

Minutes and Evaluation Report for Audit & Review Face-to-Face Meeting
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Philosophy Minor, 2017-2018

Date: April 24, 2018

Time: 11:00am-12:00pm

Place: Laurentide 4120

Attended: Associate Vice Chancellor Greg Cook; Dean David Travis; Department Chair Crista Lebens; faculty in the Philosophy Minor program: Ruth Tallman and Chris Minor; Audit & Review Team Chair Barbara Bren; Audit & Review team members: Xia Lollar and Joan Littlefield Cook

- 1) Call to order
- 2) Introductions
- 3) Overview of review team evaluation, program comments

Barbara Bren reviewed strengths of the program:

- The program strongly supports General Education, not only by providing FTE to teach the GENED 390 capstone course, but also by most of the Philosophy program's courses being available as general education electives. Courses in the minor also support other programs on campus, including Feminist Philosophy as an elective for the Women's Studies major, and courses that complement other programs including Business Ethics, Environmental Ethics, and Bioethics.
- Faculty teaching the program's courses are a major asset to the program, department and campus. Evidence during the review period includes a teaching award, awards for student support, and many compliments in exit survey comments.

- 4) Discussion of Review Team's evaluation

a) *Assessment. The program tried some innovative processes in their assessment of student learning but found they did not meet their needs, and their assessment processes have not been active. Please provide an update on current assessment activities, including plans to ensure that program-level assessment of student learning will be implemented in a sustainable way going forward.*

Program assessment planning is in progress. The faculty have revised the program's student learning outcomes and identified three key lower-level courses in the minor for entry-level assessment, which may use pre- and post- tests. Still in discussion is assessment in upper level courses, which may use signature writing assignments that focus on specific learning outcomes and are assessed with a rubric. During discussion it was suggested by one of the program faculty that perhaps a writing assignment should be used in the lower-level courses instead of the pre- and post-tests. The intent is to be able to gather more data on students in the minor and track them longer to show added value (not just in terms of content, but also skills). It will be important to differentiate between assessing work for a course grade and assessing work for learning outcome achievement at the program level (a student can earn an A or B in a lower-level course without showing mastery of a program learning outcome until more courses have been taken). Data will be collected on many students, and later the data on those students who become minors can be pulled out for analysis. How the data will be stored is to be determined. Work on a department handbook is underway, which will ensure

that the plan will be sustainable, even if there is turnover in personnel. The program faculty were encouraged to consult with Academic Assessment, and to consider attending a summer Assessment Institute, to support the planning process. Joan Cook assured the program that the review team appreciated that a lot of work had been done on assessment during the review period as well.

- b) *Curricular plans.* The program is working to develop a Philosophy major. Discuss the status of these activities, including how you might leverage courses already being taught in other departments, potential enrollment and employment prospects, and resources needed.

Crista Lebens described the program's vision for a major that could incorporate some courses taught in other departments. The 36-credit major would offer two tracks, a "science" track and an "ethics" track. A core of philosophy courses would be 12 credits (logic, ethics, history, capstone), 15 credits would be in the emphasis chosen, and 9 credits would be chosen from either outside the department or additional philosophy courses. The program faculty will work closely with students to choose the 9 credits appropriately, which will be an opportunity to forge strong relationships with students. The program faculty were encouraged to work with the Dean's Office and Provost's Office to understand the requirements for supporting a proposal for a new major, which will include market analysis on employment outlook (showing responsible use of state resources) and student interest (indicating sufficient student interest to support a major). The program is in a fortunate situation, since its classes have high enrollments of students from other programs. Dean Travis pointed out that in most cases about 90% of majors will come from other majors on campus, rather than bringing in large numbers of students who come to campus specifically for the Philosophy major. It will be important to consider the name of the major and branding. The department has plans to leverage its involvement with the Ethics Bowl to reach out to high schools. Dean Travis pointed out the need for "nimbleness," and said that some recent hires in other College departments might teach courses in support of the new major. The Women's Studies major has a lot of experience with setting up processes for using courses taught by faculty/staff from other departments, e.g., collecting program assessment data. Although there will be a new Dean, Dean Travis hopes that his successor will continue to support interdisciplinary hires.

