

Philosophy Department 2012 Annual Assessment Update

I. Mission Statement, Program Goals, Student Learning Outcomes, Curriculum Map, and Multi-Year Assessment Plan

Mission Statement

http://www.westmont.edu/_academics/departments/philosophy/MissionStatement.html

Program Learning Outcomes

http://www.westmont.edu/_academics/departments/philosophy/StudentLearningOutcomes.html

Curriculum Map

See Appendix A.

Multi-Year Assessment Plan

See Appendix B.

II. Follow up on Action Items identified in previous reports

A. Overview

The Philosophy Department's 2011-12 assessment activities included submission of its 6-Year report, assessment of the skills PLO, rubric creation, and participation in the refinement of PRTV criteria. Due to Jim Taylor's sabbatical in the spring, a number of activities that required departmental reflection and discussion were postponed until the full department could be present. Activities to which the department expects to return in its assessment conversations are noted below.

B. Skills PLO Assessment

The department's skill outcome was the major program PLO to be assessed in 2011-12. David Vander Laan created a rubric for skills assessment (see Appendix D) and assessed the work of the four students in the Senior Seminar. The students were assessed on skills of understanding, construction, and evaluation. The data are stored in the department's program review folder.

The results were these:

Understanding: 2 good, 2 excellent
Construction: 1 good, 3 excellent
Evaluation: 1 fair, 1 good, 2 excellent

Every score but one was good or better; the low score of fair appeared to be work that was hastily done.

The department will discuss the skills rubric, the results of the Senior Seminar assessment, and benchmarks for skills assessment at future departmental meetings.

C. Curricular changes

The department has continued its discussion of possible curricular changes. A number of the possible changes were mentioned in the 2011 6-Year Report. They include expanding the course offerings, such as Philosophy of Science and Philosophy of Mind, and splitting Critical Reasoning and Logic into two courses. The department is also considering whether to increase the number of units required of majors.

Together the department plans to continue discussion of these potential changes. The department has scheduled a day-long retreat for the end of the current semester and has invited members of Biola University's Philosophy Department to come for discussion of the departments' aims for students. Westmont's department hopes that, in addition to encouraging and inspiring the participants in their work, it will also inform both departments as they make curricular plans.

D. Participation in PRTV Criteria Refinement

The department was asked to participate in the GE Committee's discussion of the Philosophical Reflections on Truth and Value requirement. David Vander Laan, as chair, provided input on behalf of the department. Broadly, he proposed language for the official criteria used by the GE Committee that would more closely resemble the committee's supplementary documents, particularly by clarifying the degree of breadth that courses satisfying the requirement should have, and by including several examples. He also proposed two alternative names for the requirement that would better reflect their intended breadth. The GE Committee took this input into account in its decisions.

E. The Case for Additional Faculty

One finding of the department's 6-year report was that additional full-time faculty would in several ways make a significant difference to the overall quality of the program, including its curricular scope. A next step identified there was to share these findings with those involved in college planning processes. Jim Taylor, as the current chair, requested additional faculty in this fall's CIP request. He included data that had been gathered on curricular scope, faculty size, and student to faculty ratios at peer institutions. Those data

(among others) are available in the 6-year report itself, which is stored in the department's program review folder.

F. Removing Students' Personal Information

The Program Review Committee requested that the names of students be removed from certain data that had been stored in the program review folder. Jim Taylor took responsibility for removing that information and did so promptly.

G. Future Discussions

The department anticipates further refinement of its assessment tools in the future, including identifying suitable benchmarks for PLOs, refining the PLOs themselves, and sharpening assessment tools so as to produce more meaningful data. The department plans to discuss these items at departments meetings and then to identify appropriate ways to "close the loop."

III. 2012-13 Focus: Integrating the Major Discipline

A. This year's assessment focus will be the Integrating the Major Discipline requirement of the GE program. Since it will be assessed in the Senior Seminar in the spring semester, no data have yet been collected, and the assessment method has not yet been determined. Since Jim Taylor will teach the Senior Seminar, he will decide on the assessment tool to be used. The department will discuss an appropriate benchmark. The number of students assessed will probably be eight or nine, and the data will be stored in the program review folder, as usual.

B. As noted, it is too early to interpret the results of this assessment, since they have not yet been collected. The department plans to do this interpretation in one of its regular meetings.

