Course Assessment in a Box is a practical tool for you to conduct assessment of course Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). By following these simple steps, using assessment tools you already use to evaluate student work, you can easily produce a course assessment of SLOs.

These steps align with the course SLO assessment page in the CurricUNET Program Review Module. Once the steps are completed, simply attach it to your Program Review.

1. Number and name of the course being assessed:
   Phil 107 Practical Reasoning

2. List all the Course SLOs from the Course Outline of Record:
   1. Recognize arguments and identify the basic parts of arguments.
   2. Identify informal fallacies, and rhetorical devices used to persuade without reason.
   3. Identify both inductive and deductive forms of reasoning as they appear in everyday communication: conversation, class discussion, newspapers, television, advertising, etc.
   4. Evaluate logically inductive to be strong or weak, in an everyday context.
   5. Know how to write an argumentative paper that relies on rational argumentation and a minimum of rhetoric to support a thesis.
   6. Evaluate formal syllogistic reasoning for fallacies and validity.

3. If you have had any dialogue about the Course SLOs amongst faculty who teach this course, please describe it here (leave blank if there has been no specific dialogue):
   Dialogue with Elizabeth Rard, the adjunct who primarily teaches Phil 104 resulted in substantive changes in Phil 104 Logic, and Phil 107 practical reasoning. SLOs between Phil 104 Logic and Phil 107 Practical Reasoning needed to be altered. Phil 104’s SLOs covered topics that should not have been part of the course, specifically Phil 104 covered informal fallacies, which should be properly under Phil 107. Phil 104 also covered Venn diagramming/syllogistic reasoning, and this was moved to Phil 107.

4. List the SLO(s) you are assessing in this particular instance:
   1. Recognize arguments and identify the basic parts of arguments.
   2. Identify informal fallacies, and rhetorical devices used to persuade without reason.
   4. Evaluate logically inductive to be strong or weak, in an everyday context.
   5. Know how to write an argumentative paper that relies on rational argumentation and a minimum of rhetoric to support a thesis.

5. Describe the assessment strategy or tool that addresses the SLO(s):
   Each SLO has an assignment or exam devoted specifically to the SLO. SLO #5 is assessed by the student’s work on their argumentative paper.

   NOTE: Try to use assessment strategies you are already using to evaluate student work as part of your grading system. Examples: Rubrics for Evaluating Projects or Assignments, Portfolio Evaluation, Culminating Projects, Final Exams, Writing Assignments, Performance Assessment, Department Testing, Pre and Post Tests, Vendor or Industry Certification Examinations, Indirect Assessments (Student Surveys, Focus Group Discussions, Interviews), or others....

6. Describe how the criteria or standards in this assessment tool link to the SLO(s) being assessed:
1. In the first exam, students are asked to identify parts of arguments, premises, conclusions, and issues, as well as identify kinds of premises Objective or Subjective.

2. In the second exam, students are given short passages/arguments. Students are asked to identify rhetorical devices that are present (if any) and identify fallacies present (if any).

4. In the fourth exam, students are asked to identify different types of inductive reasoning, e.g. causal/scientific, moral, or legal reasoning. Then they are asked to evaluate the strength of various arguments based on analogical reasoning, statistical reasoning, consistency, etc.

5. Students demonstrate a synthesis of much of the course in their argumentative paper. They defend a thesis, support it with good argumentation, with a minimum of fallacious arguments and rhetoric.

7. By looking holistically at the results from all students, describe your findings

All data was gathered from Spring 2012. Students who did not take the exam or dropped from the course are not included in the statistics.

1. Students are largely successful at achieving this SLO. Out of 32 students, 23 students score 70% or higher with a median score of 76.1% and a mean of 74.7%. Maximum scores of 96.1% and a low of 46.1%. Student success on this SLO is very much like a traditional bell curve, slightly favored towards success. However, I believe that this SLO is a very basic SLO and higher achievement rates in this SLO should be aimed for.

2. Students are successful at achieving this SLO, but there is a large standard deviation for this SLO tool. Out of 31 students taking the exam, 19 students scored 70% or higher with a median score of 74% and a mean of 71.1% Maximum scores of 100% and a low score of 26%. Essentially more students have a harder time achieving the SLO, and those that fail to achieve the SLO fail by a larger margin than those that succeed.

4. Students are largely successful at achieving this SLO. Out of 28 students, 20 students score 70% or higher with a median score of 75.5% and a mean of 74.9%. Maximum scores of 95% and a low of 52%. Students are doing well meeting this SLO. With low scoring students still scoring at least above 50%, students seem to understand this concept well.

5. Students are largely successful at achieving this SLO. Out of 28 students, 19 students score 70% or higher with a median score of 77.5% and a mean of 73.5%. Maximum scores of 100% and a low of 20%. Students who fail this tool, often fail for varying reasons, including not meeting minimum standards of the assignment. Students scoring on the low end of this tool often turn in papers that are significantly under paper minimums (for example 3 page papers when the minimum is 7 pages). Students exemplifying basic competence in their paper are scored at minimum of at 70%. Mastery of the SLO are given higher scores. Scores graphed exhibit a bell curve with the peak in the mid-80s, with a long “low score” tail.

8. Describe faculty dialogue (if any) involved in the assessment process:
9. Based on an analysis of your findings and dialogue, describe revisions (if any) in curriculum or teaching strategies implemented to promote student success:

Examining the data, SLOs 1 and 2 are in need of improvement. Any changes to the curriculum however may be moot, since as of the most recent course review, additional material is being added to the Phil 107 course (and little is being taken away). Additional time isn’t available to devote to these particular SLOs. But greater emphasis and better measurements of SLOs will be utilized in the next assessment cycle to determine if students are achieving SLOs. Currently the entire exam is being used to measure SLOs, and there are parts of exams that do not directly measure what the SLOs are examining.

10. After the improvements are implemented, describe the results: