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**Brief Introductory Statement**

The Philosophy Program at Weber State University is housed in the Department of Political Science and Philosophy. The program has three full-time tenure-line faculty members and, typically, three adjuncts who teach during fall and spring semesters. The program offers a wide variety of courses that can lead to either a B.A. or minor in philosophy.

The educational opportunities we offer are not restricted to the classroom. Each year our program fields between two and three student Ethics Bowl teams that compete at the Wasatch Regional Tournament. Coached by adjunct instructor Rachel Robison-Greene, our teams have qualified to compete at the national tournament in 2011, 2013, and 2015 by winning the regional competition in 2011 and 2013 and placing second in 2015. At the national level, our team has placed as high as fifth and has always finished in the top half of the field.

Our students also have the opportunity to learn about philosophy by taking advantage of programs offered through the WSU Study Abroad office. Each of the past five years, adjunct instructor Marc Nelson has co-led a summer study abroad with his wife, Katie, an adjunct instructor in the WSU history department. Themes for their study abroad courses have included The Renaissance, Cultures and Dogmas of the Classical World, and Medieval Lives. These opportunities have allowed our students to visit historically and philosophically significant sites throughout Western Europe.

In 2013, the philosophy program established a distinguished lecture series and began raising funds for an endowment that will allow this series to continue indefinitely. This year we will bring in our fourth speaker of the series, and our endowment is over $18,000. We anticipate that the series will be fully endowed ($25,000) within two years.

Our commitment to teaching philosophy extends beyond the university. In 2013 and 2014, Dr. Greene ran a “Philosophy in the Schools” program at Polk Elementary in Ogden. A third grade class in 2013 and a fourth grade class in 2014 engaged in seven weekly philosophical discussions. These centered on a story that the students read and were followed by having the students do a drawing that exemplified the discussions. At the end of the seven weeks the students’ work was bound, providing them a book to take home.

Since our 2011 review, our program has experienced three important curriculum changes. First, PHIL 2200 Deductive Logic lost its Quantitative Literacy designation, due to the state Board of Regents changing the definition of what constitutes quantitative literacy. Second, we added two new courses—PHIL 4530 Philosophy of Mind (taught by Dr. Greene) and the variable title course PHIL 4810 Experimental, which we can use to try out new courses before adding to our curriculum. Finally, we renumbered several of our upper-division courses to better reflect the difficulty of the material and group our courses more intelligibly. For example, Great Issues in Philosophy and Great Thinkers of Philosophy are now listed as senior-level courses, instead of junior-level, since they are typically conducted as seminars.
Our full-time faculty have all established strong records of teaching, research, and service. In spring 2016, Dr. Fudge was promoted to full professor, and Dr. Willard is undergoing tenure and promotion review during the 2016-17 academic year.

Finally, we are happy to have Christopher Healong from UC Davis on our faculty this year as a replacement for Dr. Willard’s fall 2016 maternity leave and Dr. Fudge’s spring 2017 sabbatical. This is indicative of the strong level of support our program receives from the college dean’s office.
Standard A - Mission Statement

The philosophy program seeks to impart knowledge and skills that fall under the three following general categories:

1. Liberal Education: teaches the ideas of influential past and contemporary thinkers who have sought to understand the world and our experience of it. These ideas concern such topics as the nature of truth and reality, the limits of knowledge, standards of right and wrong, the experience of beauty, and world religions.

2. Methodology: emphasizes methods of sound practical reasoning, deductive logic, and language analysis.

3. Application: critically analyzes non-philosophical disciplines. For example, the philosophy of democracy analyzes the value assumptions behind democratic forms of government, while medical ethics seeks to identify and resolve dilemmas arising from conflicts between medical technology and the quality of life.

A major in philosophy first and foremost exposes students to the intellectual history of Western Civilization, though it does not limit itself to this tradition. Students in our program complete coursework in at least one major historical period (Ancient, Medieval, or Early Modern), while taking other classes that regularly include thinkers from various historical eras.

But the philosophy major does much more than provide students with a thorough understanding of Western intellectual history. Students who major in philosophy also learn to apply principles of sound reasoning. Not only is a course dealing specifically with logic part of the requirements, but all courses also emphasize logic methodology and critical thinking. In addition, philosophy majors engage speculative questions in courses in metaphysics and epistemology, further developing the abstract reasoning skills and cognitive abilities central to the discipline.

Finally, philosophy majors train in value theory. All majors take a course in ethics or aesthetics, and they will also consider value theoretic questions in no fewer than a half dozen courses in ethics, religion and politics. In sum, a philosophy major offers students the opportunity to learn the foundations of an intellectual discipline that forms a central part of a liberal education, while at the same time developing practical, marketable skills including:

- **Critical thinking skills**: logical analysis is at the heart of philosophical discourse. Students in our program must take at least one course in logic (deductive logic or critical thinking). These courses help students identify, reconstruct, and evaluate arguments, skills that transfer directly to their other coursework and to their careers.

- **Communication skills**: the practice of philosophy requires students both to evaluate the arguments of others and to construct and present their own reasoned
opinions. This is most often done in written form, though philosophy classes also require that students discuss issues with each other and with their professors in less formal settings.

- **Creative thinking skills:** because philosophy presents “perennial problems” of being, knowledge, and value, students are encouraged to explore and develop their own solutions to these problems, as well as to engage critically the reasoning of others. Both of these tasks require students to engage in creative thought experiments and to construct their own arguments.

- **Research skills:** philosophy is sometimes misunderstood as involving undisciplined speculation about the meaning of life. To the contrary, professional philosophers rigorously define philosophical problems, and the practice of philosophy requires that one understand the development and direction of philosophical discourse. Students who work in philosophy, especially at advanced levels, need to familiarize themselves with the research methods of, and resources available to, the profession.

- **The ability to understand the interrelations between various fields/subjects:** as suggested by philosophy course listings from universities around the country, philosophy serves as the foundation of virtually every other discipline. Students who study philosophy come to see the relations between these foundations and thus gain an appreciation of how seemingly disparate fields are often closely related at a fundamental level. In professional settings, philosophy graduates are thus well prepared to make connections between ideas that on the surface are not obviously related.

