

Philosophy BA

Document Parity Between Online and In-person Courses

Goal Description:

The Philosophy Program will provide assessment data demonstrating parity between the student learning outcomes of its on-line and in-person course offerings.

RELATED ITEMS/ELEMENTS

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Parity Between On-line and In-person Course Offerings

Performance Objective Description:

The Philosophy Program will gather and report data demonstrating that on-line and in-person sections of its courses provide comparable student learning outcomes.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Parity Between On-line and In-person Courses

KPI Description:

For courses that are offered in both on-line and in-person formats, the Philosophy Program will continue to report aggregate data on student learning outcomes. The program will also report disaggregated data for on-line and in-person courses. The program will consider its efforts a success if all three data sets show the requisite improvement outlined for each learning objective.

Results Description:

PHIL 1301

Whether looking at face-to-face students, on-line students, or all students aggregated, PHIL 1301 students met the criteria for success on one of the elements of knowledge of Kant (question 10) and failed to achieve the other (question 12).

Both face-to-fce and on-line sections of PHIL 1301 met the criteria for success with respect to general improvement of students' knowledge of core concepts in philosophy.

PHIL 2303

In both face-to-face and online sections of PHIL 2303, the Program failed to achieve its goal with respect to student performance on calculating linked probabilities. After discussions with faculty in both on-line and in-person sections, it was discovered that some faculty had not made teaching this element of the course a priority.

While face-to-face sections of PHIL 2303 successfully improved student performance on the TACTS test, online sections did not.

PHIL 2306

Face-to-face sections of PHIL 2306 met the criteria for both elements of knowledge of the death penalty debate; however, on-line sections only met the criterion associated with question 20 and failed to meet the criterion associated with question 19.

Both face-to-fce and on-line sections of PHIL 2306 met the criteria for success with respect to general improvement of students' knowledge of core concepts in philosophy.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

Parity Between In-person and On-line Classes

Action Description:

The initial set of disaggregated data shows that neither on-line nor in-person sections of our courses met all criteria for success, in-person sections achieved more of the criteria for success than on-line sections. Because this is the first set of data to show these results, the Program will take a measured response to the findings. In response to the 2017-2018 results, the Program will conduct a series of meetings with all instructors to ensure that all faculty are aware of the expected outcomes from their courses. This has already been identified as an issue in both on-line and in-person sections of PHIL 2303. During these meetings, the Program will also have open discussions of other potential areas of improvement in our various courses. The program will continue to monitor the outcomes in in-person and on-line sections of its courses looking for patterns.

Improve the Granularity of Data from PHIL 2303 Assessment

Goal Description:

The Philosophy Program will review the TACTS instrument used for PHIL 2303 assessment and identify specific elements that align with expected student learning outcomes in an effort to improve the granularity of assessment data.

RELATED ITEMS/ELEMENTS -----

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Identification of Specific Items on the TACTS for PHIL 2303 Assessment

Performance Objective Description:

The Program will identify specific elements with the TACTS for direct item analysis that can disaggregate data on student performance in an effort to identify specific areas for improvement with the PHIL 2303 courses. The Program expects to complete its review of the TACTS in time to begin assessing particular items during Fall 2017.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

TACTS Item Analysis Review

KPI Description:

The Philosophy Program will complete its review of the TACTS prior to the start of Fall 2017 courses. The Program will identify specific questions on the TACTS for item analyses that will aid the identification of specific areas for improvement. The Program will consider its efforts a success if it has completed the review and is able to report a list of elements that will be directly assessed during AY 2017-2018.

Results Description:

The Program completed its review of the TACTS questions and identified 20 items that will be used for assessment going forward. The Program received permission from the TACTS' authors to create a new instrument that incorporates these 20 items. The final instrument was prepared and distributed to all PHIL 2303 faculty for administration in their Fall 2017 sections of PHIL 2303. This will allow the program to reduce the noisiness of the data it collects because the assessment instrument will no longer include questions that are unrelated to the identified student learning outcomes of the PHIL 2303 course.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

Implementing Metacognition Instrument

Action Description:

The Philosophy Program will administer the new combined critical thinking and metacognition instrument in all sections of PHIL 2303 during Fall 2017 and Spring 2018. This will replace the TACTS as the main assessment instrument for PHIL 2303.

