

**Minnesota State University Moorhead  
2007-2008 Assessment Plan Cover Sheet**

(An electronic version of this form can be accessed at <http://www.mnstate.edu/assess>)

*Note: Complete this form only if you are changing your student learning outcomes and/or methods of assessment.*

**Degree Program: Philosophy B.A.**

**Department: Philosophy**

**College: Arts and Humanities**

**Date: Oct. 22, 2007**

Is this assessment plan your existing plan, a new assessment plan or a revision of an existing plan?

Existing                       New                       Revision

**1. Name(s) of Department Assessment Coordinator and/or Assessment Committee Members**

Theodore Gracyk

**2. List of All Student Learning Outcomes.** (List and number all outcomes, placing an asterisk (\*) by the outcomes you are assessing this year.)

- \*1: Philosophy majors should be able to read and understand standard philosophical texts.
- \*2: Philosophy majors should be able to write philosophical essays.
- \*3. Philosophy majors should be able to engage in philosophical discussion and make oral presentations of their research.
- \*4: Philosophy majors should know the views of major philosophers, know the primary issues in the major subject areas, and know both contemporary and non-mainstream approaches to philosophy.
- \*5: Philosophy majors should be able to evaluate and construct philosophical arguments.
- \*6: Philosophy majors should be able to engage in original philosophical research.

**3. Signatures**

---

Department Chair or Program Director

---

Dean or Director

Required Attachments:

1. Assessment Planning Forms
2. Records of department meetings when Assessment Plan was discussed and approved.

**Minnesota State University Moorhead  
2007-2008 Assessment Planning Form**

(An electronic version of this form can be accessed at <http://www.mnstate.edu/assess>)

*Note: Complete this form only if you are changing your student learning outcomes and/or methods of assessment. Include Assessment Plan Cover Sheet.*

**Academic Program:** Philosophy B.A.

**1. Identify Student Learning Outcome in the space below and note its number (to correspond with the list on the cover sheet):**

1: Philosophy majors should be able to read and understand standard philosophical texts.

**2. Which MSUM mission goals are addressed by this learning outcome? (check all that apply)**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Knowledge/content	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information literacy
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Intellectual development	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lifelong learning
<input type="checkbox"/> Talents	<input type="checkbox"/> Service
<input type="checkbox"/> Critical thinking	<input type="checkbox"/> Citizenship
<input type="checkbox"/> Oral communication	<input type="checkbox"/> Responsibility and ethics
<input type="checkbox"/> Written communication	<input type="checkbox"/> Global understanding
<input type="checkbox"/> Mathematics/statistics	<input type="checkbox"/> Other:
<input type="checkbox"/> Multiculturalism/diversity	<input type="checkbox"/> Other:

**3. How is this learning outcome achieved through the program's curriculum? Identify the courses or extra-curricular opportunities that address this outcome.**

The curriculum requires a minimum of 36 credits of philosophy; at least 27 of the 36 credits involve the study of such texts. The only courses that do not address this outcome are courses in logic; a student can apply no more than 9 credits of this topic to the 36.

**4. What methods of assessment will be used for this outcome? (Specify instrument and submit electronically with plan.)**

Assessed as part of senior project assessment by assessing students who complete portfolios.

Instrument: Evaluation of Philosophy Student Portfolio, Learning Outcome 1

**5. Who is assessed? When are they assessed?**

Every graduating senior is required to take our capstone course, Phil 498. They can elect to complete a portfolio of papers written in philosophy courses. For students who choose this option, we can gather direct evidence (content of student papers demonstrating evidence of reading ability) and indirect (student's self-assessment in the project's self-analysis essay).

**6. Who is responsible in the department for collecting data? How and when will the results be discussed by members of the program?**

When a student elects to complete a portfolio, the department chair assigns two faculty members (neither of them the student's academic advisor) to independently score the student's performance using the assessment instrument; the two meet and compare their ratings, then they submit their joint assessment to the department on a copy of the instrument. The department chair annually compiles all of the instruments completed that year and results are discussed at a department meeting prior to submitting the Assessment Report.

**7. What is satisfactory student performance on this outcome?**

During each six-year assessment cycle, 95% of graduates completing portfolios meet expectations by achieving an average score of 2 or above on the assessment instrument.

**Minnesota State University Moorhead  
2007-2008 Assessment Planning Form**

(An electronic version of this form can be accessed at <http://www.mnstate.edu/assess>)

*Note: Complete this form only if you are changing your student learning outcomes and/or methods of assessment. Include Assessment Plan Cover Sheet.*

**Academic Program:** Philosophy B.A.

**1. Identify Student Learning Outcome in the space below and note its number (to correspond with the list on the cover sheet):**

2. Philosophy majors should be able to write philosophical essays.

**2. Which MSUM mission goals are addressed by this learning outcome? (check all that apply)**

<input type="checkbox"/> Knowledge/content	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information literacy
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Intellectual development	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lifelong learning
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Talents	<input type="checkbox"/> Service
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Critical thinking	<input type="checkbox"/> Citizenship
<input type="checkbox"/> Oral communication	<input type="checkbox"/> Responsibility and ethics
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Written communication	<input type="checkbox"/> Global understanding
<input type="checkbox"/> Mathematics/statistics	<input type="checkbox"/> Other:
<input type="checkbox"/> Multiculturalism/diversity	<input type="checkbox"/> Other:

**3. How is this learning outcome achieved through the program's curriculum? Identify the courses or extra-curricular opportunities that address this outcome.**

The curriculum requires a minimum of 36 credits of philosophy; at least 27 of the 36 credits involve some formal writing. The only courses that do not address this outcome are courses in logic; a student can apply no more than 9 credits of this topic to the 36.

