

---

**Please select your course and name from the drop-down menu. If your course or name are incorrect or missing, contact Sara Wade, the Instructional Services Administrative Assistant, 541-506-6037 or [swade@cgcc.edu](mailto:swade@cgcc.edu).**

---

PHL 202- Introduction to Philosophy: Elementary Ethics - Ray Kempf- Part B- Spring 2024

**\* Part B: Your Results DIRECTIONS 1. Report the outcome achievement data gathered via the assignments, tests, etc. you identified for each outcome (question 3) of your Part A. (Only include data for students who completed the course. Do not include students who withdrew or earned an incomplete) Data for all 3 outcomes should be reported below.**

---

Personal Ethical Theory Paper

12 papers submitted  
C or better 14+/20 10 papers  
<C 13 or less 2 papers

Forum Responses

5:2 Utilitarianism and Animal Rights  
7:3 Kant and the Death Penalty  
9:3 Feminist Ethics of Care and moral duties to strangers vs family

Total answer posts to these three forum questions  
C or better score of 2 or 3 5:2(8), 7:3(0), 9:3 (4) = 12  
<C Score of 1 5:2 (3), 7:3 (10), 9:3 (5) = 18

Test #2 - Moral Theories

12 students took the test  
C or better 10+/15 9 students  
<C less than 10 3 students

---

### \* Outcome #1

Reflect critically upon their assumptions, values and mental models associated with their personal philosophy of life.

The Personal Ethical Theory Paper (Pet Project) is tailor made to do just this - the student's ability to explain their personal approach to ethics and why they find this approach preferable to others directly applies.

---

### \* % of students who successfully achieved the outcome (C or above)

83%

---

### \* Outcome #2

Read philosophy critically.

I will use some of the forum questions to evaluate critical reading: The Question in Utilitarianism regarding animal rights, (5:2) the question regarding Kant and the Death Penalty (7:3) and the Question about Feminist Ethics of Care and responsibilities to family vs strangers. (9:3).

**\* % of students who successfully achieved the outcome (C or above)**

---

40%

**\* Outcome #3**

---

Apply cognitive competence of the major philosophical thinking on ethical behavior.

The Second Test - on moral theories directly measures understanding of common moral theories...

**\* % of students who successfully achieved the outcome (C or above)**

---

75%

**\* ANALYSIS 3. What contributed to student success and/or lack of success?**

---

Outcome #2 was troubling. Generally it seemed that student's ability to reflect upon their own views and to correctly identify and describe general ideas was stronger than their ability to read critically - specifically the challenge of reading a complex argument and then reflect the argument back accurately or analyze the argument deeply. I have noticed of late an increased reliance on external (online) sources in the case of many students - with the result that getting general information seems to work okay but interacting with the specific ideas and argument in the text at a deep level seems to have suffered.

**\* 4. Helping students to realistically self-assess and reflect on their understanding and progress encourages students to take responsibility for their own learning. Please compare your students' perception of their end-of-term understanding/mastery of the three outcomes (found in student evaluations) to your assessment (above) of student achievement of the three outcomes.**

---

Generally students paired a more positive picture of their progress than my results may indicate. In all three areas. Students seemed confident that their overall level of understanding improved significantly. I suppose one thing that is difficult is that students described their overall perception of their understanding from beginning to the end - and I, on the other hand, measured performance DURING the term. It is with noting that the closer the thing I measured was towards the end of term the more mastery was demonstrated - so perhaps I and students are not as far off as it might seem. One other thing of note - students were ranking their improvement or change, but I was ranking their overall proficiency - which is not the same thing. Students generally rated themselves as progressing from no or limited understanding to some or moderate understanding - but I was not measuring growth but expression of competencies - which may be a fly in the ointment here :(

**\* 5. Did student achievement of outcomes meet your expectations for successfully teaching to each outcome (question 4 from Part A)**

---

No.

**\* 6. Based on your analysis in the questions above, what course adjustments are warranted (curricular, pedagogical, student instruction, etc.)?**

---

The one very low question (7:3) had a number of students not engaging well or clearly with the reading. Now as the last forum question in the chapter it seems reasonable that students "got their points" on the earlier questions and simply "stopped posting" - which could help explain the lack of on track follow up responses. 9:3 may have had some similar issues - so maybe using forum responses (at least the way their structured in this course isn't a great measure of student achievement - due to it's informality and idiosyncrasies? I'm not sure there is necessarily a change warranted, however, I am in a continual process to tying course content more closely to the reading and ever else general in nature to help foster attention and deep thinking.

**7. What resources would be required to implement your recommended course adjustments (materials, training, equipment, etc.)? What Budget implications result?**

---

NA

**\* 8. Describe the results of any adjustments you made from the last assessment of this course (if applicable) and their effectiveness in student achievement of outcomes.**

---

I don't remember specifics but have been on a trajectory to align forum questions and tests more closely with the reading and less general in nature. This seems to be generally positive as indicated by the reduced number of responses which seem to clearly involve Chat GPT. Not sure how immediately effective it's been but it seems to have had an impact in reducing "virtual studenting" ..

**9. Describe how you explain information about course outcomes and their relevance to your students.**

---

I'm not sure I really do. Course outcomes are (of course) listed in the syllabus (and online) but I do consciously make reference to them during the course - perhaps as an online asynchronous course that is more reasonable - because there is very little "off the cuff" communication - everything is tied to discussion of particular course content by design.

**10. Please describe any changes/additions to instruction, curriculum or assessment that you made to support students in better achieving the CGCC Institutional Learning Outcomes: ILO #1: Communication. The areas that faculty are focusing on are: "Content Development" and/or Control of Syntax and Mechanics" and ILO #2: Critical Thinking/Problem Solving. The areas that faculty are focusing on are: "Evidence" (Critical Thinking) and/or "Identify Strategies" (Problem Solving). ILO #4: Cultural Awareness. The area that faculty is focusing on is: "Openness" (Encouraging our students to "Initiate and develop interactions with culturally different others") ILO #5: Community and Environmental Responsibility. The area that faculty are focusing on are: "Applying Knowledge to Contemporary Contexts" and "Understanding Global Systems" ILO#3 - Quantitative Literacy - "Application/Analysis" and/or "Assumptions"**

---

I'm not sure what this question is asking, exactly.

I have been working to be more intentional to tie discussions to the reading, to give feedback in the form of questions seeking clarification, to not be too quick to volunteer information that students should be able to find on their own, to use plagiarism events as a teaching tool both to clarify that plagiarism is unacceptable and to clarify what I am asking of students and why - to help develop academic skills and more importantly agency, ownership of ideas, and critical thinking.