Improving Critical Thinking And Analytic Reasoning

Goal Description:

Students completing the critical thinking and logic courses in our curriculum will develop a broad-based skills in critical thinking and formal logic.

RELATED ITEMS/ELEMENTS -----

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Demonstrate Critical Thinking Skills

Learning Objective Description:

Critical thinking skills are an essential component of philosophical work. Students will be able to analyze arguments and draw conclusions from available information.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Improved Calculation of Linked Probabilities

Indicator Description:

Students will demonstrate an improvement in their ability to calculate linked probabilities from the start of the course to the end of the course, and students will demonstrate a skill level on this task that surpasses that of students in a senior-level College of Business course.

Criterion Description:

The percentage of students who correctly answer question 23 on the TACTS instrument will increase by at least 150% from the pre-test to the post-test. Further, the percentage of students who correctly answer question 23 on the post-test will exceed 50%. This target was chosen because the creators of the TACTS report that less than 40% of students in a senior-level College of Business course answered question 23 correctly. The Program will consider its efforts to improve student performance in this area a success if students show substantial improvement and the end-of-course assessment shows that students in this general education course are performing better than senior-level students have historically performed.

Findings Description:

Face-to-Face Results:

Among the 469 face-to-face students who took the pre-test, 73 (15.5%) answered question 23 correctly. Among the 434 students who took the post-test, 167 (38.4%) answered question 23 correctly. These results indicate an increase of 147% in the number of students who answered question 23 correctly. This result did not meet the criterion for success.

The post-test result that 38.4% of students answered question 23 correctly indicates that students completing this general education course did not do better on this task than historical senior-level business students. This result did not meet the criterion for success.

These results indicate a decline in performance from the previous year. In discussions with faculty, it was discovered that a faculty member teaching PHIL 2303 for the first time did not include a unit on linked probabilities for his 128 students. This may explain the decline in student performance.

Online Results:

Among the 34 online students who took the pre-test, 2 (5.9%) answered question 23 correctly. Among the 23 students who took the post-test, 4 (17.4%) answered question 23 correctly. These results indicate an increase of 195% in the number of students who answered question 23 correctly. This result did meet the criterion for success. However, the small number of students who correctly answered the question raises questions about the student learning outcome for this group of students in this area.

The post-test result that 17.4% of students answered question 23 correctly indicates that students completing this general education course did not do better on this task than historical senior-level business students. This result did not meet the criterion for success.

In discussions with faculty, it was discovered that the faculty member teaching PHIL 2303 online did not include a unit on linked probabilities for his students.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

Linked Probabilities Action

Action Description:

The program will undertake a series of program-wide meetings to ensure that all faculty are teaching all required elements of Core Curriculum courses. The focus of these meetings will be to ensure that all faculty are aware of the expectations for each course.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Response Scores On TACTS

Indicator Description:

All students who take PHIL 2303 will be tested on their critical thinking skills. All faculty who teach PHIL 2303 will administer the Texas Assessment of Critical Thinking Skill (TACTS), an externally validated test of critical thinking skills, in a pre-test/post-test format. The TACTS is a broad-based assessment of critical thinking skills that goes beyond the current scope of PHIL 2303. This will allow the faculty to determine areas that may be added to our current curriculum in the future. In addition, it allows for substantial flexibility in what is taught, thereby ensuring academic freedom for instructors to design individual sections around their own expertise and interests. A copy of the current TACTS is attached. A copy of the credited responses is attached. The Philosophy Program Coordinator will be responsible for ensuring that all faculty who teach PHIL 2303 effectively administer the pre- and post-tests in every section of their course. Dr. Sanford will be responsible for gathering pre- and post-test data from the faculty members who teach PHIL 2303.

Criterion Description:

A paired two-sample t-test will be performed on the scores of all students who take the pre-test and the post-test. The philosophy program expects to see a statistically significant improvement from the pre-test to the post-test.

Findings Description:

Face-to-Face Results

A parametric dependent samples *t*-test revealed a statistically significant difference between the pre- to post-scores for students enrolled in face-to-face sections of PHIL 2303: Critical Thinking for the 2016-2017 academic year, $t(325) = -4.08, p < .001$. This difference represented a small effect size (Cohen's *d*) of 0.26 (Cohen, 1988). The average student score increased from 29.76% to 32.95%, for an increase of approximately 3%. Readers are directed to Table 1 in the attached PDF for a breakdown of these results.