Effective fall, 2007, PHIL 300 (History of Ethics) has been approved as a writing intensive course requiring a research paper. The course is required of all philosophy majors.

**4. What methods of assessment will be used for this outcome? (Specify instrument and submit electronically with plan.)**

Assessed as part of senior project.

Instrument: Depending on student plan in PHIL 498, either the Evaluation of Philosophy Student Portfolio or items A, B, C of the Standards for Oral Presentation

**5. Who is assessed? When are they assessed?**

Every graduating senior is required to take our capstone course, Phil 498. They can elect to complete a portfolio of papers written in philosophy courses, or they can substantially revise a paper written for a previous philosophy course. For students who choose to do the portfolio, we can gather direct evidence (content of student papers demonstrating evidence of writing ability) and indirect (student's self-assessment in the project's self-analysis essay). For students who choose the single longer paper, we can gather direct evidence of writing ability (covered by item A, B, C of the Standards for Oral Presentation).

**6. Who is responsible in the department for collecting data? How and when will the results be discussed by members of the program?**

When a student elects to complete a portfolio, the department chair assigns two faculty members (neither of them the student's academic advisor) to independently score the student's performance using the assessment instrument; the two meet and compare their ratings, then they submit their joint assessment to the department on a copy of the instrument. The department chair annually compiles all of the instruments completed that year and results are discussed at a department meeting prior to submitting the Assessment Report.

When a student elects to do the single longer paper, all faculty are expected to read and evaluate the paper submitted by that student; faculty will then compare their ratings and the department chair will combine them into a single document. The department chair annually compiles all of the instruments completed that year and results are discussed at a department meeting prior to submitting the Assessment Report.

**7. What is satisfactory student performance on this outcome?**

During each six-year assessment cycle, 95% of graduates completing portfolios meet expectations by achieving an average score of 2 or above on the assessment instrument.

**Minnesota State University Moorhead**  
**2007-2008 Assessment Planning Form**

(An electronic version of this form can be accessed at <http://www.mnstate.edu/assess>)

*Note: Complete this form only if you are changing your student learning outcomes and/or methods of assessment. Include Assessment Plan Cover Sheet.*

**Academic Program:** Philosophy B.A.

**1. Identify Student Learning Outcome in the space below and note its number (to correspond with the list on the cover sheet):**

3. Philosophy majors should be able to engage in philosophical discussion and make oral presentations of their research.

**2. Which MSUM mission goals are addressed by this learning outcome? (check all that apply)**

<input type="checkbox"/> Knowledge/content	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information literacy
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Intellectual development	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lifelong learning
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Talents	<input type="checkbox"/> Service
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Critical thinking	<input type="checkbox"/> Citizenship
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oral communication	<input type="checkbox"/> Responsibility and ethics
<input type="checkbox"/> Written communication	<input type="checkbox"/> Global understanding
<input type="checkbox"/> Mathematics/statistics	<input type="checkbox"/> Other:
<input type="checkbox"/> Multiculturalism/diversity	<input type="checkbox"/> Other:

**3. How is this learning outcome achieved through the program's curriculum? Identify the courses or extra-curricular opportunities that address this outcome.**

The curriculum requires philosophy majors to complete either PHIL 407 or 408.

Effective fall 2007, the course descriptions for those courses indicate that the course requires an oral presentation. This course will build on skills acquired in SPCH 100 (or equivalent). This oral presentation will be assessed by the instructor, who is responsible for conveying expectations about oral presentations to the students.

All majors are then required to take PHIL 498 (our capstone senior project). Students can elect to satisfy this requirement by revising a paper and then presenting it to the department. For students electing this option, the oral presentation will be assessed.

Prior to presentation as part of PHIL 498, all philosophy majors are encouraged to make an oral presentation either at the MSUM Student Academic Conference or the Minnesota Student Philosophical Society spring meeting.

**4. What methods of assessment will be used for this outcome? (Specify instrument and submit electronically with plan.)**

Direct assessment of oral presentations at least once during the major, and as many as three times during the major.

Instrument: Standards for Oral Presentation, Philosophy Department

**5. Who is assessed? When are they assessed?**

Every student enrolled in PHIL 407 and 408 is assessed for items D, E, F of the evaluation instrument, providing an initial assessment. (Students who take both classes will be assessed each time.) In addition, every graduating senior is required to take our capstone course, PHIL 498 (our capstone senior project). Students can elect to satisfy this requirement by revising a paper and then presenting it to the department. For students electing this option, the oral presentation will be assessed.