In offering a B.A. in philosophy at WSU, we help impart the above-referenced skills to our students, as well as expose them to a discipline that asks them to examine the most fundamental questions at the heart of the world’s intellectual traditions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Courses in Program</th>
<th>Program Learning Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHIL HU1000 Introduction to Philosophy</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL HU1250 Critical Thinking</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL 2200 Deductive Logic</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL 3010 History of Philosophy: Classical and Medieval</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL 3020 History of Philosophy: Modern</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL 3650 Aesthetics</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL 4510 Metaphysics</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL 4520 Epistemology</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL 4600 Ethical Theory</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL 4900 Senior Capstone Seminar</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: I = introduced, E = emphasized, M = mastered

“Knowledge Of” Learning Outcomes:
1. Historical Knowledge
2. Topical Knowledge

“Knowledge How” Learning Outcomes:
1. Critical Thinking
2. Reading Comprehension
3. Writing Skills
Standard C - Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment

Measurable Learning Outcomes

Consistent with our mission, it is expected that students graduating with a B.A. from the program will have gained both “Knowledge Of” and “Knowledge How” with respect to philosophy. These expectations are delineated as follows*:

Knowledge Of:
Knowledge of philosophy is understood to consist of two distinct, though not mutually exclusive, subcategories—historical knowledge and topical knowledge:

1. Historical knowledge
   Familiarity with the basic ideas of at least three major historical figures, of whom the following are representative: Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Plotinus, Augustine, Aquinas, Descartes, Leibniz, Spinoza, Locke, Berkeley, Hume, Kant, Mill, Kierkegaard, Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, and Heidegger.

2. Topical knowledge
   An understanding of the basic issues and terminology in the following areas: logic, metaphysics or epistemology, and ethics or aesthetics.

Knowledge How:
Students in the program should be able to demonstrate proficiency with each of the following skills:

1. Critical thinking: The ability to distinguish between and assess the strength of arguments and explanations.

2. Reading comprehension: The ability to explain, interpret, and evaluate philosophical texts.

3. Writing skills:
   a) The ability to present ideas clearly and with minimal grammatical and other writing errors.
   b) The ability to conduct research in accordance with generally accepted standards within the discipline.
   c) The ability to write in a way that reflects careful attention to language, logic, and subtleties of reasoning.

* Core courses have specific, measurable learning outcomes tied to these department goals.
Five-year Assessment Summary

During summer 2012, the philosophy program identified learning outcomes and articulated them to each of our core courses, and we began assessing courses in fall of that year. (Prior to that year, the Senior Capstone Seminar was the only course that we assessed.) All upper-division courses are assessed using a rubric developed during summer 2012 (see Appendix H). It was also during this time that we began assessing our general education courses, according to standards set by the university’s General Education Assessment and Improvement Committee. The following table shows what courses were assessed from fall 2012 – spring 2016 (full assessment data for the 2015 – 2016 academic year appear in Appendix G):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>PHIL 1000 Intro to Philosophy*</th>
<th>PHIL 1120 Contemporary Moral Problems**</th>
<th>PHIL 1250 Critical Thinking*</th>
<th>PHIL 2200 Deductive Logic***</th>
<th>PHIL 3010 Classical &amp; Medieval</th>
<th>PHIL 3020 Modern</th>
<th>PHIL 3650 Aesthetics</th>
<th>PHIL 4510 Metaphysics</th>
<th>PHIL 4520 Epistemology</th>
<th>PHIL 4600 Ethical Theory</th>
<th>PHIL 4900 Capstone Seminar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2015</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denotes a lower-division course that is assessed for both general education and course/department learning outcomes.
** Denotes a lower-division course that is assessed for only general education learning outcomes.
*** Denotes a lower-division course that is assessed for only course/department learning outcomes.
Findings: we have been satisfied with the assessment outcomes for all of our classes, with the exception of PHIL 2200 Deductive Logic. We first assessed this class in spring 2013, which also happened to be the last semester that it counted toward the university’s quantitative literacy requirement. A large majority of students enrolled in the course at the time were students who struggled with math and were taking our class as an alternative. Predictably, these students struggled equally as much in our class, with pass rates of 63%, 42%, and 51% on the three exams, respectively. We assessed this class the following semester, anticipating that these rates would improve, and they did, with pass rates of 73%, 42%, and 58% on the three exams. Finally, we assessed again in fall 2015, and the pass rates were 64%, 64%, and 71%, with 88% of students who completed all three exams passing the class. While these numbers continue to be lower than we would like, we have determined that no curricular changes are in order, primarily because of the inherent difficulty of the material.

Beginning in fall 2012, we implemented an anonymous online exit interview for all of our graduating majors and minors. (Questions appear as Appendix I. Full student responses are available upon request.) Overall, students are highly satisfied with our program, with the exception of our relatively sparse upper-division offerings. As numerous students recognize, this problem stems from our having only three full-time faculty members, which is an ongoing limitation of our program and something we will continue to work to rectify.
Standard D - Academic Advising

Advising Strategy and Process

All students who sign up to be a philosophy major or minor are directed to the program advisor for an orientation session at which all program requirements are discussed. Students are also provided both a program brochure and a graduation checklist they can use to ensure that they are on track for a timely graduation. Other topics, including course descriptions and career opportunities, are discussed at the student’s request. Subsequent to this, all majors and minors are encouraged to meet with the program advisor at least once annually. Finally, all pending graduates are required to undergo a final progress check to ensure that they will have completed all requirements by their graduation date. For final graduation sign-off, students must complete an anonymous exit exam over ChiTester.

Effectiveness of Advising

As part of their exit interviews, all graduating majors and minors are asked two questions about advising:

(1) How frequently did you seek out advising in the department?

(2) What is your overall impression of the quality and availability of advising within the department?

Roughly 2/3 of students reported that they sought advising annually, and all students who took advantage of it reported a positive experience with their advising. The most common comments were that advising was easy to schedule and effective. Those students who did not take advantage of formal advising reported either that they spoke informally with department faculty about program requirements (which was sufficient) or that formal advising wasn’t necessary because the program requirements are straightforward.

