**IMPERIAL VALLEY COLLEGE**

**Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) Assessment Cycle Form**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Date: | 1/11/13 |  |  |
| Department Name: | Philosophy – Humanities Division |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Course Number/Title or Program Title: | Philosophy 100 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Contact Person/Others Involved in Process: | Lead: Aaron Edwards Others: Carol Hegarty |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| If course is part of a major(s), and/or certificate program(s), please list all below:  |  |  |  |  |
| Major(s): | Certificate(s): |  |  |  |  |  |
| Humanities |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Social Science |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Does course satisfy a community college GE requirement(s)?  | X | Yes  |  | No  |  | N/A |

If yes, check which requirement(s) below:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |   |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | American Institutions |  | Language and Rationality – English Composition |
|  | Health Education |  | Language and Rationality – Communication and Analytical Thinking |
|  | Physical Education / Activity |  | Natural Science |
|  | Math Competency | X | Humanities |
|  | Reading Competency |  | Social and Behavioral Sciences |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | **Student Learning Outcome** | **Assessment Tool**(e.g., exam, rubric, portfolio) | **Institutional Outcome\***(e.g., ISLO1, ISLO2) |
|  | **Example:** Describe and critique an argument that we covered in the class on a main Philosophical subject.  |  **Term Paper**  | ISLO1, ISLO2,ISLO4 |
|  |  |   |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**Each SLO should describe the knowledge, skills, and/or abilities students will have after successful**

**completion of course or as a result of participation in activity/program.** A minimum of one SLO is required

per course/program. You may identify more than one SLO, but please note that you will need to collect and

evaluate data for each SLO that you list above. Attach separate pages if needed. *For assistance contact: Toni Pfister* *toni.pfister@imperial.edu* *or X6546*

**\*Institutional Student Learning Outcomes: ISLO1** = communication skills; I**SLO2** = critical thinking skills;

**ISLO3** = personal responsibility; I**SLO4** = information literacy; I**SLO5** = global awareness

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1. Course Number & Date of Assessment Cycle Completion**  | **Course:** Philosophy 100: Introduction to Philosophy  **Date:** Spring 2012 |
| **2. People involved in summarizing and evaluating data** | Aaron Edwards |
| **3. Data Results**Briefly summarize the results of the data you collected. | I compared how well students understood the arguments of the theory they chose to write on. I also analyzed how clear and well thought out their arguments were. Only 9% of the students earned an “A” on the Term Paper. This is typical for an Introductory Philosophy class in which constructing arguments is very new to the student body.41% of the students earned a “B” on the Term Paper. 37% of the students obtained a “C” on the Term Paper.9% of the students earned a “D” on the Term Paper.4% of the students earned “F” on the Term Paper  |
| **4. Course / Program Improvement**Please describe what change(s) you plan to implement based on the above results. |  In my findings Student performance is very typical for an Introductory Philosophy course. The students did about the same as last year with only a one percent increase in “A”’s and a small decrease in “B”’s. I plan on decreasing the amount of different subject matter is in the overall course and focus more on what I choose to keep. This should help students not get too overwhelmed in an Introductory to Philosophy course. **\*\*Will this include a change to the curriculum (i.e. course outline)? No**  |
| **5. Next Year** Was the process effective? Will you change the outcome/ assessment for next year? (e.g., alter the SLO, assessment, faculty discussion process, strategy for providing SLO to student)? If so, how? | The process was effective in that it confirmed that writing a Philosophy paper and Philosophy in general are very hard for students to comprehend since it entails abstract theories and intense analyzing of these theories.  |
| **6. After-Thoughts** Feel free to celebrate, vent, or otherwise discuss the process. | Since the term paper is evaluated on fairly strict criteria it was not too hard to collect data and gauge how well the students understood the rubric.  |
|  |  |

1. Please list the course number. In case page 1 is separated from page 2, this will help with

organization. Please include the date that assessment cycle was fully completed.

1. To encourage collaboration and the sharing of ideas, each form must be completed by at least

two people. If you are the only one teaching the course, you are encourage to share your data

results and improvement methods with at least one other staff or faculty member. Please list

the names of all faculty, staff, and students who were involved in summarizing or evaluating

the data. These names may be the same or different than those on the original SLO ID form.

1. Your original data results, or your raw data, should be kept within your department for three

years. At this time you do not need to submit the raw data, but please keep it for future quality

control measures. Please summarize the data that you collected. You should include how well

students scored on the assessment. You might also include: how many instructors submitted

data(full-time, part-time); the type of data that was submitted (rubric scores, practical test

results, etc); and, if appropriate, if a cross-section of classes (day, evening, online) were

assessed. If a rubric was used, you might discuss the number of students who scored 1, 2, 3,

or 4, for example, on the rubric.

1. This is an opportunity to have a rich discussion with others involved in education. Please

describe any changes that can be made based on the data. Changes might be made to class

activities, assignment instructions, topics taught in class, or the course outline of record, etc.

You might include when the changes will be implemented and, if a comparison is to be made,

when the next round of data will be collected (e.g. Fall 2009).

Then, answer “Yes” or “No” to the curriculum question – no explanations required but please

answer the question.

1. This may provide an opportunity to discuss what went well and what could be improved.

If the SLO needs to be tweaked or more outcomes/assessments need to be included you might

want to do that now while the information is fresh. This may allow faculty to modify SLO(s)

for next year and be prepared to include them on next year’s syllabus.

1. Please share your thoughts, feelings, and ideas on IVC’s SLO process thus far.

When completed, please email this form to your division secretary or chair (whoever is managing it locally) **AND** send a hard paper copy to the SLO coordinator. Thanks.