- 5) **Recommended Actions:** The evaluation report lists two recommended actions (see page 11, point 4) related to program assessment and a progress report.
- 6) **Recommended Result:** *Continuation with minor concerns*
- Please make use of detailed comments in the evaluation report.
 - Please provide a progress report to College Dean by Nov. 1, 2019 and to Audit & Review by Dec. 1, 2019 on the status of the program's assessment plan, data on assessment of student learning collected and reviewed under the plan, and changes based on this data.
 - Next full self-study will be due to the College Dean by Oct. 1, 2022 and to the Audit & Review Committee by Nov. 1, 2022.
- 7) Adjourn.

Submitted by Barbara Bren

**University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Committee Form: Review of Audit & Review Self-
Studies Undergraduate Programs, 2017-2018
Majors/Minors and Standalone Minors**

Date of Evaluation 2/15/2018

Short Self Study (SS*) _____

Program PhilosophyMajor _____ Minor X**Evaluations submitted by:** Barbara Bren, Joan Littlefield Cook, Nick Guo, Xia Lollar, Jiazhen Zhou**Review meeting attended by:** Barbara Bren, Joan Littlefield Cook, Nick Guo, Xia Lollar, Jiazhen Zhou

I. Program Purpose & Overview: A. Centrality

1. The program contributes to the fulfillment of UW-Whitewater's core values, Mission, and Strategic Plan.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

2. The program supports general education, proficiency, and/or other programs at UW-W.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

3. The program has achieved or is appropriately working toward achievement of at least two goals of Inclusive Excellence.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

4. The program has been responsive to actions recommended from the previous Audit and Review Report; Progress Reports have been submitted, if relevant.

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	5
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

1. The self-study report shows good contributions to University Core Values, Mission and Strategic Plan.
 1. Page 4, the number for the goals of general education were all 1 instead of 1,2,3,..
 2. The program makes substantial contributions to the general education program at UW-W. The Philosophy Department offers 16 GH courses and also supports the core course, GENED 390.
2. Very strong General Education support, especially in the teaching of the 390 core course as well as offering electives. Will all of the current electives be proposed for recertification? Also very good support for other programs, e.g., courses like environmental ethics, feminist ethics, business ethics.

3. The department regularly teaches courses in the Race and Ethnic Studies program.
4. Did not discuss how the program has responded to the recommendations from last audit & review.
4. Regarding the 2nd recommendation (vision), I note plans to move toward offering a major with 2-3 tracks, which seem to be well chosen to complement other campus programs. Will the position revisions and other plans for the new major affect the department's vision and goals for the minor? Regarding the 1st recommendation, there were attempts, as recently as summer 2016, to create programmatic assessment that ultimately were deemed not feasible.

This self-study report demonstrates that the department has provided meaningful and sound added value to the university.

I. Program Purpose & Overview: B. Program Mission, Goals, & Accomplishments

1. The program's mission statement reflects the nature and scope of the program.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

2. Goals and objectives were identified and undertaken to improve or advance the program.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

3. The program has a process for setting and assessing goals, and making decisions about changes to the program goals.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

4. The program is considering potential revisions to mission, goals, or objectives; the program has a "vision" for where it wants to be in the future and how to get there.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

5. The program, faculty/staff, and/or students have earned recognition or awards.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

6. The program has achieved or maintained program-level accreditation or has considered seeking it, where appropriate.

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	5
--	---

Comments

2. Two primary goals are presented. The progress toward meeting the goals is clearly discussed.
 3. More information needs to be provided in this section. How is assessment data reviewed at the annual department meeting held in the first week of May?
 4. The department has the clear vision for where the program wants to be in the future and what steps will be needed to get there.
-
5. Some impressive awards!
 5. Congratulations to the faculty for some student-oriented awards, including awards for teaching and for supporting adult & LGBT* students.
-
6. No accreditation available for Philosophy programs.
 6. Accreditation is not available for programs in Philosophy.