Past Changes and Future Recommendations

Since our last program review in 2011, we have incorporated a program exit interview in our graduation sign-off process. By requiring this, we ensure that students undergo one more check on their graduation eligibility, as well as gain useful information on student perceptions of program effectiveness. Given student responses on their exit interviews (see above), we don’t see a need to modify our advising process.
Standard E - Faculty

Faculty Demographic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Tenure Status</th>
<th>Highest Degree</th>
<th>Years of Teaching</th>
<th>Areas of Expertise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fudge, Robert</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ethics, Aesthetics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene, Richard</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Epistemology, Metaphysics, Philosophy of Popular Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willard, Mary Beth</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Assistant*</td>
<td>Tenure-eligible</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Metaphysics, History of Philosophy, Aesthetics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Going up for tenure during the 2016-17 academic year

Programmatic/Departmental Teaching Standards

The philosophy program adheres to the teaching standards of the college and university, as detailed in their respective rank and tenure documents. Course evaluations are administered over ChiTester for all sections and are reviewed by the department chair. Further, peer reviews and portfolio evaluations are conducted as part of the promotion and tenure-granting process. The program director reviews adjunct faculty on an annual basis, and these reviews are stored in the adjunct faculty members’ files.

For purposes of tenure, faculty are evaluated according to the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences tenure document, which requires that faculty receive a rating of at least “good” in teaching. The definitions of the ratings for teaching are as follows (from the S&BS Policy on Tenure):

“The candidate will normally be rated unsatisfactory when evaluations by students and peers indicate that he/she has 6 consistently been lacking competence as a teacher, when there is minimal evidence that the candidate has made innovations to course material and teaching methods, and when the candidate has neither addressed nor reduced any substantial deficiencies in teaching performance noted in a previous review.

The candidate will normally be rated satisfactory when evaluations by students and peers indicate that he/she has consistently been teaching at a level of competence, there is evidence that the candidate has made few innovations to course material or teaching methods, and that he/she has taken action to address any substantial deficiencies in teaching performance noted in a previous review.

The candidate will normally be rated good when evaluations by students and peers indicate that he/she has consistently been teaching above the level of competence, there is evidence that the candidate has made some worthwhile innovations to course material and teaching methods, and that he/she has addressed and reduced any substantial deficiencies in teaching performance noted in a previous review.

The candidate will normally be rated excellent when evaluations by students and peers indicate that he/she has consistently been an outstanding teacher, and there is evidence that the candidate has made substantial and beneficial innovations to course material and teaching methods.”
For purposes of rank, faculty must achieve a rating of at least satisfactory in teaching to be promoted to associate professor and good to be promoted to full professor, as defined by the WSU Policies and Procedures Manual, 8-11.IV.

Faculty Qualifications

As required by PPM8-11.III.B, all full-time tenure-track faculty in the College of Social and Behavioral Science must hold a terminal degree in their field, which for philosophy is the Ph.D.

Faculty & Staff (current academic year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Contract</th>
<th>Adjunct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of faculty with Doctoral degrees</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of faculty with Masters degrees</td>
<td></td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of faculty with Bachelors degrees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The philosophy program has a replacement contract faculty member who is ABD at the University of California, Davis. This is equivalent to holding a Masters degree in the field.

Evidence of Effective Instruction

i. Regular Faculty

Course evaluation data cannot be disaggregated from the department as a whole (including political science course evaluation data). However, faculty members do self-report their teaching evaluation data during 3rd year, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure reviews. Additionally, faculty members submit supplementary teaching materials, including teaching statements, sample syllabi, sample assignments, and evidence of teaching innovations. Finally, effectiveness of instruction can be inferred from the course assessments we conduct on our core and general education courses (see Standard C above for a summary).

ii. Adjunct Faculty

The program director reviews each adjunct faculty member annually, using standards developed by the Department of Political Science and Philosophy. Specifically, each class is evaluated on the basis of how well it is structured, the quality and quantity of student/teacher interaction, its content, and the quality of instructional delivery. All three of our current adjuncts perform at a high level.
Faculty Scholarship (2011-2016)

**Dr. Robert Fudge**

**Publications/Book Reviews**


**Presentations**


**In-Progress**

“Aesthetic Consolation in the Face of the Sixth Mass Extinction”

“Why Dignity? An Aesthetic Defense”

*The Art and Science of Critical Thinking* (an electronic textbook with embedded lectures)

**Dr. Richard Greene**

**Publications/Book Reviews**


**Presentations**

“Interfacing High School and Intercollegiate Ethics Bowl” presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Practical and Professional Ethics; Spring 2016.
"Contextualist Bootstrapping (sort of)" presented at the Society for Skeptical Studies group meeting at the Pacific Division Meeting of the American Philosophical Association; Spring 2015.

Chaired session on virtue epistemology at the Pacific Division meeting of the American Philosophical Association; Spring 2015.

“Ethics Bowl Judging Strategies” presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Practical and Professional Ethics; Spring 2015.

Chaired session on statistical research methods at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Practical and Professional Ethics; Spring 2015.

Chaired session on skepticism at the Pacific Division meeting of the American Philosophical Association; Spring 2014.

Chaired session on moral responsibility at the Pacific Division meeting of the American Philosophical Association; Spring 2014.

Chaired session on epistemology (contextualism) at the Pacific Division meeting of the American Philosophical Association; Spring 2013.

"Proposition Sensitive Variantism" presented at the Society for Skeptical Studies group meeting at the Pacific Division Meeting of the American Philosophical Association; Spring 2012.

Chaired session on epistemology (disagreement) at the Pacific Division meeting of the American Philosophical Association; Spring 2012.

“Proposition Sensitive Variantism.” Presented at the 5th Annual Intermountain Philosophy Conference held at Brigham Young University, November 2011.

In Progress


"Knowledge on the Cheap: how to achieve certainty in an instant"

Dr. Mary Beth Willard

Publications/Book Reviews


**Presentations**


“Pseudoscience, Fiction, and the Demarcation Problem”, American Philosophical Association Eastern Division Meeting (Main Program). Washington, DC, January 6-9, 2016 and at University of Nevada, Las Vegas (January 29, 2016.)

“Beyond Empty Ideas”, American Philosophical Association Pacific Division Meeting (Main Program), Vancouver, April 1-4, 2015.

“A Softer, Gentler Street: Two Incongruities of Yarn Bombing”, at Philosophy of Street Art Conference, New York University/The Pratt Institute, March 4-8, 2015.

