

Minnesota State University Moorhead
2008-2009 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

Department: Philosophy

College: Arts and Humanities

Date: Oct. 8, 2008

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 changes have been made while we accumulate sufficient information to spot trends.

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.

A grant application was submitted with the 06-07 report, it was approved, and work was undertaken during summer 2007 by two professors (Cagle and Hong) who created an instrument that can be used to assess oral presentations in advanced philosophy courses and during senior oral presentations. The results of this new instrument are included in this report.

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
2008-2009 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

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)

Instrument: Evaluation of Philosophy Student Portfolio, Learning Outcome 1 -- Rubric attached

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)

6 students assessed, average score of 2.27

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. We continue to meet our goal for the assessment cycle.

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
2008-2009 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

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)

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 -- Rubric attached

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)

Six students chose the portfolios, and five students chose the oral presentation. Their average score is 2.1

8 of the 11 students had an average score of 2 or above.

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.

Trend gives us 22 of 27 students achieving an average score of 2 or above, an 81.5% success rate.

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 at this time.

Minnesota State University Moorhead
2008-2009 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

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

Direct assessment of oral presentations at least once during the major, and as many as three times during the major (frequency of evaluation depends on which courses enrolled and whether student selects oral presentation for senior project).

Instrument: Standards for Oral Presentation, Philosophy Department -- Rubric attached

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

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.

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

5 students chose the senior oral project. 4 achieved an average score of 2 or above. The overall average score was 2.22

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.

This is a new assessment measure and so there is no past data to establish a 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
2008-2009 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

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)

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 -- Rubric attached
Instrument: Graduation Audit for Outcome 4 -- Rubric attached

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: 6 students assessed

Of 6 students completing portfolio, 5 achieved score of above 2. Overall average score: 2.2

Breakdown into sub-categories:

(A) Student knows major figures . . .	Average score: 2.5 (3.0 scale)
(B) Student knows subject areas . . .	Average score: 2.41 (3.0 scale)
(C) Student understands major issues . . .	Average score: 2.0 (3.0 scale)
(D) Different approaches . . .	Average score: 1.92 (3.0 scale)

Graduation audit: 11 students assessed.

Overall average score of 1.4, with 2 of 11 students (roughly 18%) receiving an average score below 1. So we did not meet our expected result for this year.

Breakdown into sub-categories:

- | | |
|--|---------------------------------|
| (A) Student knows major figures . . . | Average score: 1.72 (2.0 scale) |
| (B) Student knows subject areas . . . | Average score: 1.0 (2.0 scale) |
| (C) Student understands major issues . . . | Average score: 1.54 (2.0 scale) |
| (D) Different approaches . . . | Average score: 1.36 (2.0 scale) |

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.

This is the second year using the graduation audit. Last year's graduation audit yielded an average of 1.39, this year's a yield of 1.4.

Having 2 of 16 students falling below the desired score for the graduation audit places us at a success rate of approximately 88% for the two years, below our expectations.

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.)

Since the overall average score is flat and the percentage of successful students remains close to our goal, there is no proposed action beyond continued monitoring.

Minnesota State University Moorhead
2008-2009 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

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)

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

Instrument: Evaluation of Philosophy Student Portfolio, Learning Outcome 5-- Rubric attached

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)

6 students completed the portfolio. Only two achieved an average score of 2 or above.

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.

Trend (of 22 students assessed) is a success rate of 81.8%

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 at this time.

Minnesota State University Moorhead
2008-2009 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

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)

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

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

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)

6 students assessed. (Phil 300 not taught during this evaluation period.)

5 students achieved a score of 2 or above.

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.

Trend is a success rate of 95.4%

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.

Attributes related to student learning outcome	Qualities assigned 0 points	Qualities assigned 1 point (below expectations)	Qualities assigned 2 points (meets expectations)	Qualities assigned 3 points (exceeds expectations)
(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.

Attributes related to student learning outcome	Qualities assigned 0 points	Qualities assigned 1 point (below expectations)	Qualities assigned 2 points (meets expectations)	Qualities assigned 3 points (exceeds expectations)
(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.

11/1/07

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.

Attributes related to student learning outcome	Qualities assigned 0 points	Qualities assigned 1 point (below expectations)	Qualities assigned 2 points (meets expectations)	Qualities assigned 3 points (exceeds expectations)
(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: _____

Attributes related to student learning outcome	Qualities assigned 0 points (below expectations)	Qualities assigned 1 point (meets expectations)	Qualities assigned 2 points (exceeds expectations)
(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.

Attributes related to student learning outcome	Qualities assigned 0 points	Qualities assigned 1 point (below expectations)	Qualities assigned 2 points (meets expectations)	Qualities assigned 3 points (exceeds expectations)
(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.

Attributes related to student learning outcome	Qualities assigned 0 points	Qualities assigned 1 point (below expectations)	Qualities assigned 2 points (meets expectations)	Qualities assigned 3 points (exceeds expectations)
(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.

Attributes related to student learning outcome	Qualities assigned 0 points	Qualities assigned 1 point (below expectations)	Qualities assigned 2 points (meets expectations)	Qualities assigned 3 points (exceeds expectations)
(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 15, 2008

Members present: Ted Gracyk, Phil Mouch, Chang-Seong Hong, Randy Cagle, Konrad Czynski, Tony Jacobson (student member).

Business:

1. Phil Mouch's 4-year PDP

We discussed the PDP and made minor suggestions.

2. Annual Assessment Report

The report was discussed and unanimously approved.

3. Books in the student lounge

Gracyk proposed reducing the books on the shelves. We agree that everyone should pull outdated books from the shelves for the next two weeks, after which we will give away the ones we pull from the shelves. We will arrange a day to let our majors have first choice of the discards.

Announcements:

4. 1st Annual Red River Philosophy Conference

Gracyk reminded everyone to promote it to our students.

5. Advising for Spring

Reminder that spring semester advising begins today. Be sure that majors understand that they might not have any other opportunity to take some of these courses before they graduate.

6. Budget issues

Discussion of MSUM budget and need to be wise shepherds of our resources.