

2015 Philosophy Program Review

Pepperdine University Program Review Guidebook: Academic 2015

Philosophy

OVERVIEW

PROGRAM REVIEW: INTRODUCTION

A program review is a systematic process for evaluating and improving academic programs. It is conducted through self-evaluation and peer evaluation by external reviewers, with an emphasis on assessing the quality and degree of student learning within the program. The comprehensive analysis which the review provides and the resulting Memorandum of Understanding are used to stimulate curriculum and programmatic changes and to inform planning and budgeting processes at various levels. The program review cycle occurs every five years.

Program review is a required element in WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC) accreditation and has been a part of Pepperdine's assessment cycle since 2003. While data provides the foundation for effective program review, assessment of student learning, and other quality improvement strategies, the data must be turned into evidence and communicated in useful formats. The program review does this.

When implemented effectively and followed up deliberately, program review is a powerful means for engaging faculty, staff, and administrators in evaluating and improving programs to enhance student learning. The review process is an opportunity to refine a program to meet the changing needs of student learning, retention, curriculum in various disciplines, and student support services. It is also a purposeful opportunity to link decision-making, planning, and budgeting with evidence.

This guidebook provides a framework and resources to help with the review.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

The process is intended to be meaningful, foremost, for the department and its enhancement of student learning. As a result, the process is flexible in order to serve the needs of both small and large programs as well as academic, co-curricular, and student support programs. The review should be a collaborative process involving faculty, staff, administrators, and students in order to align more effectively the college or department with institutional goals and objectives.

Two guiding principles are embedded in this Guidebook and are consistent with WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC) standards:

*** Ongoing Evaluation of What Students Learn:**

Evidence-based program review includes: a review of program learning outcomes; evaluation of the methods employed to assess achievement of the outcomes; and analysis and reflection on learning results, retention/graduation rates, core competencies, and other outcomes data over a multi-year period.

*** Quality Assurance, Planning, and Budgeting Decisions Based on Evidence:**

The results of the program review are to be used for follow-up planning and budgeting at various decision-making levels.

PREPARATION FOR PROGRAM REVIEW

The program chair is responsible for the planning of the review. An internal committee or working group should be developed to allocate responsibilities for writing the program review including data collection, writing, and use of resources. It is recommended that a meeting occur between the committee and the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) to review data needs.

PROGRAM ALIGNMENT WITH THE UNIVERSITY, MISSION, AND INSTITUTIONAL OUTCOMES

Program reviews focus on the meaning, quality, and integrity of a program as it relates to student learning and the mission of Pepperdine:

Pepperdine University is a Christian university committed to the highest standards of academic excellence and Christian values, where students are strengthened for lives of purpose, service, and leadership.

Each department carries out the University mission and institutional learning outcomes (ILOs). The ILOs are formed by two components:

- * Core commitments: knowledge and scholarship, faith and heritage, and community and global understanding
- * Institutional values: purpose, service, and leadership

Each basic commitment is seen through the lens of three essential institutional values drawn from the University mission statement: purpose, service, and leadership. These basic commitments should link to measurable objectives as stated in the student learning outcomes (SLOs).

OVERVIEW OF PROGRAM REVIEW COMPONENTS

Program review at Pepperdine University is conducted on a five-year review cycle that involves three main components and six steps (see diagram below):

SELF STUDY:

- An in-depth, internal analysis written by program faculty/staff
- Department faculty or program staff (for co-curricular and student support services) conduct a departmental self-study within guidelines provided in the Guidebook. This portion of the review identifies program strengths and limitations, and suggests solutions to identified problems.

EXTERNAL & INTERNAL REVIEWS:

- An external review conducted by an outside expert in the field or discipline. The Guidebook describes how to secure qualified, objective external reviewers, including those with understanding and experience in addressing student learning outcomes assessment. Once the self-study is completed, the external review is organized.
- An internal review by the Advancement of Student Learning Council (ASLC)

CLOSING THE LOOP:

- A Quality Improvement Plan (QIP) developed by the department
- A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) developed by the dean

Closing the Loop is used to describe the act of making decisions based on evidence. The most important product of a program review is the advancement of student learning. Therefore, the program review cycle ends by identifying evidence-based changes in the

QIP, and then the MOU explains how the plan will be supported and carried out over the next five years.

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Please download the GLOSSARY OF TERMS.

Evidence

Please attach evidence

[HuTE_2016_Program_Review.docx](#)

INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

Reviews begin with an introduction that provides a context for the review. In contrast to the rest of the self-study report, this portion is primarily descriptive and should include:

1. INTERNAL CONTEXT

This begins with an overview of the program describing (as appropriate).

- a. where the program is situated (school/division),**
- b. degrees granted, concentrations available, programs offered**
- c. where is the program located (campus location)**

Note: The Philosophy program review was originally submitted as a Microsoft Word document. It has been attached to this template in section 5, "Analysis of Evidence: Meaning" under the evidence for question 5.

During the time period under review (Fall 2010–Spring 2015), the Philosophy Program was part of the Humanities & Teacher Education Division of Seaver College. We offer a Bachelor of Arts in Philosophy and a Minor in Philosophy.

d. Provide a brief history of the program.

The Philosophy major has been a part of the curriculum since the founding of Seaver College in 1973. Prior to 2007, Philosophy at Pepperdine was taught by Dr. David Gibson and Dr. Russell Gough. Dr. Caleb Clanton arrived in fall of 2007, having been hired to replace Dr. Russell Gough and to serve as the director of the Philosophy Program. Dr. Gibson moved toward retirement in 2008, and the Program hired Dr. Mason Marshall in the fall of 2008. The number of majors grew sharply under Drs. Clanton and Marshall, which led to the need for a third faculty member: Dr. Garrett Pendergraft, who was hired in a visiting capacity in the fall of 2010 and then hired as a tenure-track philosopher in the fall of 2011. Dr. Clanton left late in the spring of 2012. The Program hired an adjunct to cover his fall courses and then was able to hire Dr. Tomas Bogardus in the spring of 2013. Thus Drs. Marshall, Pendergraft, and Bogardus are the current full-time tenure-track philosophers, and are responsible for the vast majority of the teaching within the Philosophy Program.

e. Describe the changes made to the program since the last review.

