## 1. Unit Planner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Key Knowledge/Key Skills</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Pedagogies</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1    | O3KK1 – 3 O1KS1          | Introduction to philosophy  
- What is philosophy?  
- Main branches of philosophy  
- Techniques and skills for reasoning and argument | Introduction  
- What is philosophy? (introductory video, podcast and discussion)  
**LECTURES/POWERPOINTS**  
- Branches of philosophy  
- Skills and techniques for reasoning and argument  
**ACTIVITIES**  
- Branches of philosophy  
  - Write down a definition of philosophy and 10 philosophical questions from different branches of philosophy  
  - Swap questions with another pair  
  - Match received questions to the branches of philosophy  
  **Socratic Method**  
  - Write down statement we accept as common sense  
  - Think of exceptions where the statement could be false  
  - Adapt statement to take account of exceptions  
  - Repeat the process (getting closer to the truth).  
  - Discuss individual work in groups of 3-4.  
  **Community of Inquiry**  
  - Stimulus: “An unexamined life is not worth living” – Socrates  
  - (Divide class into two groups). | NOTE: Students will be required to have “VCE Philosophy – A student text for VCE units 1&2” (See References). All page numbers refer to this textbook.  
Introductory video:  
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1A_CAkYt3GY  
Introductory podcast:  
https://philosophynow.org/podcasts/What_is_Philosophy (first 10-15 minutes).  
Branches of philosophy p. 3  
Philosophical reasoning:  
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NKEhdsnKKHs&index=2&list=PL8dPuuaLjXtNgK6M2zucdYldNkMybYIHK8  
Socratic method video:  
https://vimeo.com/49906158 focus on this segment if short on time  
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=X1VcFggcLTY | Written reflection  
Discussion  
Community of Inquiry (COI) |
| 2    | O3KK2 – 3 O3KS3 O3KS5   | Introduction to logic and reasoning  
- Identifying arguments  
- Constructing arguments  
  o Standard Form | **LECTURES/POWERPOINTS**  
- Identifying arguments  
- Constructing and reconstructing arguments (standard form) | Evaluating arguments link:  
Discussion |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O1KK1</th>
<th>O1KK3</th>
<th>O1KS3</th>
<th>O3KS2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>On the material mind</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Metaphysics – what exists?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dualism and materialism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Descartes 1st and 2nd Meditations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LECTURES/POWERPOINTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Introduction to dualism and materialism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Descartes 1st and 2nd meditations – summary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACTIVITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What is the mind?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Draw what you imagine the mind to be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Explain picture to class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Discuss different ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Concept game</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Students classify items as having ‘a mind’, ‘no mind’ and ‘?’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Text Study – 1st and 2nd Meditation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Text is read by student individually at home, in class (verbally annotated by teacher) and then again by students who are required to fill in a guided worksheet in order to highlight and annotate key parts. (This is to be completed separately for mediation 1 and 2).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Premise and Conclusion indicators p. 24 |
| For definitions or further clarification: [http://plato.stanford.edu/](http://plato.stanford.edu/) |

| Primary Text: |
| Descartes: Meditations 1 and 2 |

| Written Reflection Discussion |
| 4 | O1KK1 – 6  
O1KS1 – 3  
O1KS5 – 7  
O3KK2 – 3  
O3KS2  
O3KS3  
O3KS5 | **Continued.**  
- Appeal of Dualism  
- Challenges to Dualism  
- Alternative to Dualism – materialism | **LECTURES/POWERPOINTS**  
- Appeals and challenges of Dualism  
- Introduction to Materialism  
**ACTIVITIES**  
Philosophical writing  
- Students are to:  
  - Summarise 3 arguments in favour of dualism  
  - Write them in standard form  
  - Evaluate them  
  - Rank from strongest to weakest (justifying reasoning)  
  - Attempt to produce a counter argument.  
- Discuss any counter arguments as a class.  
**Excursion**  
- Mind/Body Gallery at Melbourne Museum  
- Students are given a page of questions to consider as they visit the exhibit.  
- Core question: Does science present a challenge to Dualism? (Cases like Phineas Gage, drugs, coma).  
- Class discussion of thoughts/questions raised. | **Textbook:** p. 117-121  
**Dualism:**  
[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5HHzt-mCCUE](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5HHzt-mCCUE)  
**Written reflection**  
**Discussion** |
|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | O1KK1 – 6  
O1KS1 – 6  
O3KK1  
O3KK2  
O3KS3 | **Continued.**  
- Materialism – identity theory  
- Appeals and challenges to Materialism  
- Thinking about Dualism and Materialism simultaneously | **LECTURES/POWERPOINTS**  
- Armstrong ‘The Nature of the Mind’ summary  
- Appeals and challenges of Materialism  
  - Ockham’s Razor  
  - Qualia  
  - Consciousness  
  - The Turing Test  
**ACTIVITIES**  
Text Study – The Nature of the Mind  
- Text is read by student individually at home, in class (verbally annotated by teacher) and then again by students who are | **Primary Text:**  
David Armstrong – ‘The Nature of the Mind’  
**Available:**  
**Written reflection**  
**Discussion** |
required to fill in a guided worksheet in order to highlight and annotate key parts.