On-line Results

For online students, a parametric dependent samples *t*-test did not reveal a statistically significant difference between the pre- to post-scores, $t(21) = -1.36, p = .19$. Readers are directed to Table 2 in the attached PDF for a breakdown of these results.

Combined Results

Finally, for both populations combined, a parametric dependent samples *t*-test revealed a statistically significant difference between the pre- to post-scores for the 2016-2017 academic year, $t(347) = -4.26, p < .001$. This difference represented a small effect size (Cohen's *d*) of 0.26 (Cohen, 1988). The average student score increased from 30.17% to 33.34%, for an increase of approximately 3%. Readers are directed to Table 3 in the attached PDF for a breakdown of these results.

Attached Files

 [Texas Assessment of Critical Thinking Skills 2016-2017 Report](#)

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

TACTS Scores Action

Action Description:

The Program will continue to monitor student learning outcomes in all sections of PHIL 2303. In addition, the Program will hold meetings with all faculty who teach PHIL 2303 to facilitate sharing of successful strategies for engaging students and improving outcomes. The focus of these meetings will be on improving performance in on-line sections of PHIL 2303.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Demonstrate Formal Logic Skills

Learning Objective Description:

Formal reasoning is a highly regarded component of philosophical work. Students will be able to analyze formal arguments and construct formal proofs.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Formal Arguments and Proofs

Indicator Description:

All students in PHIL 2352 will be tested on their knowledge of basic concepts in formal logic using a locally standardized pre-test and post-test for each section. Following a review of best practices for the teaching of these courses, a group of Program faculty chose the questions for the assessment. The questions asked cover the range of concepts that are taught in peer departments. Instruction on these concepts promotes a basic competence in analysis of formal arguments and construction of formal proofs. The attached document provide the assessment instrument for PHIL 2352.

Criterion Description:

A paired two-sample t-test will be performed on the scores of all students who take the pre-test and the post-test. Students will demonstrate a statistically significant improvement from the pre-test to the post-test.

Findings Description:

The paired two-sample t-test showed significant improvement from the pre-test to the post test.

The pre- and post-test scores for all students are in the attached PDF named "PHIL 2352 Pre-Post Scores (2016-2017)." The attached PDF named "PHIL 2352 Pre-Post t-Test (2016-2017)" shows the descriptive statistics.

Attached Files

 [PHIL 2352 Pre-Post t-Test \(2016-2017\).](#)

 [PHIL 2352 Pre-Post Scores \(2016-2017\).](#)

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

Formal Logic Action

Action Description:

The Program will continue to monitor student performance in PHIL 2352 while it focuses its improvement efforts elsewhere.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Develop Instrument for Assessing Metacognitive Judgement in PHIL 2303

Performance Objective Description:

The ability to evaluate one's own knowledge and skills is an essential part of critical thinking and decision making. In order to better understand this understudied component of critical thinking, the Program has encouraged Dr. Sanford and Dr. Wright to work with Jeff Roberts, SHSU's Director of Assessment, to advance their research in this area by promoting the development and future deployment of an instrument for assessing students' metacognitive performance.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Development of an Instrument for Measuring Students' Metacognitive Abilities

KPI Description:

The Program will develop an instrument to assess students metacognitive abilities and intellectual humility as part of the PHIL 2303 course assessment. These efforts will be considered successful if the Program is able to implement a metacognition and intellectual humility assessment instrument in Fall 2017.

Results Description:

The Program was successful at developing an instrument that will allow for assessment of students metacognitive abilities and intellectual humility. Combining elements of the instruments Dr. Wright and Dr. Sanford have been working on with items from the TACTS, the Program successfully developed an instrument that can assess critical thinking, metacognition, and intellectual humility. It will be used in all PHIL 2303 sections during 2017-2018.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

Implementing Metacognition Instrument

Action Description:

The Philosophy Program will administer the new combined critical thinking and metacognition instrument in all sections of PHIL 2303 during Fall 2017 and Spring 2018. This will replace the TACTS as the main assessment instrument for PHIL 2303.

