process after this first round and maybe discuss how to better norm our scoring. The faculty are considering some shared writing guidelines, particularly with respect to the citation of sources. We may also consider utilizing the services of the SCAA to help us improve writing in the major. Our portfolio assessment would be assisted by portfolio software that would allow students to save and share their work as well as a database that we could use to score the portfolios. |

**E. Suggestions and Recommendations for the CLASS FACT Project in the Future**

|  |
| --- |
| Next year, I would like to work with the new Blackboard Assessment tool and maybe get some specific training and time to work with folks in MATS to develop our portfolio database. |

Thank you for your hard work for the past year, and have a Great Summer!

Thanks Guo, have a good summer yourself!

**Philosophy Major Portfolio Assessment, 12-13**

At the time when they file for graduation (two quarters prior to graduation) Philosophy majors will submit three electronic samples of their written work to their major portfolio on Blackboard. Students will choose their samples in consultation with their faculty advisors.

These portfolios will be evaluated by a committee of department faculty based on a rubric developed by the faculty that reflects a selection of the program’s Student Learning Outcomes. The rubric may change to measure different SLOs.

Faculty will review the results of the portfolio evaluations, discuss their findings, and make decisions that may impact future writing assignments in major courses.

**Major Portfolio Assessment**

During the Spring 2010, Dr. Jennifer Eagan taught PHIL 4606 *Seminar in Philosophy*, an open topic class which she taught as a seminar in academic writing. Twelve Philosophy majors took this class and developed writing portfolios within the scope of this class.

In Fall 2012, the Philosophy faculty developed a rubric designed to evaluate SLO#1 “Philosophy majors will be able to write clear, academically rigorous, argumentative essays.” This rubric elaborates in detail what the faculty in the program think the essential elements of SLO#1 are.

Two papers from each of the twelve majors were evaluated using the rubric, using 6 criteria rating each on a scale of 5 high – 0 low. Each paper was evaluated by two of four faculty members participating in the project. The rubric and the scoring of the papers follow this narrative.

**What we learned from this project:**

On the whole, our majors write pretty well and generally satisfy SLO #1 to our satisfaction.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Average Across All Papers** |
| Context and Purpose of the Paper | 4.13 |
| Content Development | 3.56 |
| Writing in the Discipline | 3.49 |
| Sources and Evidence | 3.15 |
| Logic, Thesis Development, and Organization | 3.86 |
| Control of Syntax, Mechanics, and Style | 4.10 |

Our lowest score for any criteria in the use of sources and evidence. This is certainly an area for growth, though the papers were diverse in style and stemmed from different prompts, which may account for the lack of source citation in some of the student’s papers. We also judged another area for improvement in the content and substance within the disciplines of Philosophy and Religious Studies.

In terms of individual majors, the range of scores (for two papers with two scores each) was between 118 and 70 (with the next lowest score an 80) out of 120.

Another thing that we learned is that we have differing opinions on how to rank papers according to the criteria, likely stemming from our difference areas of expertise and fields of study.

**What are we doing to close the loop?**

The Philosophy faculty is still looking at analyzing this data. We may choose to alter or revise the process after this first round and maybe discuss how to better norm our scoring. The faculty are considering some shared writing guidelines, particularly with respect to the citation of sources. We may also consider utilizing the services of the SCAA to help us improve writing in the major. Our portfolio assessment would be assisted by portfolio software that would allow students to save and share their work as well as a database that we could use to score the portfolios.

