

# 2013-2014 ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT TEMPLATE

This template intends to make our annual assessment and its reports simple, clear, and of high quality not only for this academic year but also for the years to come. Thus, it explicitly specifies some of the best assessment practices and/or expectations implied in the four WASC assessment rubrics we have used in the last few years (see the information below\* that has appeared in Appendices 1, 2a, 2b, and 7 in the *Feedback for the 2011-2012 Assessment Report*; Appendix 2 in the *Feedback for the 2012-2013 Assessment Report*, and Appendices 5 to 8 in the *2013-2014 Annual Assessment Guideline*).

We understand some of our programs/departments have not used and/or adopted these best practices this year, and that is okay. You do not need to do anything extra this year, and ALL YOU NEED TO DO is to report what you have done this academic year. However, we hope our programs will use many of these best practices in the annual assessment in the future.

We also hope to use the information from this template to build a digital database that is simple, clear, and of high quality. If you find it necessary to modify or refine the wording or the content of some of the questions to address the specific needs of your program, please make the changes and highlight them in red. We will consider your suggestion(s). Thank you!

If you have any questions or need any help, please send an email to Dr. Amy Liu ([liuqa@csus.edu](mailto:liuqa@csus.edu)), Director of University Assessment. We are looking forward to working with you.

\*The four WASC rubrics refer to: 1) WASC “Rubric for Assessing the Quality of Academic Program Learning Outcomes”; 2) WASC “Rubric for Assessing the Use of Capstone Experience for Assessing Program Learning Outcomes”; 3) WASC “Rubric for Assessing the Use of Portfolio for Assessing Program Learning Outcomes”; and 4) WASC “Rubric for Assessing the Integration of Student Learning Assessment into Program Reviews”.

## Part 1: Background Information

**B1. Program name:** [Philosophy: General Major, Logic Philosophy of Science Concentration, Ethics Politics and Law Concentration: Core Disciplinary Competencies Only]

**B2. Report author(s):** [\_\_Bellon\_\_]

**B3. Fall 2012 enrollment:** [\_\_103\_\_]

Use the *Department Fact Book 2013* by OIR (Office of Institutional Research) to get the fall 2012 enrollment: (<http://www.csus.edu/oir/Data%20Center/Department%20Fact%20Book/Departmental%20Fact%20Book.html>).

**B4. Program type: [SELECT ONLY ONE]**

X	1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major
	2. Credential
	3. Master’s degree
	4. Doctorate: Ph.D./E.D.D.
	5. Other, specify:

**Part 2: Six Questions for the 2013-2014 Annual Assessment**

**Question 1 (Q1): Program Learning Outcomes (PLO) Assessed in 2013-2014.**

**Q1.1.** Which of the following program learning outcomes (PLOs) or Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals did you assess in 2013-2014? (See 2013-2014 Annual Assessment Report Guidelines for more details). [CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]

X	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1)*
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
X	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
X	6. Inquiry and analysis
X	7. Creative thinking
X	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
X	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Others. Specify any PLOs that were assessed in 2013-2014 but not included above: a. Core Competencies according to the Department’s Program Values Rubric for Philosophy (includes Critical thinking, written communication, Reading in the discipline) b. c.

\* One of the WASC’s new requirements is that colleges and universities report on the level of student performance at graduation in five core areas: **critical thinking, information literacy, written communication, oral communication, and quantitative literacy.**

**Q1.1.1.** Please provide more detailed information about the PLO(s) you checked above:

*Please review the attached Program Values Rubric for Philosophy which includes as among the core disciplinary skills in Philosophy: critical and creative thinking, written communication, and inquiry and analysis, each of which is modified from the AACU individual rubric for each.*

**Q1.2.** Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission of the university?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don’t know

**Q1.3.** Is your program externally accredited (except for WASC)?

	1. Yes
--	--------

X	2. No (If no, go to Q1.4)
	3. Don't know (Go to Q1.4)

**Q1.3.1.** If yes, are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission/goals/outcomes of the accreditation agency?

	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q1.4.** Have you used the *Degree Qualification Profile (DQP)*\* to develop your PLO(s)?