In addition to the hires mentioned above, the most important program changes since the last review have been curriculum changes, which are described in §10.

10. Curriculum changes over the last five years.

- The previous review also identified curriculum gaps, and as a result the Philosophy faculty added three courses to the Program's curriculum: Aesthetics, Epistemology, and Metaphysics. These were the three courses that met the following two criteria: they would fill a curriculum gap and they were within the area of expertise of at least one faculty member. (Note also that those three courses all count as essential according to the definitions above.)
- In order to minimize the budgetary impact on the Program as a result of adding these three courses, two courses were removed from the curriculum: Traditional Chinese Thought and Society, and Existentialism. (Note also that Existentialism would count as superfluous according to the definitions in §9.)
- Several courses were renumbered from the 500 level to the 400 level to better reflect their place in the sequence of courses within the major.

2. THE EXTERNAL CONTEXT

This should explain how the program responds to the needs of the area in which it serves: this can include the community, region, field, or discipline.

The Philosophy major at Pepperdine is designed to offer students a broad education in historical and contemporary philosophical explorations of various regions of human experience—including the nature of knowledge and reality, the theoretical foundations of morality and ethics, and the distinction between cogent and fallacious reasoning. Philosophy examines the fundamental assumptions and problems implicit in human experience, critically assesses the assumptions, and seeks to articulate and defend different ways of addressing the problems. Philosophy is undoubtedly an important and historically significant part of liberal arts education. Most colleges and universities have departments of philosophy, and many require philosophy courses as part of their general education curriculum. Given the nature of the discipline, philosophy is relevant to a number of fields of study outside of the humanities, including political science, law, religion, and the arts, as well as the various areas of ethical concern in a number of other disciplines (including business, technology, and medicine).

PROGRAM OUTCOMES

Institutional Learning Outcomes

Identifier	Description
CA-PEP-ILO-15.L-1-KS	Think critically and creatively, communicate clearly, and act with integrity.
CA-PEP-ILO-15.L-2-FH	Practice responsible conduct and allow decisions and directions to be informed by a value-centered life.
CA-PEP-ILO-15.L-3-CGU	Use global and local leadership opportunities in pursuit of justice.
CA-PEP-ILO-	Demonstrate expertise in an academic or professional discipline, display

15.P-1-KS	proficiency in the discipline, and engage in the process of academic discovery
CA-PEP-ILO-15.P-2-FH	Appreciate the complex relationship between faith, learning, and practice.
CA-PEP-ILO-15.P-3-CGU	Develop and enact a compelling personal and professional vision that values diversity
CA-PEP-ILO-15.S-1-KS	Apply knowledge to real-world challenges.
CA-PEP-ILO-15.S-2-FH	Respond to the call to serve others.
CA-PEP-ILO-15.S-3-CGU	Demonstrate commitment to service and civic engagement.

Additional Standards/Outcomes

Identifier	Description
CA-PEP-SVR-15.BAPHILOS-1	Clearly communicate both orally and in writing
CA-PEP-SVR-15.BAPHILOS-2	Think critically
CA-PEP-SVR-15.BAPHILOS-3	Exhibit knowledge of the history of philosophy
CA-PEP-SVR-15.BAPHILOS-4	Exhibit knowledge of ethical theory and of how it applies to various situations
CA-PEP-SVR-15.BAPHILOS-5	Produce a paper informed by relevant philosophical research

CURRICULUM MAP

MISSION, PURPOSES, GOALS, AND OUTCOMES

3. MISSION, PURPOSES, GOALS, AND OUTCOMES

A key component in providing the context for the review is a description of the program's mission, purpose, goals, and outcomes.

- a. **Mission** - This should be a general explanation of why the program exists, what it hopes to achieve in the future, and the program's essential nature, its values, and its work.
- b. **Goals** are general statements of what the program wants to achieve.
- c. **Outcomes** are the specific results that should be observed if the goals are being met.

The program's purpose, goals, and outcomes should relate to and align with the mission and goals of the college and of the University.

The mission of the Philosophy Program is to provide the education described in the first two sentences of §2 ("External Context"): The Philosophy major at Pepperdine is designed to offer students a broad education in historical and contemporary philosophical explorations of various regions of human experience—including the nature of knowledge and reality, the theoretical

foundations of morality and ethics, and the distinction between cogent and fallacious reasoning. Philosophy examines the fundamental assumptions and problems implicit in human experience, critically assesses the assumptions, and seeks to articulate and defend different ways of addressing the problems.

This mission is embodied in the learning outcomes described in §4.

4. Learning outcomes and support for the institutional mission

A student who graduates with a major in Philosophy should be able to:

1. Clearly communicate both orally and in writing.
2. Think critically.
3. Exhibit knowledge of the history of philosophy.
4. Exhibit knowledge of ethical theory and of how it applies to various situations.
5. Produce a paper informed by relevant philosophical research.

These five Program Learning Outcomes align with Pepperdine University's Institutional Learning Outcomes [as shown in attached table]

I - Introduced
D - Developed
M - Mastered

Curriculum Map Philosophy

	PHIL 200	PHIL 290	PHIL 300
CA-PEP-SVR-15.BAPHILOS-1 Clearly communicate both orally and in writing	I	I	D
CA-PEP-SVR-15.BAPHILOS-2 Think critically	I	M	D
CA-PEP-SVR-15.BAPHILOS-3 Exhibit knowledge of the history of philosophy	I		M
CA-PEP-SVR-15.BAPHILOS-4 Exhibit knowledge of ethical theory and of how it applies to various situations	I		D
CA-PEP-SVR-15.BAPHILOS-5 Produce a paper informed by relevant philosophical research	I		D

	PHIL 310	PHIL 320	PHIL 580
CA-PEP-SVR-15.BAPHILOS-1 Clearly communicate both orally and in writing	D	D	M
CA-PEP-SVR-15.BAPHILOS-2 Think critically	D	D	M
CA-PEP-SVR-15.BAPHILOS-3 Exhibit knowledge of the history of philosophy	M	D	D
CA-PEP-SVR-15.BAPHILOS-4 Exhibit knowledge of ethical theory and of how it applies to various situations		M	D
CA-PEP-SVR-15.BAPHILOS-5 Produce a paper informed by relevant philosophical research	D	D	M

Alignment of PLOs with ILOs

Please upload the evidence.