Review/Revise Assessment Instrument for PHIL 1301

Goal Description:

Given that the program has used the same instrument for pre-test/post-test assessment in PHIL 1301 sections for several years, all faculty who currently teach this course will be invited to serve on a committee charged with reviewing (and revising, as necessary) this instrument to ensure

adequate assessment of current controversies and pedagogical approaches. The committee will make a recommendation to the Program faculty. The Program faculty will act on these recommendations in adopting an instrument for future use in assessment of PHIL 1301 sections.

RELATED ITEMS/ELEMENTS -----

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Review of PHIL 1301 Assessment Instrument

Performance Objective Description:

The Program faculty will undertake a review (and revision, if necessary) of the assessment instrument for PHIL 1301. This review will focus on ensuring shared learning outcomes across all sections, Core Curriculum requirements, and student preparation for upper-division philosophy courses.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Review/Revision of PHIL 1301 Assessment Instrument

KPI Description:

The Program faculty are expected to complete a review of the assessment instrument for PHIL 1301 in time to allow for use of the revised instrument beginning in Fall 2017. The committee will revise the instrument by adding questions, removing questions, or rewriting questions as needed to ensure that the items on the instrument align with expected student learning outcomes.

Results Description:

A committee composed of Charles Carlson, Glenn Sanford, Tom Brommage, West Gurley, Frank Fair, Ben Mitchell-Yellin, and David Wright reviewed the existing instrument for assessing PHIL 1301.

Each member of the committee reviewed the exam with the aim of identifying questions that needed revisions or to be replaced and then filled out a survey with their responses. These surveys were compiled and the committee met to discuss the results. During this discussion 14 of the 20 questions were substantially revised, and one question was replaced with a new question.

The material covered in the revised exam cuts a broad swath, and both the structure of the questions and the available answers have been revised to improve clarity and reduce ambiguity.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

Implementation of Revised PHIL 1301 Assessment Instrument

Action Description:

The Philosophy Program will administer the newly revised assessment instrument in all sections of PHIL 1301 during Fall 2017 and Spring 2018.

Understanding Of General Philosophical Concepts

Goal Description:

Ensuring that students acquire a general understanding of basic philosophical concepts.

RELATED ITEMS/ELEMENTS -----

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Demonstrate Advanced Understanding Of History Of Philosophy

Learning Objective Description:

Well-educated philosophy students will demonstrate appreciation for the arguments and positions of earlier thinkers. Because so much of what is written in philosophy is a reaction to the metaphysical and epistemological presuppositions of earlier thinking, it is the core of well-rounded philosophical education.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Pre-test Post-test Response Scores On Locally-Standardized Instruments (3364/3365)

Indicator Description:

All students in PHL 3364 and PHL 3365 will be tested on their knowledge of general concepts in the history of philosophy. All faculty who teach these courses will administer a pre-test and post-test to all students. All Philosophy BA students are required to take PHL 364 (Ancient and Medieval Philosophy) and PHL 365 (Modern Philosophy). Together, these courses provide students with upper-level instruction covering the history of metaphysics and epistemology. Following a review of best practices for the teaching of these courses, a group of Program faculty chose the questions for the assessment. The questions cover the range of concepts that are taught in peer departments. Instruction on these concepts promotes a well-rounded understanding of the history of philosophy.

Criterion Description:

A paired two-sample t-test will be performed on the scores of all students who take the pre-test and the post-test. Students in both courses will demonstrate a statistically significant improvement from the pre-test to the post-test.

Findings Description:

The 10 students in PHIL 3364 who took both the pretest and posttest improved their average scores from 1.6 to 11.3 correct responses. This was a statistically significant improvement.

The 23 students in PHIL 3365 who took both the pretest and posttest improved their average scores from 1.9to 12.9correct responses. This was a statistically significant improvement.

The data and descriptive statistics for both classes are provided in the accompanying PDF’s.