Describing partner activity
- Attempt to describe the colour ‘green’
  - Is it impossible? Did you accurately and completely describe it?
  - Would scientific knowledge help? What does this tell us about the nature of the mind?
  - Class discussion on qualia.

Turing Test Activity
Students are to:
- Write a list of questions to ask an artificial intelligence (AI)
- Think about how an AI’s ‘thinking’ is different from their own
- Interrogate the AI with their questions
- Think about: did the AI pass the Turing Test? What does this mean for materialism and dualism?

Quizlet
- Students are to add new terms.

Continued.

- Relevant contemporary debate – artificial intelligence
- Writing a philosophy essay

LECTURES/POWERPOINTS
- Writing a philosophy essay

ACTIVITIES
Movie – I, Robot
- Students will watch the movie in preparation for further activities.
- While watching, consider: How plausible is this representation of thinking and intelligence? What is the movie suggesting about what is means to be human? Is the movie supporting a Dualist or Materialist view of the mind?

Community of Inquiry
- Facilitated questioning, analysis, discussion and evaluation on the stimulus I, Robot.

Essay (approx. 500 words)
- Students will be given time in class to begin their essay and then will continue it for homework. It will be due at the beginning of the following week.

How to write a philosophy essay handout p. 577

Artificial Intelligence
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=39EdqUbj92U&index=23&list=PL8dPuuaLjXINgK6MZucdYldNkMybY1HXR


Written reflection

Discussion

COI

Essay (Summative)
Question: Could computer’s one day have minds? Discuss and challenge ideas with reference to both the dualist and materialist approach. Which approach do you think best answers the question and why?

On the existence and nature of God
- Attributes of God
- The problem of Evil
- The Cosmological Argument
- Difference between necessary and contingent

LECTURES/POWERPOINTS
- Attributes of God
- Problem of Evil
- Cosmological argument

ACTIVITIES
Introduction
-In groups of 3-4 students discuss the following: What does the word ‘God’ mean to you? Can we know that God exists/can’t exist? Do we need to know in order to believe?

-Students are to then try the philosophical experiment (see link).

Podcast – Existence of God
-Students will be given the transcript and are to highlight and make notes to answer the following: What qualities does God have? What is the problem of evil? Are you convinced by the answer to the problem of evil?

-Discussion on Podcast content

What is God Like? / Problem of evil
-Watch 0:00 – 1:32 of What is God Like?

-Pause to write down attributes and discuss: Are the attributes problematic? Are they capable of coexisting?

-Watch 1:32 – 3:15 of What is God Like?

-Think then discuss: Can you think of further problems?

-Watch 1:32 – 9:00 of The problem of evil

-Think then discuss: How effective is the problem of evil against the existence of God? Is the free will defence enough to reconcile? Can evil be good?

Domino analogy – cause and effect
In partner’s students are to make up a simple domino rally and answer the following: What caused the middle domino to fall? What caused the first domino to fall? What caused the first...
**Text Study – “Five Ways”**
- Read the first three ‘ways’ as a class
- Divide class into 6 groups
- Each group is allocated a ‘way’ and is to put it in standard form.
- Two members from original groups swap with two members from the group with the same allocated ‘way’
- ‘Way’ is refined if necessary.
- Standard form ‘ways’ are distributed to the class.