[Philosophy_ILOs_to_PLOs.docx](#)

ANALYSIS OF EVIDENCE: Meaning

Meaning

Analysis of Direct Student Learning: Meaning Quality and Integrity

The university is required to define and ensure a distinctive and coherent educational experience for each of its degree programs. The findings from the program assessment and analysis process should explain how effectively courses, curricula, the co-curriculum, and other experiences are structured, sequenced, and delivered so that students achieve learning outcomes at the expected levels of performance in core competencies in their majors or fields of specialization, in general education, and in areas distinctive to the institution. It means ensuring alignment among all these elements, and maintaining an assessment infrastructure that enables the institution to diagnose problems and make improvements when needed. Direct student learning, an examination of how well students are meeting the program learning outcomes, should come from the past four years of annual assessments.

(2013 WSCUC Accreditation Handbook.)

Meaning of the Degree: Describe how the program ensures a holistic experience by answering the following questions about the coherence and alignment within the program:

4. What are the learning outcomes and how does the degree support the institutional mission and institutional learning outcomes?

A student who graduates with a major in Philosophy should be able to:

1. Clearly communicate both orally and in writing.
2. Think critically.
3. Exhibit knowledge of the history of philosophy.
4. Exhibit knowledge of ethical theory and of how it applies to various situations.
5. Produce a paper informed by relevant philosophical research.

These five Program Learning Outcomes align with Pepperdine University's Institutional Learning Outcomes as follows: [see ILO chart in section 4]

5. How does the degree embody the distinct values, basic commitment, and traditions of the institution?

The Philosophy degree (and the study of philosophy in general) not only embodies, but is vital to the Christian mission and values of Pepperdine University. The official mission statement of the University reads as follows: "Pepperdine is a Christian university committed to the highest

standards of academic excellence and Christian values, where students are strengthened for lives of purpose, service, and leadership.” First, students of philosophy are uniquely equipped to refine their sense of purpose and meaning, especially insofar as philosophical training is pivotal for developing a systematic Christian worldview. Second, major areas of philosophy concern how to be of service to other people, while philosophical reasoning in general enables us see the world from other people’s perspectives, helping us to grow more compassionate and broad-minded. Third, studying philosophy does a great deal to enhance a person’s capacity for leadership—particularly insofar as philosophy teaches us to think critically about the world and thus make wiser and more rational decisions.

Evidence

Please attach evidence.

[Philosophy_Program_5YR__F10__S15_.docx](#)

6. Is there a coherent, aligned sequence of learning opportunities?

The coherence and alignment of learning opportunities in the Philosophy Program are represented in the following curriculum matrix for core courses:

Evidence

Please attach evidence.

[philosophy_curriculum_matrix.docx](#)

7. Does the degree offer sufficient breadth and depth of learning for this particular major or program? Please explain.

The Philosophy degree offers sufficient breadth and depth of learning. As demonstrated in §6, the degree offers breadth by introducing every learning outcome and giving students to practice each learning outcome in at least two core courses; and it offers depth by giving students an opportunity to master each learning outcome in at least one core course.

8. Please present a curriculum comparison with at least three peer institutions and with national disciplinary or professional standards if available.

Curriculum comparison table

Please attach the curriculum comparison table.

[Philosophy_Curriculum_Comparison.docx](#)

[See table attached]

9. How current is the program curriculum?

For the purposes of this review, let's define an essential course and a superfluous course as follows: An essential course is one whose course type is offered by all three of the peer institutions considered in the curriculum map [curriculum comparison] in §8. (A curriculum that is lacking an essential course has a curriculum gap.) A superfluous course is one whose course type is offered by none of the peer institutions considered in the curriculum map in §8.

According to the curriculum map in §8, the Philosophy Program offers no superfluous courses. However, it does have a few curriculum gaps. In particular, it lacks five essential courses: Philosophy of Language, Philosophy of Natural Science, Biomedical Ethics, Philosophy of Gender, and Continental Philosophy.

10. How has the curriculum changed (if at all) over the last five years including the reasons for the change (e.g., the result of a learning outcome assessment) and evidence used as a basis for change?

- The previous review also identified curriculum gaps, and as a result the Philosophy faculty added three courses to the Program's curriculum: Aesthetics, Epistemology, and Metaphysics. These were the three courses that met the following two criteria: they would fill a curriculum gap and they were within the area of expertise of at least one faculty member. (Note also that those three courses all count as essential according to the definitions above.)
- In order to minimize the budgetary impact on the Program as a result of adding these three courses, two courses were removed from the curriculum: Traditional Chinese Thought and Society, and Existentialism. (Note also that Existentialism would count as superfluous according to the definitions in §9.)
- Several courses were renumbered from the 500 level to the 400 level to better reflect their place in the sequence of courses within the major.

Evidence

Please attach evidence.

11. Pedagogy: Please present measures of teaching effectiveness (e.g., course evaluations, peer evaluations of teaching or implementing, scholarship on issues of teaching and learning, formative discussions of pedagogy among faculty, survey measures, participation rates, and student satisfaction surveys).

Teaching

Please attach evidence.

[Philosophy_Pedagogy.docx](#)

[See attachment]

ANALYSIS OF EVIDENCE: Quality

Quality

Quality of the Degree: In meaning of the degree student learning outcomes and curriculum matrixes were used to define the degree. Now please describe the processes used to ensure the quality of the program.

12. Describe the high impact practices which enrich the learning experiences (How are they integrated in the curriculum? Are they assessed?)

- a. Service learning**
- b. Research opportunities**
- c. Internships**
- d. High-impact practices**

The Philosophy faculty engage in numerous practices that enrich our students' learning experiences, including (but not limited to) the following:

- Undergraduate research. Our efforts to facilitate undergraduate research have been quite fruitful over the past five years, as evidenced by the 24 published philosophy articles written by students while at Pepperdine. (See §16 for a complete list.) In addition to these published efforts, the Philosophy faculty have completed various collaborative research projects with students. Some of these projects have been informal, but most have been funded by the Summer Undergraduate Research Program, the Academic Year Undergraduate Research Initiative, or the Cross-Disciplinary/Interdisciplinary Undergraduate Research Program. (As a faculty, on average, we participate in two of these programs each academic year.)
- Writing-intensive courses. Although only one Philosophy course is officially listed as writing-intensive, rigorous analytical writing is one of the essential practices of philosophy as a discipline. Thus, almost every course offered by the Program requires students to engage in rigorous analytical writing.
- Capstone course. The Major Philosophical Problems course is our capstone course (and also our writing-intensive course). In this course, our students integrate and apply what they have learned over the course of their philosophical studies by writing a substantive senior thesis.

