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(1) Goals. State the purpose or mission of your major.

The purpose of the Philosophy Major is stated in three Philosophy Department goals:

- **Department Goal 1:** Students will be able to express in oral and written form their understanding of major concepts and intellectual traditions within the field of philosophy.
- **Department Goal 2:** Students will demonstrate their ability to utilize the principles of critical thinking and formal logic in order to produce a sound and valid argument, or to evaluate the soundness and validity of the arguments of others.
- **Department Goal 3:** Students will demonstrate their ability to complete research on a philosophy-related topic, analyze objectively the results of their research, and present arguments to support their point of view.

These Philosophy Department learning goals represent our allegiance to Millikin University’s commitment to an educational experience that “integrates theory and practice.” Because this claim is ripe for misunderstanding, it merits considerable commentary.

The Philosophy Department vigorously opposes any understanding of “theory-practice” that would co-opt “practice” for things like labs, practica, internships, or other vocational experiences and limit the meaning of that concept to those sorts of activities only. If the term “practice” is defined in that way, then philosophy does not do anything practical…and we are proud to admit that fact, for we can do nothing else so long as we remain true to our discipline! We have absolutely no idea what a “philosophy internship” or “philosophy practicum” or “philosophy lab” would even be. While some of our courses include readings that address “practical” or “applied issues,” often under the label of “applied ethics” (e.g., lying, abortion, capital punishment, stem cell research, etc.), what this amounts to is simply bringing critical thinking skills to bear on concrete issues. We certainly are not going to have capital punishment labs or an abortion practicum!

More importantly, we find the impulse to define “practice” in a limited and territorial fashion to be a misguided and dangerous understanding of practice and, by implication, of philosophy, and, by further implication, liberal education in general.
There is a widespread view of philosophy in which philosophical study is viewed as purely theoretical, as purely speculative, and as having no practical relevance whatsoever. “The Thinker,” a figure deep in thought and apparently doing nothing, best represents this image. We contend that this view is a serious mischaracterization of philosophical study. Philosophical study is not a form of purely detached speculation and contemplation. Rather, philosophical study is a kind of activity, a kind of doing. And it is practical in what we believe to be the most important senses, the senses that lie at the heart of Millikin’s mission. Serious philosophical study is a rigorous activity that trains the mind and facilitates the development and growth of skill sets that are essential to any occupation or vocation, to any effort to engage in meaningful democratic citizenship in a global environment, and to any attempt to develop a life of meaning and value. These skills sets include:

- The ability to think critically, analytically, and synthetically.
- The ability to comprehend dense and difficult readings, readings that often focus on the perennial questions of human existence.
- The ability to convey ideas clearly and creatively in both written and oral form.

These skill sets are always practical. For example, in any field of inquiry or vocation, individuals will have to problem solve, think critically, assess arguments or strategies, communicate clearly, spot unspoken assumptions that may be driving a certain position, understand the implications of adopting a certain point of view or principle, etc. Since we encourage the development and growth of the skill sets that are essential to doing any of these things well, and hone their development in each and every class, philosophical study is inherently practical. As the Times of London noted (August 15, 1998), “Their [philosophy graduates’] employability, at 98.9%, is impressive by any standard...Philosophy is, in commercial jargon, the ultimate ‘transferable work skill’.”

In philosophy, our emphasis on the development and growth of skill sets is an emphasis on how to think well, not an emphasis on what to think. Again, this focus is perfectly consistent with Millikin’s mission to “deliver on the promise of education” through the three prepares. In terms of professional success and post-graduate employment, the vast bulk of knowing what to do is learned on site; you learn “on the job.” The skill sets we aim to develop are skill sets that will allow students to do what they do in their jobs well. And this applies to any and all jobs.

Millikin began with an allegiance to philosophy as a discipline and that allegiance continues. When the MPSL plan was developed, the Philosophy Department faculty suggested that the central questions we ask each day in class, “Who am
I?”, “How can I know?” and “What should I do?” are primary questions each student needs to engage. The faculty embraced this idea, and these three questions continue to form the heart of our general education program. The “practice” of delivering the very educational curriculum that we now aim to assess cannot take place without philosophical activity. Again, the practical relevance of philosophical activity could not be clearer.

A final aspect of our commitment to the practicality of philosophy that we would highlight is our contribution to Millikin’s moot court program. Although moot court is not a Philosophy Department program and is open to all interested (and qualified) students at the university, many of the students involved have been (and currently are) philosophy majors (minors). In addition, Dr. Money has been the faculty advisor for our moot court team since 2004. The simulation is educational in the best and fullest sense of the word. Beginning six weeks prior to the actual competition, Dr. Money meets with the participating students between 2-4 hours per week in the evenings. During these meetings, the students collectively analyze the closed-brief materials, work on the formulation of arguments representing both sides of the case, practice oral delivery and presentation of those arguments, and practice fielding questions from the other participants. During the competition, each team is given thirty minutes for argument and each team member must talk for at least ten minutes. Each team argues twice on each of the first two days, alternating between representing the petitioner and the respondent. Those teams that make the semi-final round argue an additional time, with one final argument made by those teams reaching the finals. Teams are judged on their knowledge of the case, their ability to formulate and present compelling arguments, and their ability to respond on their feet to difficult questions from the justices hearing the case. We have had great success since Dr. Money assumed leadership of this program. At the 2005 Model Illinois Government (MIG) competition, our two teams took first and second place in the competition, facing each other in the final round of the competition. One of our three student justices also won for most outstanding justice. At the 2006 MIG competition, our two teams took first and second place in the competition, facing each other in the final round of the competition. One of our three student justices also won for most outstanding justice. At the 2006 MIG competition, one of our teams took third place and one of our student justices was elected to the position of Chief Justice for the 2007 competition. At the 2007 competition, our teams took second and third place, and the student serving as Chief Justice was re-elected to serve as Chief Justice for the 2008 competition. At the 2008 competition, one of our teams took first place and another team took third place. At the 2009 competition, our teams again took first and second place in the competition, facing each other in the final round of the competition. In addition, a student was honored as “most outstanding attorney.”