	1. Yes
	2. No, but I know what DQP is.
X	3. No. I don't know what DQP is.
	4. Don't know

\* **Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP)** – a framework funded by the Lumina Foundation that describes the kinds of learning and levels of performance that may be expected of students who have earned an associate, baccalaureate, or master's degree. Please see the links for more details:

[http://www.luminafoundation.org/publications/The\\_Degree\\_Qualifications\\_Profile.pdf](http://www.luminafoundation.org/publications/The_Degree_Qualifications_Profile.pdf) and  
<http://www.learningoutcomeassessment.org/DQPNew.html>.

**Question 2 (Q2): Standards of Performance/Expectations for EACH PLO.**

**Q2.1.** Has the program developed/adopted **EXPLICIT** standards of performance/expectations for the PLO(s) you assessed in **2013-2014 Academic Year**? (For example: We expect 70% of our students to achieve at least a score of 3 on the Written Communication VALUE rubric.)

X	1. Yes, we have developed standards/expectations for <b>ALL PLOs assessed in 2013-14.</b>
	2. Yes, we have developed standards/expectations for <b>SOME PLOs assessed in 2013-14.</b>
	3. No (If no, go to Q2.2)
	4. Don't know (Go to Q2.2)
	5. Not Applicable (Go to Q2.2)

**Q2.1.1.** If yes, what are the desired levels of learning, including the criteria and standards of performance/expectations, especially at or near graduation, for **EACH PLO** assessed in 2013-2014 Academic Year? (For example: what will tell you if students have achieved your expected level of performance for the learning outcome.) **Please provide the rubric and/or the expectations that you have developed for EACH PLO one at a time below.** [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS FOR EACH PLO]

*During 2012-13 Assessment, the department adopted explicit standards of performance at 70% of graduating seniors scoring at the level of Proficient, which on our Program Value Rubric is 4 or higher out of 5 points for each PLO. We discovered that this expectation might have been a bit high, as fewer than 50% of our students attained that level, including several majors who have since been admitted to quality graduate programs. After review of several other successful programs at Sac State, we moderated our expectations to expect success to be demonstrated at 80% of our graduating seniors attaining scores of Competent (3) or higher. We added the expectation that program success would be further demonstrated when 60% of graduating seniors demonstrate Proficiency (≥4) in each of the PLOs. Completing this year's assessment, 2013-14, using the same combination of assessment instruments, indicates that the program is achieving greater success. We believe that this increased indication of success is much more reflective of our actual success, and brings our assessment measures more in line both with*

*the results of students self-reporting in the exit survey and with the results of the student self-reported Program Evaluation administered to each student enrolled in a PHIL course in the program. The former indicates a high level of satisfaction among graduating seniors and confidence in the value of their education. The latter reveals a high degree of confidence that courses are rigorous, appropriately demanding, and that grades are reliable indicators of student success. (247 words)*

**Q2.2. Have you published the PLO(s)/expectations/rubric(s) you assessed in 2013-2014?**

X	1. Yes
	2. No <b>(If no, go to Q3.1)</b>

**Q2.2.1. If yes, where were the PLOs/expectations/rubrics published? [CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]**

	1. In <b>SOME</b> course syllabi/assignments in the program that claim to introduce/develop/master the PLO(s)
	2. In <b>ALL</b> course syllabi/assignments in the program that claim to introduce /develop/master the PLO(s)
	3. In the student handbook/advising handbook
	4. In the university catalogue
X	5. On the academic unit website or in the newsletters
X	6. In the assessment or program review reports/plans/resources/activities
	7. In the new course proposal forms in the department/college/university
X	8. In the <b>department/college</b> /university's strategic plans and other planning documents
X	9. In the <b>department/college</b> /university's budget plans and other resource allocation documents
	10. In other places, specify:

**Question 3 (Q3): Data, Results, and Conclusions for EACH PLO**

**Q3.1. Was assessment data/evidence collected for 2013-2014?**

x	1. Yes
	2. No <b>(If no, go to Part 3: Additional Information)</b>
	3. Don't know <b>(Go to Part 3)</b>
	4. Not Applicable <b>(Go to Part 3)</b>

**Q3.2. If yes, was the data scored/evaluated for 2013-2014?**

x	1. Yes
	2. No <b>(If no, go to Part 3: Additional Information)</b>
	3. Don't know <b>(Go to Part 3)</b>
	4. Not Applicable <b>(Go to Part 3)</b>

**Q3.3. If yes, what DATA have you collected? What are the results, findings, and CONCLUSION(s) for EACH PLO assessed in 2013-2014? In what areas are students doing well and achieving the expectations? In what areas do students need improvement? Please provide a simple and clear summary of the key data and findings, including tables and graphs if applicable for EACH PLO one at a time. [WORD LIMIT: 600 WORDS FOR EACH PLO]**

**Please see appendix E for the excel file including the results of the assessment and analysis of the data.**

Good: disciplinary knowledge.

