

## Student Learning Outcome and Assessment Plan Rio Hondo College

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

Course title/number: Philosophy of Religion /PHIL 140

Participating Faculty: Preston

### State Student Learning Outcome:

Given a writing prompt referencing the design argument for God's existence, as well as Hume's criticism of such arguments, the student will summarize one version of the design argument and describe how one of Hume's criticisms could undermine that argument's effectiveness.

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

- ◆ *Course exam (written assessment) or course paper.*

### Collection and Evaluation Process:

*5 sample responses from a written course exam or course paper will be collected (randomly) from each section. The sample 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: PHIL 140: Philosophy of Religion

SLO: Given a writing prompt referencing the design argument for God’s existence, as well as Hume’s criticism of such arguments, the student will summarize one version of the design argument and describe how one of Hume’s criticisms could undermine that argument’s effectiveness.

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.

<b>Performance standard</b>	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Satisfactory</i>	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>
Student will articulate the key elements of the selected version of the design argument.	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 articulate the selected criticism from Hume, and its application to the design argument.	See above	See above	See above