**6. Who is responsible in the department for collecting data? How and when will the results be discussed by members of the program?**

Each year, the department offers either PHIL 407 or 408. Each time that one of these is offered, the instructor will assess student oral presentations using the designated instrument. The department chair annually compiles all of the instruments completed that year and results are discussed at a department meeting prior to submitting the Assessment Report.

When a student elects to do the oral presentation in PHIL 498, all faculty are expected to observe the student's oral presentation; all participating faculty will complete the designated instrument and will then compare their ratings. The department chair will compile these results into a single assessment of the student. The department chair annually compiles all of the instruments completed that year and results are discussed at a department meeting prior to submitting the Assessment Report.

Although satisfactory student performance will be measured in terms of PHIL 498, collecting the data in 407 & 408 will allow us to monitor progress.

**7. What is satisfactory student performance on this outcome?**

During each six-year assessment cycle, 95% of graduates completing senior project oral presentations will meet expectations by achieving an average score of 2 or above on the assessment instrument.

**Minnesota State University Moorhead  
2007-2008 Assessment Planning Form**

(An electronic version of this form can be accessed at <http://www.mnstate.edu/assess>)

*Note: Complete this form only if you are changing your student learning outcomes and/or methods of assessment. Include Assessment Plan Cover Sheet.*

**Academic Program:** Philosophy B.A.

**1. Identify Student Learning Outcome in the space below and note its number (to correspond with the list on the cover sheet):**

4. Philosophy majors should know the views of major philosophers, know the primary issues in the major subject areas, and know both contemporary and non-mainstream approaches to philosophy.

**2. Which MSUM mission goals are addressed by this learning outcome? (check all that apply)**

<input type="checkbox"/> Knowledge/content	<input type="checkbox"/> Information literacy
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Intellectual development	<input type="checkbox"/> Lifelong learning
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Talents	<input type="checkbox"/> Service
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Critical thinking	<input type="checkbox"/> Citizenship
<input type="checkbox"/> Oral communication	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Responsibility and ethics
<input type="checkbox"/> Written communication	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Global understanding
<input type="checkbox"/> Mathematics/statistics	<input type="checkbox"/> Other:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiculturalism/diversity	<input type="checkbox"/> Other:

**3. How is this learning outcome achieved through the program's curriculum? Identify the courses or extra-curricular opportunities that address this outcome.**

The curriculum requires a minimum of 36 credits of philosophy. This includes PHIL 300 (History of Ethics), PHIL 303 (Classical Phil), PHIL 305 (Modern Phil 17th Century), PHIL 306 (Modern Phil 18th Century), restricted electives requiring an additional 3 credits in the history of philosophy, and restricted electives requiring an additional 3 credits in PHIL 407 (Theory of Knowledge) or PHIL 408 (Metaphysics).

As a result, every graduating philosophy major takes 15 credits of historical courses that address major philosophers in major subject areas (including ethics), plus an additional 3 credits on contemporary approaches to major subject areas. Students also take at least eight additional elective credits within the major, and almost all of the offerings available to students address either a major philosopher or a major subject area.

Unrestricted electives allow students to study feminist theory, Asian philosophies, and other contemporary and non-mainstream approaches.

**4. What methods of assessment will be used for this outcome? (Specify instrument and submit electronically with plan.)**

Assessed as part of senior project assessment and during a graduation audit by the department chair.

Instrument: Evaluation of Philosophy Student Portfolio, Learning Outcome 4

Instrument: Graduation Audit for Outcome 4

**5. Who is assessed? When are they assessed?**

Every graduating senior is required to take our capstone course, PHIL 498. They can elect to complete a portfolio of papers written in philosophy courses, or they can substantially revise a paper written for a previous philosophy course. For students who choose to do the portfolio, we can gather direct evidence (content of student papers demonstrating breadth of knowledge) and indirect (student's self-assessment in the project's self-analysis essay).

Audit: Each student is assessed immediately following graduation; the department chair is responsible for reviewing final transcripts of graduates immediately following each MSUM graduation. This audit provides an independent measure and ensures assessment of students who do not complete a portfolio as par of PHIL 498.

**6. Who is responsible in the department for collecting data? How and when will the results be discussed by members of the program?**

For students completing the portfolio as part of PHIL 498, the department chair assigns two faculty members (neither of them the student's academic advisor) to independently score the student's performance in the capstone project using the assessment instrument; the two meet and compare their ratings, then they submit their joint assessment to the department on a copy of the instrument. The department chair annually compiles all of the instruments completed that year and results are discussed at a department meeting prior to submitting the Assessment Report.

Following each university graduation in which a Philosophy B.A. is conferred, the department chair is responsible for analyzing a copy of the final post-graduation transcript of each graduating student. The chair will complete the Graduation Audit, which indicates whether the student met expectations for credits completed in these topics. The department chair annually compiles all of the instruments completed that year and results are discussed at a department meeting prior to submitting the Assessment Report.