Attached Files

- [PHIL 3364 Pre-Post Scores \(2016-2017\)](#)
- [PHIL 3364 Pre-Post t-Test \(2016-2017\)](#)
- [PHIL 3365 Pre-Post Scores \(2016-2017\)](#)
- [PHIL 3365 Pre-Post t-Test \(2016-2017\)](#)

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

3364/3365 Action

Action Description:

The Program will continue to monitor student performance in PHIL 3364/PHIL 3365 while it focuses its improvement efforts elsewhere.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Demonstrate Basic Understanding Of Core Concepts In Philosophy

Learning Objective Description:

As students progress through the Philosophy BA, they will acquire a basic understanding of metaphysics, epistemology, and moral theory. This basic information, provided by our introductory courses serves as the foundation for student success in upper-division courses.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Improved Student Knowledge Of Kant

Indicator Description:

Students will demonstrate increased understanding of Immanuel Kant's philosophy. Questions 10 and 12 on the pre-test and post-test were chosen to measure our Program faculty's ability to improve this targeted area.

Criterion Description:

After comparing students' pre-test and post-test performance on questions 10 and 12 of those tests, the Program will consider this effort successful if the data indicate at least a 100% improvement in student performance on each question or at least 75% of students correctly answer these questions. Anything less will be taken as an indication that the Program must improve its performance in this area.

Findings Description:

Face-to-Face Sections

In the PHIL 1301 in-person sections, 481 students took the pre-test and 263 took the post-test. The breakdown of student pretest/ post test performance on the Kant questions was:

Question 10: Pre-test correct: 138 (28.69%) Post-test correct: 179 (68.06%) 137.2% Improvement

Question 12: Pre-test correct: 206 (42.83%) Post-test correct: 191 (72.62%) 69.6% Improvement

Face-to-face student performance demonstrated success on question 10, but failed to meet the criterion for question 12.

On-line Students

In the PHIL 21301 online sections, 68 students took the pre-test and 71 took the post-test. The breakdown of student pretest/ post test performance on the Kant questions was:

Question 10: Pre-test correct: 16 (23.53%) Post-test correct: 40 (56.34%) 139.4% Improvement

Question 12: Pre-test correct: 38 (55.88%) Post-test correct: 42 (59.15%) 5.9% Improvement

On-line student performance demonstrated success on question 10, but failed to meet the criterion for question 12.

All Students

Overall, 549 students took the pre-test and 334 took the pos-ttest. The breakdown of student pretest/ post test performance on the Kant questions was:

Question 10: Pre-test correct: 154 (28.05%) Post-test correct: 219 (65.57%) 133.8% Improvement

Question 12: Pre-test correct: 244 (44.44%) Post-test correct: 233 (69.76%) 57.0% Improvement

Overall, student performance demonstrated success on question 10, but failed to meet the criterion for question 12.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

Kant Knowledge Action

Action Description:

The Program will continue to monitor student learning outcomes in all sections of PHIL 1301. In addition, the Program will hold meetings with all faculty who teach PHIL 1301 to facilitate sharing of successful strategies for engaging students and improving outcomes. The focus of these meetings will be on improving performance in on-line sections of PHIL 1301.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Improved Student Knowledge Of The Death Penalty Debate

Indicator Description:

Students will demonstrate increased understanding of arguments related to the death penalty. Questions 19 and 20 on the pre-test and post-test were chosen to measure our Program faculty's ability to improve this targeted area.

Criterion Description:

After comparing students' pre-test and post-test performance on questions 19 and 20 of those tests, the Program will consider this effort successful if the data indicate at least a 100% improvement in student performance on each question or at least 75% of students correctly answer these questions. Anything less will be taken as an indication that the Program must improve its performance in this area.

Findings Description:

In-Person Students

In the PHIL 2306 in-person sections, 623 students took the pre-test and 502 took the post-test. The breakdown of student pre-test/post-test performance on the death penalty questions was:

Question 19: Pre-test correct: 374 (60.0%) Post-test correct: 386 (76.9%) 128.2% Improvement

Question 20: Pre-test correct: 490 (78.7%) Post-test correct: 459 (91.4%) 16.3% Improvement

The performance of in-person students met the program criteria for both questions.

On-line Students

In the PHIL 2306 on-line sections, 133 students took the pre-test and 108 took the post-test. The breakdown of student pre-test/post-test performance on the death penalty questions was:

Question 19: Pre-test correct: 86 (64.7%) Post-test correct: 73 (67.6%) 4.5% Improvement

Question 20: Pre-test correct: 109 (82.0%) Post-test correct: 93 (86.1%) 5.0% Improvement

The performance of on-line students met the program criterion for question 20, but failed to meet the program criterion for question 19.