**Philosophy Portfolio Assessment Rubric**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reviewer: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Paper Title: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 or 0 | Score |
| **Context and**  **Purpose**  **of the Paper** | Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose and a clear focus. | Demonstrates adequate consideration of context, audience, and purpose and a clear focus. | Demonstrates adequate consideration of context, audience, and purpose, but strays from the focus or thesis of the paper at times. | The purpose and context of the paper is generally unclear to the reader. | Lacks all consideration of context, audience, and purpose and a clear focus |  |
| **Content**  **Development** | Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to illustrate mastery of the subject, conveying the writer's understanding of the content. | Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to explore ideas with the context of the Philosophy/ Religious Studies. | Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop and explore ideas through most of the work, | Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop simple ideas in some parts of the work. | Generally does not use appropriate and relevant content. |  |
| **Writing in the Discipline** | This looks like a nearly publishable academic paper. Follows recognizable and acceptable conventions of writing in Philosophy/ Religious Studies. | This is a sophisticated and clear academic paper. Follows recognizable and acceptable conventions of writing in Philosophy/ Religious Studies. | This looks like a solid undergraduate paper. Generally follows recognizable and acceptable conventions of writing in Philosophy/ Religious Studies. | This paper falls short of being a solid undergraduate paper. Fails to follow recognizable and acceptable conventions of writing in Philosophy/ Religious Studies. | This paper is not recognizable as a paper in the discipline of Philosophy or Religious Studies. |  |
| **Sources**  **and Evidence** | Demonstrates skillful use of high-quality, credible, relevant sources to develop ideas that are appropriate for Philosophy/ Religious Studies and the purpose of the paper. | Demonstrates consistent use of credible, relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for Philosophy/ Religious Studies and the purpose of the paper. | Demonstrates an attempt to use credible and/ or relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for Philosophy/ Religious Studies and the purpose of the paper. | Does not consistently use and document credible, relevant sources to develop ideas that are appropriate for Philosophy/ Religious Studies and the purpose of the paper. | Does not use or document sources effectively. |  |
| **Logic, Thesis Development,**  **and Organization** | Perfectly clear, excellent organization with visible, logical thesis statement on topic backed up by detailed argumentation. | Logical sequence of ideas, obvious attempt to establish and support thesis statementson your chosen topic but may lack detail or support. | Strays from the thesis, ideas unorganized in places, weak evidence in support of thesis. | A little too wordy. scattered or lacks detail, a little difficult to follow in places, and only moderately structured, weak thesis | No clear thesis statement, extremely vague, completely jumbled, poor flow |  |
| **Control of Syntax, Mechanics,**  **and Style** | Uses clear language that communicates meaning to readers with clarity and fluency, virtually error free. | Uses understandable language that generally conveys meaning to readers. Few style errors. | Generally conveys meaning, but with some lack of clarity and/ or style mistakes. | Some egregious errors in mechanics, hard-to-follow sentence structure, and instances of poor grammar, serious lack of clarity. | Many egregious errors in mechanics, hard-to-follow sentence structure, and instances of poor grammar, serious lack of clarity. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Score Total | 0 |
| Notes (Optional): | |  |  |  |  |  |

This rubric represents the full elaboration of SLO#1 of the CSUEB’s Philosophy program “1) Philosophy majors will be able to write clear, academically rigorous, argumentative essays.”

* Adapted from AAC&U's Written Communication VALUE Rubric and Dr. Michael Lee's SCORE Rubric

**Philosophy Portfolio Assessment by Paper**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Paper Title** | **Content/ Purpose** | **Develop-ment** | **Discipline** | **Sources** | **Logic/ Org** | **Style** | **Paper Total** |
| Kid A: Eval 1 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | **28** |
| Kid A: Eval 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | **24** |
| Parenting: Eval 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | **18** |
| Parenting: Eval 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | **10** |
| Art is Reality:  Eval 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | **16** |
| Art is Reality:  Eval 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | **20** |
| Marx's Philosophy:  Eval 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | **24** |
| Marx's Philosophy:  Eval 2 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | **25** |
| Desire is as Desire Does: Eval 1 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | **28** |
| Desire is as Desire Does: Eval 2 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | **26** |
| Morally Good Defense Lawyers: Eval 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | **30** |
| Morally Good Defense Lawyers: Eval 2 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 5 | **25** |
| Gun Control:  Eval 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | **19** |
| Gun Control:  Eval 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | **20** |
| Plea Bargains:  Eval 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 5 | **23** |
| Plea Bargains:  Eval 2 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 3 | **19** |
| Astral Projection:  Eval 1 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | **18** |
| Astral Projection:  Eval 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | **20** |
| Orange Phenomenology:  Eval 1 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 4 | **20** |
| Orange Phenomenology:  Eval 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | **12** |
| Development of Ideas: Eval 1 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | **19** |
| Development of Ideas: Eval 2 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | **26** |
| Nature of Infinity:  Eval 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | **24** |
| Nature of Infinity:  Eval 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | **11** |
| Freedom Determinism:  Eval 1 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | **20** |
| Freedom Determinism:  Eval 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | **15** |
| Sartre and Beauvoir: Eval 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | **24** |
| Sartre and Beauvoir: Eval 2 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | **23** |
| Atheist's View of the Afterlife: Eval 1 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | **22** |
| Atheist's View of the Afterlife: Eval 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | **20** |
| Racist Jokes:  Eval 1 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 | **27** |
| Racist Jokes:  Eval 2 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | **30** |
| Dexter:  Eval 1 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | **27** |
| Dexter:  Eval 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | **21** |
| Person Place Thing:  Eval 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | **25** |
| Person Place Thing:  Eval 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | **13** |
| Attempt at Phenomenology: Eval 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | **25** |
| Attempt at Phenomenology: Eval 2 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | **26** |
| Survival Lottery:  Eval 1 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | **22** |
| Survival Lottery:  Eval 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | **18** |
| Natural vs. Positive Law: Eval 1 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | **28** |
| Natural vs. Positive Law: Eval 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 5 | **21** |
| Subjectivity Self Free Will: Eval 1 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | **22** |
| Subjectivity Self Free Will: Eval 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | **17** |
| Genesis: Eval 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | **30** |
| Genesis: Eval 2 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | **29** |
| Pragmatism and Education: Eval 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | **30** |
| Pragmatism and Education: Eval 2 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | **29** |
| **AVERAGE PER CATEGORY** | **4.13** | **3.56** | **3.49** | **3.15** | **3.86** | **4.10** |  |