C. Plans to close the loop also have yet to be made. (See above.)

IV. Next Steps

A. Skills PLO Assessment

The department as a whole will meet and discuss the results of this past spring's Skills PLO assessment, as well as the rubric developed for this purpose. The department will also discuss which benchmarks seem most appropriate. This will most likely be done later this fall. Primary responsibility for scheduling this discussion belongs to the department chair.

B. Curricular Changes

The department plans to discuss the potential curricular changes noted above. Since there are several of these, it is difficult to say

when the department will focus its energies on each of them. It should also be noted that Mark Nelson anticipates being on sabbatical in the spring 2013 semester, and David Vander Laan anticipates being on sabbatical during the 2013-14 academic year. For that reason some of the course the department regularly offers may not be taught in the next few years, and changes to those courses (or the introduction of new ones) might make more sense at a later date.

That said, David Vander Laan has taken primary responsibility for proposing two courses to take the place of the current Critical Reasoning and Logic course, one to serve as a GE course on broadly applicable reasoning skills, another as a more advanced formal course aimed at majors. He will most likely make this proposal soon after his sabbatical year.

C. Future Discussions

The department's plans for the future include discussion of the other items noted in section II G above. No timeline has been established for when each of these items will be discussed, though it will very likely take place at the department's regular meetings. The primary responsibility for scheduling these discussions belongs to the department chair.

V. Appendices

- A. Curriculum Map
- B. Multi-Year Assessment Plan
- C. 2011 response from the PRC
- D. Prompt used to collect data in PHI-195, spring 2012
- E. Skills rubric
- F. Written Communication appendix

**Appendix A:
Curriculum Map**

<u>Student Learning Outcomes</u>	Knowledge	Skills	Virtues
<p>Where are the Learning Outcomes met? I introduced D developed M mastered (required courses in bold)</p>	<p>I PHI 006 D PHI 101 D PHI 102 D PHI 104 D PHI 113 D PHI 130 D PHI 133 D PHI 135 D PHI 163 D PHI 170 D PHI 175 M PHI 195</p>	<p>I PHI 006 D PHI 012 D PHI 101 D PHI 102 M PHI 195</p>	<p>I PHI 006 D PHI 101 D PHI 102 D PHI 104 D PHI 113 D PHI 130 D PHI 133 D PHI 135 D PHI 163 D PHI 170 D PHI 175 M PHI 195</p>
<p>How are they assessed?</p>	<p>PHI 195 (Capstone)</p>	<p>PHI 195 (Capstone)</p>	<p>PHI 195 (Capstone)</p>
<p>Link to the learning standards</p>	<p>Written and Oral Communication</p>	<p>Critical/Interdisciplinary Thinking</p>	<p>Christian Orientation</p>

**Appendix B:
Multi-Year Plan**

Outcomes	2011 - 2012	2012 - 2013	2013 - 2014	2014 - 2015	2015- 2016	2016 - 2017	Means of Assessment, Benchmark	Who is in charge?	How the loop will be or has been closed
1. Knowledge			X				PHI-195 paper	Nelson	to be determined
2. Skills	X						PHI-195 paper	Vander Laan	results collected, to be discussed
3. Virtues					X		PHI-195 paper	Taylor	to be determined
GE Projects									
4. Philosophical Reflections				X			various, depending on the instructor	all dept. members	to be determined
5. Reasoning Abstractly						X	various, depending on the instructor	Taylor, Vander Laan	to be determined
6. Integrating the Major Discipline		X					various, depending on the instructor	Taylor	to be determined



WESTMONT

Program Review Committee

MEMORANDUM

Date: November 28, 2011
To: Dr. David Vander Laan, Chair of the Department of Philosophy
From: Program Review Committee
Re: 2011 Six-Year Program Review Report

Thank you for your timely submission of the Six-Year Program Review Report and for downloading it into the Program Review Archives. The Program Review Committee recognizes the time and efforts that you have dedicated to this task. In particular, we would like to acknowledge the following accomplishments of your department:

- Revising your mission statement, Program/Student Learning Outcomes, Curriculum Map and Multi-Year Assessment Plan
- Posting mission statement, Program/Student Learning Outcomes the aforementioned documents on the departmental website
- Comparing your curriculum with the curricula of peer institutions and recommendations made by the American Philosophical Association
- Creating the Senior Seminar which serves as the department's capstone course and the locus of the PLOs assessment
- Faculty collaborative spirit and a positive attitude towards assessment

Your reports demonstrates that the department faculty understand the strengths and challenges of your program and are taking steps towards improving the program's effectiveness and sustainability. In the spirit of Christian cooperation, please accept the following comments in an effort to strengthen your accomplishments and guide your future work in assessment.

