

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

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

*Note: All non-accredited programs are required to complete this form. Include Assessment Reporting Forms for each learning outcome assessed.*

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

**Department: Philosophy**

**College: Arts and Humanities**

**Date: Oct. 22, 2007**

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

**Theodore Gracyk**

**2. List of All Student Learning Outcomes.** (List 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. Describe how your program has addressed the comments from the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee during the past two academic years? (If you have made changes to your plan, file a revised Assessment Plan Cover Sheet and Assessment Planning Form(s).)**

No comments to address. We worked on an instrument for assessing SLO 3 and we are filing a revised Plan.

**4. If you have received an Instructional Improvement Grant in the past two years, identify the outcomes on which the grant was based and provide a summary here of the results from your grant.**

Yes. The grant was based on disappointing results when assessing student abilities in discussion and presentations. Thanks to the grant, two professors worked together to create an instrument that can be used to assess presentations in advanced philosophy courses and in the capstone course.

## **5. Signatures**

---

Department Chair or Program Director

---

Dean or Director

### **Required Attachments:**

1. Assessment Reporting Forms
2. Records of department meetings when Assessment Report was discussed and approved.

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

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

*Instructions: Include this form for each student learning outcome assessed during the previous year. Include Assessment Report Cover Sheet.*

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

**1. Learning outcome assessed (please include the number of the outcome to correspond with the list on the cover sheet).**

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

**2. Describe assessment measure used for this learning outcome (attach instrument or rubric)**

**Evaluation of Philosophy Student Portfolio, Learning Outcome 1**

**3. Expected/satisfactory student results (from assessment plan)**

**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.**

**4. Actual results from the past year (attach additional information, if necessary)**

**5 students assessed, average score 2.0**

**5. Describe and explain available trend data for student performance on this outcome over the past several years. In other words, describe how the results of this measure have changed over the past several years.**

**No discernable change.**

**6. Proposed action in response to results.** (Please note if improvements can be made with existing department resources. If improvements cannot be made with existing department resources, consider applying for an Instructional Improvement Grant.)

**No action planned.**

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

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

*Instructions: Include this form for each student learning outcome assessed during the previous year. Include Assessment Report Cover Sheet.*

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

**1. Learning outcome assessed (please include the number of the outcome to correspond with the list on the cover sheet).**

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

**2. Describe assessment measure used for this learning outcome (attach instrument or rubric)**

**Evaluation of Philosophy Student Portfolio, Learning Outcome 2**

**3. Expected/satisfactory student results (from assessment plan)**

**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.**

**4. Actual results from the past year (attach additional information, if necessary)**

**5 students assessed. Average score 2.4**

**5. Describe and explain available trend data for student performance on this outcome over the past several years. In other words, describe how the results of this measure have changed over the past several years.**

**No discernable change.**

**6. Proposed action in response to results.** (Please note if improvements can be made with existing department resources. If improvements cannot be made with existing department resources, consider applying for an Instructional Improvement Grant.)

**No action planned.**

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

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

*Instructions: Include this form for each student learning outcome assessed during the previous year. Include Assessment Report Cover Sheet.*

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

**1. Learning outcome assessed (please include the number of the outcome 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. Describe assessment measure used for this learning outcome (attach instrument or rubric)**

**Instrument:**Evaluation of Philosophy Student Portfolio, Learning Outcome 4  
**Instrument:** Graduation Audit for Outcome 4

**3. Expected/satisfactory student results (from assessment plan)**

**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**

**4. Actual results from the past year (attach additional information, if necessary)**

**Evaluation of Student Portfolio: 5 students assessed**

- |   |                                       |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| <b>(A) Student knows major figures . . .</b>      | <b>Average score: 2.0 (3.0 scale)</b> |
| <b>(B) Student knows subject areas . . .</b>      | <b>Average score: 2.4 (3.0 scale)</b> |
| <b>(C) Student understands major issues . . .</b> | <b>Average score: 2.2 (3.0 scale)</b> |
| <b>(D) Different approaches . . .</b>             | <b>Average score: 0.4 (3.0 scale)</b> |

**OVERALL AVERAGE: 1.4**

**Graduation Audit: 5 students assessed.**

- |   |                                       |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| <b>(A) Student knows major figures . . .</b>      | <b>Average score: 1.8 (2.0 scale)</b> |
| <b>(B) Student knows subject areas . . .</b>      | <b>Average score: 1.4 (2.0 scale)</b> |
| <b>(C) Student understands major issues . . .</b> | <b>Average score: 1.4 (2.0 scale)</b> |
| <b>(D) Different approaches . . .</b>             | <b>Average score: 1.2 (2.0 scale)</b> |

**OVERALL AVERAGE: 1.39**

**The interesting result of using two different measures is that the first (looking at papers written by students) shows majors as collectively below expectations in the area of understanding different approaches to philosophy. However, the graduation audit shows that the students collectively meeting expectations. So although students are taking courses that require them to learn about different approaches, few of them are including those papers in their portfolios.**

**5. Describe and explain available trend data for student performance on this outcome over the past several years. In other words, describe how the results of this measure have changed over the past several years.**

**No discernable change with Portfolio assessment. First use of Graduation Audit, so no trend.**

**6. Proposed action in response to results.** (Please note if improvements can be made with existing department resources. If improvements cannot be made with existing department resources, consider applying for an Instructional Improvement Grant.)

**No action planned.**

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

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

*Instructions: Include this form for each student learning outcome assessed during the previous year. Include Assessment Report Cover Sheet.*

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

**1. Learning outcome assessed (please include the number of the outcome to correspond with the list on the cover sheet).**

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

**2. Describe assessment measure used for this learning outcome (attach instrument or rubric)**

**Instrument:**Evaluation of Philosophy Student Portfolio, Learning Outcome 5

**3. Expected/satisfactory student results (from assessment plan)**

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

**4. Actual results from the past year (attach additional information, if necessary)**

**5 students assessed. Average score 2.4**

**5. Describe and explain available trend data for student performance on this outcome over the past several years. In other words, describe how the results of this measure have changed over the past several years.**

**No discernable change with Portfolio assessment. First use of Graduation Audit, so no trend.**

**6. Proposed action in response to results.** (Please note if improvements can be made with existing department resources. If improvements cannot be made with existing department resources, consider applying for an Instructional Improvement Grant.)

**No action planned.**

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

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

*Instructions: Include this form for each student learning outcome assessed during the previous year. Include Assessment Report Cover Sheet.*

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

**1. Learning outcome assessed (please include the number of the outcome to correspond with the list on the cover sheet).**

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

**2. Describe assessment measure used for this learning outcome (attach instrument or rubric)**

**Instrument:**Evaluation of Philosophy Student Portfolio, Learning Outcome 6

**3. Expected/satisfactory student results (from assessment plan)**

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

**4. Actual results from the past year (attach additional information, if necessary)**

**5 students assessed. Average score 2.0**

**5. Describe and explain available trend data for student performance on this outcome over the past several years. In other words, describe how the results of this measure have changed over the past several years.**

**No discernable change with Portfolio assessment.**

**6. Proposed action in response to results.** (Please note if improvements can be made with existing department resources. If improvements cannot be made with existing department resources, consider applying for an Instructional Improvement Grant.)

**No action planned.**

**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: 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.

**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