**7. What is satisfactory student performance on this outcome?**

During each six-year assessment cycle, 95% of graduates meet expectations by achieving an average score of 2 or above on the portfolio assessment instrument and 95% of graduates meet expectations by achieving an average score of 1 or above on the graduation audit instrument.

**Minnesota State University Moorhead  
2007-2008 Assessment Planning Form**

(An electronic version of this form can be accessed at <http://www.mnstate.edu/assess>)

*Note: Complete this form only if you are changing your student learning outcomes and/or methods of assessment. Include Assessment Plan Cover Sheet.*

**Academic Program:** Philosophy B.A.

**1. Identify Student Learning Outcome in the space below and note its number (to correspond with the list on the cover sheet):**

5: Philosophy majors should be able to evaluate and construct philosophical arguments.

**2. Which MSUM mission goals are addressed by this learning outcome? (check all that apply)**

<input type="checkbox"/> Knowledge/content	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information literacy
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Intellectual development	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lifelong learning
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Talents	<input type="checkbox"/> Service
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Critical thinking	<input type="checkbox"/> Citizenship
<input type="checkbox"/> Oral communication	<input type="checkbox"/> Responsibility and ethics
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Written communication	<input type="checkbox"/> Global understanding
<input type="checkbox"/> Mathematics/statistics	<input type="checkbox"/> Other:
<input type="checkbox"/> Multiculturalism/diversity	<input type="checkbox"/> Other:

**3. How is this learning outcome achieved through the program's curriculum? Identify the courses or extra-curricular opportunities that address this outcome.**

The curriculum requires PHIL 340, Symbolic Logic, which trains students in argument construction and evaluation. The curriculum also includes PHIL 110, Practical Reasoning, which emphasizes critical thinking. A majority of our majors take this as an elective within the major.

All philosophy courses except World Religions involve evaluation and construction of philosophical arguments, so at least 33 of a student's 36 minimum credits address this outcome.

**4. What methods of assessment will be used for this outcome? (Specify instrument and submit electronically with plan.)**

Assessed as part of senior project assessment (currently limited to senior portfolios).

Instrument: Evaluation of Philosophy Student Portfolio, Learning Outcome 5

**5. Who is assessed? When are they assessed?**

Every graduating senior is required to take our capstone course, PHIL 498. They can elect to complete a portfolio of papers written in philosophy courses, or they can substantially revise a paper written for a previous philosophy course. For students who choose to do the portfolio, we can gather direct evidence (faculty assess a minimum of four essays providing a minimum of 25 pages of writing) and indirect (student's self-assessment in the project's self-analysis essay).

**6. Who is responsible in the department for collecting data? How and when will the results be discussed by members of the program?**

For students completing the portfolio as part of PHIL 498, the department chair assigns two faculty members (neither of them the student's academic advisor) to independently score the student's performance in the capstone project using the assessment instrument. The two meet and compare their ratings, then they submit their joint assessment to the department on a copy of the instrument. The department chair annually compiles all of the instruments completed that year and results are discussed at a department meeting prior to submitting the Assessment Report.

**7. What is satisfactory student performance on this outcome?**

During each six-year assessment cycle, 95% of graduates meet expectations by achieving an average score of 2 or above on the assessment instrument.

**Minnesota State University Moorhead  
2007-2008 Assessment Planning Form**

(An electronic version of this form can be accessed at <http://www.mnstate.edu/assess>)

*Note: Complete this form only if you are changing your student learning outcomes and/or methods of assessment. Include Assessment Plan Cover Sheet.*

**Academic Program:** Philosophy B.A.

**1. Identify Student Learning Outcome in the space below and note its number (to correspond with the list on the cover sheet):**

6: Philosophy majors should be able to engage in original philosophical research.

**2. Which MSUM mission goals are addressed by this learning outcome? (check all that apply)**

<input type="checkbox"/> Knowledge/content	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information literacy
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Intellectual development	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lifelong learning
<input type="checkbox"/> Talents	<input type="checkbox"/> Service
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Critical thinking	<input type="checkbox"/> Citizenship
<input type="checkbox"/> Oral communication	<input type="checkbox"/> Responsibility and ethics
<input type="checkbox"/> Written communication	<input type="checkbox"/> Global understanding
<input type="checkbox"/> Mathematics/statistics	<input type="checkbox"/> Other:
<input type="checkbox"/> Multiculturalism/diversity	<input type="checkbox"/> Other:

**3. How is this learning outcome achieved through the program's curriculum? Identify the courses or extra-curricular opportunities that address this outcome.**

Many advanced courses in the major assign research papers to the students.

**4. What methods of assessment will be used for this outcome? (Specify instrument and submit electronically with plan.)**

Assessed as part of senior project. Instrument: Evaluation of Philosophy Student Portfolio, Learning Outcome 6

Assessed in required writing intensive course (PHIL 300): Instrument: Evaluation of Student Research Outcomes in Writing Course

**5. Who is assessed? When are they assessed?**

Every philosophy major must take PHIL 300 as the major's writing intensive course. At least one of the formal writing assignments for that course will be a research paper. Every student in PHIL 300 will be assessed for research skills each time the course is taught.