Program Mission Statement and Outcomes

We acknowledge your thoughtful work in crafting a clear, stimulating and concise mission statement. Thank you for posting it on the departmental website. If your department does not have objections we will ask our Public Affairs Office to post appropriate photographs on your Mission Statement and Student Learning Outcomes websites.

We also recognize your good work in revisiting your Program Learning Outcomes. It is commendable that you have a manageable number of Program Learning Outcomes now. Regarding your PLOs, we would like to note the following:

- Your Skills Program Learning Outcome is clear, measurable and expressed in a simple language, which is laudable.

- Regarding your Knowledge Learning outcome, we wonder what exactly your students should demonstrate, do or present for the faculty to be able to assert that these students are indeed “exhibiting understanding of important philosophical positions, concepts, arguments, and themes.” Are your students expected to explain the significance of these positions, concepts, arguments, and themes? Compare or contrast them? Be able to apply them in various contexts? The language of this outcome needs to be further refined to make it clearer and measurable. If you sharpen your outcome your assessment process will be easier.
- Your Virtues Program Learning Outcome is an affective outcome, which may present a challenge for measuring student learning in relation to it. Have you considered how appreciation of “values and limits of rational inquiry” as well as display of “both the love of wisdom and Socratic humility” in thinking will be assessed? Will students self-report their appreciation and ways of thinking? Or will you be using more direct methods of assessment and augment them by indirect methods for triangulation?
- The PRC thinks that the Program Learning Outcomes should precede the GE Student Learning Outcomes on your SLOs departmental website
<http://www.westmont.edu/academics/departments/philosophy/StudentLearningOutcomes.html>

GE Student Learning Outcomes

We are grateful for your continued collaboration with the GE committee on modifying the language of the Outcome, Certification Criteria, and Interpretive Statement for the Philosophical Reflections on Truth and Value (PRTV) GE area. Regarding the General Education Student Learning Outcomes, we would like to mention the following:

- Your GE PRTV outcome is clear and measurable. Given that the Philosophy Department has primary responsibility for the Philosophical Reflections on Truth and Value GE requirement it is appropriate to list this specific GE outcome on the departmental website. We are not convinced that Reasoning Abstractly and Integrating the Major Discipline outcome should be listed on your departmental website as well. They are posted among other Certification Criteria on the General Education website
http://www.westmont.edu/offices/institutional_portfolio/program_review/GEAssessment.html
- The GE Reasoning Abstractly outcome appears to be a compound outcome. It is our understanding that your department is planning plans to modify this outcome in conjunction with other academic departments offering courses in this GE area and the GE Committee prior to embarking on its assessment.

Alignment Chart and Curriculum Map

Your Curriculum Map (Appendix 6B) clearly demonstrates that the locale of your PLOs assessment is PHI-195: Senior Seminar; while PHI-006 and PHI-012, 101, and 102 are used for assessing student learning in PFTV and Reasoning Abstractly (RA) GE areas respectively. According to your Alignment Chart (Appendix 6A) though, only seven departmental courses and one RS course taught by your department faculty support student learning in relation to either PLOs or GE SLOs. We wonder to which extent this information is accurate as it appears that your Curriculum Map and Alignment Chart are poorly aligned.

We also wonder whether it was intentional that you introduce, develop and assess your Knowledge and Virtue outcomes in the same set of courses rather than in different courses.

Finally, we would also like to warn you that the URLs to the Alignment Chart and Multi-Year Assessment Plan do not work on your departmental website. We hope that both documents will be accessible soon.

Role within the College

We appreciated your contribution to the college's mission, noteworthy your contribution to the GE curriculum, and specifically adding the PHI-195: Senior Seminar, which serves as the departmental capstone course. We applaud the addition of undergraduate research to the curriculum. Both capstone courses and undergraduate research are identified by the American Association of Colleges and Universities as high-impact practices which have proven to be beneficial for college students from many backgrounds. We are interested in learning more about your students' experience with these high-impact practices.

Regarding the PHI-113: Contemporary Moral Problems course, which is no longer required for Liberal Studies majors, we wonder how this specific course learning outcomes are aligned with your PLOs. What categories of students benefit from taking this course? These questions need to be addressed prior to deciding how often the course should be offered and whether it should be taken before the Ethics course.