Many of Millikin’s core educational skills are facilitated in this simulation: critical and moral reasoning, oral communication skills, collaborative learning, etc. More importantly, however, these are the very same skill sets that are facilitated and
emphasized in every philosophy course. Whether we call the activity “moot
court” or “Introduction to Philosophy,” the same skills sets – skills sets that are
inherently practical – are being engaged and developed.

Philosophy services Millikin University’s core goals and values. Close examination
of the Millikin curriculum and its stated mission goals confirms that philosophy is
essential to the ability of Millikin University to deliver on “the promise of
education.” This mission has three core elements.

The first core element of Millikin’s mission is “to prepare students for professional
success.” If philosophy is the “ultimate transferable work skill,” then we prepare
students for work in a variety of fields. Instead of preparing students for their
first job, we prepare them for a lifetime of success—no matter how often they
change their careers – something the empirical evidence suggests they will do
quite frequently over the course of their lifetimes.

The second core element of Millikin’s mission is “to prepare students for
democratic citizenship in a global environment.” Our focus on philosophy of law,
political philosophy, and value questions in general reveals our belief in and
commitment to the Jeffersonian model of liberal education. In order to engage
meaningfully in democratic citizenship, citizens must be able to ask the following
kinds of questions and be able to assess critically the answers that might be
provided to them: What makes for a good society? What are the legitimate
functions of the state? How should we resolve conflicts between the common
good and individual rights? Might we have a moral obligation to challenge the
laws and policies of our own country? These are philosophical questions; not
questions of the nuts and bolts of how our government runs, but questions
about our goals and duties. Confronting and wrestling with these questions
prepare students for democratic citizenship.

The third core element of Millikin’s mission is “to prepare students for a personal
life of meaning and value.” Clearly this is exactly what philosophy does. That
Millikin’s mission includes this goal along with the first distinguishes us from a
technical institution. We are not a glorified community college willing to train
students for the first job they will get, and leaving them in a lurch when they
struggle to understand death, or agonize over ethical decisions, or confront those
whose ideas seem foreign or dangerous because they are new. Millikin University
wants its students to be whole: life-long learners who will not shy away from
the ambiguities and puzzles that make life richer and more human. Philosophy is
the department that makes confronting these issues its life’s work.

Philosophical study, then, is exemplary of Millikin’s promise to prepare students
for professional success, prepare them for democratic citizenship, and prepare
them for a life of personal value and meaning. The Philosophy Department learning goals, then, match well with Millikin’s University-wide learning goals:

- University Goal 1: Millikin students will prepare for professional success.
- University Goal 2: Millikin students will actively engage in the responsibilities of citizenship in their communities.
- University Goal 3: Millikin students will discover and develop a personal life of meaning and value.

The accompanying table shows how Philosophy Department goals relate to University-wide goals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Philosophy Department Learning Goal</th>
<th>Corresponding Millikin University Learning Goal Number(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Students will be able to express in oral and written form their understanding of major concepts and intellectual traditions within the field of philosophy.</td>
<td>1, 2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Students will demonstrate their ability to utilize the principles of critical thinking and formal logic in order to produce a sound and valid argument, or to evaluate the soundness and validity of the arguments of others.</td>
<td>1, 2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Students will demonstrate their ability to complete research on a philosophy-related topic, analyze objectively the results of their research, and present arguments to support their point of view in a variety of venues, including an individually directed senior capstone thesis in philosophy.</td>
<td>1, 2, 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In sum, so long as we reject any hidebound understanding of “practice,” philosophical study reveals itself to be inherently practical. The skill sets it develops and the issues it engages facilitate professional success, democratic citizenship, and the development of a personal life of value and meaning. It seems to us that the daily practice of delivering on the promise of education should be the goal of every department and program at Millikin University. This, we do.
Given our emphasis on skill set development, it is no accident that philosophical study is excellent preparation for law school. Accordingly, our Department has developed a “pre-law track” for those of our majors who are interested in law school. It is extremely important to emphasize that gaining admission to law school is not a function of gaining substantive content knowledge as an undergraduate. This is vividly illustrated by pointing out the fact that the undergraduate major with the highest acceptance rate to ABA approved law schools is physics. Law schools require no specific undergraduate curriculum, no specific undergraduate major, and no specific undergraduate plan of study for admission. Law schools select students on the basis of evidence that they can “think like a lawyer.” Philosophy prepares students to think in this way. In fact, a recent study by the American Bar Association shows that, after physics, the major with the highest acceptance rate to law school is PHILOSOPHY.