- In groups think and discuss the following: *How does the third way differ from the first or second? Can you think of times that cause and effect did not seem applicable to everyday life? Have developments in science impacted the cosmological view? How appealing do you find this argument?*
  - Class discussion to clarify

**Quizlet**
- Students are to add new terms.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8</th>
<th>O1KK1 – 3</th>
<th>Continued.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O1KK5 – 6</td>
<td><strong>LECTURES/POWERPOINTS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O1KS1 – 7</td>
<td>- Appeals and challenges to the cosmological argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O3KK1 – 2</td>
<td>- Teleological argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O3KS2 – 3</td>
<td><strong>ACTIVITIES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Think – Pair – Share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>After reading Paley’s analogy individually, students explain to their partner how the analogy works, before answering the following: <em>How effective is the analogy? Could science undermine Paley’s argument? Can you see any problem with the analogy? Are you convinced?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Discuss as a class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Jigsaw Puzzle</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Students are allocated into groups (3-4) and given simple jigsaws. Some groups are blindfolded and asked to complete, while others complete with full sight. Discuss: <em>is the universe likely to be created blindfolded (by chance) or with sight (by</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cosmological Argument: <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TpsehuGOyY&amp;list=PL8dPuualXtNkg6MZucdYldNkMybYIHKR&amp;index=10">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TpsehuGOyY&amp;list=PL8dPuualXtNkg6MZucdYldNkMybYIHKR&amp;index=10</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intelligent Design <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7e9v_fsZB6A&amp;list=PL8dPuualXtNgK6MZucdYldNkMybYIHKR&amp;index=11">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7e9v_fsZB6A&amp;list=PL8dPuualXtNgK6MZucdYldNkMybYIHKR&amp;index=11</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0:00 – 3:21)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Written Reflection Discussion**
| O1KK1 – 6 | 9 |
| O1KS1 – 7 |
| O3KK1 – 3 |
| O3KS2 |

### Text Study – Aquinas’ Fifth way
Students are to read through Aquinas’s Fifth way and then work in a group to present it in standard form.

**Discuss:** How is it similar to Paley’s argument? What is similar/different? Whose is more successful and why?

### Quizlet
- Students are to add new terms.

### ACTIVITIES

- **Read the review of Swinburne’s argument**
- **Watch “The God Delusion”** (alternatively read a summary if time poor).
- **While watching think about:** How does Dawkins view challenge Swinburne’s? How could this challenge be overcome? Is Dawkins argument persuasive?

- **Research of a contemporary debate**
  - Students research Kitsmiller v. Dover Area School District then think about the following: Do Teleological arguments have enough philosophical appeal to be taught in a science class, why/why not?

- **Dialogue**
  - Students are to pretend they have been invited on a radio talk show as a philosopher to discuss the Kitsmiller V. Dover Area School debate. They are to write down the conversation that could occur.
  - Think: What side would you take? What would be your reasoning? How would you challenge arguments from the opposing side?

- **Podcast Dialogue Assessment**
  - Students are assigned a partner, who they will be working

### Written Reflection

- **Discussion**
- **Dialogue (informal formative)**
with for this assessment.
- Assessment is explained (See Appendix B)
- Students will have the school holidays to work on this assessment, as well as 2-3 lessons the first week back.
- DUE: Friday Week 10 in class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10</th>
<th>O1KK1 – 6</th>
<th>Continued.</th>
<th>LECTURES/POWERPOINTS</th>
<th>Textbook p. 234 - 238</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O1KS1 – 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Other arguments for God's existence</td>
<td>Written Reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O3KK2 – 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Other arguments for the existence of God: religious experience, miracles, faith.</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O3KS1 – 2</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ACTIVITIES</strong></td>
<td>Podcast Dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Think – pair – share on other arguments</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Questions: <em>How do we decide if an experience we have is religious? Do these provide a more compelling argument than the teleological or cosmological?</em></td>
<td>(Formal Formative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preparation for assignment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Students are to use the remaining time in this week to work on/finalise their assignments due on Friday in class.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
References


2. Assessments

Appendices

Appendix A.

VCE Philosophy: Unit 1 – Outcome 1

FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT
Written Reflections

Recall from our work in class that philosophers use special skills and techniques to assist them in thinking and reasoning well. This ongoing assessment gives you the opportunity to use and develop these philosophical skills.