Need work: inquiry, analysis, synthesis; critical & creative thinking.

Good: in traditional research style essay writing.

Need work: in timed philosophical analysis, where we test the degree to which the skills acquired have been integrated into the general practice of the students when reading, evaluating, and writing about a complex philosophical argument. Might be that the time limit set was too short given the assignment, or that timing poses challenges for students which would not appear absent the pressures of time. We plan to examine the degree to which mode of administering the Philosophical Analysis might be impeding students' demonstration of their competence. However, we are adamant that there be some way to measure the degree to which students are not merely able to show they can master the core skills, but have internalized them and habituated themselves to reading, reflecting, analyzing critically and philosophically.

**Q3.4.** Do students meet the expectations/standards of performance as determined by the program and achieved the learning outcomes? [PLEASE MAKE SURE THE PLO YOU SPECIFY HERE IS THE SAME ONE YOU CHECKED/SPECIFIED IN Q1.1].

**Q3.4.1.** First PLO: [ \_\_\_\_\_ Critical Thinking \_\_\_\_\_ ]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
x	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

**[NOTE: IF YOU HAVE MORE THAN ONE PLO, YOU NEED TO REPEAT THE TABLE IN Q3.4.1 UNTIL YOU INCLUDE ALL THE PLO(S) YOU ASSESSED IN 2013-2014.]**

**Q3.4.2.** Second PLO: [ \_\_ Written Communication \_\_ ]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
x	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

**Q3.4.2.** Third PLO: [ \_\_\_\_\_ Inquiry & Analysis \_\_ ]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
x	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

**Q3.4.2.** Fourth PLO: [ \_\_\_\_\_ Creative Thinking \_\_\_\_\_ ]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
x	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set

	5. Don't know
--	---------------

Q3.4.2. Fifth PLO: [      Reading in the Discipline      ]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
x	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

Q3.4.2. Sixth PLO: [      Disciplinary Knowledge      ]

x	1. Exceed expectation/standard
	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

**Question 4 (Q4): Evaluation of Data Quality: Reliability and Validity.**

Q4.1. How many PLOs in total did your program assess in the 2013-2014 academic year? [   6   ]

Q4.2. Please choose **ONE ASSESSED PLO** as an example to illustrate how you use direct, indirect, and/or other methods/measures to collect data. If you only assessed one PLO in 2013-14, YOU CAN SKIP this question. If you assessed MORE THAN ONE PLO, please check **ONLY ONE PLO BELOW EVEN IF YOU ASSESSED MORE THAN ONE PLO IN 2013-2014.**

x	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) <sup>1</sup>
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Other PLO. Specify:

**Direct Measures**

**Q4.3.** Were direct measures used to assess this PLO?

x	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Q4.4)
	3. Don't know (Go to Q4.4)

**Q4.3.1.** Which of the following **DIRECT** measures were used? [Check all that apply]

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1. Capstone projects (including theses, senior theses), courses, or experiences
	2. Key assignments from other <b>CORE</b> classes
	3. Key assignments from other classes
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4. Classroom based performance assessments such as simulations, comprehensive exams, critiques
	5. External performance assessments such as internships or other community based projects
	6. E-Portfolios
	7. Other portfolios
	8. Other measure. Specify:

**Q4.3.2.** Please provide the direct measure(s) [key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)] that you used to collect the data. [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

We used two direct measures, both implemented in PHIL 189: Senior Seminar, a capstone course taken in the final semester.