Every graduating senior is required to take our capstone course, PHIL 498. They can elect to complete a portfolio of papers written in philosophy courses, or they can substantially revise a paper written for a previous philosophy course. For students who choose to do the portfolio, we can gather direct evidence (faculty assess a minimum of four essays providing a minimum of 25 pages of writing) and indirect (student's self-assessment in the project's self-analysis essay).

**6. Who is responsible in the department for collecting data? How and when will the results be discussed by members of the program?**

For students in PHIL 300, the course instructor is responsible for completing the assessment instrument. The department chair annually compiles them and results are discussed at a department meeting prior to submitting the Assessment Report.

For students completing the portfolio as part of PHIL 498, the department chair assigns two faculty members (neither of them the student's academic advisor) to independently score the student's performance in the capstone project using the assessment instrument. The two meet and compare their ratings, then they submit their joint assessment to the department on a copy of the instrument. The department chair annually compiles all of the instruments completed that year and results are discussed at a department meeting prior to submitting the Assessment Report.

**7. What is satisfactory student performance on this outcome?**

During each six-year assessment cycle, 95% of graduates meet expectations by achieving an average score of 2 or above on the assessment instrument.

**INSTRUMENT: Evaluation of Philosophy Student Portfolio**

Learning Outcome 1: Philosophy majors should be able to read and understand standard philosophical texts.

Evaluator: Check one box in each row across. Compare results with second faculty assigned to this portfolio; submit combined assessment.

<b>Attributes related to student learning outcome</b>	<b>Qualities assigned 0 points</b>	<b>Qualities assigned 1 point (below expectations)</b>	<b>Qualities assigned 2 points (meets expectations)</b>	<b>Qualities assigned 3 points (exceeds expectations)</b>
(A) Student identifies the main point(s) being made in the writing.	Student cannot identify it.	Student does not regularly identify it.	Student regularly identifies it.	Student always identifies it.
(B) Student locates the main argument(s) given in support of main point(s).	Student cannot locate it.	Student does not regularly locate it.	Student regularly locates it.	Student always locates it.
(C) Student paraphrases and summarizes (in own words) the main point(s) and argument(s).	Student cannot paraphrase them in own words.	Student has difficulty paraphrasing.	Student regularly succeeds at paraphrase.	Student always offers clear and accurate paraphrases.

**INSTRUMENT: Evaluation of Philosophy Student Portfolio**

Learning Outcome 2: Philosophy majors should be able to write philosophical essays.

Evaluator: Check one box in each row across. Compare results with second faculty assigned to this portfolio; submit combined assessment.

<b>Attributes related to student learning outcome</b>	<b>Qualities assigned 0 points</b>	<b>Qualities assigned 1 point (below expectations)</b>	<b>Qualities assigned 2 points (meets expectations)</b>	<b>Qualities assigned 3 points (exceeds expectations)</b>
(A) Expresses ideas clearly.	Student is never clear.	Student is regularly unclear.	Student regularly expresses ideas clearly.	Student always expresses ideas clearly.
(B) Organizes and structures essays in a coherent, logical manner.	Essays lack coherent, logical structure.	Essays often lack coherent, logical structure.	Student regularly organizes and structures essays in a coherent, logical manner.	Student always organizes and structures essays in a coherent, logical manner.
(C) Essays make clear what their main thesis and arguments are.	Main thesis and arguments are never clear.	Main thesis and arguments are often unclear.	Essays regularly make clear what their main thesis and arguments are.	Essays always make clear what their main thesis and arguments are.
(D) Essays define important concepts clearly, and use them consistently with that definition.	No definitions of important concepts provided.	Definitions of important concepts often lacking, and/or concepts used inconsistently.	Essays regularly define important concepts clearly, and use them consistently with that definition.	Essays always define important concepts clearly, and use them consistently with that definition.
(E) Student writes complete, grammatically correct sentences.	Student cannot write complete, grammatically correct sentences.	Student often writes incomplete, grammatically incorrect sentences.	Student seldom writes incomplete, grammatically incorrect sentences.	Student always writes complete, grammatically correct sentences.

(F) Essays present and defend original ideas.	Essays never present and defend original ideas.	Essays seldom present and defend original ideas.	Essays regularly present and defend original ideas.	Essays always present and defend original ideas.
(G) Essays avoid irrelevant material.	Essays contain substantial amounts of irrelevant material.	Essays often introduce irrelevant material.	Essays seldom introduce irrelevant material.	Essays never introduce irrelevant material.
(H) Essays avoid inconsistency.	Essays regularly contain inconsistency.	Essays often contain inconsistency.	Essays seldom contain inconsistency.	Essays never contain inconsistency.
(I) Student recognizes possible objections to their claims and arguments, and respond to such objections.	Student never deals with possible objections.	Students seldom deals with possible objections.	Student regularly deals with possible objections.	Students always deal with possible objections.
(J) Student uses original examples to help clarify ideas.	Student uses original examples to help clarify ideas.	Student seldom uses original examples to help clarify ideas.	Student regularly uses original examples to help clarify ideas.	Student always uses original examples to help clarify ideas.
(K) Student improves essays by re-writing and revision.	No evidence that student engages in re-writing and revision.	Student sometimes improves essays by re-writing and revision.	Student regularly improves essays by re-writing and revision.	Student always improves essays by re-writing and revision.