While our primary emphasis is on content neutral skill set development, we do not want to short-change the substantive content of philosophical writings. We develop the above mentioned skill sets by reading and discussing topics and issues central to the human condition. For example:

- Who am I? How can I know? What should I do? The Millikin core questions are essentially philosophical questions!
- Does God exist? If God exists, how is that fact consistent with the existence of evil in the world?
- Do human beings possess free will? Or is human behavior and action causally determined?
- What is the relation between mental states (mind, consciousness) and brain states (body)?
- What justification is there for the state? How should finite and scarce resources be distributed within society?
- Are there universal moral principles? Or are all moral principles relative either to cultures or individuals?
- What does it mean to judge a work of art beautiful? Is beauty really in the eye of the beholder?

The description of the philosophy program that appears in the Millikin Bulletin is crafted to emphasize the relevance of philosophical study to students with diverse interests and goals. According to the 2008-09 Millikin University Bulletin, the Philosophy Major is designed to meet the requirements of four classes of students: (a) those who have no professional interest in philosophy but who wish to approach a liberal education through the discipline of philosophy; (b) those who want a composite or interdepartmental major in philosophy and the natural sciences, behavioral sciences, humanities, or fine arts; (c) those who want an intensive study of philosophy preparatory
to graduate study in some other field, e.g., law, theology, medicine, or education; (d) those who are professionally interested in philosophy and who plan to do graduate work in the field and then to teach or write....Philosophy also offers a “pre-law track” within the Philosophy Major. According to the American Bar Association, after physics, the major with the highest percentage of acceptance into ABA approved law schools is philosophy. We have developed a track within our Philosophy Major to provide students with the courses that emphasize the skills and the knowledge content that will make it both likely that they will get into law school and that they will succeed both there and later as lawyers. (p.74)

While a significant number of our majors go on to pursue graduate study in philosophy and aspire eventually to teach, most of our majors go on to pursue other careers and educational objectives. Accordingly, the successful student graduating from the philosophy major might be preparing for a career as a natural scientist, a behavioral scientist, an attorney, a theologian, a physician, an educator, or a writer, or might go into some field more generally related to the humanities or the liberal arts. Whatever the case, he or she will be well prepared as a result of the habits of mind acquired in the process of completing the Philosophy Major. (See “Appendix One” for post-graduate information of recently graduated majors.)

There are no guidelines provided by the American Philosophical Association for undergraduate study.

(2) Snapshot. Provide a brief overview of your current situation.

The Philosophy Department has three full-time faculty members: Dr. Jo Ellen Jacobs, Dr. Robert Money, and Dr. Eric Roark.

Dr. Jacobs has taught in every category of the University Studies sequential program. She teaches two sections of honors IN140 each fall, serving up to 40 students. He also helps deliver the first week introduction to ethical reasoning program. Her logic course serves students who need to develop their quantitative reasoning skills and meets the quantitative reasoning requirement of the University Studies. The Ancient World Wisdom course introduces majors to Asian and Western philosophy, as well as students who want to understand the fundamentals of global studies. Other courses complement the large number of fine arts students at Millikin. Historical studies students may select among a range of Dr. Jacobs’ classes. A large number of humanities students supplement their majors with many of the upper division courses and seminars taught by Dr. Jacobs.
Dr. Money serves 40 first-year honors students each fall by offering two sections of Honors University Seminar. He also coordinates the “first week” introduction to ethical reasoning, a program that impacts on all incoming freshmen. Dr. Money regularly teaches an honors seminar in humanities, typically in the spring semester. He serves philosophy majors and minors, and the general student body, by offering a variety of philosophy courses. He serves political science majors and minors, and the general student body, by offering a variety of courses either as political science courses (e.g., Constitutional Law) or as cross-listed courses (e.g., Political Philosophy, Philosophy of Law). All of these are 300-level courses. He serves students who need to meet the Historical Studies requirement by offering both Modern Philosophy and Contemporary Philosophy on a regular basis. He serves pre-law students as Director of the Pre-Law Program, and as faculty advisor to the Moot Court Team.

Dr. Roark teaches two sections of IN140 each fall, serving 40 students. He also helps deliver the first week introduction to ethical reasoning program. Dr. Roark also teaches the business ethics course required within Tabor’s MBA program. During his first year, Dr. Roark taught IN203, Honors Seminar in Humanities, twice. We anticipate that he will continue making regular contributions to the honors program going forward. Dr. Roark taught an applied ethics course on “just war theory” during his first year. He is scheduled to teach PH217, Bioethics during the fall 2009 semester. He is already making substantial contributions to the delivery of our new ethics minor. In addition, Dr. Roark teaches a variety of courses with the philosophy program. Our students will benefit immensely from the increased diversity of course offerings that our three-person department will be able to offer going forward.

As of the spring 2009 semester, the Philosophy Department had 19 majors and 13 minors. This is the first time that the philosophy program has had over 30 students involved as either majors or minors. The department has grown considerably over the past decade. This growth is all the more impressive given that few students come to Millikin (or any college) as announced philosophy majors.

The Department sponsors the Theo-Socratic Society.

Along with Interdepartmental courses such as IN140, IN203, IN250, and IN350, Philosophy Department faculty teach over 12 different courses from 100-through 400-level, including one course in the MBA Program.