1. Philosophical Analysis (see Appendix B) serves as a core assignment in several PHIL major courses, including all of the upper division core courses in the major. In PHIL 189 it is administered as a timed exam. Students have two hours to read and review a published paper they have not previously seen, analyze it to provide a summary of the central argument and develop a critique of that argument. This tests students' ability to professional papers, write effectively, analyze and reconstruct a logical argument, then criticize the argument. As a timed exam, the intent is also to assess the degree to which students have mastered these skills.
2. Senior Essay is submitted during the semester students take PHIL 189. As a participant in PHIL 189, this essay is a required submission. The senior essay is either an originally written essay or a substantially revised previously submitted essay. Students work with one of the FT faculty to revise the essay. These are typically sustained arguments, on a topic of student interest, with considerable explication, though they need not present original developments.

While the results for the Senior Essay are better than for the timed Philosophical Analysis, the Department still considers the timed PA to be the better indicator of student internalization of, habituation to, and retention of the basic skills taught in the discipline. The Senior Essay is done under considerable supervision with faculty. There are also no standard requirements for the essay. Some students write original essays, some revise already graded and reviewed essays. With this degree of variation, we are concerned that the value of this instrument for assessment purposes is lower than the timed PA.

**Q4.3.2.1.** Was the direct measure(s) [key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)] aligned directly with the rubric/criterion?

x	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q4.3.3.** Was the direct measure (s) [key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)] aligned directly with the PLO?

x	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q4.3.4.** How was the evidence scored/evaluated? [Select one only]

	1. No rubric is used to interpret the evidence (If checked, go to Q4.3.7)
	2. Use rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class
x	3. Use rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty
	4. Use rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty
	5. Use other means. Specify:

**Q4.3.5.** What rubric/criterion was adopted to score/evaluate the above key assignments/projects/portfolio? [Select one only]

	1. The VALUE rubric(s)
	2. Modified VALUE rubric(s)
x	3. A rubric that is totally developed by local faculty
	4. Use other means. Specify:

**Q4.3.6.** Was the rubric/criterion aligned directly with the PLO?

x	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q4.3.7.** Were the evaluators (e.g., faculty or advising board members) who reviewed student work calibrated to apply assessment criteria in the same way?

x	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q4.3.8.** Were there checks for inter-rater reliability?

x	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q4.3.9.** Were the sample sizes for the direct measure adequate?

x	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q4.3.10.** How did you select the sample of student work (papers, projects, portfolios, etc)? Please briefly specify here:



We used all the graduating seniors who were required to enroll in PHIL 189: Senior Seminar, in each semester for 2013-14. This is the first cohort of substantial size which was required to take PHIL 189, as this course was added to the program effective 2012 catalog rights.

**Indirect Measures**

**Q4.4.** Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO?

x	1. Yes
	2. No <b>(If no, go to Q4.5)</b>

**Q4.4.1.** Which of the following indirect measures were used?

	1. National student surveys (e.g., NSSE, etc.)
	2. University conducted student surveys (OIR surveys)
x	3. College/Department/program conducted student surveys
	4. Alumni surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	5. Employer surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	6. Advisory board surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	7. Others, specify:

**Q4.4.2.** If surveys were used, were the sample sizes adequate?

x	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q4.4.3.** If surveys were used, please, briefly specify how you select your sample? What is the response rate?

We used all the graduating seniors who were required to enroll in PHIL 189: Senior Seminar, in each semester for 2013-14. This is the first cohort of substantial size which was required to take PHIL 189, as this course was added to the program effective 2012 catalog rights. The senior exit survey is a required component of the course. All students completed it, 27. See Appendix D.

**Other Measures**

**Q4.5.** Were external benchmarking data used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
x	2. No <b>(If no, go to Q4.6)</b>

**Q4.5.1.** Which of the following measures was used?

	1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams
	2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g., CLA, CAAP, ETS PP, etc)
	3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g., ETS, GRE, etc)
	4. Others, specify:

**Q4.6.** Were other measures used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
x	2. No <b>(Go to Q4.7)</b>
	3. Don't know <b>(Go to Q4.7)</b>

**Q4.6.1.** If yes, please specify: [\_\_\_\_\_]

**Alignment and Quality**

**Q4.7.** Please describe how you collected the data? For example, in what course(s) (or by what means) were data collected? How reliable and valid is the data? [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

The VALUE critical thinking rubric has been used to collect data in order to directly assess 10 student papers selected from two required core courses offered in spring 2013: Statistics (Soc. 215) and Theory (Soc. 240). The graduate assessment committee is made up of four faculty members, each of whom read two papers. To determine the final scores, the group came together to discuss the similarities and differences of our scores until a consensus was reached. The group met again a week later, after reading 8 more papers. All papers were agreed upon with one exception. This one paper was re-read and the average score was used as our final data.