II. Assessment: A. Curriculum**1. The program has a clearly articulated, efficient, and purposeful curriculum, including options or emphases within the program (if applicable).**

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

2. If program offers dual-listed courses, the expectations of graduate students differ from undergraduate students; otherwise NA

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	5

3. Appropriate assessment data were used in making curricular revisions.

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	1
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

4. The program provides opportunities for students to learn in ways that extend beyond the classroom, and discussed the extent to which students are involved in these activities and opportunities.

Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	3
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

5. Online courses are evaluated in ways that ensure effective delivery, continuous improvement, and student learning (if applicable)

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

2. The Philosophy minor does not offer dual-listed courses.
3. No formal curricular changes were made.
3. Senior exit survey comments support the department's work toward creation of a major. In general, work on the assessment plan needs to be restarted to be useful for program-level evaluation, not just individual course improvements.
4. The program offers the Philosophy Club, Philosophy Facebook page and a project to bring philosophy out into the community. I would like to know more about this project.
4. Is there a faculty mentor for the Philosophy Club? There was no explanation of the group's programming. I'd be interested to know what happened with the Ethics Bowl.
5. Online courses seem to be evaluated but the process for doing this is not well described.

II. Assessment: B. Assessment of Student Learning**1. The program has a clearly articulated learning outcomes for students, courses are "mapped" to these learning outcomes, and some outcomes received specific attention during the review period.**

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

2. Student learning outcomes are aligned with the LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes in a way that is reasonable and meaningful.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

3. The program has an appropriate assessment plan for measuring students' progress in attaining the outcomes.

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	1
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

4. The program collected a variety of appropriate assessment data allowing judgments about the extent to which students are achieving learning outcomes.

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	4
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

5. Program faculty consider assessment data in making changes to the curriculum, students' learning outcomes, and/or other aspects of the program.

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	4
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

6. Results of assessment efforts have been shared with appropriate internal and external constituencies.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

1. Is the listing of SLOs in the WINS SLO tracking document the current list? If so, the program might benefit from reviewing these and considering revisions, perhaps reducing the number.

1. Would the program benefit from participating in the UWW Assessment Institute? This may provide the time and some support to restart their assessment program, which the program says needs attention.

3. The program put a lot of effort into the WINS tracking system. Unfortunately it didn't work well in the end, but the effort hopefully helped the program gain insight into a system that will be successful and meet their needs.

3. A new assessment plan is in progress. The section lacks detail to address the plan.

3. The report can provide more details on the new assessment plan and its implications on teaching and course design.

3-5. The report concedes that the program needs to restart work on an assessment plan. I appreciate that time and effort were spent considering proposals during this review period that ultimately were deemed unfeasible, as well as that time and energy in the department were spent on other very pressing matters (searches for other positions, etc.).

With respect to the 2014 proposal to use WINS to collect assessment data, it's unclear how scores on combined LOs could be used to assess individual SLOs. Wouldn't you need to separate them? Otherwise, I thought this plan had potential, even if it's just in a spreadsheet.

4. Direct and indirect assessment data have been collected and provided from selected courses, but there are no recent direct assessment data available.

5. Development of the new major has been driven by data from senior exit surveys

6. What assessment results were included in last year's (2016/17) annual report to the College Dean?

III. Student Recruitment, Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation: A. Trend Data**1-2. Five-year enrollment and graduation trends reflect program vitality and sustainability.**

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

3. [MAJORS ONLY] Credits-to-degree show that students can complete the degree in four years, or reasonably efficiently.

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	5

4. Program has strategies to recruit and retain diverse students.

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	4
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

5. [MAJORS ONLY] Composition of students approximates or exceeds the diversity of students at the University

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	5

6. Students can enroll in appropriate courses and proceed without delaying graduation.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

7. Claim that the program is oversubscribed, undersubscribed, or at optimum level is justified or supported by examples or data.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments (please label by item numbers, e.g., 1; 2; etc.).

1-2. 2017 seems to have a 6-year high in the number of minors.