In terms of new initiatives and improvements, the Philosophy Department just expanded to three faculty members starting fall 2008. This addition required that we review our curriculum to ensure that our curriculum is aligned with the
teaching interests and abilities of the philosophy faculty. Significant changes were made. Most significantly, we created an “ethics minor” within our program. As part of this new program, we will be teaching three additional courses under the broad category of “applied ethics.” These courses include PH215, Business Ethics; PH217, Bioethics; and PH219, Environmental Ethics. We have intentionally designed two of these “applied ethics” courses to connect to other major academic units. PH215, Business Ethics, connects to Tabor; PH217, Bioethics, connects to the pre-med, medical technology, and nursing programs. We believe that the ethics minor will be a way to attract more students to philosophy. Early indications are that this is, indeed, the case. We have gone from 4 minors in spring 2008 to 13 minors in 2009. The ethics minor also coheres with and reinforces the recently revised University Studies program, which emphasizes three skill sets over the course of the sequential elements: reflection, writing, and ethical reasoning. Every course that we offer in the area of value theory generally, including the applied ethics courses, engage students in all three of these skills.

The learning goals of the ethics minor program are as follows:

1. Students will use ethical reasoning to analyze and reflect on issues that impact their personal lives as well as their local, national, and/or global communities; and

2. Students will be able to express in written form their understanding of major ethical concepts and theories and demonstrate competency in the application of those concepts and theories to specific topics (business, medicine, environment, politics, etc.).

We believe it to be self-evident that ethical reasoning and reflection on ethical issues and topics are indispensable for the kind of intellectual and personal growth our students need if they are to find professional success, participate meaningfully in democratic citizenship in a global environment, and create and discover a personal life of meaning and value. Hence, the ethics minor coheres well with the stated goals of Millikin University – indeed, it flows from it.

The Philosophy Department rotates or modifies the content of its upper-level seminars on an ongoing basis. The Department also makes some modifications in its normal courses, rotating content in and out. Doing so allows philosophy faculty to keep courses fresh and exciting for the students, and helps to keep faculty interest and enthusiasm high. For example, Dr. Money had taught the PH 381 seminar as a course on Nietzsche, as a seminar on personal identity, and as a course on the intelligent design-evolution controversy. Similarly, Dr. Jacobs has taught the same course as a seminar on philosophy and literature, the aesthetics and ethics of class, and the politics and aesthetics of food. The title of
the course is the same, but it is a new course nonetheless. This type of “internal evolution” takes place frequently within the Department.

A number of changes have occurred in the philosophy curriculum in the last year. In addition to the creation of the ethics minor (see above), the Department constructed an “ethics track” within the major. In addition, the Department modified the history of philosophy sequence, changing from a requirement that students take 3 out of 5 courses in the Department’s historical sequence to a requirement that students take 3 of 4. PH302, Medieval Philosophy, was eliminated. In addition, the entire history sequence is now taught only at the 300 level; cross-listing of those courses as 200/300 level courses was eliminated. (See “Appendix Two” for an overview of requirements within the major.) Finally, both minors are now aligned at 18 in terms of the total credit hours required to complete them.

(3) The Learning Story. Explain the typical learning experience provided through your major. How do students learn or encounter experiences leading to fulfilling your learning outcome goals?

It is important to emphasize that we do not require that our majors complete the Philosophy Major by following a formal and rigid sequential curricular structural plan. While there are required courses within the major, these courses (with one exception) need not be taken in a specific sequential order. Given the context within which the Philosophy Department operates, the demand for that kind of “structural plan” is unrealistic. More importantly, given the nature of philosophical activity and philosophical teaching, the demand for a structural plan is inappropriate. What this shows is that assessment efforts cannot demand a “one size fits all” approach. Assessment demands must respect disciplinary autonomy, as well as the practical realities of “the situation on the ground.” Assessment of philosophy may be a worthy goal, but it must be assessment of philosophy. Respect for disciplinary autonomy comes first and assessment tools must be constructed that respect that autonomy. The following makes clear why the demand for a “structural plan” in the Philosophy Major is both impractical and inappropriate.

A structural plan in philosophy is impractical. Students rarely come to Millikin as declared philosophy majors, since few have even heard of this discipline in high school. Students switch to or add philosophy as a major, often during their second or even third year at Millikin, because they recognize the quality of the teaching provided by our faculty, the way philosophical study develops the skill sets essential to any quality educational experience, and because of the power of the questions philosophy forces students to ask and wrestle with, questions that
form the heart of a life of meaning and value—one part of Millikin’s stated mission “to deliver on the promise of education.”

In light of the peculiar nature of our discipline and the nature of “recruitment” to our major, we cannot insist on a rigid formal sequential curricular pathway for our majors. While we might prefer our majors start with PH110 (Basic), then move on to PH213 (Logic), then complete the history sequence in order (PH300, 301, 303 and/or 304), then take PH381 (seminar), and finally end with PH400 (senior thesis), this preference is completely unrealistic. The only situation in which we could realistically expect its implementation would be with those very few incoming freshmen students who declare philosophy as a major during summer orientation and registration. Even with these students, however, we would be limited by the small size of our Department and our faculty’s commitment to making substantial contributions to other portions of the university curriculum (e.g., University Studies, the honors program, etc.). In light of these realities on the ground, we simply could not guarantee that the needed courses would be offered with the degree of regularity that would make it possible to implement a rigid formal sequential curricular pathway. So, this kind of “stepping stone” curricular plan is impractical for us to implement.

