

Student Learning Outcome and Assessment Plan Rio Hondo College

Department/program: Philosophy Date: 2-12-07

Course title/number: Introduction to Ethics/PHIL 120

Participating Faculty: Preston

State Student Learning Outcome:

Given a particular set of hypothetical circumstances (the “problem”) and prior exposure to major ethical theories (e.g., ethical egoism, subjectivism, ethical relativism, utilitarianism, Kantianism/deontological theories, or virtue ethics), the student will interpret the circumstances and identify what course of action would be the “right thing to do” according to the selected theory.

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

- ♦ *Course exam (written assessment) or course paper.*
- ♦ *Class report*

Collection and Evaluation Process:

Responses from a written course exam or course paper will be collected from each course. The responses 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: Ethics & Morality/PHIL 120

SLO: Given a particular set of hypothetical circumstances (the “problem”) and prior exposure to major ethical theories (e.g., ethical egoism, subjectivism, ethical relativism, utilitarianism, Kantianism/deontological theories, or virtue ethics), the student will interpret the circumstances and identify what course of action would be the “right thing to do” according to the selected theory.

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 explain the relevant features of the selected theory.	Student displays exceptional or excellent insight and accuracy, though rare and minimal errors may be present. (“A” or “B” quality work)	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. (“C” quality work)	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. (“D” or “F” quality work)
Student will apply the facts of the scenario to the decision-making procedure of the theory and secure a conclusion.	See above	See above	See above