INSTRUMENT: Standards for Oral Presentation, Philosophy Department

Attributes Related to Student Learning Outcome	Qualities Assigned 0 points	Qualities Assigned 1 points (below expectations)	Qualities Assigned 2 points (meets expectations)	Qualities Assigned 3 points (exceeds expectations)
(A) Topic of paper is orally deliverable and appropriate in scope (neither too broad nor too narrow).	Paper's topic is unmanageable in scope or one that is not orally deliverable.	The scope of the paper's topic makes adequate written treatment or oral presentation of it difficult.	Topic is appropriate in scope both for adequate written treatment and oral presentation.	The topic's scope is maximal for both written treatment and oral presentation.
(B) Paper is organized well and documents sources correctly.	Paper shows no or very little organization, or documents sources incorrectly or not at all.	Paper is arranged well overall but transitions are unclear.	Paper is clear in articulating the function of each of its parts and transitions.	Paper's organization is fully transparent, both overall and in its parts, to reader or listener throughout.
(C) Paper articulates content clearly (including anticipating and responding to counter-argument).	Paper is unclear in its articulation of thesis, supporting argumentation, or response to counter-argument.	Paper is minimally clear in articulating thesis, supporting argument, or response to counter-argument.	Paper is clear in its articulation of thesis, supporting argumentation and response to counter-argument.	Paper is clear in its articulation of thesis, supporting argumentation and counter-argument despite exceptional complexity of topic.
(D) Student presents with appropriate volume, enunciation and pacing.	Student presents with inappropriate volume, enunciation or pacing.	Student's volume, enunciation or pacing is uneven or not communicative to audience.	Student presents with adequate volume, enunciation, and pacing.	Student's volume, enunciation, and pacing are excellent throughout.

(E) Student engages audience and maintains their attention through effective speaking style.	Student fails to engage audience or maintain their attention through speaking style.	Student does not consistently engage or maintain audience's attention through effective speaking style.	Student engages and maintains audience attention through effective speaking style.	Student engages fully and continuously maintains audience attention through effective speaking style.
(F) Student listens and responds after presentation to all questions and comments appropriately and respectfully.	Student does not listen or respond appropriately or respectfully to audience members' questions or comments.	Student listens and responds appropriately and respectfully to few audience members' questions or comments.	Student listens and responds appropriately and respectfully to most audience members' questions or comments.	Student listens and responds appropriately and respectfully to all questions or comments posed by audience members.

09/17/07

CHECK ONE:

\_\_\_\_\_ Evaluation of senior project presentation (complete all rows)

\_\_\_\_\_ Evaluation of oral presentations in PHIL 407 & 408

(do not complete rows A, B, C unless applicable)

SCORE: Add the score from the completed rows: \_\_\_\_\_

Divide that sum by the number of completed rows: \_\_\_\_\_

Student Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Term assessed: \_\_\_\_\_

Faculty conducting this assessment: \_\_\_\_\_

**INSTRUMENT: Evaluation of Philosophy Student Portfolio**

Learning Outcome 4: Philosophy majors should know the views of major philosophers, know the primary issues in the major subject areas, and know both contemporary and non-mainstream approaches to philosophy.

Evaluator: Check one box in each row across. Compare results with second faculty assigned to this portfolio; submit combined assessment.

<b>Attributes related to student learning outcome</b>	<b>Qualities assigned 0 points</b>	<b>Qualities assigned 1 point (below expectations)</b>	<b>Qualities assigned 2 points (meets expectations)</b>	<b>Qualities assigned 3 points (exceeds expectations)</b>
(A) Student knows major figures and developments in the history of Western philosophy.	Student essays do not demonstrate this knowledge.	Student essays do not regularly display this knowledge.	Student essays regularly display this knowledge.	Student essays always display this knowledge.
(B) Students knows the issues in major subject areas in philosophy. (See list below)	Student essays do not demonstrate this knowledge.	One student essay displays this knowledge.	Two student essays display this knowledge.	Three or more student essays display this knowledge.
(C) Student understands some major issues in contemporary philosophy. (See list below)	Student essays do not demonstrate this knowledge.	One student essay displays this knowledge.	Two student essays display this knowledge.	Three or more student essays display this knowledge.
(D) Student understands different approaches to philosophy and alternative philosophical styles. (See list below)	Student essays do not demonstrate this knowledge.	One student essay displays this knowledge.	Two student essays display this knowledge.	Three or more student essays display this knowledge.