Fortunately, implementation of a curricular structural plan is also unnecessary. Many of our courses involve a mix of students, both majors and non-majors. Teaching a group of students who are from various backgrounds is always a challenge. However, students who are good at reading, writing, and thinking can succeed in philosophy courses at the upper division level, even if they’ve never had a philosophy course before. (The same principle underlies the institution’s commitment to the viability of IN250 and IN350 courses.) In physics or French it is highly unlikely that a student beginning the major or a student from another discipline could enter an upper level course and succeed. However, in philosophy, first year undergraduate students in PH110 Basic Philosophical Problems and graduate students in graduate school seminars read many of the same texts, e.g., Plato’s _Republic_, Descartes’ _Meditations_, etc. We regularly have students from history, English, or music who do as well or better than philosophy majors in the same courses. This somewhat peculiar feature of philosophical inquiry and activity explains (and completely justifies) why we do not insist on a formal rigid sequential curricular pathway for our majors. High quality intellectual engagement with philosophical issues and philosophical texts does not require that we follow a stepping stone model.

---

1 During the 2005-2006 academic year, one senior student declared a major in philosophy during his senior year! He had to take courses in the summer in order to complete the major. It is wildly implausible to suppose that he could complete the major by following some structural plan of study. Yet, the fact remains that he was an outstanding student, who produced high quality exemplary work. An electronic copy of his senior thesis is posted on our website (Jordan Snow).
The only exception to our curricular flexibility is the philosophy capstone course: PH400 Senior Thesis. That course can only be taken during the senior year. In that course, philosophy faculty work one-on-one with each of our senior majors to help them produce some of the best work of their career at Millikin. The student is responsible (in consultation with a faculty adviser) for choosing the topic. Hence, we insist that this particular course come at the end of the student’s undergraduate philosophical exploration. We want our students to have exposure to a wide range of philosophical issues, topics, and texts before they select a topic of personal interest for in-depth exploration in their senior theses.

To summarize, philosophy majors do not fulfill a formal sequential curricular plan because such a plan is both impractical for us to implement and unnecessary given the nature of philosophical study.

Students in the Philosophy Major learn to think critically. All members of the Philosophy Department have been recognized as outstanding teachers. Students respond to their philosophy education for three key reasons: (1) philosophy faculty are passionate about the subject matter that they teach, and that passion is contagious; (2) philosophy faculty are rigorous in their expectations, and establish high expectations for their students, encouraging the students to have high expectations for themselves; and (3) philosophy faculty employ an intense, discussion-driven format in which students are engaged, challenged on many of their core beliefs and assumptions, and encouraged to take charge of their own education and their own thinking.

All philosophy faculty employ written forms of evaluation, including in-class essay examinations, take-home essay exams, and papers.

The learning experience provided through the Philosophy Major is strongly interactive in nature. For example, Dr. Jacobs uses group oral presentations in her Aesthetics class because of the nature of the students in the class. With a large number of arts students, she has discovered that they learn well when placed in groups that include one or more philosophy or humanities students and a variety of different art students. Each group presents the material for one day’s class reading. They often draw on their training in the arts in using a variety of settings and techniques for presenting the material.

In each of Dr. Jacobs’s classes, students write a one-page paper each day on the reading to be covered in that period. This practice helps them focus on the reading at hand and prepares them for a fruitful discussion. They often learn what it is that they don’t understand about the reading – always a useful place to begin a discussion. Either a student writing tutor or Dr. Jacobs responds to each paper, but only four are randomly graded throughout the semester. Students also have the option of turning in a “portfolio” of all their daily writing, if they
feel that the randomly graded papers do not reflect their true grade for this work.

Similarly, Dr. Money employs written assignments as the primary basis for assessing student learning. Dr. Money has also made extensive use of e-mail communication and the Moodle forum feature to extend class discussions after class, eliciting sophisticated discussion from undergraduates and extending their philosophy education into the world beyond the classroom.

Students are expected to read challenging texts, and philosophy faculty use those texts, and subsequent discussions of those texts, to help students spot the assumptions behind arguments – especially the unstated assumptions that inform a particular outlook or worldview. The philosophy curriculum is unlike nearly every other in that the texts for freshman students are the same as those for seniors, and indeed for graduate students. Freshmen may read fewer pages than seniors, but the difficulty is in the texts themselves; there are no “beginner” philosophy texts, per se.

The Philosophy Department uses all primary texts. These texts raise challenging questions related to Millikin’s core questions: Who am I? How can I know? What should I do? These are essentially philosophical questions, and every philosophy course addresses at least one of them. Students can take away varying levels of understanding, but all are called upon to work with the most profound philosophical writing available, so that from the beginning they can be thinking in the deepest way they can.

As noted above, the fact that philosophy texts lend themselves to different levels of interpretation and understanding allows philosophy faculty to engage students who may be along a varying continuum of intellectual abilities, including non-majors and majors alike. The discussion driven format of philosophy courses exploits the varying degrees of student intellectual abilities for collective benefit – often more advanced students expose less advanced students to central issues and ideas in a way that can be easily understood by the less advanced student. Class discussion is not simply vertical (between students and teacher), but quite often horizontal as well (between students). Some of our most effective learning takes the horizontal form.

