Student Learning Outcome and Assessment Plan Rio Hondo College

Department/program: _____*Philosophy*__ Date: __9-13-06_____

Course title/number:_____Introductory Logic/PHIL 112_____

Participating Faculty: ___Preston, Romero

State Student Learning Outcome:

Given a short (2-3 premise) deductive argument expressed in a natural language (i.e., not symbolized), the student will evaluate the validity of the argument using one of the following formal techniques: square of opposition, Venn diagrams, truth-tables, derivation rules—correctly identifying the argument as either valid or invalid, while demonstrating correct application of the selected formal technique.

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

- *In-class exams or homework sets (closed book/notes only)*

Collection and Evaluation Process:

5 sample argument evaluations from an in-class exam, or in-class homework set (closed book/notes only) will be collected (randomly) from each class. The sample arguments 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: Introduction to Logic/PHIL 112_____

SLO: Given a short (2-3 premise) deductive argument expressed in a natural language (i.e., not symbolized), the student will evaluate the validity of the argument using one of the following formal techniques: square of opposition, Venn diagrams, truth-tables, derivation rules—correctly identifying the argument as either valid or invalid, while demonstrating correct application of the selected formal technique.

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	***Excellent***	***Satisfactory***	***Unsatisfactory***
Student will correctly identify the parts of the argument.	The conclusion and all premises are identified.	The conclusion is identified, but some premises might be neglected.	Neither the conclusion nor the premises are identified.
Student will apply a technique for formal evaluation.	The choice of formal techniques is clear, and, given the constraints of the formal technique chosen, the student has properly set-up, the evaluative step. When applicable, symbolization is accurate.	The choice of formal techniques is clear, and, given the constraints of the formal technique chosen, the student has (generally) set-up the evaluative step properly, but minor omissions or errors may be present. When applicable, symbolization is generally accurate, but minor omissions or errors may be present	The choice of formal technique is unclear, or entirely absent. Where a formal technique is employed, it has been set up contrary to the relevant constraints. When applicable, symbolization is non-existent, or profoundly flawed.
Student will correctly identify the argument as valid, or invalid.	The argument's validity is accurately assessed, and the application of the formal evaluation technique demonstrates the steps needed to validate that assessment.	The argument's validity is accurately assessed, but ambiguities in the application of the formal evaluation technique calls into question the student's ability to produce the same accurate results with consistency.	The validity assessment is incorrect, or, if correct, this claim is not supported by the work provided, and a "lucky guess" can't be excluded as the cause of the correct response.