13. Co-Curricular : How intentional are the co-curricular experiences which are provided and how are they integrated into the curricular plan?

- a. Academic and career advising programs and resources**
- b. Tutoring, supplemental instruction, and teaching assistants**
- c. Orientation and transition programs**
- d. Financial support for obtaining scholarships, fellowships, teaching assistantships, etc.**
- e. Support for engagement in the campus community**
- f. Support for emotional and psychological variables of success**
- g. Spiritual development programs and opportunities**
- h. Multicultural opportunities which support diversity**
- i. Plays, musicals, art exhibits, and lectures**
- j. the Sophomore Experience**
- k. Study Abroad**

Because Seaver College faculty serve as advisors for the majors within which they teach, every

Philosophy faculty member engages in extensive advising with Philosophy students regarding academic schedules and career plans (including graduate school plans). The success of our students in getting into graduate programs (see §16 for detail) is partial evidence of our commitment to advising.

We also offer supplemental instruction in the form of visiting speakers. The following is a list of visiting philosophers who have given talks at Pepperdine over the past three academic years:

- Dr. Andrew Cullison, Associate Professor at DePauw University, Spring 2013
- Dr. Timothy Pickavance, Associate Professor at Biola University, Spring 2013
- Dr. Andrew Bailey, Assistant Professor at Yale-NUS College, Spring 2013
- Daniel Eaton, graduate student at the University of Texas, Fall 2013
- Dr. Sam Lebens, postdoctoral fellow at Rutgers University, Fall 2013
- Dr. Mark Makin, Assistant Professor at Biola University, Spring 2014
- Rick Stody, graduate student at UCSB, Fall 2014
- Dr. Andrew Moon, postdoctoral fellow at Rutgers, Spring 2015
- Michaela McSweeney, graduate student at Princeton, Spring 2015
- Dr. Michael Rota, Associate Professor at the University of St. Thomas, Fall 2015
- Dr. Heidi Savage, Assistant Professor at SUNY Geneseo, Spring 2016
- Dr. Tim Pawl, Associate Professor at the University of St. Thomas, Spring 2016

The Philosophy faculty regularly participate in the spiritual mentoring program offered by the convocation office, as well as the “Club Convo” program (in which we discuss issues in philosophy of religion and philosophical theology).

And finally, the Pepperdine Philosophy Club (which is open to both majors and non-majors) serves as a forum for discussion of issues that students are interested in, and also for peer evaluation and assistance on papers and other writing assignments. This is a student-led group that meets on a weekly basis in-person and also has an active Facebook group consisting of contributions from both current and former members of the Club.

14. What is the profile of students in the program and how does the profile relate to or enhance the purpose and goals of the program?

Please explain your student success data (enrollment and retention data). Evidence should include student retention and graduation rate trends (disaggregated by different demographic categories such as race, gender, first-generation students, etc.).

OIE provides this data annually and houses the reports on the OIE website and LiveText site.

Student Success Data

Please download student success data.

Although our overall enrollment numbers have declined since 2010, the most recent number of majors for which we have OIE data (41 majors in Fall 2014) is strong. The number is high when compared to the history of the Philosophy program at Pepperdine, and also when compared to similar institutions. For example, between 1996 and 2007, the average number of Philosophy majors at Seaver College was between 12 and 13. And our ratio of philosophy majors to faculty members, 11.67, is significantly higher than it is at similar schools (cf. § 21).

The table below represents the diversity of the Philosophy program. We have been pleased to

see an increasing proportion of women in the program, and our hope is that we can produce a similar trend when it comes to ethnic diversity.

F10 F11 F12 F13 F14

% of female Philosophy majors 23% 19% 24% 33% 41%

% of female Philosophy minors 50% 37% 16% 40% 60%

% of non-white Philosophy majors 37% 36% 43% 40% 37%

% of non-white Philosophy minors 58% 60% 53% 47% 50%

15. Please present your student and alumni survey data examining student attitudes, satisfaction levels and dispositions. OIE will provide the data in tables and graphs in their Educational Effectiveness Report. Programs are responsible for explaining the survey results. Survey data includes: UCLA/CIRP satisfaction survey data, alumni data.

Student Survey Data

Please download student survey data.

We were happy to note the following results from the 2015 OIE alumni survey:

- All Philosophy graduates responded positively to the question, “How well did your Pepperdine education prepare you for your primary activity?”: There were 24 responses, and 100% of them responded “Reasonably well” (54.2%) or “Extremely well” (45.8%). (Film Studies, which had 4 responses, was the only other major for which all respondents gave positive answers.)
- In the “utilization of HuTe experiences and knowledge” category, 71% of Philosophy graduates said they had “Thought seriously about a philosophical issue” in the past month; and 90% said they had “Drawn on the critical thinking skills I developed in Pepperdine’s philosophy program” in the past month.
- 71.4% of Philosophy graduates said that the Philosophy program prepared them “Extremely well” to “Act ethically and morally in the workplace.”
- 89.3% of Philosophy graduates said that the Philosophy program prepared them “Extremely well” to “Be able to comprehend and analyze written text.”
- 96.4% of Philosophy graduates said that the Philosophy program prepared them “Extremely well” to “Think critically to solve problems.”
- 85.7% of Philosophy graduates said that the Philosophy program prepared them “Extremely well” to “Express ideas clearly.”
- 80% of Philosophy graduates said that the Philosophy program prepared them “Extremely well” to “Think critically and creatively, communicate clearly, and act with integrity,” which is an Institutional Learning Outcome.
- 78.6% of Philosophy graduates “Strongly agreed” that the Philosophy faculty “were devoted to student learning.”
- 85.7% of Philosophy graduates “Strongly agreed” that the Philosophy faculty “created an environment in which challenging and thought-provoking issues were explored in ways that were respectful of student views.”