“Theatre, Transportation, and Moral Persuasion.’ Pittsburgh Area Philosophy Colloquium, September 2013

“Against Simplicity.” Bellingham Summer Philosophy Conference, Western Washington University, August 2013


“Game Called On Account of Fog: Metametaphysics and Epistemic Dismissivism.” Bellingham Summer Philosophy Conference, Western Washington University,July 2012

“Stop Over-Analyzing It: The Puzzle of Historical Inaccuracy and the Pragmatic Interpretation of Imaginative Resistance.” American Society for Aesthetics, Pacific Division Meeting, April 2012 and Intermountain Philosophy Conference, Brigham Young University, November 2011

**Mentoring Activities**

Ours is a small program consisting of only three faculty members, none of whom has been hired in the past five years. Mentoring has consequently been conducted informally as junior faculty come up for review.
Diversity of Faculty

The discipline of philosophy is notoriously non-diverse. Of the 3,074 members of the American Philosophical Association (out of 9,007 members total) who reported their gender in 2016, only 754 (25%) self-identified as female. Of those identifying their race/ethnicity, only 24% identified as non-white/Caucasian. During the entire period since our previous program review, 1/3 of our full-time faculty has been female. Although only 1 of the 7 adjuncts we employed during that time is a woman, this is a bit misleading, as we have never had more than 4 adjuncts at a time, and our female adjunct has been with us since fall 2012. (In recent years, we have only employed 3 adjuncts, so again, 1/3 of our adjunct faculty is female.) We nevertheless recognize the need to increase both the gender and ethnic diversity of our faculty, despite the fact that we rarely have occasion to conduct replacement hires.

Ongoing Review and Professional Development

As required by both university and college standards, our full-time faculty undergo regular reviews. These consist of annual reviews submitted to our department chair and formal third-year, tenure, and post-tenure reviews. Tenure reviews typically occur during the faculty member's fifth or sixth year, and post-tenure reviews occur every five years subsequent to receiving tenure.

Adjunct faculty are reviewed annually by the Program Director. These reviews serve as the basis for continued employment, as well as for deciding how many classes to offer each adjunct each semester.

All faculty are encouraged to engage in professional development activities, including attending conferences, attending on-campus teaching workshops, etc.

Dr. Robert Fudge

- Participated in the inaugural WSUOnline Blended Learning Project, spring 2014
  
  Participating in this program afforded me the opportunity to learn about the methodologies and advantages/disadvantages of both blended and flipped learning. As part of the program I designed a flipped version of my critical thinking class, which I began teaching in fall 2014.

- Attended the WSU Innovative Teaching Conference, fall 2013
  
  Attending this conference was the inspiration to convert my critical thinking textbook, *The Art and Science of Critical Thinking*, into an eText, as well as to participate in the WSU Blended Learning Project (see previous item).

- WSU Center for Poverty and Economic Inequality Development and Instruction Grant, summer 2015
  
  This grant supported the development of a teaching module on the moral dimensions of economic inequality, incorporated into my Contemporary Moral Problems course, beginning spring 2016.
Dr. Richard Greene
- Completed the WSU Master Online Teaching Program, fall 2014

Dr. Mary Beth Willard
- Participated in the inaugural WSU Coaching Certification (summer 2014)

  Participating in the sessions introduced me to the many support services available for students. I enrolled in this seminar series because I found that often students would expect me, as a professor, to be able to help them with the administrative details of being a student (e.g., registrar, financial aid, etc.), and this series helped me become more familiar with the resources we have, and where to send students who need assistance.

- Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Scholar program (spring 2016)

  In this semester-long class I worked on developing a study on teaching methods that help to improve students’ metacognition by teaching them time management and planning skills. The study will begin in spring 2017.
Standard F – Program Support
Support Staff, Administration, Facilities, Equipment, and Library

Adequacy of Staff

The department has one full-time Administrative Specialist who supports both political science and philosophy faculty. The department has a department chair, and the philosophy program has a separate coordinator who handles scheduling, advising, and other administrative duties.

From 2009 – summer 2016, Ms. Debra Strait served as our Administrative Specialist. Upon her retirement, she was replaced by Ms. Nicole Gabor. Under Ms. Strait’s leadership, the department maintained organized storerooms, records for all departmental business, supervision of the budget, relationships across campus, and a friendly face for students. She consistently received top ratings in every aspect of the annual Performance Review and Enrichment Program (PREP) report, and we hope for a continuing high level of support from Ms. Gabor.

i. Ongoing Staff Development

Since hiring on with us in summer 2016, Ms. Gabor has completed the following training sessions:

- Google Calendar refresher and Q&A (October 2016)
- Customer Love: Great Stories About Great Service (October 2016)
- Communication Bleeps and Blunders in Customer Service (October 2016)
- The Simple Truths of Service (October 2016)
- Introduction to Argos Reporting (September 2016)
- Information Security Awareness (September 2016)
- Ethics, Integrity, and Fairness: Legal Issues in Higher Education (July 2016)
- University Governance and Employee Rights (July 2016)
- Discrimination, Harassment & Title IX (July 2016)
- Building a Safe Campus through Trust and Education (June 2016)
- New Employee Breakfast/Tour (June 2016)

This demonstrates to us a strong commitment to her job, and we anticipate that she will continue to gain new skills and participate in additional training opportunities in the future.

Adequacy of Administrative Support

The program has benefitted from sustained, positive support from the Development Office, the Dean’s office, and the offices of the Provost and President. The College maintains two academic advisors, who advise students on degree mapping and on choosing majors/minors.

Adequacy of Facilities and Equipment

The College provides funding for technology, so we don’t have a line item for technology in our budget. We have in recent years received funding to upgrade each of our computers, monitors, and printers, and the College’s technology support person ensures that these are kept in optimal working order. All of our classrooms are smart classrooms equipped with computers, projection equipment, and Internet access.
Adequacy of Library Resources

The Stewart Library at Weber State University provides a broad range of information resources and services on both the Ogden and Davis campuses. Collections include print, electronic, and audio-visual materials as well as an increasingly large number of electronic databases. Day, evening, and weekend hours are maintained to accommodate patron needs at both campuses. Off-campus access to resources and services is available twenty four hours a day, seven days a week through the library’s website: http://library.weber.edu.