All Students

Overall, 756 students took the pre-test and 610 took the post-test. The breakdown of student pre-test/post-test performance on the death penalty questions was:

Question 19: Pre-test correct: 460 (60.8%) Post-test correct: 459 (75.2%) 23.7% Improvement

Question 20: Pre-test correct: 599 (79.2%) Post-test correct: 552 (90.5%) 14.3% Improvement

Taken together, all PHIL 2306 students me the program criteria for both questions.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

Death Penalty Debate Knowledge Action

Action Description:

The Program will continue to monitor student learning outcomes in all sections of PHIL 2306. In addition, the Program will hold meetings with all faculty who teach PHIL 2306 to facilitate sharing of successful strategies for engaging students and improving outcomes. The focus of these meetings will be on improving performance in in-person and online sections of PHIL 2306.

Additionally, PHIL 2306 is scheduled to be the first Core Curriculum course that will be reviewed for content alignment. This alignment will look at the documentation submitted to the THECB when the course was included in the Core Curriculum, the assessment plan, and the content of individual sections that are taught by different instructors.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Statistically Significant Improvement Of Student Scores From Pre-test To Post-test (1301/2306)

Indicator Description:

All students in PHIL 1301 and PHIL 2306 will be tested on their knowledge of basic concepts in metaphysics, epistemology, and moral theory using a locally standardized pre-test and post-test for each course. Following a review of best practices for the teaching of these courses, a group of Program faculty chose the questions for the assessment. The questions asked cover the range of concepts that are taught in peer departments. Instruction on these concepts promotes a basic competence in metaphysics, epistemology, and moral theory. The attached documents provide the assessment instruments for PHIL 1301 and PHIL 2306 as well as the credited responses for each.

Criterion Description:

A paired two-sample t-test will be performed on the scores of all students who take the pre-test and the post-test. Students in both courses will demonstrate a statistically significant improvement from the pre-test to the post-test.

Findings Description:

PHIL 2306 Contemporary Moral Issues Findings

For face-to-face students, a non-parametric dependent samples *t*-test revealed a statistically significant difference between in the pre- to post-scores for the 2016-2017 academic year $z = -14.25, p < .001$. This difference represented a large effect size (Cohen's *d*) of 0.95 (Cohen, 1988). The average student score increased from 56.71% to 68.91%, for an increase of approximately 12%. Readers are directed to Table 1 in the linked document for a breakdown of these results.

For online students, a parametric dependent samples *t*-test revealed a statistically significant difference between in the pre- to post-scores for the 2016-2017 academic year, $t(98) = -9.40, p < .001$. This difference represented a large effect size (Cohen's *d*) of 0.95 (Cohen, 1988). The average student score increased from 56.65% to 69.70%, for an increase of approximately 13%. Readers are directed to Table 2 in the linked document for a breakdown of these results.

A parametric dependent samples *t*-test revealed a statistically significant difference between in the pre- to post-scores for the combined face-to-face and online populations of PHIL 2306: Contemporary Moral Issues for the 2016-2017 academic year, $t(533) = -21.15, p < .001$. This difference represented a large effect size (Cohen's *d*) of 0.95 (Cohen, 1988). The average student score increased from 56.70% to 69.06%, for an increase of approximately 13%. Readers are directed to Table 3 in the linked document for a breakdown of these results.

PHIL 1301 Introduction to Philosophy

A parametric dependent samples *t*-test revealed a statistically significant difference between the pre- to post-scores for students enrolled in face-to-face sections of PHIL 1301: Introduction to Philosophy for the 2016-2017 academic year, $t(306) = -6.43, p < .001$. This difference represented a moderate effect size (Cohen's *d*) of 0.74 (Cohen, 1988). The average student score increased from 31.89% to 36.86%, for an increase of approximately 5%. Readers are directed to Table 1 in the linked document for a breakdown of these results.

For online students, a parametric dependent samples *t*-test revealed a statistically significant difference between the pre- to post-scores for the 2016-2017 academic year, $t(52) = -7.52, p < .001$. This difference represented a large effect size (Cohen's *d*) of 1.36 (Cohen, 1988). The average student score increased from 37.74% to 59.72%, for an increase of approximately 22%. Readers are directed to Table 2 in the linked document for a breakdown of these results.