This is the first time that our graduate program has used a rubric (The VALUE rubric) to EXPLICITLY AND DIRECTLY assess our students' critical thinking skills. We have discovered excellent insight into students' critical thinking skill even though our sample size is small. We plan to include more papers in our program's future assessment studies.

**Q4.8.** How many assessment tools/methods/measures **in total** did you use to assess this PLO? [\_3\_\_\_\_]

**NOTE: IF IT IS ONLY ONE, GO TO Q5.1.**

**Q4.8.1.** Did the data (including all the assignments/projects/portfolios) from all the different assessment tools/measures/methods directly align with the PLO?

	1. Yes
X (only the 2 direct instruments)	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q4.8.2.** Were **ALL** the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures for the PLO?

x	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Question 5 (Q5): Use of Assessment Data.**

**Q5.1.** To what extent have the assessment results **from 2012-2013** been used for? [CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]

	Very Much (1)	Quite a Bit (2)	Some (3)	Not at all (4)	Not Applicable (9)
1. Improving specific courses			x		
2. Modifying curriculum			x		

3. Improving advising and mentoring			X		
4. Revising learning outcomes/goals			X		
5. Revising rubrics and/or expectations	X				
6. Developing/updating assessment plan		X			
7. Annual assessment reports		X			
8. Program review					X
9. Prospective student and family information		X			
10. Alumni communication				X	
11. WASC accreditation (regional accreditation)					X
12. Program accreditation					X
13. External accountability reporting requirement					X
14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations					X
15. Strategic planning	X				
16. Institutional benchmarking					X
17. Academic policy development or modification		X			
18. Institutional Improvement					X
19. Resource allocation and budgeting					X
20. New faculty hiring		X			
21. Professional development for faculty and staff		X			
22. Other Specify:					

**Q5.1.1.** Please provide one or two best examples to show how you have used the assessment data above.

1. The department revised its expectations from those stipulated in 2012-13, which expected 70% of students to demonstrate Proficiency in our Program Values Rubric. Given the Semester and CSUS GPAs of our graduates, this expectation was unreasonable. We modified our expectations to 80% Competent or higher and 60% proficient in each PLO. This seems much more in line with our students' overall abilities as indicated in GPAs. Also, it seemed to better match our understanding of our individual students' abilities much better. We used this adjusted expectation for 2013-14 and our hope that it better aligns with students abilities as indicated by indirect measures (GPA, exit survey self-assessment).
2. The results from 2012-13 and from 2013-14 are also being used to revise the Department's program by adding a PHIL 89 as a beginning or entry level introduction to Philosophical Methods, wherein students can be assessed for their basic skills attainment (benchmark) and through the semester they can be introduced to the core skills they will then practice through the balance of the courses they take until they arrive in the senior seminar, PHIL 189. This would allow us to more uniformly determine the value added in the program, without distracting features such as variation between instructors, in conditions under which the Philosophical Analysis is completed in various core courses, and for students who are in the several concentrations. This conversation was begun last year and will continue this year. We anticipate action being taken this year, with the course available for assessment purposes for 2015-16.
3. Also finally, we were able to hire the last two years, and much of our interview criteria focused specifically on evaluating candidates for their ability to contribute to improving the program in our core PLOs.

**Q5.2.** As a result of the **assessment effort in 2013-2014** and based on the prior feedbacks from OAPA, do you anticipate making any changes for your program (e.g., course structure, course content, or modification of program learning outcomes)?

X	1. Yes
---	--------

	2. No ( <b>If no, go to Q5.3</b> )
	3. Don't know ( <b>Go to Q5.3</b> )

**Q5.2.1.** What changes are anticipated? By what mechanism will the changes be implemented? How and when will you assess the impact of proposed modifications? [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

1. Introduction of PHIL 89 as early snapshot and introduction to skills aligned with the PLOs. Will require course approval and program change. Likely not implementable until 2015-16. See above.
2. Elimination of the Senior Essay requirement, as too unreliable as a measure for assessment purposes. Effectively, if adopted by the department, with 2014-15.
3. Modification of the Program Values Rubric to separate out the several different skills currently grouped under disciplinary Knowledge: Reading, Writing, Critical Thinking/Logic, Inquiry & Analysis/Synthesis, Creative Thinking.