To ensure that the library’s online and on-site resources are relevant to curricular needs, a librarian is assigned to each college. These subject librarians collaborate with faculty in developing the collection and consult regularly with them to assess their library needs. In addition to their collection management and faculty liaison responsibilities, subject librarians provide course-integrated instruction to inform students and faculty of library resources and services available in their areas of interest.

The Stewart Library maintains an up-to-date core collection of print monographs and edited collections that compares very favorably with collections at similar institutions that support an undergraduate major in philosophy. For materials not available in our collection, the library provides an effective and efficient automated interlibrary loan service with an average turnaround of three to seven days. In addition, through the library’s membership in the Utah Academic Library Consortium (UALC), students and faculty at Weber State University have borrowing privileges at all other academic libraries in Utah.

The library also maintains subscriptions to a representative core collection of journals in philosophy and related fields, with a special emphasis on titles that support undergraduate research and instruction. Access to the scholarly literature in philosophy is also supported by electronic subscriptions to various indexing and abstracting services, including Philosopher’s Index. In addition, as a member of UALC, the library provides access to a growing collection of electronic journals in philosophy, including those available through EBSCO’s Religion & Philosophy Collection, Project Muse, and JSTOR. Off-campus access to these electronic resources is available to students, staff, and faculty twenty four hours a day, seven days a week through the library website. For articles not available in print or electronic form directly though the library, our interlibrary loan service is able to deliver a majority of requested articles in electronic form within twenty four to forty eight hours.

In sum, it is clear that the Stewart Library meets the needs of the philosophy program at Weber State. The library is also committed to working closely with the philosophy faculty in order to maintain and (as circumstances allow) enhance that level of support.
Standard G - Relationships with External Communities

Description of Role in External Communities

Dr. Robert Fudge
- President-Elect, Ogden Symphony Ballet Association (summer 2016 – summer 2017)
- Board Member, Ogden Symphony Ballet Association (summer 2009 – summer 2015; summer 2016 – present)
- Member, American Society for Aesthetics

Dr. Richard Greene
- Executive Board Chair, Intercollegiate Ethics Bowl
- Executive Director, Society for Skeptical Studies
- Director of the Philosophy in the Schools Program, Ogden School District (2013 – 2014)
- Steering Committee Member, National High School Ethics Bowl
- Chair, Rules Committee, Intercollegiate Ethics Bowl (through 2012)
- Member, American Philosophical Association
- Member, Association for Practical and Professional Ethics

Dr. Mary Beth Willard
- Board member, Richard Richards Institute (2011-present)
- Member, American Philosophical Association
- Member, American Society for Aesthetics

Summary of External Advisory Committee Minutes

The philosophy program does not have an External Advisory Committee.
Standard H – Program Summary
Results of Previous Program Reviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Identified</th>
<th>Action Taken</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. No established procedure for gathering/storing assessment outcome data for the Senior Capstone Seminar.</td>
<td>All area exam data are stored on ChiTester. Assessment data concerning completion of the capstone project are stored by supervising faculty and reported annually to the Program Director for inclusion in the annual assessment report.</td>
<td>This procedure was implemented beginning spring 2013 and has been maintained ever since.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Insufficient evidence showing that gen ed courses meet established learning outcomes.</td>
<td>In summer 2012, the philosophy program faculty established an assessment schedule to ensure that all gen ed courses meet learning outcomes. The results of these assessments are reported to the Program Director for inclusion in the annual assessment report.</td>
<td>This procedure was implemented beginning fall 2012 and has been maintained ever since.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Feedback from program alumni is primarily anecdotal.</td>
<td>In summer 2012, the philosophy program faculty wrote an exit interview that must be completed by all graduating majors and minors before they are cleared for graduation. Responses to this are anonymous and are stored on ChiTester.</td>
<td>This exit interview was implemented beginning fall 2012, and all graduating majors and minors have been held to the requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Insufficient records kept on adjunct teaching.</td>
<td>Beginning spring 2012, the Program Director began keeping records on all courses taught by adjunct faculty.</td>
<td>This procedure was implemented beginning spring 2012 and has been maintained ever since.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Learning outcomes not included on departmental syllabi.</td>
<td>Prior to each semester, the Program Director now sends out a reminder e-mail.</td>
<td>This procedure was implemented beginning fall 2012 and has been maintained ever since.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with all learning outcomes to be included on the relevant syllabi.</td>
<td>since.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. There is no established process for gathering and storing program assessment materials.</td>
<td>Beginning fall 2012, the Program Director began compiling and reporting assessment materials on a regular basis.</td>
<td>This procedure was implemented beginning fall 2012 and has been maintained ever since.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. As identified by the previous review team, the implementation of a philosophy major has created a pressing need for an additional faculty member to cover additional courses. This is especially so, given the very large number of student credit hours produced each semester.</td>
<td>The philosophy program faculty continue to remind the Dean of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences of the ongoing need for a fourth philosophy faculty member.</td>
<td>This effort is ongoing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As suggested by the above, most of the issues identified in our last program review concerned the compiling and storing of data (especially assessment data). These issues were rectified quickly, and the procedures put in place have been maintained ever since.
Action Plan for Ongoing Assessment Based on Current Self Study Findings

Action Plan for Evidence of Learning Related Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Identified</th>
<th>Action to Be Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issue 1: Small size of program continues to limit our ability to grow majors and maintain stability/continuity during periods when full-time faculty members go on sabbaticals or other kinds of leave. There also exists the potential to hamper faculty members' ability to serve in positions such as department chair, director of the Honors Program, etc., since these positions limit the person's time that can be devoted to teaching, advising, and mentoring.</td>
<td>• This is an ongoing issue, and we will continue to advocate for a fourth full-time faculty member.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Issue 2: Our number of majors dropped considerably after the 2012-2013 academic year and has held steady since then. In part, this is because we had a large critical mass of students build up between 2011-2013, and many of these students graduated (see Appendix A). Nevertheless, growing our program continues to be a major goal of our program. | • Continue to advocate for an additional full-time faculty member to bring stability and additional areas of expertise to our department (see above). This is an ongoing issue and is to a considerable degree out of our control.  
• Apply lessons from development theory to reorient our promotional materials. At present, we do a good job explaining what we do and how we do it, but we do not communicate to students why our discipline is important.  
• Establish a greater presence on campus, through talks, debates, promotional events, and philosophy club activities. |