We were disappointed in the results of the responses to the “Working with faculty on research”: only 33.3% said that working with faculty on research contributed “Very much” to personal development and only 27.8% said it contributed “Very much” to professional development. However, we have done quite a bit of research with students over the past few years (as evidenced by #16 below), and our hope is that if the survey were restricted to more recent graduates, those “Very much” numbers would be considerably higher.

16. Please describe evidence of students' research and publications, awards and

recognition, professional accomplishments.

Evidence

Please attach evidence.

[Philosophy___Evidence_of_student_accomplishment.docx](#)

Graduate School Placement of Pepperdine Philosophy Students: These rankings are drawn from the Philosophical Gourmet Report—by far the most prominent and trusted ranking of philosophy graduate programs—for the year each student entered the graduate program.
[table in attachment]

Published Philosophy Articles Written by Students while at Pepperdine

1. Justin Beck, "A Critical Assessment of van Inwagen's Response to the Evidential Argument from Evil," *Arête* (2012-2013):49-67
2. Shane A. Bilsborough, "The Republic's Ambiguous Democracy" (with Mason Marshall), *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 27.4 (2010): 301-316
3. Anna Brinkerhoff, "Resolving the Paradox of Fiction: A Defense of Irrationalism," *Stance* 7 (2014): 41-50
4. Justin Clardy, "Free Will, Moral Responsibilities, and Alternative Possibilities: An Empirical Investigation," *Polymath* 1.2 (2011): 47-59
5. Justin Clardy, "On the Nature of Romantic Love," *Valley Humanities Review* 2 (2011)
6. Justin Clardy, "Knowledge and Rational Desirability," *Dialogue* 54.2-3 (2012): 181-185
7. Aaron M. Clark, "Is Clarity Essential to Good Teaching?" (with Mason Marshall), *Teaching Philosophy* 33.3 (2010): 271-289
8. Matthew Dougherty, "Platonic Epistocracy: A Response to Andrew Forcehimes' 'Deliberative Democracy with a Spine,'" *Dialogue* 52.2-3 (2010): 79-83
9. Andrew T. Forcehimes, "Deliberative Democracy with a Spine: Epistemic Agency as Political Authority," *Dialogue* 52.2-3 (2010): 69-78
10. Andrew T. Forcehimes, "A Peircean Epistemic Argument for a Modest Multiculturalism" (with J. Caleb Clanton), *Contemporary Pragmatism* 8.2 (2011): 163-185
11. John Gunter, "Edward Scribner Ames, Pragmatism, and Religious Naturalism: A Critical Assessment" (with J. Caleb Clanton), *Heythrop Journal* 55.3 (2014): 375-390
12. Craig B. Knepley, "For What I Hate, I Do: An Investigation of Weakness of Will," *Global Tides* 7 (2013)
13. Benjamin Kryder, "The Possibility of Akrasia in the Protagoras and the Republic," *Global Tides* 6 (2012)
14. Justin Kundrak, "The Compatibility of Aristotle and Evolution," *Ex Nihilo* (2012): 1-14
15. Chad Marxen, "Fatalism and Truth at a Time," *Stance* 6 (2013): 29-35
16. Chad Marxen, "Yes, Safety Is in Danger" (with Tomás Bogardus), *Philosophia* (forthcoming)
17. Maximillian M. Muller, "How a Skeptical Foundationalist Might Respond to Peter Klein," *Global Tides* 7 (2013)
18. Blake McAllister, "The Principle of Sufficient Reason and Free Will," *Stance* 3 (2010): 1-8
19. Blake McAllister, "The Universe Began to Exist? Craig's Philosophical Arguments for a Finite Past," *Stance* 4 (2011): 103-114
20. Jacob Perrin, "A Defense of Socrates' Denial of Akrasia," *Dialogue* 54.1 (2011): 36-42
21. Jacob Perrin, "The Incoherence of William James' Moral Philosophy," *Aporia* 21.2 (2011): 11-18
22. Jacob Perrin, "Justice and Global Health," in *2012 Undergraduate Ethics Symposium: Ethics and Relationships: Friends, Family and Community* (DePauw University, 2012): 52-61
23. Peter Zuk, "Plantinga, Kant and Cognitive Reliability," *Global Tides* 4 (2010)
24. Peter Zuk, "Rethinking the Republic," *Arête* 5 (2011): 17-26

ANALYSIS OF EVIDENCE: Integrity

Integrity

In meaning of the degree (section four) student learning outcomes and curriculum matrixes were used to define the degree. Now please describe the processes used to ensure the rigor of the program.

17. Are the graduates achieving the student learning outcomes at the expected level? How was the threshold determined? How do you know your expectations are appropriate? Do you use comparisons based on national standards or benchmarking? How have your assessment findings supported this?

Prior to 2009, the philosophy program focused on assessing one PLO per year, across every course offering. Since 2009, and as a result of consultation with WASC representatives, the philosophy program has focused instead on assessing one course per year, gauging the extent to which the course achieves all the intended PLOs. In previous years, the philosophy program has assessed the Capstone course—which students take at the end of their careers—as well as the Introduction to Philosophy course—which students take at the beginning of their careers. Since then, the program has assessed courses that students take in the middle of their careers in the program.

Before the program assesses any course, a portfolio is compiled, typically consisting of the final exams that the students wrote in the course, the final papers that the students wrote for the course, and all comments from the professor on these. All the faculty then assess how well students performed on the PLOs for that course. For an integrated analysis of this direct evidence of student learning, please see § 19 below.