YOUR TASK:

- Each week you will be required to post a 300 to 400-word written reflection in your online journal.
- The written reflection will be based upon a set question or prompt that has relevance to what we have been covering in class. Questions/prompts for the next 10 weeks are shown below:

DUE DATES

WEEK 1 – 30th to 3rd Feb 2017: “Think left and think right and think low and think high. Oh, the thinks you can think up if only you try!” – Dr Seuss. Use this quote to help you discuss what the nature of philosophy is.

WEEK 2 – 6th to 10th Feb 2017: Write the following argument in standard form and then critically evaluate: “Two weeks ago when I made an apple tea cake, the price of apples was $3.50 per kilogram. Today I want to make another apple tea cake so the price of apples must be $3.50 per kilogram”.

WEEK 3 – 13th to 17th Feb 2017: Do you think your thoughts are located somewhere? If so, where do you think they are located? Give reasons and examples to support your thinking?

WEEK 4 – 20th to 24th Feb 2017: In severe cases of trauma to the brain a person may appear to be a living body, devoid of any attributes of the mind. Outline Descarte’s dualist position, and think about how he might defend his position in face of this example.

WEEK 5 – 27th to 3rd Mar 2017: Most identity theorists though that progress in neuroscience would be developed much more than it is now – that is, we would be certain that the mind is physical in the 21st Century. Outline the materialist perspective and consider whether this statement challenges the materialist position. Give reasons for your thinking.

WEEK 6 – 6th to 10th Mar 2017: Materialists believe that spiritual experiences, pain, and love are all physical occurrences, that is, they are nothing more than electrical messages in the brain. If this is the case, does it diminish these experiences and what we consider to make us human?
Appendix A cont.

WEEK 7 – 13th to 17th Mar 2017: Outline and critically evaluate the problem of evil. Do you think that it is possible to reconcile God’s goodness with the existence of evil?

WEEK 8 – 20th to 24th Mar 2017: Outline and critically evaluate the cosmological argument for the existence of God. How convincing do you think this argument is?

WEEK 9 – 27th to 31st Mar 2017: Do you think Dawkins argument is a persuasive objection to Swinburne’s? Is it a persuasive case against the existence of God in general?

WEEK 10 – 18th to 21st Apr 2017: Do you think that the Teleological or Cosmological ‘proof’ provides a better argument for the existence of God?

- Written reflections are due weekly at 5pm Friday (dates highlighted in blue).
- Each week I will read through your reflection and provide feedback.
- After feedback is provided you may adapt your original post by posting a revised version below your original post within the next week. Revised versions have the same due date as the following weeks post.
- If you choose to revise your original post the revised version will be formally assessed.
- Assessment is based on ALL posts overall.
- Assessment criteria are shown on the following page.
Appendix A cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>Beginner (1pt)</th>
<th>Progressing (2pts)</th>
<th>Proficient (3pts)</th>
<th>Exemplary (4pts)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language and expression</td>
<td>Some basic ideas are presented however are un-organised, and cannot be clearly followed. Philosophical vocabulary is not used where appropriate.</td>
<td>Some ideas are presented in an organised manner. The ideas cannot always be followed. Philosophical vocabulary is not always used where appropriate.</td>
<td>Ideas are presented in an organised way. The ideas can mostly be followed. Philosophical vocabulary is appropriate.</td>
<td>Ideas are presented in a clear and precise way. Ideas can be followed and arguments are clearly expressed. Philosophical vocabulary is both effective and appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and understanding</td>
<td>Shallow knowledge of philosophical issues and limited understanding of concepts is demonstrated.</td>
<td>Some knowledge of philosophical issues and a basic understanding of concepts is demonstrated.</td>
<td>Good knowledge of philosophical issues is used to enhance argument and a general understanding of concepts is demonstrated.</td>
<td>Excellent knowledge of the philosophical issues is used to successfully support the argument. A good understanding of concepts is demonstrated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of relevant material</td>
<td>Little awareness what the question is asking. Relevant material is rarely identified and used in a limited way. There is only a small amount of analysis and no examples.</td>
<td>Some awareness of what the question is asking. Some relevant material is identified and used in some basic analysis. Some appropriate examples are used.</td>
<td>Good awareness of what the question is asking. Relevant material is identified and used in a sound analysis. Appropriate examples are used to give support to the argument.</td>
<td>Clear awareness of what the question is asking. Relevant material is identified and used in a good analysis. Appropriate examples are used to give support and persuasion to the argument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of viewpoints</td>
<td>Limited evaluation. Limited identification of strengths and weaknesses. Limited to no links to contemporary debates. No use of objections or counter-examples.</td>
<td>Basic evaluation. Identification of some strengths and weaknesses. Links to contemporary debates are sometimes used where appropriate. Limited use of objections and counter-examples.</td>
<td>Good evaluation. Identification of a relevant strengths and weaknesses. Links to contemporary debates are used where appropriate. Consistent attempt to use objections and counter-examples.</td>
<td>Excellent evaluation. Identification of a range of relevant strength and weaknesses. Extensive links to contemporary debates are used whenever appropriate. Consistent use of objections and counter examples to convince reader.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement and consistency of posts</td>
<td>Little to no improvement in the development of philosophical skills over time. Posts have consistently been late and/or not submitted at all. No attempt has been made to revise original posts.</td>
<td>Basic improvements in the development of philosophical skills over time. Posts have been regularly late, however are now all submitted. No attempt has been made to revise original posts.</td>
<td>Good improvement in the development of philosophical skills over time. Posts have been submitted on time each week and some posts have been revised.</td>
<td>Excellent improvement in the development of philosophical skills over time. Posts have been submitted on time each week and all posts have been revised.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: If a student has not shown enough evidence to reach a beginner standard, they may be awarded 0 points for that particular criteria.