The primary challenge facing the philosophy program is growth. As detailed above, we are a small department stretched too thin when it comes to covering the major sub-disciplines of philosophy. Indeed, there are many areas we are unable to cover because of both time constraints and lack of area expertise. This has limited our ability to appeal to students, and while we continue to attract a healthy number of majors and minors, we have not experienced the amount of growth we would like to see.
Because gaining an additional faculty member is almost entirely out of our control, our goal of increasing majors and minors will have to focus on reorienting how we promote ourselves to students and the university community at large. Beginning summer 2017, we will look closely at our promotional materials and, applying lessons from development theory, will develop a strategy for explaining why our discipline is important, thus aligning our values with those of prospective students. We will then develop a more structured way to advertise our program across the university.
**Action Plan for Staff, Administration, or Budgetary Findings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Identified</th>
<th>Action to Be Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We have identified no problems concerning staff, administration, or budget.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Philosophy Program deems its staff, administrative, and budgetary support adequate.
### Summary of Artifact Collection Procedure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifact</th>
<th>Learning Outcome Measured</th>
<th>When/How Collected?</th>
<th>Where Stored?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capstone seminar area exams</td>
<td>Area subject knowledge</td>
<td>Administered over ChiTester during the student’s final spring semester.</td>
<td>Stored on ChiTester under a special username created for the department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam interview</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Administered over ChiTester after the student has applied for graduation and seeks graduation clearance.</td>
<td>Stored on ChiTester under a special username created for the department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course and enrollment tracking</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>The Program Director collects detailed information each semester on courses offered, third-week enrollments, and instructor data.</td>
<td>All data are kept in a notebook in the Program Director’s office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Data</td>
<td>All learning outcomes</td>
<td>The Program Director compiles data at the end of each semester from the faculty members generating assessment data in their classes.</td>
<td>Individual faculty members store the data for their assessed classes; the Program Director stores the compiled data both electronically and in an assessment notebook; and, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness posts/stores all assessment materials on the Provost’s website.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDICES

Appendix A: Student and Faculty Statistical Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>6,173</td>
<td>6,238</td>
<td>5,175</td>
<td>6,482</td>
<td>7,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>4,482</td>
<td>4,427</td>
<td>3,594</td>
<td>4,069</td>
<td>4,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Credit Hours Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,655</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,665</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,769</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,551</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,395</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student FTE Total</strong></td>
<td>355.17</td>
<td>355.50</td>
<td>292.30</td>
<td>351.70</td>
<td>379.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Majors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy*</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Graduates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy (first majors only)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy (first and second majors) **</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy minors***</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Demographic Profile</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty FTE Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>16.75</strong></td>
<td><strong>16.15</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.54</strong></td>
<td><strong>15.49</strong></td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct FTE</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract FTE</td>
<td>9.11</td>
<td>9.11</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>9.11</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student/Faculty Ratio</strong></td>
<td><strong>21.20</strong></td>
<td><strong>22.01</strong></td>
<td><strong>20.10</strong></td>
<td><strong>22.70</strong></td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Except as noted below, data provided by Institutional Effectiveness*

* We find the reliability of these numbers suspect, as the university systems only report on first majors, and many of our students have declared philosophy as their second major.

** Because we have tracked our graduates during the past five years, we have been able to confirm with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness that this row reflects our true number of graduates.

*** Data compiled by the Philosophy Program Director.
Program Credit Hour requirements: 120
  General Education hours: 42 (19 credits of core courses, 23 credits of breadth courses)
  Required support course hours: 0
  Required major course hours: 36
  Required elective course hours: 42

(These figures are provided by the Institutional Effectiveness office in partner with the Registrar's Office)

Course Requirements for BA Degree

Core Courses Required (9 credit hours)

- PHIL HU1000 Introduction to Philosophy (3)
- PHIL HU1250 Critical Thinking (3)
  or PHIL 2200 Deductive Logic (3)
- PHIL 4900 Senior Capstone Seminar (3)

Electives (27 credit hours minimum)
Select a minimum of 27 credit hours from the following list, of which at least 24 must be upper division, including one of either PHIL 3010 or 3020, one of either PHIL 3600 or 3650, and one of either PHIL 4510 or 4520.

- PHIL HU1120 Contemporary Moral Problems (3)
- PHIL 2920 Short Courses, Workshops, Institutes and Special Programs (1-3)
- PHIL 3010 History of Philosophy: Classical & Medieval (3)
- PHIL 3020 History of Philosophy: Modern (3)
- PHIL 3150 Existentialism (3)
- PHIL 3200 Philosophy of Democracy (3)
- PHIL 3250 Philosophy of Law (3)
- PHIL 3350 Medical Ethics (3)
- PHIL 3500 Philosophy of Western Religion (3)
• PHIL 3550 Philosophy of Eastern Religion (3)
• PHIL 3650 Aesthetics (3)
• PHIL 4400 Great Issues in Philosophy (3)
• PHIL 4450 Great Thinkers of Philosophy (3)
• PHIL 4510 Metaphysics (3)
• PHIL 4520 Epistemology (3)
• PHIL 4530 Philosophy of Mind (3)
• PHIL 4540 Philosophy of Language (3)
• PHIL 3600 Ethical Theory (3)
• PHIL 4810 Experimental
• PHIL 4830 Directed Readings (1-2)
• PHIL 4920 Short Courses, Workshops, Institutes and Special Programs (1-3)