In 2013, we began administering an annual survey of graduating Philosophy majors. The bulk of the questions on the survey relate directly to our Program Learning Outcomes, and thus provide indirect evidence that those outcomes are being achieved. We have determined that we would like our average responses to be above a 3.5 threshold (on a 5-point scale) for the relevant questions. Here are the average results on those questions:

Question 2013 avg 2014 avg 2015 avg

#2: Please rate how much you've learned, through your years in the Pepperdine philosophy program, about arguments and views in the fields of ancient philosophy and modern philosophy [cf. PLO 3]: 4.55 3.65 4.64

#3: Please rate how much you've learned, through your years in the Pepperdine philosophy program, about ethical theory and how it applies to various situations [cf. PLO 4]: 4.33 4 4.27

#4: Please rate how much you've learned, through your years in the Pepperdine philosophy program, not just about the history of philosophy or ethical theory but about philosophy in general [cf. PLO 3 & 4]: 4.88 4.35 4.54

#5: Please rate how much your years in the Pepperdine philosophy program have improved your critical-thinking skills [cf. PLO 2]: 4.88 4.75 4.64

#6: Please rate how much your years in the Pepperdine philosophy program have improved your ability to communicate clearly in your writing [cf. PLO 1]: 4.66 4.3 4.81

#7: Please rate how much your years in the Pepperdine philosophy program have improved your ability to communicate clearly when you're speaking [cf. PLO 1]: 4.22 3.45 4.27

#8: Please rate how much your years in the Pepperdine philosophy program have improved your

ability to write a paper informed by philosophical research that is relevant to your topic [cf. PLO 5]: 4.72 4.2 4.45

* “[year] avg” covers the responses given by majors who graduated in spring or fall of [year].

Although we haven’t yet compared our expectations to national standards or benchmarks, we hope to identify some standards that we can compare with as we continue to enhance our assessment efforts. (One reason for this lack of comparison is that the American Philosophical Association has been slow to embrace assessment. That seems to be changing, so we’re hoping that the APA will begin providing some of these benchmarks.)

[see attachment for question 19 for formatted tables]

18. Is there assurance that students consistently meet the standards of performance that the major has established? What happens to students that don't meet the standards?

In every class, Philosophy faculty members utilize various assessment methods to evaluate direct evidence of student performance, distributing grades according to performance. Students who don’t meet our program’s standard of performance, on the basis of this evaluation of direct evidence, receive low grades, and we attempt to correct the problem by giving low-performing students extra instructional attention.

19. Please present an integrated analysis of the data collected from the assessment of direct learning and indirect learning (survey data, focus group, alumni data, and authentic evidence). Please report on the findings from the last comprehensive program review. In summary please explain how the program has achieved a holistic evaluation of the students' educational experience.

Evidence

Please attach evidence.

[Philosophy___Integrity_17_19.docx](#)

In § 17, we described the annual process of accumulating student work from a single course and evaluating that direct evidence of student performance vis-a-vis the intended PLOs for that course. In this section, we’ll summarize the findings from the last comprehensive program review. Last year, we assessed Philosophy of Religion (PHIL 527), and we evaluated students’ written communication by investigating the clarity, organization, polish, and citation practices within the students’ work.

Of the 17 students, 4 (24%) fully displayed the desiderata indicated just above, 10 (59%) performed well, and 3 (18%) were weakest. The most common strengths were high degrees of lucidity, obvious theses, and diligent editing. The most common weaknesses were improper or incomplete citations. Dr. Bogardus, who teaches this course, resolved to emphasize in future courses the importance of proper citation practices.

We also evaluated how well students developed their critical thinking skills, by investigating the argumentative rigor of the students’ work. Of the 17 student performances, 5 (29%) were

excellent, 9 (53%) were good, and 3 (18%) were weakest. The most common mistake was attempting to do too much, to cover too much ground. This resulted in incomplete or poorly supported arguments, and often the inclusion of irrelevant material or quotations.

In addition, we evaluated how well the student developed their research skills in philosophy, by investigating whether students cited the appropriate number of sources, and whether these sources were relevant to their projects. Out of the 17 students, 6 (35%) performed excellently, 5 (29%) performed well, and 6 (35%) were weakest. Students rarely cited irrelevant sources. But the most common weakness was failing to cite a sufficient number of sources. Students also struggled to use proper citation practices, especially within the text. To address these and other issues, Dr. Bogardus has resolved to provide more guidance to students regarding proper citation practices.

The program intends to continue this annual process of evaluating PLOs for a single course—each year rotating which course is evaluated—and updating our teaching practices in light of the direct evidence that we uncover.

For data relating to student surveys, please see §§ 11, 15, and 17 above.

WASC 5 CORE COMPETENCIES

WASC 5 CORE COMPETENCIES

20. How does the program ensure that graduates meet the WASC FIVE CORE COMPETENCIES? Present your findings of measurements you have done of the core competencies (may be less than 5).

We design our courses in order to introduce, develop, or produce mastery of four Core Competencies: Critical Thinking (CT), Information Literacy (IL), Oral Communication (OC), and Written Communication (WC). Below, we have indicated whether, in each course offered, students are Introduced to the Core Competency (I), Develop their skills related to the core competency (D), or demonstrate Mastery of the core competency (M).

Evidence

Please attach evidence.

[Core_Competencies_in_the_Philosophy_Program.docx](#)

SUSTAINABILITY: RESOURCES

Sustainability

21. With the rapid changes in the higher education environment, the University needs to demonstrate how financial viability and planning of their long-term stability are ensured.

In order to demonstrate this each program should address

- a. questions about the level of student demand for the program and**
- b. the degree to which resources are allocated appropriately so they are sufficient to maintain program quality.**
- c. What is happening within the profession, local community, or society that identifies an**

**anticipated need
for this program in the future? (If appropriate include market research.)**

According to the American Philosophical Association, "Bachelor's degree completions in philosophy more than doubled from 1987 to 2009, and the percentage of bachelor's degrees issued in philosophy as a percentage of all bachelor's degrees awarded, though small, rose slowly but steadily throughout that same time period." Data are available here.

According to those data compiled by the APA, in 2009 philosophy degrees were 0.498% of all bachelor degrees conferred that year. (This comports with data from the Institute for Education Sciences, which puts the percentage of Philosophy degrees and Religious Studies degrees at 0.706%.)

In the table below, you'll see that Pepperdine's percentage of philosophy majors at Seaver College (1.01%) is more than double the national average (0.498%), despite our relatively high ratio of philosophy majors to philosophy faculty (11.67 students for every 1 tenured or tenure-track faculty member), as well as our limited presence on the GE curriculum (no philosophy courses are required of all students, and only one philosophy course counts toward a GE requirement).

Evidence

Please attach evidence if applicable.

[sustainability_of_the_philosophy_program.docx](#)

22. FACILITIES

Please describe the adequacy of

- a. Classroom space**
- b. Laboratories**
- c. Office space**
- d. Programming venues**
- e. Student study spaces**

Some of the classrooms we use on a regular basis aren't set up well for the type of group discussion that philosophy courses typically require. In some cases this is due to the room layout, and in some cases this is due to furniture issues (e.g., a shortage of easily movable desks). Other than that, the facilities are adequate for our purposes.