III. Student Recruitment, Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation: B. Demand for Graduates**1. [MAJORS ONLY] Placement information indicates that program graduates find employment or continue their education.**

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	5

2. Data suggests that employment opportunities for graduates of this program will remain strong.

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	4
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

3. The program systematically tracks graduates of the program.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	2
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

2. Appreciate the discussion about graduate/law school admission tests and philosophy majors.

2. I wonder how many business students take Business Ethics? Are there flyers, etc. on campus targeted at specific majors taking an ethics course appropriate for their majors? Are these ethics courses something that advisors in the relevant programs recommend as electives?

2. This report makes a strong case for the Philosophy Minor. I love the quotes it cites. Besides students who are interested in law school and communication, I hope more from business and economics can benefit from learning philosophy.

2. The report made a very strong argument for the value of learning philosophy. For example, philosophy majors consistently perform best or near best on graduate school admission exams and the Law School Admission Test.

3. Could the Philosophy Club or Facebook account be used to connect to alumni? The student exit comments are so positive, maybe there could be an intentional invitation to remain in contact through FB?

III. Student Recruitment, Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation: C. Comparative Advantage(s)

1. The program has unique features that distinguish it from competing programs--giving it a competitive edge

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	4
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments (please label by item numbers, e.g., 1; 2; etc.).

I like the emphasis on applied ethics, which I suspect appeals to our many career-oriented students. Apparently the faculty are a competitive advantage, since taking a course seems to encourage students to take more, even if they hadn't been considering a philosophy minor.

1. The program focuses on applied philosophy.

IV. Resource Availability & Development: A. Faculty Characteristics

1-2. Information is provided about the composition of the department faculty & instructional academic staff (e.g., gender, ethnicity, expertise, academic rank, etc.)

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

3-4. The program has identified staffing changes and anticipated areas of potential future need.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

IV. Resource Availability & Development: B. Teaching & Learning Enhancement

1-2. Faculty & instructional academic staff are engaged in activities to enhance teaching and advising.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0

No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

IV. Resource Availability & Development: C. Research & other Scholarly/Creative Activities 1-2.

Faculty (and staff, if relevant) are active in research and/or scholarly/creative activities.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

Notable are the promotions during the review period, one from Assistant Professor to tenured Associate, and one from Associate to Full. Also noted are successful post-tenure reviews.

IV. Resource Availability & Development: D. External Funding

1-2. Faculty and staff (if relevant) pursue funding through grants, contract, and/or gifts.

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	4
No/Limited Evidence	1
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

Mainly internal funding

The report notes that there are no departmental expectations or requirements for seeking external funding, so long as research expectations are met. The items listed in this section are internal funding, but I am glad that two of them were supporting efforts on assessment.

IV. Resource Availability & Development: E. Professional & Public Service

1-2. Faculty (and staff, if relevant) are active in professional and public service, beyond the department.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

The ongoing philosophy course at a public library seems unique to me. I'm glad there are people attending, and that an alum is participating.

IV. Resource Availability & Development: F. Resources for Students in the Program

1. The program has adequate personnel, student help, and service and supplies to serve its undergraduate students.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments**IV. Resource Availability & Development: G. Facilities, Equipment, & Library Holdings****1. The program has adequate facilities, equipment, and technological resources to effectively serve its students.**

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments**V. Conclusions and Recommendations from the Department or Program****1. Program strengths are discussed.**

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

2. Areas of improvement and continued progress are discussed.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

3. Recommendations and resources are discussed.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

1-3. Several students' exit comments were glowing. May you continue to be staffed with excellent people who inspire students to make such comments. Elsewhere in the report the need to restart efforts on the program-level assessment plan is noted.

2. Good discussion on the plan of creating the new major.

3. Discussed the significance of filling current and future vacant positions.

VI. Reviewer Conclusions**1. Strengths of the Program**

Interesting courses, and interesting possibilities being considered for future courses/emphases.

The program provides significant support for General Education, and for some key ELOs like critical thinking that have life-long benefits for students. The courses, and the plans for the tracks in the major, are relevant to other programs on campus. The applied focus should have great appeal. The Philosophy program benefits from having talented people teaching its courses, who are dedicated to their students, and who inspire their students.

Contribution to general education and diversity courses

Support to a variety of majors, particularly psychology, English, political science, communication and liberal studies

Philosophy is apparently a subject provides lots of added value to students who study it. The program is an important component of the university.