Students majoring in philosophy must also satisfy the 12-credit B.A. language requirement. Six of these credits must be from foreign language classes (they need not be in the same language), while the other six are automatically satisfied by taking upper-division philosophy classes.
Appendix B: Contract/Adjunct Faculty Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Tenure Status</th>
<th>Highest Degree</th>
<th>Years of Teaching</th>
<th>Courses Taught</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jason Goltz</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Spring 2014 - present</td>
<td>1000, 1120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Healow</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Visiting Instructor</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td>ABD</td>
<td>Fall 2016 - present</td>
<td>1000, 1120, 3200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Hermon</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Fall 2008 – Fall 2013</td>
<td>1000, 1120, 2200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Hill</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td>J.D., M.A.</td>
<td>Fall 2011 – Spring 2012</td>
<td>1000, 1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Jonesinski</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>Fall 2007 - Spring 2012</td>
<td>1000, 1120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc Nelson</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>Spring 2012 - present</td>
<td>1000, 1120, 2920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Robison-Greene</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td>ABD</td>
<td>Fall 2011 - present</td>
<td>1000, 1120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key**
PHIL 1000 Introduction to Philosophy
PHIL 1120 Contemporary Moral Problems
PHIL 1250 Critical Thinking
PHIL 2920 Special Programs (study abroad)
PHIL 3200 Philosophy of Democracy
### Appendix C: Staff Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Years of Employment</th>
<th>Areas of Expertise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Debra Strait</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Administrative Specialist I</td>
<td>2009 – 2016</td>
<td>General office administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole Gabor</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Administrative Specialist I</td>
<td>2016 - present</td>
<td>General office administration; Microsoft Office &amp; Windows; basic accounting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Financial Analysis Summary

(This information is provided by the Provost’s Office)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>10-12</th>
<th>12-13</th>
<th>13-14</th>
<th>14-15</th>
<th>15-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriated Fund</td>
<td>$756,236</td>
<td>$836,138</td>
<td>$842,990</td>
<td>$859,507</td>
<td>$891,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Legislative Appropriation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants or Contracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Fees/Differential Tuition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$756,236</td>
<td>$836,138</td>
<td>$842,990</td>
<td>$859,507</td>
<td>$891,562</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E: External Community Involvement Names and Organizations

This material appears Standard G above and will not be repeated here.
Appendix F: Site Visit Team (both internal and external members)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael Wutz</td>
<td>Rodney H. Brady Presidential Distinguished Professor of English</td>
<td>Weber State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Popich</td>
<td>Professor of Philosophy</td>
<td>Westminster College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G: Evidence of Learning Courses within the Major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurable Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Method of Measurement</th>
<th>Threshold for Evidence of Student Learning</th>
<th>Findings Linked to Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Interpretation of Findings</th>
<th>Action Plan/Use of Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topical Knowledge:</strong> Demonstrate an understanding of the basic issues and terminology in the following areas: logic, metaphysics, epistemology, and ethics.</td>
<td>Measure 1: Students complete a set of exams over ChiTester covering each of the four areas being assessed.</td>
<td>Measure 1: Each exam will be passed by at least 80% of students within two attempts of taking it.</td>
<td>Measure 1: Two out of two students taking the course in spring 2016 passed all the exams on the first attempt.</td>
<td>Measure 1: Students successfully demonstrated adequate understanding of the basic issues and terminology in the four areas being tested.</td>
<td>Measure 1: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Critical Thinking:</strong> Demonstrate the ability to distinguish between and assess the strength of arguments and explanations.</td>
<td>Measure 1: Reasoning skills evaluated in capstone paper on a topic of their choice.</td>
<td>Measure 1: At least 80% of students will demonstrate the ability to construct and defend plausible arguments in support of their main thesis.</td>
<td>Measure 1: Two out of two students taking the course in spring 2016 demonstrated the ability to construct and defend plausible arguments in support of their main thesis, averaging a 9.0 on a 10-point scale (proficiency is anything higher than 7.0).</td>
<td>Measure 1: Students successfully demonstrated critical thinking skills.</td>
<td>Measure 1: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurable Learning Outcome</td>
<td>Method of Measurement</td>
<td>Threshold for Evidence of Student Learning</td>
<td>Findings Linked to Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>Interpretation of Findings</td>
<td>Action Plan/Use of Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will...</td>
<td>Direct and Indirect Measures*</td>
<td>anything higher than 7.0)</td>
<td>Measure 1: Two out of two students taking the course in spring 2016 demonstrated the ability to accurately explain, interpret, and evaluate philosophical texts, averaging a 9.0 on a 10-point scale (proficiency is anything higher than 7.0).</td>
<td>Measure 1: Students successfully demonstrated explicative, interpretive, and evaluative skills.</td>
<td>Measure 1: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading Comprehensions:</strong></td>
<td>Measure 1: Explicative, interpretive, and evaluative skills are evaluated in capstone paper on a topic of their choice.</td>
<td>Measure 1: At least 80% of students will demonstrate the ability to accurately explain, interpret, and evaluate philosophical texts.</td>
<td>Measure 1: Two out of two students taking the course in spring 2016 demonstrated the ability to accurately explain, interpret, and evaluate philosophical texts, averaging a 9.0 on a 10-point scale (proficiency is anything higher than 7.0).</td>
<td>Measure 1: Students successfully demonstrated explicative, interpretive, and evaluative skills.</td>
<td>Measure 1: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Writing:</strong></td>
<td>Measure 1: Writing skills assessed in capstone paper.</td>
<td>Measure 1: At least 80% of students will demonstrate the ability to present ideas clearly and with minimal grammatical and other writing errors.</td>
<td>Measure 1: Two out of two students taking the course in spring 2016 demonstrated the ability to present ideas clearly and with minimal grammatical and other writing errors, averaging a 10 on a 10-point scale (proficiency is anything higher than 7.0).</td>
<td>Measure 1: Students successfully demonstrated the ability to present ideas clearly and with minimal grammatical and other writing errors.</td>
<td>Measure 1: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurable Learning Outcome</td>
<td>Method of Measurement</td>
<td>Threshold for Evidence of Student Learning</td>
<td>Findings Linked to Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>Interpretation of Findings</td>
<td>Action Plan/Use of Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Writing:</strong> The ability to conduct research in accordance with generally accepted standards within the discipline.</td>
<td>Measure 1: Students will demonstrate ability to research, document, and cite sources in capstone paper.</td>
<td>Measure 1: At least 80% of students will demonstrate the ability to research, document, and cite sources in capstone paper.</td>
<td>Measure 1: Two out of two students taking the course in spring 2016 demonstrated effective research skills, averaging a 10 on a 10-point scale (proficiency is anything higher than 7.0).</td>
<td>Measure 1: Students successfully demonstrated effective research skills.</td>
<td>Measure 1: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Writing:</strong> The ability to write in a way that reflects careful attention to language, logic, and subtleties of reasoning.</td>
<td>Measure 1: Writing skills assessed in capstone paper.</td>
<td>Measure 1: At least 80% of students will demonstrate the ability to present ideas clearly with careful attention to language, logic, and subtleties of reasoning.</td>
<td>Measure 1: Two out of two students taking the course in spring 2016 demonstrated the ability to present ideas clearly with careful attention to language, logic, and subtleties of reasoning, averaging a 9.0 on a 10-point scale (proficiency is anything higher than 7.0).</td>
<td>Measure 1: Students successfully demonstrated the ability to present ideas clearly with careful attention to language, logic, and subtleties of reasoning.</td>
<td>Measure 1: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Evidence of Learning: General Education Courses**