FACULTY AND STAFF

23. What are the qualifications and achievements of the faculty/staff in the program in relation to the program purpose and goals? How do faculty/staff members' backgrounds, expertise, research, and other professional work contribute to the quality of the program?

Evidence in this category should include (this could be collected through faculty CVs) :

- a. Proportion of faculty with terminal degrees**
- b. List of faculty/staff specialties within discipline (and how those specialties align with the program curriculum)**
- c. Record of scholarship for each faculty member, professional presentations for staff**

members**d. Faculty/staff participation in development opportunities related to teaching, learning, and/or assessment****e. External funding awarded to faculty/staff**

We have three full-time faculty members. Each one holds a Ph.D. in Philosophy.

Faculty specialties:

- Dr. Tomas Bogardus: AOS: Epistemology and Philosophy of Mind. AOC: Ethics, Logic, Philosophy of Religion.
- Dr. Mason Marshall: AOS: Ancient Philosophy. AOC: Modern Philosophy, Aesthetics.
- Dr. Garrett Pendergraft: AOS: Action Theory and Philosophy of Religion. AOC: Metaphysics, Epistemology, Logic, Business Ethics.

Every course one of our faculty members teaches is within either his AOS or AOC, which produces a favorable alignment of our specialties with our curriculum.

Record of scholarship:

Dr. Tomas Bogardus:

- "Only All Naturalists Should Worry about Only One Evolutionary Debunking Argument," forthcoming in Ethics
- "Yes, Safety is in Danger," co-authored with Pepperdine student Chad Marxen, *Philosophia* 42(2): 321-334 (2014)
- "Knowledge under Threat," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 88(2): 289-313 (2014)
- "The Problem of Contingency for Religious Belief," *Faith and Philosophy* 30(4): 371-392 (2013)
- "Undefeated Dualism," *Philosophical Studies* 165(2): 445-466 (2013)
- "Disagreeing with the (Religious) Skeptic," *International Journal for Philosophy of Religion* 74: 5-17 (2013)
- "Foley on Self-Trust and Religious Disagreement," *Logos & Episteme* 4(2): 217-226 (2013)
- "What Certainty Teaches," *Philosophical Psychology* 25(2): 227-243 (2012)
- "A Vindication of the Equal-Weight View," *Episteme: A Journal of Social Epistemology* 6(3): 324-335 (2009)
- Zhu et al., "Nerve Growth Factor Exerts Differential Effects on the Growth of Human Pancreatic Cancer Cells," *Clinical Cancer Research* 7: 105-112 (2001)

Dr. Mason Marshall:

- "Is Clarity Essential to Good Teaching?" (with Seaver student Aaron M. Clark), *Teaching Philosophy* 33.3 (2010): 271-289
- "The Republic's Ambiguous Democracy" (with Seaver student Shane A. Bilsborough), *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 27.4 (2010): 301-316
- "A Problem for the Political Reading of Plato's Republic," *Newsletters for the Society for Ancient Greek Philosophy* 10.2 (2009): 3-12
- "Democracy in Plato's Republic: How Bad Is It Supposed to Be?" *Southwest Philosophy Review* 25.1 (2009), (revised and expanded) *Newsletters for the Society for Ancient Greek Philosophy* 9.3 (2008): 3-13
- "Revisiting Gender-Inclusive God-Talk: A New, Wesleyan Argument" (with J. Aaron Simmons), *Philosophy and Theology* 20.1-2 (2009): 243-263
- "The Possibility Requirement in Plato's Republic," *Ancient Philosophy* 28.1 (2008): 71-85
- "Freedom through Critique: Thoreau's Service to Others," *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 41.2 (2005): 395-427
- "The Role of Reason for Borden Parker Bowne," *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 38.4 (2002): 649-671

Dr. Garrett Pendergraft:

- “Against Deliberation Restrictions,” *Religious Studies* 50 (2014): 341-357
- “No (New) Troubles with Ockhamism” (with D. Justin Coates), *Oxford Studies in Philosophy of Religion* 5 (2014): 185-208.
- “Does the Consequence Argument Beg the Question?” (with John Martin Fischer), *Philosophical Studies* 166 (2013): 575-95
- “The Explanatory Power of Local Miracle Compatibilism,” *Philosophical Studies* 156 (2011): 249-66
- “Nelson Pike's Contribution to the Philosophy of Religion,” *Philosophia* 39 (2011):409-31.
- “In Defense of a Causal Requirement on Explanation,” in Phyllis McKay Illari, Federica Russo, and Jon Williamson (eds.), *Causality in the Sciences* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), pp. 470-92.

Faculty participation in development opportunities:

Dr. Garrett Pendergraft:

- Spring 2016 American Association of Philosophy Teachers Workshop: Teaching and Learning in Philosophy (Jan 2016).
- Spring 2015 TechLearn Faculty Professional Development program on Gamification.
- Teaching Professor Conference in Boston (May 30–Jun 1, 2014).
- “Assessment 101” in Pomona in October of 2013.
- A WASC assessment workshop in Anaheim in September of 2012.
- Teaching Professor Conference in Atlanta (summer 2011)

All three faculty members consistently read a significant number of recent issues of the journals relevant to their fields of research. And they stay up-to-date on all major books published in their fields of interest, focusing on the major academic presses (e.g. Oxford, Cambridge, Routledge, and MIT Presses).

External funding awarded to faculty:

Dr. Garrett Pendergraft:

- The Immortality Project: Essay Prize (\$3,000), June 2015
- The Immortality Project: Younger Scholars Workshop and Capstone Conference Participant (\$1,000 honorarium), May 2015

Dr. Tomas Bogardus:

- Fordham Summer Seminar on Understanding Participant, \$600 honorarium plus expenses paid, June 2016
- St. Thomas Summer Seminar Participant, \$2,000 honorarium plus expenses paid, June 2012
- St. Thomas Summer Seminar Paper Prize (1st Place, \$1,000), June 2012

Evidence

Please attach evidence.

24. FACULTY/STAFF

Are there sufficient numbers of faculty/staff to maintain program quality? Do program faculty/staff have the support they need to do their work?