Strong
enroll
ment

2. Areas for Work or Improvement

Assessment needs attention, which the program notes. A program-level assessment plan.

The
planni
ng for
a
major.

Could improve the assessment plan

3. Other comments/questions

This minor is a very good companion for many majors on campus.

Enjoyed reading the self-study--I always learn a lot about philosophy from the program's self-studies!

Enjoyed reading the self-study report. I have learned a lot about the program!

4. Recommended Actions

1. Assessment:

- a. Review SLOs, consulting with the Office of Academic Assessment and considering whether revisions are needed in wording and/or number.
- b. Prepare an assessment plan, which will be sustainable given current resources. Participating in an Assessment Institute may provide needed support.
- c. Implement the plan, collect and make use of data. The program may want to have assistance from people with statistics strength to handle data.

2. Submit progress report to Audit & Review on assessment plan in 2 years (due Fall 2019*).

5. Recommended Result*

Insufficient Information in the self-study to make a determination; revise self-study & resubmit.	
Continuation without qualification	
Continuation with minor concerns. A progress report may be required, at the discretion of the review team.	X*
Continuation with major concerns in one or more of the four areas; submit annual progress report to the College Dean & Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs on progress addressing the major concerns	
Withhold recommendation for continuation, place on probation, and require another complete Audit & Review self-study within 1-3 years, at the Committee's discretion.	
Withhold recommendation for continuation, place on probation, recommend placing in receivership within the college, and require another complete Audit & Review self-study within 1-3 years at the Committee's discretion.	
Non-continuation of the program.	

***Progress Report due to College Dean by Nov. 1, 2019 and to Audit & Review Committee by Dec. 1, 2019. The program's next full self-study is due to the College Dean by October 1, 2022 and to the Audit & Review Committee by November 1, 2022.**

Audit and Review
Discussion of the Progress Report for
Philosophy

March 6, 2020
10:00-11:00am
Laurentide 4012

Attendance: Frank Goza (Dean, CoLS), David Simmons (Department Chair), Crista Lebens (Program Coordinator), Christopher Minor, Sheung Tak (Derek) Lam, Catherine Chan (Assessment Representative), Sasha Karnes (Review Team Member), Yushan Zhao (Review Team Chair).

1. Recommended Actions:

The evaluation report listed one recommended action:

To support the next self-study that is due in Fall 2022, please more thoroughly address recommendations #2 & #3 from the previous evaluation. Please provide an assessment plan that maps out where in the curriculum each of the nine SLOs are evaluated and the methods of evaluation (also on page 4 of the report).

2. Final Results:

- Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).
- Submit a progress report describing progress toward the Recommended Action. Due dates are February 1, 2021 to the Dean of the College of Letters and Sciences and February 15, 2021 to the Office of Academic Assessment.
- Next full self-study will be due on October 1, 2022 to the Dean of the College of Letters and Sciences and November 1, 2022 to the Office of Academic Assessment.

3. Meeting adjourned at 11:00am.

University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Committee Form: Review of Audit & Review Progress Report
Undergraduate Programs, 2019-2020
Majors/Minors and Standalone Minors

Program Name: Philosophy Minor

Date of Review Team Meeting: February 12, 2020

Date of Follow-Up Meeting: March 6, 2020 Time: 10:00-11:00am Location: Laurentide 4012

Evaluations submitted by: Yushan Zhao, Sasha Karnes, S-A Welch, Catherine Chan

Review meeting attended by: Yushan Zhao, Sasha Karnes, S-A Welch, Catherine Chan

Recommendation #1

Review SLOs, consulting with the Office of Academic Assessment and considering whether revisions are needed in wording and/or number

Recommendation #1 Overall Evaluation (please select your choice).

Good Progress	2
Making Progress	2
Little/No Progress	0

Comments related to recommendation #1

The list of SLO's is more specific to learning objectives and therefore should be easier to align with assessment data....so, this is very helpful to the department....GOOD JOB!

SLOs were revised. I am very interested to see how these objectives are aligned with LEAP essential learning outcomes.

In reviewing current SLOs, question whether the wording in objective #9 lends readily to the evaluation of student progress.