- Major subject areas in philosophy specifically include ethics, elementary symbolic logic, epistemology, and metaphysics.
- Major issues in contemporary philosophy specifically include the mind-body problem, deontology vs. consequentialism, free will vs. determinism, the nature of justification, personal identity, and the problem of evil.
- Different approaches to philosophy and alternative philosophical styles specifically include feminism, phenomenology, and non-Western philosophy.

**ASSESSMENT TOOL FOR LEARNING OUTCOME 4: Graduation Audit**

**Learning Outcome 4:** Philosophy majors should know the views of major philosophers, know the primary issues in the major subject areas, and know both contemporary and non-mainstream approaches to philosophy.

**Procedure:** Department chair initiates this form when student seeks chair approval for graduation; department fills out name & date and gives the form to the department secretary; each semester and summer, department secretary obtains transcripts for previous semester's philosophy graduates, and department chair uses them to complete the form.

Student Name \_\_\_\_\_ Date of graduation: \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Attributes related to student learning outcome</b>	<b>Qualities assigned 0 points (below expectations)</b>	<b>Qualities assigned 1 point (meets expectations)</b>	<b>Qualities assigned 2 points (exceeds expectations)</b>
(A) Student knows major figures and developments in the history of Western philosophy.	Student is graduating without completing required upper division courses on ancient and modern philosophy.	Student completed required upper division courses on ancient and modern philosophy with an average of B or less.	Student completed required upper division courses on ancient and modern philosophy with an average of B+ or better.
(B) Student knows the issues in major subject areas in philosophy. (See list below)	Student graduated without completing three upper division courses among ethics, symbolic logic, and restricted elective in subject areas.	Student completed three or more upper division courses in subject areas with an average of B or less.	Student completed four or more upper division courses in subject areas with average of B+ or better.
(C) Student understands some major issues in contemporary philosophy. (See list below)	Student is graduating without completing any upper division courses focused on major issues.	Student completed one or more upper division courses focused on major issues with an average of B or less.	Student completed two or more upper division courses focused on major issues with average of B+ or better.
(D) Student understands different approaches to philosophy and alternative philosophical styles. (See list below)	Student is graduating without completing any upper division courses in these areas.	Student completed one or more upper division courses focused on these approaches with an average of B or less.	Student completed two or more upper division courses focused on these approaches with average of B+ or better.

TOTAL POINTS FROM 4 ROWS: \_\_\_\_\_ ÷ 4 = \_\_\_\_\_

- Major subject areas in philosophy specifically include ethics, elementary symbolic logic, epistemology, and metaphysics.
- Major issues in contemporary philosophy specifically include the mind-body problem, deontology vs. consequentialism, free will vs. determinism, the nature of justification, personal identity, and the problem of evil.
- Different approaches to philosophy and alternative philosophical styles specifically include feminism, phenomenology, and non-Western philosophy.

**INSTRUMENT: Evaluation of Philosophy Student Portfolio**

Learning Outcome 5: Philosophy majors should be able to evaluate and construct philosophical arguments.

Evaluator: Check one box in each row across. Compare results with second faculty assigned to this portfolio; submit combined assessment.

<b>Attributes related to student learning outcome</b>	<b>Qualities assigned 0 points</b>	<b>Qualities assigned 1 point (below expectations)</b>	<b>Qualities assigned 2 points (meets expectations)</b>	<b>Qualities assigned 3 points (exceeds expectations)</b>
(A) Student identifies and clearly expresses conclusions and premises of arguments.	Student cannot identify them.	Student does not regularly identify them.	Student regularly identifies them.	Student always identifies them.
(B) Student explores the implications of premises and conclusions.	Student cannot identify implications.	Student does not regularly explore implications.	Student regularly explores implications.	Student always explores implications.
(C) Student assesses the logical strength of arguments.	Student cannot assess them.	Student has difficulty assessing them.	Student regularly assesses them.	Student always assesses them.
(D) Student assesses the plausibility of premises.	Student cannot assess them.	Student has difficulty assessing them.	Student regularly assesses them.	Student always assesses them.
(E) Student concentrates on major issues in evaluating arguments.	Student cannot distinguish major issues from minor ones.	Student seldom concentrates on major issues.	Student regularly concentrates on major issues.	Student always concentrates on major issues.
(F) Student compares arguments with alternatives.	Student cannot identify alternative arguments.	Student seldom identifies alternative arguments.	Student regularly identifies alternative arguments.	Student always identifies alternative arguments.

(G) Student recognizes the fallacies of others.	Student cannot identify fallacies.	Student seldom identifies fallacies.	Student regularly identifies fallacies.	Student always identifies fallacies.
(H) Student avoids fallacies when constructing arguments.	Student's arguments are regularly fallacious.	Student's arguments are frequently fallacious.	Student's arguments are seldom fallacious.	Student's arguments are never fallacious.
(I) Student assesses the credibility of sources used.	Student never assesses credibility of sources.	Student seldom assesses credibility of sources.	Student regularly assesses credibility of sources.	Student always assesses credibility of sources.