The key experiences in the philosophy curriculum, along with encounters with challenging texts (as mentioned above), include intensive engagement with philosophy professors, engagement with fellow students, reflection and digestion of ideas, and presentation of the students’ own ideas in written form. The overall learning experience in the Philosophy Major, then, is one of intellectual engagement (with a great deal of one-on-one engagement outside of class as well), in which students are challenged to think critically about core beliefs and
assumptions, and are expected to be able to present critical and creative ideas regarding those core beliefs and assumptions in oral and, especially, written form.

The Philosophy Major requires 30 credits to complete.

The Philosophy Major includes four required courses (12 credits):

- **Philosophy 110, Basic Philosophy.** This course gives students an initial glance at both the kinds of texts they will encounter and the kind of teaching style that informs and characterizes the Philosophy Major.
- **Philosophy 213, Logic.** This course is essential for critical thinking.
- **Philosophy 381, Seminar in Philosophy.** This course gives Philosophy majors (or advanced Philosophy students) a chance to learn in a small setting, usually 12-15 students. It is the most discussion-driven of all Philosophy courses. Moreover, this course allows students truly to lead the direction of the course. The course goes where students’ questions in response to readings take the course. Philosophy faculty also use the course to “rotate in” materials and subjects that are of current interest.
- **Philosophy 400, Senior Thesis.** This independent research paper allows students to pursue in depth a topic of their choosing, and to bring together the research and writing skills that they have acquired over the course of their Philosophy Major at Millikin.

The Philosophy Department also has a history sequence. Students must take three out of the following four courses (9 credits):

- **Philosophy 300, Ancient World Wisdom;**
- **Philosophy 301, Golden Age of Greece;**
- **Philosophy 303, Modern Philosophy;**
- **Philosophy 304, Contemporary Philosophy.**

The Department is committed to facilitating students’ understanding of philosophical issues and problems in their historical context, i.e., presenting students with a “history of ideas.” Doing so gives philosophy faculty a chance to expose philosophy students to many of the seminal works in philosophy.

In addition, the Department offers a range of electives, many under the umbrella of “value theory”: political philosophy, ethical theory and moral issues, meta-ethics, aesthetics, and the like. These elective courses provide philosophy students with a chance to encounter a range of normative issues, and challenge them to think not only in descriptive terms (e.g., what is the case, what is the claim) but also in normative terms (e.g., what *should* be the case). Students are required to take three electives (9 credits).
An overview of the requirements for completion of the Philosophy Major is offered as an appendix to this document (see Appendix Two).

(4) Assessment Methods. Explain your methods and points of data collection for assessing fulfillment of your key learning outcomes, and for assessing effectiveness.

Student intellectual growth is assessed in every class, on every assignment, and in every course. In addition, there is the assessment that comes from the close relationship between philosophy faculty and philosophy majors. Philosophy faculty interact with philosophy majors a great deal, meeting with them to discuss class materials, life issues, and the like. These “advising” moments are also moments of assessment. Philosophy faculty assess each student’s character development during his or her four years as a philosophy major at Millikin. Finally, philosophy faculty keep copies of particularly good papers and exams that are shared anonymously with students who are having trouble understanding and assessing their own growth and learning as philosophy majors.

We believe that given the peculiar nature of our discipline and the nature of “recruitment” to our major, the natural point for formal “data” collection and analysis is PH400, Senior Thesis. At the end of the student’s career, the writing of the senior thesis provides an important key opportunity for assessing the student’s growth and learning over the course of the Philosophy Major. The senior thesis provides us with an opportunity to assess our effectiveness in delivering on each of our key learning goals. There are three “aspects” or “elements” in the development of a senior thesis.

First, philosophy faculty members meet with students over the course of a semester. Early in the semester, these weekly meetings involve students reporting on their progress, trying out various formulations of a central thesis or idea for exploration, finding and locating sources to be used, etc. (Learning Goal 3). Later in the semester, these weekly meetings involve students bouncing arguments and ideas off of the other seniors and faculty, polishing up arguments and ideas, providing feedback to the other students, etc.

Second, students complete a substantial written essay (generally, between 25-30 pages). This essay is the basis for their course grade. We assess the quality of the written work by employment of the “writing rubric for senior thesis” (see Appendix Three) in conjunction with our own intuitive trained judgments regarding the quality of the writing, the difficulty of the subject matter, etc. (Learning Goals 1 and 2).
Finally, each student makes a formal presentation of their senior thesis to philosophy majors and faculty members. We assess the quality of the oral presentation by employment of the “rubric for assessment of oral communication” (see Appendix Four) (Learning Goal 1).

The senior thesis, therefore, provides us with an opportunity to assess student learning in relation to all three of our learning goals. It is, therefore, the artifact that we will collect and analyze.

(5) Assessment Data

Assessment data on key learning outcomes will be collected each academic year. The “artifacts” to be collected include the following:

1. All majors will submit a copy of their senior thesis. The senior thesis will offer a basis to assess student learning in the Philosophy Major in relation to all three stated learning goals. First, it (along with the oral presentation) will allow us to assess a student’s ability “to express in written and oral form their understanding of major concepts and intellectual traditions within the field of philosophy.” (Goal 1) The presentation of arguments in the writing will allow us to assess the student’s “ability to utilize the principles of critical thinking and formal logic in order to produce a sound and valid argument, or to evaluate the soundness and validity of the arguments of others.” (Goal 2) Finally, the senior thesis and weekly advisory sessions will allow us to assess our student’s ability “to complete research on a philosophy-related topic, analyze objectively the results of their research, and present arguments to support their point of view in a variety of venues. (Goal 3).