### PHIL 1120 Contemporary Moral Problems, Spring 2016: General Education Learning Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Learning Goal</th>
<th>Measurable Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Method of Measurement</th>
<th>Findings Linked to Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Interpretation of Findings</th>
<th>Action Plan/Use of Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will...</td>
<td>Students will...</td>
<td>Students assessed on 15 multiple-choice questions (exam 1)</td>
<td>On average 76.7% of students answered each question correctly (goal is 70% or higher).</td>
<td>Students met expectations of learning outcome</td>
<td>No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1: Students will demonstrate knowledge of diverse philosophical traditions, as well as key themes, concepts, issues, terminology, and ethical standards in philosophy.</td>
<td>Demonstrate knowledge of discipline-specific terminology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 2: Students will analyze cultural artifacts within philosophy. (For our purposes, this will be interpreted as involving logical analysis of philosophy texts.)</td>
<td>Distinguish between and assess different kinds of arguments</td>
<td>Students assessed on 4 essay exam questions concerning philosophical arguments (exam 1)</td>
<td>Students averaged an 80.5% on these questions (goal is 70% or higher).</td>
<td>Students met expectations of learning outcome</td>
<td>No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 3: Students will demonstrate the ability to effectively communicate their understanding of philosophical issues in written, oral, or graphic forms</td>
<td>Identify and summarize the competing philosophical positions contained within a passage or text</td>
<td>Students assessed on a paper assignment, covering one of the three controversial moral issues covered during the semester.</td>
<td>Students averaged an 87.3% on the paper (goal is 70% of higher).</td>
<td>Students met expectations of learning outcome</td>
<td>No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At least one measure per objective must be a direct measure. Indirect measures may be used to supplement evidence provided via the direct measures.
### Appendix H: Upper-Division Assessment Rubric

**Assessment Rubric for Upper-Division Philosophy Courses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topical Knowledge</strong></td>
<td>Pervasive and fundamental misunderstandings.</td>
<td>Rudimentary understanding, but much room for improvement.</td>
<td>Strong grasp of material, but not demonstrating mastery.</td>
<td>Mastery of topic demonstrated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Critical Thinking</strong></td>
<td>Arguments are absent or consistently poor.</td>
<td>Attempt to formulate arguments, but still in need of considerable development.</td>
<td>Arguments are generally strong, but some improvement can still be made.</td>
<td>Very strong, well-focused arguments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading Comprehension</strong></td>
<td>Student demonstrates pervasive misunderstanding of philosophical texts.</td>
<td>Some understanding of texts demonstrated, but crucial points overlooked or misunderstood.</td>
<td>Strong grasp of texts, but still room for improvement.</td>
<td>Mastery of texts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Writing: Mechanics</strong></td>
<td>Pervasive writing errors.</td>
<td>Though not pervasive, writing quality not up to college level.</td>
<td>Writing is good, but some improvement still need.</td>
<td>Few to no writing issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Writing: Research Standards</strong></td>
<td>No references present and no attempt to satisfy research requirements of assignment.</td>
<td>References incomplete or incorrectly formatted and little to no attempt to satisfy research requirements.</td>
<td>References are complete, but some errors; good attempt to satisfy research requirements.</td>
<td>Complete and appropriate references; research requirements fully satisfied.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Writing: Attention to language, logic, and subtleties of reasoning</strong></td>
<td>Writing lacks philosophical sophistication.</td>
<td>Some attention paid to philosophical writing, but still room for much improvement.</td>
<td>Good level of philosophical sophistication demonstrated in writing.</td>
<td>Writing demonstrates a strong grasp of language, logic, and subtleties of reasoning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Historical Knowledge (History Courses Only)</strong></td>
<td>No understanding or fundamental misunderstanding of historical figures demonstrated.</td>
<td>Knowledge of historical figures is rudimentary.</td>
<td>Knowledge of historical figures demonstrates some sophistication.</td>
<td>Knowledge of historical figures is accurate and demonstrates both depth and breadth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I: Exit Interview

1. What led you to choose philosophy as your major/minor?

2. Of the courses you have taken in this department, which did you find most valuable? Why? Which did you find least valuable?

3. What is your overall impression of the availability of upper-division philosophy courses within the program? Did you have any trouble satisfying the program requirements because of the course rotation?

4. What is your overall impression of the selection of upper-division philosophy courses within the program? Are there any courses you think should be added to or removed from the program?

5. How frequently did you seek out advising in the department?

6. What is your overall impression of the quality and availability of advising within the department?

7. What is your overall impression of the library resources in philosophy (including holdings, access to journals, and interlibrary loan services)?

8. Did you take advantage of any extracurricular programs (NOUS, Ethics Bowl) offered by the department? Why or why not?

9. If you did participate in any of the philosophy program’s extracurricular activities, what was your impression of their overall quality?

10. Can you think of any additional extracurricular activities you would like to see offered by the department?

11. What are your plans after graduation?
12. How well did earning a major/minor in the philosophy program prepare you for achieving your post-graduation goals?

13. What skills did you gain in the philosophy program that you think will best serve you after graduation?

14. If you had a chance to do college over again, would you choose philosophy as your major/minor? Why or why not?

15. What discipline was your major/second major/minor in outside of philosophy? How well did your study of philosophy mesh with this other discipline?

16. Did you ever feel that your needs as a student were not given their full attention by the philosophy faculty or that you were ever not treated with respect? If so, explain.

17. What do you consider the overall strengths and weaknesses of the philosophy program?