**State University of New York at Oswego**

**Division of Academic Affairs**

**Reporting Guidelines for Annual Submission of Assessment Reports**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Due Date | Activity/Action |
| June 19 | Dept./division examine results of assessment completed in their area during the previous academic cycle. Report, as compiled by the dept./director is submitted regarding assessment activities completed, actions taken in response to assessment results, and assessment plan for upcoming academic year to the appropriate dean. (Graduate program reports should be submitted to the Graduate Dean.) Each dept./division will submit its report by June 19th using the standard template (attached). |
| July 30 | Deans review the results of assessment activities from the dept./division assessment reports and activities proposed for next academic year. Each assessment report will receive a response regarding student outcome assessment and program review by the appropriate dean/associate dean by July 30th. The Assessment Coordinator will provide support to deans to ensure that all assessment activities meet institutional expectations. |
| August 3 | Final assessment reports, responses by deans, and amended assessment plans will be submitted to the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment by August 3rd by the deans. The Office of Institutional Research will serve as the depository for all assessment reports and will ensure the college is prepared to provide information as needed to the campus community, external reviewers, and accrediting agencies, and that all assessment activities meet institutional expectations. |
| September | Dept./divisions implement assessment activities for academic year. The Assessment Coordinator supports departments in this process by sharing outstanding assessment activities and by maintaining a repository of good assessment practices and resources. |
| October 1 | The Assessment Coordinator compiles by October 1st each year, a comprehensive report that outlines department/division achievements for the assessment cycle just completed. The report includes a status report regarding implementation of improvements/resource allocation as a result of the previous year’s student learning assessment results.  |

\* “Department/programs,” as nomenclature to identify the academic unit, should also be interpreted to include those interdisciplinary programs, which are shared by two or more academic units and that have a coordinator.
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**\_\_\_ Philosophy (fictional)\_\_\_\_ Major Assessment Report and Plan**

1. **Student learning outcomes/g****oals: [List ALL major learning outcomes/goals]**

**1. Students will be able to write a clear and compelling argumentative essay on a philosophical topic, such as whether virtue can be taught.**

**2. Students will be able to identify, analyze, evaluate and construct arguments.**

**3. Students will demonstrate knowledge of the philosophical works of key canonical figures, for example, Plato, Aristotle, Descartes, Hume or Kant.**

1. **Assessment activities completed in the recent academic year 2014-2015**
	1. **Report student learning outcomes/goals assessed in academic year 2014-2015:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Goal** | **Results and Interpretations** |
| **Students in the Capstone course completed an in-class test on logic and critical thinking, designed to test them on their abilities to identify, analyze, evaluate and construct arguments.** | **2** | **Students were very strong in evaluating arguments (40 % exceeded expectations; 50 % met expectations; 10 % failed to meet expectations); students faced challenges analyzing arguments (20 % exceeded expectations; 40 % met expectations; 30 % approached expectations; 10 % failed to meet expectations).****It appears that students lacked the relevant technical vocabulary to analyze arguments effectively.** |
| **In the Capstone course students had to write an argumentative paper addressing a contemporary philosophical article with which they disagree. The papers were scored with a rubric developed by the department.** | **1****2** | **Students generally did well in organizing their paper (40 % exceeding expectations; 40 % meeting expectations; 20 % approaching expectations). Students faced significant challenges in developing a compelling argument in their essays (20 % exceeding expectations; 40 % meeting expectations; 40 % approaching expectation). It appears that many students are not able to identify the sorts of evidence that would support their thesis effectively.** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

* 1. **Report ALL changes implemented or proposed based on assessment data gathered:**

**1. At our annual assessment retreat we encouraged all faculty members to review the key logical concepts in their courses. We also encouraged them to designed small assignments that require students to use these concepts to analyze the arguments discussed in their classes.**

**2. Two faculty members have volunteered to pilot a process of scaffolding writing assignments, breaking the essay writing down into a series of discrete tasks, to determine if such a practice leads to marked improvements in students’ abilities to write argumentative papers.**

**3.**

* 1. **Required resources to implement the above changes:**

**1. The faculty members piloting the scaffolding project will attend a conference on writing in the disciplines sponsored by SUNY Central Administration. We need to get funding to support their travel to Buffalo and expenses for the two-day conference.**

**2.**

**3.**

* 1. **Recommended changes to the assessment process:**

**1. We will conduct an assessment of student papers in a sample of lower division classes next year in order to determine if our expectations of graduating students are too high.**

**2.**

**3.**

1. **Assessment activities planned for upcoming academic year 2015-2016:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Goal** |
| **We will assess student argumentative essays in both the capstone and in a sample of lower division courses.** | **1****2** |
| **We will conduct an assessment of students’ knowledge of key early modern philosophers in an upper division history of philosophy seminar.** | **3** |
|  |  |