2. Philosophy faculty will continue to track the post-graduate placement of our majors. Acceptance into quality postsecondary educational programs is evidence that we are fulfilling our educational mission. (Goals 1, 2, and 3). Information on the post-graduate placement of graduates since 2000 is included in Appendix One.

(6) Analysis of Assessment Results

For the 2008-2009 academic year, we had three students complete PH400, with one graduating in December. The other two are seniors who require a few more credit hours before they are eligible to graduate. These students were:

- #1
- #2
- #3
Assessment of student learning in the Philosophy Major focuses on the following:

1) The written senior thesis produced by each graduating philosophy major.
2) The oral defense of the senior thesis provided by each graduating philosophy major.
3) The post-graduation placement of each graduating philosophy major, if known.

Analysis of assessment results for each key learning outcome goal, with effectiveness measures established on a green-light, yellow-light, red-light scale, occurs for each academic year. We see no reason to reinvent the wheel. We correlate letter grades with this “colored-light” schema. A grade of “A” or “B” correlates to “green.” A grade of “C” correlates to “yellow.” And a grade of “D” or “F” correlates to “red.”

A. Written Senior Thesis

Regarding the written product, the supervising faculty member will generate a brief evaluative summary for each thesis supervised during the academic year (included below). This summary will indicate the name of the student, the title of the senior thesis, the grade earned on the senior thesis, and an indication of the basis for the grade assigned. We employ the “Rubric for Senior Thesis” as a general guideline for grading. (The rubric is included as Appendix Three to this report.) In general, if a student earns an A or B on the senior thesis, this will be taken to indicate a “green light” in terms of assessment of student learning. If a student earns a C, this will be taken to indicate a “yellow” light in terms of assessment. Finally, if a student earns a D or an F, this will be taken to indicate a “red” light in terms of assessment. Finally, any additional information deemed relevant to the assessment of the student’s work may be included.

Electronic copies of all senior theses will be obtained and stored by the Chair of the Philosophy Department. In addition, electronic copies of all senior theses will be posted on the Department’s webpage. This invites a “public” viewing of our students’ work. To see the quality of their work, visit our website!

The data for philosophy seniors completing PH400 during the 2008-2009 academic year is provided below.
Student: Student #1
Thesis Title: An Answer to the Error Theory: Utilitarianism
Grade: ▶ (Green Light) (Dr. Money)

#1’s thesis was the outgrowth of several papers that #1 wrote for me in PH381, Seminar in Philosophy. That course focused on the connection between the historically influential theories of Hume and Kant and more contemporary scholarship in metaethics – particularly the work of Shaun Nichols (who defends a form of Humean sentimentalism) and Richard Joyce (who defends a version of an error theory, predicated on acceptance of certain Kantian claims about the nature and status of moral deliberation considerations). In the thesis, #1 develops the error theory in a way that is different from the way in which Joyce develops it. #1 argues that moral judgment (and action?) presupposes freedom of the will. That is, when we issue a moral judgment praising or blaming a person for an action, this judgment presupposes that the person we are praising or blaming was free to do otherwise than she did, in fact, do. This is a version of the philosophical doctrine that “ought implies can.” #1 also, however, subscribes to determinism. Under determinism, no agent could do otherwise than they, in fact, do. Hence, a fundamental presupposition of moral judgment is false. As a result, an error theory looms: all moral judgments are false because they presuppose something that is, in fact, not the case – freedom of the will. In the thesis, #1 does not argue directly for determinism. Rather, #1’s aim is to present the basis for an error theory predicated upon the denial of free will. This part of the thesis is primarily conceptual in nature. In the latter parts of the thesis, #1 argues that any error theory will present certain substantial risks to efficient and effective social functioning. Thus, #1 presents a pragmatically grounded case for embracing utilitarianism as a way to avoid certain risks that flow from acceptance of the error theory. #1 argues that utilitarianism is consistent with determinism, while being preferable on pragmatic grounds to the error theory. As is the case with almost any writing in metaethics, one of the primary difficulties is in finding a topic that can be addressed without having to get into a much larger array of issues (ontology, epistemology, etc.). Some of #1’s ideas needed more development and the connections could have been strengthened. While some transitions are not clear, #1 generally stays focused and on target. One issue that should be dealt with more substantially is the tension between motivating the error theory by arguing that moral judgment presupposes free will, and then arguing for the utilitarian view, in part, because of its compatibility with determinism. It would seem that if a genuine moral view presupposes freedom of the will, then a view that is compatible with determinism would, in virtue of that very fact, not be a genuine moral theory. Perhaps the idea is that utilitarianism should be embraced as the most suitable replacement for a moral theory, while not actually being understood as a genuine moral theory. However, it is then not clear what would become of the pragmatic concerns. If the error theory is dangerous because it undercuts morality, then why isn’t the
replacement of morality with some non-moral alternative any less dangerous? A second issue that should have been discussed is the compatibilist position on the freewill-determinism issue and its implications for the error theory and the appeal to utilitarianism. Even if one embraces the idea that moral thinking presupposes “ought implies can,” does that necessitate a libertarian construal of that doctrine? If not (as some compatibilists maintain), then the impetus to embrace an error theory is undercut. Similarly, the compatibilist position would enable utilitarianism to be presented as a genuine moral theory, not a “best we can do in the circumstances” alternative to the error theory. Overall, while there are some holes, the thesis represents an “above average” grasp of complex and multifaceted philosophical topics.