Since you identified interest in revising your program curriculum, we would recommend that you begin with identifying the knowledge and skills your faculty members expect all the graduates to possess by the time they graduate. Are these skills and competences adequately reflected in your PLOs? You need to conduct a thorough assessment before making decisions about your program and curriculum. Your data should guide your program modification. If you position yourselves as a student-centered department, your program revision should start with establishing clear and measurable standards (outcomes) of student learning.

On a related note, we would like to acknowledge D. Taylor's participation in the Responses to Student workshop held on November 2, 2011 and encourage your faculty to participate in subsequent workshops and assessment clinics on Writing across the Curriculum in Spring 2012. As you stated in your report, "writing is a great importance in philosophical education" (p. 8) and therefore, your involvement in assessing this competence at the institutional and GE level will be beneficial for your program.

Assessment of the Program Learning Outcomes

Again, we acknowledge your revision of the PLOs during the past year, as well as the adjustment of your methods of assessing both, major and GE courses. As mentioned, at least two of your PLOs can be further refined so as to serve you better in your assessment process.

We have not found any program-level assessment data collected prior to Fall 2010 in your Assessment folder in the Program Review Archives and would appreciate your clarification on this issue.

It would be helpful if you included the assessment result summaries for major and GE courses in the body of your report. Without the summaries of your data it is difficult to understand your inferences.

In general, the PRC finds it challenging to comprehend and interpret your assessment results, predominantly because your Knowledge outcome is vague and your assessment instruments have not clearly defined your criteria and grading/assessment subscales. We also wonder why the PHI-104: Ethics course was selected for the program level assessment. According to your Curriculum Map (Chart 6B), in this course the Knowledge outcome is just developed. Hence, it should not be assessed there, as we assess student learning only in the courses where the outcome is mastered. Moreover, even as a course assessment, the project does not appear to yield desired results. Specifically, we wonder what you meant exactly by stating that "results seemed decent but left plenty of room for improvement" (p. 13).

We also wonder whether you can substantiate and support your claim that in the PHI-195: Senior Seminar the results "were encouraging" (p. 13) by providing us with the data summary to back up this

claim. Which criteria were used to assess students' answers with respect to charity, humility, carefulness, creativity, and fair-mindedness dimensions? How do you communicate to your students that they have achieved a certain level of mastery of "clear and correct exposition" of the concept, "relevant terms," or "distinctions and context"? Since the assessment tool does not provide a clear description of the parameters and expected achievements for each dimension and subscale, it is difficult to say what makes a student work excellent, or good, or poor.

If the collected data do not provide faculty with sufficient evidence of student learning or deficiencies they cannot infer specific conclusions from the assessment data other than "results left room for improvement" (p. 14). The insufficient and vague data hinder the in-depth discussion about student learning—which is one of the benefits of assessment, —and preclude closing the loop. In our opinion, your data do not appear to allow you to consider changes in pedagogy, curriculum development, resource allocation, faculty or student support. We are concerned that without clearly articulated outcomes and well-developed assessment instruments you will not be able to collect this type of the data.

General Education and Service Courses

Given that your department is responsible for teaching a substantial number of the GE courses in three different GE areas, we appreciated your detailed and candid account of the GE assessment experience, as well as your valuable suggestions for improvement, which we passed to the GE committee for revision and implementation.

The following comments are in order concerning your GE assessment:

- The PRC strongly encourages you to continue collaborating with the GE committee on refining the certification criteria for the Philosophical Reflections GE area. As you noted in your report (pp. 18-19), the revision of these criteria with the purpose of exploring the possibility to include "the metaphysical underpinnings of epistemological and ethical views" is important. The task needs to be accomplished during the 2011-2012 academic year. We would also like to know whether your department would consider assessing student learning in this GE area in 2012-2013 and not in the 2014-2015 academic year as previously planned. Please, inform us whether this request is doable.
- We commend your refinement of the PHI-006: Philosophical Reflections course learning outcomes (objectives) which constitute a three-part PRTV outcome (pp. 17-18). However, we would like to see a clear expectation of student performance for every dimension and each subscale of your rubric, if you prefer using an analytical rubric, or a clear expectation of student performance for every dimension and a clear description of the highest level of performance expected for each dimension if you prefer using holistic rubric. Brief characteristics of both types of rubric are posted in the Educational Effectiveness website in the Assessment Toolkit folder. The URL is http://www.westmont.edu/offices/institutional_portfolio/program_review/assessmenttoolkit.html. If you are interested in participating in the Assessment Clinic on rubric construction, please contact Dean of Curriculum and Educational Effectiveness.
- We fully support your plan to refine the Reasoning Abstractly certification criteria and assessment tools in conjunction with the GE committee and other departments offering courses in this area prior to conducting the assessment of the RA courses. Since this process is time-consuming, it would be prudent to conduct the assessment of this GE area during the 2014-2015 academic year or even later.