Finally, for both populations combined, a non-parametric dependent samples *t*-test revealed a statistically significant difference between the pre- to post-scores for the 2016-2017 academic year, $z = -8.12, p < .001$. This difference represented a moderate effect size (Cohen's *d*) of 0.53 (Cohen, 1988). The average student score increased from 32.76% to 40.22%, for an increase of approximately 8%. Readers are directed to Table 3 in the linked document for a breakdown of these results.

Attached Files

- [PHIL 2306 Contemporary Moral Issues 2016-2017 Report](#)
- [PHIL 1301 Introduction to Philosophy 2016-2017 Report](#)

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

PHIL 1301/PHIL 2306 General Knowledge Action

Action Description:

The Program will continue to monitor student performance in PHIL 1301/PHIL 2306 while it focuses its improvement efforts elsewhere.

Update to Previous Cycle's Plan for Continuous Improvement

Previous Cycle's Plan For Continuous Improvement (Do Not Modify):

The Program is committed to undertaking several actions aimed at ensuring the quality of instruction and concomitant student learn outcomes. During 2016-2017, the Program will:

- 1) ask all faculty teaching PHIL 1301, 2303, and 2306 to share ideas concerning effective techniques for achieving student learning outcomes with respect to specific targeted areas;

2) implement improved data gathering in on-line sections of PHIL 2352;

3) conduct a review of the TACTS instrument used in PHIL 2303 in order to ensure alignment between the instrument, Core Curriculum requirements and future course offerings (As part of this review, the Program will identify specific questions from the instrument that align with course objectives in an effort to improve targeted assessment of PHIL 2303 offerings.);

4) will conduct a review of the PHIL 1301 assessment instrument in order to ensure alignment between the instrument, Core Curriculum requirements and future course offerings (As part of this review, the Program will identify specific questions from the instrument that align with course objectives in an effort to improve targeted assessment of PHIL 1301 offerings.);

5) will work with Professors Sanford and Wright, who will coordinate with Jeff Roberts, SHSU's Director of Assessment, to promote ongoing development of an instrument for assessing students' metacognitive capacities with respect to the skills taught in PHIL 2303; and

6) The Program will continue its efforts to assess the relative equivalence of on-line and in-person sections of all courses.

Update of Progress to the Previous Cycle's PCI:

The Program completed the following actions with respect to the 2015-2016 PCI:

1) Program faculty were asked to share ideas for improving outcomes in our Core Curriculum classes (1301/2303/2306). While there is no direct measure of the success of these efforts, the 2016-2017 findings related to Core classes indicates that the Program needs to implement a more formal discussion of course expectations.

2) The Program successfully gathered all required data for PHIL 2352.

3) The Program successfully completed its review and revision of the assessment instrument for PHIL 2303.

4) The Program successfully completed its review and revision of the assessment instrument for PHIL 1301.

5) Program successfully development of an assessment instrument for PHIL 2303 that incorporates metacognitive measures.

6) The Program successfully gathered and reported disaggregated data on the relative success of its on-line and in-person sections. These efforts identified areas needing improvement moving forward.

2016-2017 Plan for Continuous Improvement

Closing Summary:

The Program plans a series of actions aimed at assessing and improving student learning outcomes moving forward. These include:

1) The Program will hold a series of meetings with all faculty to confirm that all faculty are teaching the required elements of all Core Curriculum courses. This is expected to improve performance in both in-person and on-line sections of Core classes.

As part of this discussion, the Program will lay the groundwork for reviewing/revising the assessment instruments for its Core Curriculum classes every four years. Beginning in 2018-2019, the Program will review one of the three Core Class assessment instruments/plans each year. This review will serve as an occasion to reaffirm the required student learning outcomes and tailor the assessment instruments to the Program's priorities. During the 4th year of these cycles, the Program will conduct a general review of its courses and expected student learning outcomes.

3) The Program will begin gathering data on critical thinking and metacognition in all PHIL 2303 sections using the revised assessment instrument.

4) The Program will begin assessing all section of PHIL 1301 using the revised assessment instrument.

5) The Program will review faculty expectations for teaching in its upper-level courses where more than one faculty member teaches the same course. This review will be conducted to ensure that all faculty are aware of the Program's expectations for these courses.

6) The Program will continue to gather and report disaggregated data on in-person and on-line sections of its Core Curriculum courses.