**Philosophy Portfolio Assessment by Reviewer**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Paper Title** | **Major #** | **Reviewer 1** | **Reviewer 2** | **Score 1** | **Score 2** | **Paper Score** |
| Kid A | 1 | Eagan | Moreman | 28 | 24 | 52 |
| Parenting | 1 | Hall | Gorton | 18 | 10 | 28 |
| Art is Reality | 2 | Gorton | Moreman | 16 | 20 | 36 |
| Marx's Philosophy | 2 | Hall | Eagan | 24 | 25 | 49 |
| Desire is as Desire Does | 3 | Eagan | Moreman | 28 | 26 | 54 |
| Morally Good Defense Lawyers | 3 | Hall | Gorton | 30 | 25 | 55 |
| Gun Control | 4 | Gorton | Moreman | 19 | 20 | 39 |
| Plea Bargains | 4 | Eagan | Hall | 23 | 19 | 42 |
| Astral Projection | 5 | Hall | Moreman | 18 | 20 | 38 |
| Orange Phenomenology | 5 | Eagan | Gorton | 20 | 12 | 32 |
| Development of Ideas | 6 | Hall | Moreman | 19 | 26 | 45 |
| Nature of Infinity | 6 | Eagan | Gorton | 24 | 11 | 35 |
| Freedom Determinism | 7 | Gorton | Moreman | 20 | 15 | 35 |
| Sartre and Beauvoir | 7 | Eagan | Hall | 24 | 23 | 47 |
| Atheist's View of the Afterlife | 8 | Gorton | Moreman | 22 | 20 | 42 |
| Racist Jokes | 8 | Eagan | Hall | 27 | 30 | 57 |
| Dexter | 9 | Hall | Moreman | 27 | 21 | 48 |
| Person Place Thing | 9 | Eagan | Gorton | 25 | 13 | 38 |
| Attempt at Phenomenology | 10 | Eagan | Hall | 25 | 26 | 51 |
| Survival Lottery | 10 | Gorton | Moreman | 22 | 18 | 40 |
| Natural vs. Positive Law | 11 | Hall | Gorton | 28 | 21 | 49 |
| Subjectivity Self Free Will | 11 | Eagan | Moreman | 22 | 17 | 39 |
| Genesis | 12 | Hall | Moreman | 30 | 29 | 59 |
| Pragmatism and Education | 12 | Eagan | Gorton | 30 | 29 | 59 |

**Philosophy Portfolio Score by Major**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Major** | **Total Score** |
| 1 | 80 |
| 2 | 85 |
| 3 | 109 |
| 4 | 81 |
| 5 | 70 |
| 6 | 80 |
| 7 | 82 |
| 8 | 99 |
| 9 | 86 |
| 10 | 91 |
| 11 | 88 |
| 12 | 118 |