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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Curriculum Mapping</th>
<th>Assessment Methods</th>
<th>Use of Assessment Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What do you expect all students who complete the program to know, or be able to do?</td>
<td>Where is the outcome learned/assessed (courses, internships, student teaching, clinical, etc.)?</td>
<td>How do students demonstrate their performance of the program learning outcomes? How does the program measure student performance? Distinguish your direct measures from indirect measures.</td>
<td>How does the program use assessment results to recognize success and &quot;close the loop&quot; to inform additional program improvement? How/when is this data shared, and with whom?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Students will make a scholarly contribution to the field of philosophy

At completion of dissertation.

Students demonstrate this primarily in the dissertation. Measured by dissertation committee’s assessment of the quality of the dissertation (see Dissertation Rubric)

Student results are included in the annual OA report written by OA Coordinator. This is seen by the chair and associate dean and is also archived so that comparisons can be made year-to-year to observe trends in the results. Results will also be brought to a department meeting so that the faculty can discuss whether changes are needed to the program.
2. Students will teach philosophy effectively (meeting expectations on all dimensions of the “Checklist for Review of Graduate Student Teachers”)  

Student teaching assessed in the fourth year of the graduate program.  

Student demonstrates in a course s/he is teaching.  

Each year all 4th-year student teachers will be visited by a faculty-member, who will assess the student’s teaching using “teaching rubric” and will forward to the OA director and chair, along with a copy of the student’s syllabus.  

Results kept in student’s file. Positive comments from the teaching rubric can be incorporated into the “teaching letter” written by the chair for the job market. Any areas in which students fail to meet expectations will be communicated to them so that they can figure out how to improve during their fifth year of study. Results will also be communicated to the director of the department’s first-year teacher training program to see if any changes need to be made there to avoid any problematic patterns that are observed.

---

1. **It is not recommended** to try and assess (in depth) all of the program learning outcomes every semester. It is best practice to plan out when each outcome will be assessed and focus on 1 or 2 each semester/academic year. Describe the responsibilities, timeline, and the process for implementing this assessment plan.

Outcome 1 will be measured for all relevant students in Spring 2020. Outcome 2 will be assessed by the end of each spring term beginning in the 2015-16 academic year. It is important to do that annually for all students approaching the job market.

2. **Please explain how these assessment efforts are coordinated with Madrid (courses and/or program)?** Coordination of these learning outcomes with Madrid is not required, because the Madrid does not have graduate programs.

3. **The program assessment plan should be developed and approved by all faculty in the department. In addition, the program assessment plan should be developed to include student input and external sources (e.g., national standards, advisory boards, employers, alumni, etc.).** Describe the process through which your academic unit created this assessment plan. Include the following:

   a. Timeline regarding when or how often this plan will be reviewed and revised. (This could be aligned with program review.)
The plan will be reviewed annually by the OA coordinator. If coordinator would like to recommend changes to the program, these will be reported to the chair and discussed at a department meeting early the following year.

b. How students were included in the process and/or how student input was gathered and incorporated into the assessment plan.

Students were not incorporated in the development of this plan. However, the OA coordinator would like to meet with the Philosophy Graduate Student Association to discuss the program at some point during the spring term of 2016. If they recommend changes, these could end up as suggestions for revision in the May 2016 OA report.

c. What external sources were consulted in the development of this assessment plan?

None.

d. Assessment of the manageability of the plan in relation to departmental resources and personnel.

Assessment of #1 involves only minimal extra effort for committee members, and the numbers of PhD’s are small, so processing the data will be simple for the OA coordinator.

Assessment of #2 is more involved. However, we have been able to review student teaching like this in the past, so it seems feasible.
Dissertation Rubric

Student Name:  
Dissertation Title:  
Term:  
Assessing Professor:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Fails to Meet Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student will make a scholarly contribution to the field of philosophy</td>
<td>The dissertation does not advance the state of the discussion on the chosen topic and shows little promise of developing into an early-career research program.</td>
<td>Student synthesizes information uncovered in extensive research to generate a novel thesis that advances the state of the discussion on the chosen topic. The dissertation has strong potential to be mined for future publications, whether articles or books.</td>
<td>The thesis of the dissertation is a “game changer” likely to be highly influential in the field, or at least half of the dissertation is ready for nearly immediate publication.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Checklist for Review of Graduate Student Teachers (GST’s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Fails to Meet Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GST gives effective oral presentation of information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GST uses visual aids effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GST effectively uses student questions and comments to further group learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GST creates a safe atmosphere conducive to student inquiry and engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GST begins and ends class promptly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GST’s syllabus clearly articulates appropriate course learning outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GST’s course design covers content necessary for achievement of specified “content” outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GST’s course design includes exercises enabling students to develop skills specified in learning outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Below, please include comments to explain the boxes you marked, as well as any other comments you have regarding the graduate student’s strengths and weaknesses as a teacher.
Department of Philosophy
Summary Timeline of Multi-Year Assessment Plan

N.B Assessment of Core Contribution can be conducted as needed on a timeline to be determined by the College of Arts and Sciences.

2015-16

Assessment of Major
Learning Goal:
1. Students will synthesize knowledge of two different periods of Western philosophy

Assessment Methods: Exam question in Phil 460 and rubric.

Assessment of Thesis M.A.
NB: Non-thesis M.A. is for Philosophy and Letters students and is assessed by P&L Learning Goals:
1. Students will analyze and defend a philosophical position on a philosophical problem.
2. Students will gather sources relevant to a philosophical problem.
3. Students will interpret sources relevant to a philosophical problem.
4. Students will synthesize sources relevant to a philosophical problem.

Assessment Method: Rubric applied to Master’s Thesis by committee members.

Assessment of PhD
Learning Goals
1. Students will make a scholarly contribution to the field of philosophy.

Assessment Method: Rubric Applied to Dissertation by committee members.

2. Graduate student teachers teach philosophy effectively.

Assessment Method: Annual review of all 4th-Year Grad student teachers by faculty

2016-17

Assessment of Major
Learning Goals:
2. Students will correctly employ principles of logical reasoning in philosophical analysis.
3. Students will analyze and defend a philosophical position on a philosophical problem.
4. Students will gather sources relevant to a philosophical problem.
5. Students will interpret sources relevant to a philosophical problem.
6. Students will synthesize sources relevant to a philosophical problem.

Assessment Method: Capstone Papers and rubric.

Assessment of Thesis M.A.: Same as previous year

Assessment of PhD: Same as previous year

2017-18

Assessment of Minor
Learning Goal: Students will articulate and evaluate a philosophical argument.

Assessment Method: Identify students in their last class to complete minor. Have instructor apply rubric to a relevant assignment from the course.

Assessment of Thesis M.A.: Same as previous year

Assessment of PhD: Same as previous year