FEEDBACK:  

MARK:  /20

Appendix B.
SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT
Podcast dialogue

Working with a partner you are to create a 6-minute podcast on one of the following:

**On the existence and Nature of God** (one person taking the cosmological approach (Aquinas), and one the teleological (Paley))

1. Outline and critically discuss the cosmological and teleological arguments for the existence of God. Can these arguments overcome the problem of evil?
2. Is a person who has had a religious experience justified in believing that God exists? Discuss with reference to the views of Aquinas and Paley, before stating your conclusion.
3. What implications do developments in science of the natural world have on the plausibility of the existence of God? In thinking about this whose argument do you think is stronger, Aquinas or Paley?

**On the material mind** (one person as a dualist and on a materialist).

1. Explain the concept of qualia. To what extent does it challenge the materialist view of the mind? Does qualia support dualism? Discuss.
2. Choose one argument in favour of Dualism and on in favour of Materialism. Explain these arguments in detail so someone unfamiliar with philosophy would understand, and then debate their plausibility bringing up at least one contemporary idea.

In your Podcast you must:

- Present arguments from both parties (Dualist and Materialist OR Aquinas and Paley).
- Critically analyse, compare and evaluate the philosophical viewpoints.
- Discuss how each viewpoint relates to the specific question asked.
- Reach a decision based upon your discussion.
- **NOTE:** You will be required to submit a written transcript along with your Podcast.
Appendix B cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>Beginner</th>
<th>Progressing</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expression and delivery</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Tone and character portrayal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Articulation and conciseness of arguments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Use of philosophical terminology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge and understanding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Knowledge of philosophical issues</td>
<td>Shallow knowledge of the philosophical issues and limited understanding of concepts is demonstrated.</td>
<td>Some knowledge of the philosophical issues and a basic understanding of concepts is demonstrated.</td>
<td>Good knowledge of the philosophical issues is used to enhance argument and a general understanding of concepts is demonstrated.</td>
<td>Excellent knowledge of the philosophical issues is used to successfully support the argument. A good understanding of concepts is demonstrated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis of relevant material</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Understanding of the question</td>
<td>Little awareness of what the question is asking. Relevant material is rarely identified and used in a limited way. There is only a small amount of analysis and no examples.</td>
<td>Some awareness of what the question is asking. Some relevant material is identified and used in some basic analysis. Some appropriate examples are used.</td>
<td>Good awareness of what the question is asking. Relevant material is identified and used in a sound analysis. Appropriate examples are used to give support to the argument.</td>
<td>Clear awareness of what the question is asking. Relevant material is identified and used in a good analysis. Appropriate examples are used to give support and persuasion to the argument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation of viewpoints</strong></td>
<td>Limited evaluation. Limited identification of strengths and weaknesses. Limited to no links to specific question posed. No use of objections or counter-examples.</td>
<td>Basic evaluation. Identification of some strengths and weaknesses. Links to question posed are sometimes used where appropriate. Limited use of objections and counter-examples.</td>
<td>Good evaluation. Identification of a relevant strengths and weaknesses. Links to question posed are used where appropriate. Consistent attempt to use objections and counter-examples.</td>
<td>Excellent evaluation. Identification of a range of relevant strength and weaknesses. Extensive links to question posed are used whenever appropriate. Consistent use of objections and counter-examples to convince reader.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collaborative engagement</strong></td>
<td>Little evidence of collaborative engagement. Final submission is not cohesive. Podcast submitted but no written transcript.</td>
<td>Evidence of collaborative engagement. Final submission is cohesive. Podcast and written transcript submitted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feedback:

Total mark: 50 / 50

Converted mark: 30 / 30
Appendix C.

Philosophy Unit 1 – Key Knowledge and Key skills codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUTCOME 1</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On completion of the unit the student should be able to analyse metaphysical problems, evaluate viewpoints and arguments arising from these, and identify philosophical problems in relevant contemporary debates.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KEY KNOWLEDGE</strong></td>
<td><strong>KEY SKILLS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O1KK1 – “central viewpoints and arguments associated with the chosen metaphysical questions as represented in at least one primary text”;</td>
<td>O1KS1 – “formulate philosophical questions arising from metaphysical problems”;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O1KK2 – “debates and questions that arise from exploration of at least two metaphysical themes as outlined above”;</td>
<td>O1KS2 – “identify key philosophical concepts and questions related to metaphysical problems in the context of contemporary debates”;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O1KK3 – “definitions of key terms and concepts associated with the chosen metaphysical problems”;</td>
<td>O1KS3 – “outline philosophical viewpoints and arguments associated with metaphysical problems”;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O1KK4 – “reasons for the diversity of metaphysical viewpoints”;</td>
<td>O1KS4 – “analyse viewpoints and arguments presented in a primary philosophical source and the implications of these”;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O1KK5 – “viewpoints and arguments central to the chosen metaphysical problems”;</td>
<td>O1KS5 – “offer justified critical responses to viewpoints and arguments associated with metaphysical problems”;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O1KK6 – “the relationship between metaphysical problems and relevant contemporary debates, such as punishment, the treatment of animals, issues of life and death and artificial intelligence” (VCAA, 2013, p. 14).</td>
<td>O1KS6 – “reflect critically on their own viewpoints and arguments relating to metaphysics”;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O1KS7 – “formulate informed responses to metaphysical problems, and explain, defend and refine those ideas in philosophical exchanges with others” (VCAA, 2013, p. 14).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C cont.

### OUTCOME 3

On completion of this unit the student should be able to apply methods of philosophical inquiry to the analysis of philosophical viewpoints and arguments, including those in metaphysics and epistemology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY KNOWLEDGE</th>
<th>KEY SKILLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O3KK1 – “the roles of reasoning and argument, intuition, imagination, metaphor, emotion and experience in philosophical thinking about metaphysical and epistemological problems”;</td>
<td>O3KS1 – “analyse the roles of reasoning and argument, imagination, emotion and experience in examples of philosophical thinking”;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O3KK2 – “key terms associated with philosophical reasoning, including argument, deduction, induction, reason, premise, conclusion, validity, invalidity, soundness, unsoundness, consistency, contradiction, implication, entailment, assumption, standard form, syllogism, analogy, example, counterexample, counterargument, objection, refutation, proposition, claim, assertion, definition, probability, criteria”;</td>
<td>O3KS2 – “apply philosophical thinking, including techniques of reason and argument and knowledge of cognitive biases, to analysis of philosophical viewpoints and arguments, including those in metaphysics and epistemology and related debates”;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O3KK3 – “techniques of reasoning and argument”;</td>
<td>O3KS3 – “analyse simple arguments to identify the premises and conclusions, and the relationships between the premises and conclusion, including ‘standard form’ presentation”;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O3KK4 – “cognitive biases that undermine reasoning and investigation, such as gamblers’ fallacy, attribution bias, confirmation bias, Dunning-Kruger effect and any implications of these for approaching debates in epistemology and metaphysics” (VCAA, 2013, p. 17).</td>
<td>O3KS4 – “identify and describe errors in reasoning such as cognitive biases”;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O3KS5 – “use appropriate terminology when analysing and evaluating arguments” (VCAA, 2013, p. 17).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>