

As one part of ongoing program assessment at Eastern Washington University, each department is asked to report on assessment results for *each* program for *at least one* Student Learning Outcome this year. Use this electronic file to report on your program assessment for AY 2011-12, and please submit it to both your Dean and to Academic Affairs (SHW 220) by Nov. 1, 2012. The following definitions explain the assessment information you'll enter in the table below:

1. **Student Learning Outcome:** The student performance or learning objective as published either in the catalog, the AIEA assessment data portal, or elsewhere in your department literature.
2. **Strategy or method of measurement:** Mode and process through which student performance data was gathered. Examples: embedded test questions in a course or courses, portfolios, in-class activities, standardized test scores, case studies, analysis of written projects, etc. Additional detailed description could describe the use of rubrics, etc. as part of the assessment process.
3. **Observations gathered from data:** The findings and analysis of those findings from the above strategies.
4. **Actions recommended based on observations:** Course (activities or content) or program changes recommended.
5. **Plan and timeline for taking action:** How the recommended actions will be implemented, and in what timeframe.
6. **Overall evaluation of progress on objective:** The extent to which the student learning outcome is still valid and the assessment of it is producing important and meaningful data.

Please fill out a separate assessment table for each program of study (e.g., one table for BA-Art, another for BAE-Visual Arts, etc.) As needed, add additional rows to the table for each student learning outcome for which you gathered assessment results during 2010-11.

1. Student Learning Outcome	2. Strategy or method of measurement	3. Observations gathered from data	4. Actions recommended based on observations	5. Plan and timetable for taking action	6. Overall evaluation of progress on objective
-----------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------------	--	---	--

1. Student Learning Outcome	2. Strategy or method of measurement	3. Observations gathered from data	4. Actions recommended based on observations	5. Plan and timetable for taking action	6. Overall evaluation of progress on objective
<p>“Students will be able to critically analyze, using logic and other tools, the consistency and verifiability of their own beliefs and the beliefs of others, as well as engage in reasoned public deliberation challenging those beliefs.”</p>	<p>Instructor assessment of peer evaluations of students’ written assignments over the course of the spring 2012 quarter.</p> <p>Instructor assigned one point for use of each of the following peer assessment methods:</p> <p><i>Critical</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Detailed incompleteness of an answer. -Demonstrated inconsistency in an argument. -Indicated use of fallacies or violations of logical principles. <p><i>Constructive</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Suggested a revision. -Indicated counter-evidence in the text. -Engaged with the student’s writing in more than a superficial way. 	<p>Students were given a pre-assessment of work written by the instructor to evaluate. Later, in evaluating student responses to each others’ work, a rubric that was used to gauge the degree to which student feedback on their peers’ work (over 7 assignments) was both <i>critical</i> and <i>constructive</i>.</p> <p>Students who scored an average of 5-6 had their peer evaluations scored “Excellent,” 2-4 “Competent,” and 0-1 “Needs Work.”</p> <p>These results are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-assessment average (42 students): 2.05 • Average for 7 assignments of peer review (39 students): 2.55 • Change between pre- and post-assessments: +.5 	<p>Most students were at a low “Competent” standard and advanced this to a higher standard on the same bracket. The layout of scores did not show an even bell curve, however, as there were far more individual instances of evaluations that “Need Work” than were “Excellent.” In addition, “Excellent” evaluators were not consistent across the quarter.</p>	<p>While instruction was offered on peer evaluation of philosophical writing and fallacies and basic logical principles were covered at the beginning of class, students were not provided with the rubric for evaluating their feedback. The intention was illustrate peer evaluation by demonstration rather than by “teaching to the rubric.” However, many students’ lack of clarity about how to peer evaluate (even to the end of class) indicates that the provision of the rubric to students is probably a needed inclusion. This will occur in fall 2012.</p>	<p>This assessment seems to indicate that most need additional instruction and a rubric for peer review of work in Introduction to Philosophy.</p>