HCC Core Curriculum
Assessment Plan

Required Core Objective Critical Thinking for PHIL 2306, Introduction to Ethics

I. Methodology of Assessment
A. How will the core objectives be covered in this class?
PHIL 2306 satisfies each component of the Critical Thinking rubric. It supports Analysis, Interpretation, Evaluation, and Consistency by teaching students these skills as part of a consideration of classical and contemporary theories, problems, and views on the nature of goodness, happiness, duty, and freedom. PHIL 2306 develops Creativity, Perspective, and Self-reflection by teaching students to apply what they learn to questions of character and human excellence in a multi-cultural, global environment.

B. Provide the specific assessment methodology.
In philosophy courses, all assessments are accomplished by reference to discipline-specific standard form rubrics. Initially, we will supplement existing rubrics with the new core objective rubric for Critical Thinking. These objectives will be assessed using embedded assessments that are at the discretion of the instructor (please see the accompanying “Assignments” document for examples of embedded assessments). Recommended types of assessments for critical thinking include written exercises, public discussion topics, quizzes or exams.

Selected instructors then report their assessment of students to the program coordinator at the end of the semester by returning a spreadsheet that records the number of students achieving each level of achievement for each dimension of measurement. The assessment of core objectives will initially occur alongside SLO assessment, but eventually it will be integrated into the SLO assessment plan.

C. How will assessment count within the course?
Assessments are embedded in the course so as to best meet the needs of the instructor in achieving course goals and objectives consistent with Philosophy program guidelines. The assessment tool is an assignment that can either be a supplement to other graded components or can be incorporated as one (or a portion of one) of the graded components of the course syllabus. The instructor then reports the relevant assessment score from the assignment.

D. Explain how your plan includes a representative sample of HCC faculty and students.
The assessment plan in Philosophy calls for the program coordinator to randomly select at least 1/3 of the total sections of PHIL 2306 offered in a given semester with at least one sample from each of the varieties of term lengths and delivery options.
II. Rubric: How will the appropriate rubric(s) be incorporated in the course?
The individual instructor for the course will refer to the core objective rubric for Critical Thinking in
designing assessments within the course and tailoring assignment-specific rubrics for students.
Philosophy faculty recognize the importance of rubrics for course design and already incorporate
standard form rubrics for SLOs assessment. Assessments for the new core objectives will be
incorporated into our courses consistent with our already successful SLO/PLO assessment structure.
(See I.B)

III. Results: Describe the process of evaluating the results.
The program coordinator compiles the reports of individual instructors into a single spreadsheet
containing a representative distribution of students achieving a given level of achievement for each
measurement dimension. Percentages are determined and tracked from year to year.

IV. Analysis:
A. How will the results be documented and archived?
The program coordinator will record the numbers from each individual report and then compile
scores in a single spreadsheet file that will be saved on the program coordinator’s personal
computer. The compiled report will be archived in the Core Assessment Report on the HCC
Sharepoint site for Assessments.

B. Describe how the results will be used to improve student learning.
Each year, the program coordinator will review the results of assessments and report this review
back to instructors. This report becomes a topic for discussion at our semi-annual Program
meetings, at faculty development meetings, and at a regular workshop that is held during the
May intersession period.