- We back up your plan to begin the assessment of the PHI-195: Senior Seminar fulfilling the Integrating the Major Discipline GE requirement in 2012-2013 academic year and recommend you to incorporate the follow-up assessment of this important area of your major and GE curriculum in the next six-year assessment plan.

Let us reiterate: the assessment instruments currently used for the GE assessment are not effective and specific enough to clearly identify patterns of deficiencies and attainments. The PRC recommends that the Department collaborate with the Dean of Curriculum and Educational Effectiveness on refining the assessment tools and collected reliable and valid data, which would allow the department to address issues in student learning.

Future Steps

Your next steps seem well-thought and logical. The PRC supports your plans to continue refining the major program and GE outcomes and assessment tools. Having recognized that your department has a number of resources to develop effective GE assessment, the PRC would like to see your faculty confidently leading assessment in the Philosophical Perspectives GE area and effectively collaborating with the GE Committee and faculty from other academic departments in assessing the Reasoning Abstractly area. Again, we would like to acknowledge your effective current collaboration with the GE committee and are looking forward to your notable contribution to the General Education assessment in the years to come.

Report and Program Review Archives Organization

Your report is clear, concise and easy to read. We appreciated its positive tone and constructive suggestions. The inclusion of the data summary, preferably in the form of charts or tables, would be very helpful for reading your report by external readers. In the future, we would recommend submitting all the report-related documentation in a .pdf format.

Program Review Archives Organization

It is easy to access your report in the departmental PR Archives, which is laudable. We are concerned, however, that you named the students whose samples were collected in your Program Review Archive Assessment Data. Due to confidentiality issues, we ask you to remove this information from the collected samples by December 15, 2011. Please, use the appropriate codification to protect students' confidentiality, e.g., student 1, student 2, student 3, etc.

Conclusion

We would like to acknowledge that your department has made notable strides in revising your assessment procedures and enhancing student learning in both, major program and GE courses. We appreciated your understanding that the department's future assessment needs to be more sustainable as well as your clear intention to work towards this goal.

Based on our review of your report and assessment activities conducted by the Department of Philosophy in 2005-2011 academic years, the PRC has developed the following recommendations for the department to act upon in the next six-year assessment cycle:

1. solicit an external review for your program
2. refine your PLOs to make them clear and measurable
3. sharpen your assessment tools
4. examine the depth and breadth of offerings in Philosophy following a thorough assessment of student learning in relation to your PLOs and provide evidence of the program quality,

effectiveness, viability and sustainability in the next six-year program review report due on September 15, 2017. You need to adapt effective assessment tools (rubric) to conduct this type of assessment and collect reliable and valid data.

5. review the Philosophy curriculum and provide evidence of its cohesiveness. Please, ensure that all departmental syllabi include course learning outcomes aligned with the program learning outcomes. Ensure that all course learning outcomes are aligned with course assignments, instructional activities, tests, exams, and other instructional products. You may consider using Bloom's Taxonomy posted at the Educational Effectiveness website to complete this task. We would ask your department to demonstrate the alignment between courses and program learning outcomes (PLOs); to discuss the program scaffolding (how all the parts progressively build on each other) and provide evidence of how students learning in relation to your PLOs is supported by all instructional and assessment activities and products in your next six-year program review report.
6. collaborate with the GE committee and other academic department on refining certification criteria and assessment tools for the Philosophical Reflections in Truth and Value and Reasoning Abstractly GE areas. Sharpen your tools for assessing student learning in the GE courses.
7. act upon your data as much as feasible. The end of assessment is action.

In order to ensure that our expectations for your assessment work are supported by adequate resources, the PRC has prepared the attached Memorandum of Understanding to be discussed and signed during your departmental meeting with the Provost and Dean of Curriculum and Educational Effectiveness. This is a new document that we ask all the departments completing their six-year program review this academic year to review and sign. The MOU will serve as general guidance or blueprint for the next assessment cycle, as well as a doable Action Plan, which we would like you to create, following the approval of the MOU, and include in the 2012 Annual Assessment Update Report.