Congratulation on formulating a revised set of SLOs.

Recommendation #2

Prepare an assessment plan, which will be sustainable given current resources. Participating in an Assessment Institute may provide needed support.

Recommendation #2 Overall Evaluation (please select your choice).

Making Progress	1
Little/No Progress	3
Good Progress	0

Comments related to recommendation #2

- It was unclear if the program wanted pre-post tests done in other classes beyond the intro class. It might be a good idea to use pre-post tests, OR another new assessment measure

- I would like to see the revised assessment plan if it is available. New assessment plan template may be useful to develop a sustainable action plan in the future.
- It is inferred that the assessment was done through a description of the development of pre/post assessment tools. However, the reviewer does not see a clear assessment plan. The evaluation report from 2018 included suggestions for longitudinal, other than pre/post data collection. While suggestions such as these are only suggestions and not requirements, it would be useful for the reviewer to know more specifics about the plan that was implemented.
- It is good to see assessment tools being developed and implemented. Whereas assessment tools are necessary for an assessment plan, it is not sufficient. The assessment plan should describe where in the curriculum each of the nine SLOs are evaluated and the methods of evaluation. I assume that in order to assess all 9 SLOs, evaluation needs to be conducted beyond Intro to Logic and Intro to Ethics.

Recommendation #3

Implement the plan, collect and make use of data. The program may want to have assistance from people with statistics strength to handle data.

Recommendation #3 Overall Evaluation (please select your choice).

Good Progress	1
Making Progress	3
Little/No Progress	0

Comments related to recommendation #3

- The chart provided is quite distinct. However, I was unclear about what the red numbers meant and some of the terms used. It is not clear if the data was used for reflection or program improvement.
- Problem areas were identified. I would like to see what actions were taken to improve student learning based on assessment results.
- There was considerable effort to analyze the existing data and to think about what implications there are for the program, and what changes might benefit students in the philosophy minor.
- It is unclear if changes have been made that would qualify as "make use of the data", but it sounds like changes were proposed for fall of 2019.
- I appreciate the thoroughness of the data provided, especially for Intro to Logic. Areas of improvement for students are identified and suggestions for mitigation has been proposed. I look forward to seeing the next iteration of the course and student outcomes after the intervention strategies have been implemented. I do want to reiterate the point that the program needs to have a complete assessment plan that evaluates all 9 SLOs. A curricular map where each of the SLOs are introduced/developed/mastered are identified and evaluated would be really helpful. The program also needs to consider how collected can be used for continuous program improvement.

Recommendations for next review. Additional progress reports required?

Yes, Please List Due Dates (e.g. in 1 year, 2 years)?	4
No	0

If Yes, Please List Due Dates (e.g. in 1 year, 2 years)?

1 year

Next report should specifically address the following:

To support the next self-study that is due in Fall 2022, please more thoroughly address recommendations #2 & #3 from the previous evaluation. Please provide an assessment plan that maps out where in the curriculum each of the nine SLOs are evaluated and the methods of evaluation.

Additional comments:

- The review team would like to emphasize that while preparing another progress report requires significant efforts, it is an opportunity to prepare elements the program will need (and receive feedback) for its self-study due in 2022.
 - I have absolutely no doubt that effort has been put in by the program in response to the final A&R report and for that they should be COMPLIMENTED!! There were some vague areas (mainly related to recommendation # 3) that would make things better understood if they were clarified.
 - I would just like to see clarification on data related to recommendation # 3.
-
- Continue to work on the recommendations from the last audit and review: Review SLOs, consulting with the Office of Academic Assessment and considering whether revisions are needed in wording and/or number.
 - Prepare an assessment plan, which will be sustainable given current resources. Participating in an Assessment Institute may provide needed support.
 - Implement the plan, collect and make use of data. The program may want to have assistance from people with statistics strength to handle data

****The program should submit a progress report by February 1, 2021 to the College Deans and by February 15, 2021 to the Office of Academic Assessment describing progress toward recommended actions #2 and #3.**

****Next FULL Self-Study due by October 1, 2022 to the College Deans and by November 1, 2022 to the Office of Academic Assessment.**