

Student Learning Outcome and Assessment Plan Rio Hondo College

Department/program: Philosophy Date: 11-12-06

Course title/number: Critical Thinking/PHIL 110

Participating Faculty: Preston

State Student Learning Outcome:

Given previous instruction in the recognition of common formal and informal fallacies, and being presented with examples, the student will correctly identify which formal or informal fallacy, if any, is evidenced by each example.

Proposed Types of Assessment to be used: (attach rubric)

- ♦ *Multiple choice or matching questions.*
- ♦ *Short answer responses*

Collection and Evaluation Process:

10 sample answers sets, consisting of 5 examples each, will be collected (randomly) from each course. The answer sets will be assessed using the attached rubric, and compared across sections and semesters where applicable. Cross-section comparisons will involve each instructor of record from those sections.

Changes being considered (if any):

N/A. Current goal is to establish baseline competency.

Review and recommendations; scheduled completion date:

Rubric for Evaluation of a Student Learning Outcome

Course: Critical Thinking/Phil 110

SLO: Given previous instruction in the recognition of common formal and informal fallacies, and being presented with examples, the student will correctly identify which formal or informal fallacy, if any, is evidenced by each example.

Faculty participating: Preston

For each performance standard described in the SLO, describe the criteria for various levels of meeting that standard. Three levels is recommended, but you may use more. Be as specific as possible, so that new instructors would understand the criteria.

Attach this to the SLO and Assessment Plan.

Performance standard	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Satisfactory</i>	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>
Student will properly identify the fallacy for each statement, discussion, or example.	Student identifies the correct source religion at least 80% of the time.	Student identifies the correct source religion at least 70% of the time, but less than 80% of the time.	Student identifies the correct source religion less than 70% of the time.
Where applicable, student will justify selection by appealing to central features of the fallacy.	When explanation is required, the student displays exceptional or excellent insight and accuracy, though rare and minimal errors may be present. Application to the specific example is clear. (“A” or “B” quality work)	When explanation is required, student insight and accuracy is merely adequate. This represents the minimal “passing” knowledge and skill needed for this assessment. Errors are common, and significant, but do not overwhelm the effort, as a whole. Application to the specific example might be vague, or inadequately supported. (“C” quality work)	When explanation is required, student insight and accuracy is inadequate. Some correct responses or efforts are detectable, but significant and pervasive errors overwhelm the occasional success. Student displays some understanding, but not enough to demonstrate competency; or. Either no understanding is demonstrated, or else the correct skill displays can’t be distinguished from what might be obtained by chance alone. Application to the specific example is profoundly flawed, or not even attempted. (“D” or “F” quality work)