In 2011-2012 academic year, we would ask you to

- remove students' personal information from the Program Review Archives by December 15, 2011
- develop an Action Plan for the next six-year assessment cycle based on the Memorandum of Understanding
- further refine your PLOs
- further sharpen your assessment tools so that the department can collect meaningful data effectively and efficiently
- participate in the Philosophical Reflection on Truth and Value certification criteria and interpretive statement revision

We are also interested in knowing how you evaluate the departmental progress in each of the five categories of the WASC [rubric for Assessing the Quality of Program Learning Outcomes](#) posted on the Educational Effectiveness website, including Comprehensive List, Assessable Outcomes, Alignment, Assessment Planning, and The Student Experience. Please, conduct this exercise prior to your meeting with the Provost and Dean of Curriculum and Educational Effectiveness so that you will be able to bring your results to the meeting for discussion.

We commend you on the continued improvement of your assessment work. The Program Review Committee looks forward to seeing the fruits of this labor in the years to come.

Appendix D:
Prompt for Skills PLO Assessment, Spring 2012
(syllabus excerpt)

Term Paper

Each student will write a 10-12 page original research paper on an appropriate topic of his or her choice (proposal Feb. 28, draft due Mar. 27, final due Apr. 26). Topics must be approved by the instructor in advance. Late drafts and late papers will be penalized. Drafts and final together will be worth 20% of the final grade.

Appendix E: Skills Rubric

Philosophy Major Skills Rubric

	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
understanding	The student fails to notice or offer pertinent arguments; misidentifies conclusions; confuses premises and conclusions.	The student presents arguments with some errors, or with dubious relevance; vaguely or inaccurately indicates the line of reasoning; fails to note their significance.	The student presents arguments accurately; indicates the line of reasoning; describes what a given conclusion does and does not entail.	The student presents arguments precisely, clearly, and thoroughly; notes their significance; indicates their logical structure and type (e.g., inference to best explanation); identifies implicit premises; indicates what motivates crucial premises.
construction	The student fails to present arguments, or presents arguments that are invalid or weak; have implausible premises; reach irrelevant conclusions; are unoriginal.	The student leaves arguments implicit, or presents arguments that have doubtful validity or strength; have implausible premises; are unoriginal.	The student presents arguments that are valid or strong; have plausible or widely held premises; reach relevant conclusions.	The student creates arguments that are valid or strong; have plausible premises; reach substantive and significant conclusions; advance the discussion.
evaluation	The student objects to conclusions without evaluating arguments for them; fails to consider objections.	The student objects to conclusions without evaluating arguments for them; criticizes arguments imprecisely or superficially; rarely considers objections.	The student identifies and explains invalid and weak inferences, implausible assumptions, implausible consequences; considers and responds to objections.	The student clearly identifies and explains invalid and weak inferences, implausible assumptions, implausible consequences; considers and effectively responds to objections.

APPENDIX F: 2012 Assessment of the Written Communication Outcome

Inquiry Does your department have a PLO focused on written communication? If yes, please provide the exact language of the outcome in the box below. If your department does not have the written communication outcome, you do not need to answer the questions below. Thank you.		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <i>To uncheck a box, right click and select properties.</i>	
PLO:			
<hr/>			
1a	Have you assessed student learning in relation to this outcome within the past three years?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<i>If not, please provide a brief explanation as to why not in the box below</i>
<hr/>			
1b	If you have not assessed your student learning in relation to this outcome within the past three years, will you plan to assess this outcome in the 2012-2013 academic year?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<i>If yes, please explain in the box below.</i>
<hr/>			
2	In the boxes below describe briefly the utilized instrument for	<i>Assessment data</i>	
2a	direct assessment of student learning (tests, essays, portfolios, embedded assessments , etc.)	<i>n*=</i>	<i>Results:</i>
2b	Indirect assessment (surveys, interviews, focus groups, etc.)	<i>n*=</i>	<i>Results:</i>

3	What pertinent information did your assessment uncover? <i>Provide your answer in the box below</i>			
4	What conclusions did you come to and what recommendations made? <i>Provide your answer in the box below.</i>			
5	What changes will be incorporated as a result of the departmental data analysis?			
	<i>Closing the loop</i>	<i>When</i>	<i>Who is in charge</i>	<i>Resources required</i>

n = number of student samples or participants