**INSTRUMENT: Evaluation of Philosophy Student Portfolio**

Learning Outcome 6: Philosophy majors should be able to engage in original philosophical research.

Evaluator: Check one box in each row across. Compare results with second faculty assigned to this portfolio; submit combined assessment.

<b>Attributes related to student learning outcome</b>	<b>Qualities assigned 0 points</b>	<b>Qualities assigned 1 point (below expectations)</b>	<b>Qualities assigned 2 points (meets expectations)</b>	<b>Qualities assigned 3 points (exceeds expectations)</b>
(A) Student reads and understands philosophical texts independently.	Student does not understand texts read independently.	Student seldom understands text read independently.	Student regularly understands texts read independently.	Student always understands texts read independently.
(B) Student finds and uses appropriate secondary sources.	Student never uses secondary sources.	Student seldom uses secondary sources, or regularly uses inappropriate ones.	Student regularly finds and uses appropriate secondary sources.	Student always finds and uses appropriate secondary sources.
(C) Student uses proper scholarly format for writing papers.	Student never uses proper scholarly format.	Student has difficulty using proper scholarly format.	Student regularly uses proper scholarly format.	Student always uses proper scholarly format.
(D) Student prepares bibliographies as appropriate.	Student never prepares bibliographies.	Student has difficulty preparing bibliographies.	Student regularly prepares bibliographies as appropriate.	Student always prepares bibliographies as appropriate.

INSTRUMENT: Evaluation of Student Research Outcomes in Writing Course

Learning Outcome 6: Philosophy majors should be able to engage in original philosophical research.

Student Name \_\_\_\_\_

Faculty Evaluator \_\_\_\_\_

Date of evaluation \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator: Check one box in each row across.

<b>Attributes related to student learning outcome</b>	<b>Qualities assigned 0 points</b>	<b>Qualities assigned 1 point (below expectations)</b>	<b>Qualities assigned 2 points (meets expectations)</b>	<b>Qualities assigned 3 points (exceeds expectations)</b>
(A) Student reads and understands philosophical texts independently.	Student does not understand texts read independently.	Student seldom understands text read independently.	Student regularly understands texts read independently.	Student always understands texts read independently.
(B) Student finds and uses appropriate secondary sources.	Student never uses secondary sources.	Student seldom uses secondary sources, or regularly uses inappropriate ones.	Student regularly finds and uses appropriate secondary sources.	Student always finds and uses appropriate secondary sources.
(C) Student uses proper scholarly format for writing papers.	Student never uses proper scholarly format.	Student has difficulty using proper scholarly format.	Student regularly uses proper scholarly format.	Student always uses proper scholarly format.
(D) Student prepares bibliographies as appropriate.	Student never prepares bibliographies.	Student has difficulty preparing bibliographies.	Student regularly prepares bibliographies as appropriate.	Student always prepares bibliographies as appropriate.

TOTAL POINTS FROM 4 ROWS: \_\_\_\_\_ ÷ 4 = \_\_\_\_\_

**Minutes**  
**Philosophy Department Meeting**  
**Wednesday, October 31, 2007**

Present: Faculty; Randy Cagle, Konrad Czynski, Ted Gracyk, Chang-Seong Hong, Christine Metzko, Philip Mouch, Administrative Assistant; Ginny Bachmann, Student Representatives; Nathan Wood, Jennifer Sheets.

Dr. Gracyk called the meeting to order at 8:50 a.m. in MA 268.

- **2007-2008 Assessment Plan and Report Forms**  
**Form:** Instrument: Standards for Oral Presentation: on the second page, change “Divide that sum by four” to “Divide that sum by 6 or 3...”  
A few minor typos need to be corrected.  
The Assessment Plan and Report Forms were unanimously approved.
- **Tri-College Philosophy Student Conference Proposal**  
Nathan Wood proposed the possibility of a Tri-College Philosophy Student Conference. All were in favor of pursuing this, and suggested it be held next fall sometime just before the Thanksgiving holiday. Nathan will visit with the chairs from Concordia, NDSU, and possibly UND. A suggestion was made to have a faculty member as a keynote speaker. A suggested title was “Student Philosophy Conference of the Red River Valley.”
- **2008 Summer Schedule**

Mouch:	PHIL 312 Business Ethics – 1 <sup>st</sup> session
Gracyk:	ART/PHIL 320 Phil of Art – 1 <sup>st</sup> session (chair’s duty days)
	PHIL 311 Morals & Medicine – 2 <sup>nd</sup> session
	PHIL 318 Professional Ethics – 2 <sup>nd</sup> session
Cagle:	PHIL 110 Practical Reasoning – 1 <sup>st</sup> session
Czynski:	PHIL 120 World Religions – 2 <sup>nd</sup> session
Hamrick	PHIL 120 World Religions – 1 <sup>st</sup> session

(English)
- **Next meeting:** To be announced. Major issue: Tenure application of P. Mouch. He will let everyone know when it is available for review.
- **Meeting Adjourned:** 9:35a.m.

Respectively submitted, Ginny Bachmann