

**COURSE SLO ASSESSMENT REPORT, SCC**

Department: Philosophy Course: Phil 110, & 106

Year: 2008 Semester: FALL

1) Outcome to be assessed	2) Means of assessment and criteria of success	3) Summary of data collected	4) Analysis of data	5) Plan of action/what to do next
<p>To be able to write a “solid argument” on the topic of min. wage (2 arguments, one pro min. wage as a “strong/good solution”, and one con min. wage as a “weak/poor solution”).</p>	<p>A morning Intro to Philosophy class (106) was chosen, as was the more advanced, Critical Thinking class (110). The idea here was to contrast two different types of classes that contain similar population groups (younger morning students); the 110 class had had heavy training in how to argue a thesis, whereas the 106 had had little at my hands, since my 106 course focuses more on content and understanding ideas, than on creating and evaluating formal argument.</p>	<p>Criteria/Grading Rubric:            3 = strong logic + strong premises            2 = good logic + weak premises            1 = weak logic + weak premises</p> <p>Stats for 110 class:            3s = 11 students            2s = 10 students            1s = 4 students</p> <p>Stats for 106 class:            3s = 7 students            2s = 16 students            1s = 7 students</p>	<p>The 110 class:            84% received 2 or 3            17 % received a 1</p> <p>The 106 class:            80% received 2 or 3            23% received a 1</p> <p>The 110 class was lower than expected with respect to 2s and 3s, but not by far; in fact, the scores were super close to calibrated expectations; the 106 class, which has no prerequisite and is not centrally based on argument and logic, did better than expected.</p>	<p>1) The student performances met my reasonable (in my view) expectations, so I will continue with the same kinds of practices with respect to teaching students about argument creation.</p> <p>2) I will, however, emphasize, in a more intense and thorough manner, argument creation, as a formal kind of work; i.e., I will lay out “premise 1, 2, 3...etc.”, and “conclusion” on the board in a more explicit and systematic manner, so that they get more intense</p>

	<p>Scoring Rubric: 3 = strong logic + strong premises 2 = good logic + weak premises 1 = weak logic + weak premises</p> <p>Criteria for Success:</p> <p>In 110 = circa 85% would score either 2 or 3; &amp;, less than circa 15% would receive a 1</p> <p>In 106 = circa 70% would score either 2 or 3; &amp;, less than circa 30% would receive a 1</p>			<p>exposure to what an explicit and well formed argument “looks like”, in my attempt to diminish the amounts of 1s in both classes.</p>
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------