- Distribution of faculty across ranks (or staff years at institution)**
- Diversity of faculty/staff**
- Number of full-time faculty (ratio of full-time faculty to part-time faculty)**
- Student-faculty ratio**
- Faculty workload**
- Faculty review and evaluation processes**
- Mentoring processes**

h. Professional development opportunities and resources (including travel and research funds)

i. Sufficient time for research, program development

Distribution of faculty across ranks (or staff years at institution): Dr. Marshall is an Associate Professor. Dr. Pendergraft and Dr. Bogardus are both Assistant Professors each at least halfway to tenure.

- Diversity of faculty/staff: Our faculty members have a suitable diversity of educational backgrounds, research areas, and philosophical views to expose our students to a wide variety of perspectives.
- Number of full-time faculty (ratio of full-time faculty to part-time faculty): Three full-time faculty. In recent semesters, there have been no part-time faculty.
- Student-faculty ratio: There are approximately 11 majors for every 1 faculty member.
- Faculty workload: Our pre-tenure faculty have 3/2 teaching loads. Our tenured faculty member has a 3/3 teaching load.
- Faculty review and evaluation processes: Faculty members are periodically evaluated formally by other faculty, Pepperdine's Rank-Tenure-Promotion Committee, the Division Chair, the Dean, the Provost, the Board of Regents, and the President. Every faculty member goes through a pre-tenure review process after three years of teaching. Then, each faculty member goes through the tenure review process after six years of teaching. After that, faculty members are evaluated every five years. All faculty receive a less formal annual review from the Divisional Dean.
- Mentoring processes: New faculty are assigned to a senior faculty mentor as part of the new faculty orientation process.
- Professional development opportunities and resources (including travel and research funds): All faculty have an approximately \$1,500 travel budget each year. Faculty may also apply for funding through Seaver Fellowships, Dean's Research Grants, the Summer Undergraduate Research Program, the Academic Year Undergraduate Research Initiative, and through Technology and Learning Grants. And, after tenure, faculty may apply for a course reduction to support an active research agenda (thereby moving from a 3/3 load to a 3/2 load).
- Sufficient time for research, program development? Yes, we have sufficient time for research and program development.

Evidence

Please attach evidence if applicable.

FINANCIAL RESOURCES

Financial Resources

25. Financial Resources:

Please describe your operational budget (revenues and expenditures) and trends over a 3-5 year period.

Since budgetary decisions take place at the Divisional level and not the Program level, the Divisional Dean is in a better position to discuss the operating budget (and budgetary trends) than are the program director or the individual faculty members.

Evidence

Please attach evidence.

EXTERNAL REVIEW

External Review Report

In summary please explain how, through the findings in the annual assessments, the program has achieved a holistic evaluation of the educational experience that is supported through benchmarking. (Has the program been reviewed by external stakeholders, such as practitioners in the field, or compared with other similar institutions, or national standards?)

I. GUIDELINES FOR ORGANIZING THE EXTERNAL REVIEW

The external review typically occurs after a program or department completes its self-study report, but the selection and invitation of external reviewers can occur during the self-study process to ensure the availability of the best reviewers. However, programs with concurrent accreditation (e.g., AACSB, APA, ABA) can use the visiting team for that discipline-specific accreditation as the external review. The report from the site visitors should be included in the final report. For an illustration of potential areas for the reviewers to consider, see Attachment below.

II. CHOOSING REVIEWERS

The size and composition of the review team can vary, depending on the size of the program under review. Usually, the team involves one or two people. At the time a department or program is notified that it will be conducting a program review, appropriate individuals should submit a list of names of possible reviewers. These reviewers should be external to the school/University. External reviewers should be distinguished scholars/teachers/practitioners in the field and be familiar with campuses that are similar to Pepperdine University and the program undergoing review. It is also helpful for external reviewers to have had experience with program administration and with program assessment. At least one of the reviewers should be experienced with student learning outcomes assessment in order to review and analyze the program's assessment processes and results.

III. MATERIALS FOR THE EXTERNAL REVIEW TEAM

At least 30 days prior to the scheduled department visit, the information from the program self-study and appropriate additional materials are sent to each member of the external review team. An identical information package should be provided to appropriate members of the administrators overseeing the program. The reviewers should compile a report that includes observations, strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations based on evidence. The attached External Review Report expectations outlines the guidelines for the external reviewers' site visit and report. Reviewers and Divisional Deans should also sign a consultant agreement. External Reviewers should also be given a schedule for their visit and a confirmation letter, and programs will submit a budget proposal for the site visit to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness.

IV. CATEGORIES FOR EVALUATION

- curricular offerings in terms of relevance, currency, and quality.
- the appropriateness and effectiveness of assessment methodologies and Program Learning Outcomes

- whether changes in response to assessment data reflect the best practices of the discipline
- the quality of instruction and faculty members' scholarly activity/accomplishments
- the program's ability to recruit and retain successful students
- the program's strengths and growth areas, based on evidence-based analysis and comparisons to peer/aspirational programs

V. EXTERNAL REVIEW TEAM VISIT AND REPORT

The review team visit typically lasts for two days, during which time the review committee members meet with department faculty, academic advisors, students, and select administrators. The review team typically takes part in an exit interview just prior to concluding its departmental visit.

The team is expected to submit its written evaluation to the campus program review committee as soon as possible after the visit. The written evaluation should include a review of strengths and challenges, resource allocation, and program viability as well as suggestions for policy and resources. Upon submission of the report, off-campus reviewers receive a previously agreed upon stipend and travel expense reimbursement (to be determined by the department under review).

As soon as the program receives the report from the external review team, it is distributed to the appropriate individuals. The department is typically asked to review the report (within a brief time period) for factual inaccuracies and misperceptions. To maximize the effectiveness of program review, the findings and resulting decisions should be shared with all of the stakeholder groups. Such sharing of findings generates buy-in to the program's and/or institution's goals. To facilitate and track the implementation of improvement plans, each year the relevant faculty members should review the progress of programs reviewed in previous years. If the department/program was not successful in implementing all aspects of the plan, they may follow up with their appropriate administrative unit regarding resource allocation or other barriers involved in preventing successful implementation.

External Reviewer Report

Please attach the External Reviewer Report.

[Report_on_Pepperdine.pdf](#)