**Q5.2.2.** Is there a follow-up assessment on these areas that need improvement?

x	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q5.3.** Many academic units have collected assessment data on aspects of a program that are not related to program learning outcomes (i.e., impacts of an advising center, etc.). If your program/academic unit has collected assessment data in this way, please briefly report your results here. [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

N/A

**Question 6 (Q6).** Which program learning outcome(s) do you plan to assess next year?

x	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) <sup>1</sup>
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
x	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
x	6. Inquiry and analysis
x	7. Creative thinking
x	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
x	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline

	19. Others. Specify any PLOs that the program is going to <b>assess but not included above:</b> a. b. c.
--	---

### Part 3: Additional Information

**A1.** In which academic year did you **develop** the current assessment plan?

	1. Before 2007-2008
	2. 2007-2008
	3. 2008-2009
	4. 2009-2010
	5. 2010-2011
	6. 2011-2012
x	7. 2012-2013
	8. 2013-2014
	9. Have not yet <b>developed</b> a formal assessment plan

**A2.** In which academic year did you last **update** your assessment plan?

	1. Before 2007-2008
	2. 2007-2008
	3. 2008-2009
	4. 2009-2010
	5. 2010-2011
	6. 2011-2012
	7. 2012-2013
x	8. 2013-2014
	9. Have not yet <b>updated</b> the assessment plan

**A3.** Have you developed a curriculum map for this program?

	1. Yes
X (not yet)	2. No
	3. Don't know

**A4.** Has the program indicated explicitly where the assessment **of student learning** occurs in the curriculum?

x	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**A5.** Does the program have any capstone class?

x	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

A5.1. If yes, please list the course number for each capstone class: [\_PHIL 189\_\_]

A6. Does the program have ANY capstone project?

x	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

A7. Name of the academic unit: [\_Philosophy\_\_]

A8. Department in which the academic unit is located: [\_Philosophy\_\_\_\_]

A9. Department Chair's Name: [\_Christina Bellon\_\_]

A10. Total number of annual assessment reports submitted by your academic unit for 2013-2014: [\_1\_\_]

A11. College in which the academic unit is located:

x	1. Arts and Letters
	2. Business Administration
	3. Education
	4. Engineering and Computer Science
	5. Health and Human Services
	6. Natural Science and Mathematics
	7. Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies
	8. Continuing Education (CCE)
	9. Other, specify:

**Undergraduate Degree Program(s):**

A12. Number of undergraduate degree programs the academic unit has: [\_4\_\_]

A12.1. List all the name(s): [\_General Major; Ethics Politics and Law; Logic and Philosophy of Science; Honors.\_\_\_\_]

A12.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program? [\_3\_\_]

**Master Degree Program(s):**

A13. Number of Master's degree programs the academic unit has: [\_\_\_]

A13.1. List all the name(s): [\_\_\_\_\_]

A13.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master program? [\_\_\_\_\_]

**Credential Program(s):**

A14. Number of credential degree programs the academic unit has: [\_\_\_\_\_]

A14.1. List all the names: [\_\_\_\_\_]

**Doctorate Program(s)**

A15. Number of doctorate degree programs the academic unit has: [\_\_\_\_\_]

A15.1. List the name(s): [\_\_\_\_\_]

A16. Would this assessment report apply to other program(s) and/or diploma concentration(s) in your academic unit\*?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1. Yes
<input type="checkbox"/>	2. No

\*If the assessment conducted for this program (including the PLO(s), the criteria and standards of performance/expectations you established, the data you collected and analyzed, the conclusions of the assessment) is the same as the assessment conducted for other programs within the academic unit, you only need to submit one assessment report.

16.1. If yes, please specify the name of each program: \_\_\_ Philosophy General Major\_\_\_\_\_

16.2. If yes, please specify the name of each diploma concentration: \_\_\_ All three Concentrations for core competencies. Ethics Politics and Law; Logic and Philosophy of Science; Honors. \_\_\_\_\_