**Student: Student #2**  
**Thesis Title:** Deterministic Utilitarianism  
**Grade:** ■ (Green Light) (Dr. Roark)

#2’s paper was the outgrowth of an earlier paper #2 wrote in Dr. Money’s Seminar in Philosophy course (PH 381). The paper was also awarded third place in the 2009 H.U.R.F competition. In addition #2 presented the paper during the H.U.R.F during the 2009 day of scholarship at Millikin. The primary crux of #2’s paper seeks to evaluate how the thesis of determinism might impact the truth of various normative ethical theories. Simply put, if we assume that human action is determined (as opposed to being freely chosen), then what implications would this have on the truth of various claims about normative ethical theory. To #2’s credit he gives extended attention offering the sketch of an argument defending the thesis of determinism as well as discussing the distinction between hard determinism and compatibilism. #2’s argument does not make a definitive case for the truth of the determinism (but this is not a complaint as many thousands of pages of philosophical ink before #2 have not made a definitive case for the truth of determinism either). #2 specifically examines the impact that determines might have upon: error theory, Kantianism, and utilitarianism. One difficulty with the paper is that #2 never gives a clear account of error theory. #2 does cite passages from Richard Joyce who is an error theorist so the reader does get some sense of what error theory amounts to but the definition of error theory is never simply stated. Error theory is the view that all of our moral judgments are cognitive in nature and hence could be true or false. But it just so happens that all of our moral judgments are in fact false. Thus, when we make a claim like ‘murder is morally wrong’ what we have uttered is false. All of our moral claims, error theory says, are false. #2 mentions that such a view is very psychologically unappealing. And this seems right. But it isn't clear what impact determinism has on error theory. The truth or falsity of determinism would not impact the truth or falsity of error theory. And further, error theory would be just as psychologically unappealing whether determinism was true or false. In other words, we would be just as psychologically bothered by the claim that
‘murder is wrong’ is false irrespective of whether we lived in a deterministic world or a world that was not deterministic. In respect to his discussion of Kantianism, #2 does a very nice job picking out text from Kant which does suggest that his theory of morality depends upon free human action. That is, for Kant’s theory to work Kant does seem to suggest (as #2 points out) that determinism would have to be false. #2, who endorses determinism, uses this as an opportunity to reject Kantianism. One line of thought that #2 might want to pursue on this score is a possible inconsistency in the thought of Kant. Kant argued, in passages #2 did not address, that the divine will (in effect God’s will) acts perfectly and in a completely moral fashion. What makes this highly relevant to the issue at hand is that Kant suggests that God as a fully rational agent could not in any other way but in a completely moral fashion. This implies that for Kant a being (God) could be determined and yet also act in a moral fashion. Thus, we have at least one case for Kant in which the thesis of determinism is consistent with acting morally. Kant never fully explains why this consistency between determinism and moral action couldn’t extend to human beings and this might be a good area for #2 to investigate further. #2 concludes the paper with an extended discussion endorsing the idea of deterministic utilitarianism. Utilitarianism is the view that the right moral action is that which maximizes utility or the greater good. The truth of utilitarianism does not depend on the truth or falsity of determinism. Utilitarianism simply argues that the morally right thing to do is maximize utility, it says nothing about this having to be done in a way that is determined or free. #2, argues that we should get rid of the language of ‘ought’ and ‘should’ in our moral language, since #2 thinks people are determined beings. So according to #2 we should not really say that a person ‘ought to act to maximize utility’. Instead, we should praise those who actually do strive to be ‘good utilitarians’ (even though they are determined to be good utilitarians) by simply noting that their conduct was good without saying that people ought or should act in certain ways. One puzzle that remains is what the point of such revised deterministic moral language would serve? Our ‘new way’ of talking about morality without words like ‘should’ and ‘ought’ would not change the way things are to be (if determinism is true) so why use moral language at all if it is not efficacious? Perhaps we could say that this new way to talk about morality is still useful because of its descriptive power. But if moral talk were just descriptive and we all appreciated that is was not efficacious to the way people ‘ought’ to act (because determinism was accepted as true) would it even be moral language any more or would it simply be similar to the language used to describe a tree or television set? This is a big picture question that #2’s work leaves unaddressed (but good philosophy always leaves a few unanswered questions). #2 does make a nice case for thinking that taking the idea of determinism seriously likes puts us some type utilitarian ethical camp.
Student: Student #3  
Thesis Title: A Proposal to Modify the Just Way Theory: Discussion and Justification  
Grade: ▬ (Green Light) (Dr. Roark)

#3’s thesis was the outgrowth of a paper that he wrote for me in PH 260, Applied Ethics, during the Fall 2008 semester. In that course, our primary area of study was just war theory and human rights. #3 seemed to become especially interested in the topic of just war theory after reading Michael Waltzer’s ‘Just and Unjust Wars’. #3’s thesis developed around what #3 found to be a major oversight in just war theory. Just war theory suggests that a state may only engage in a war in response to an aggressive action by another state. #3, however, proposed a case in which one country by refusing to trade scarce resources with another country was, in a non-aggressive fashion, ‘letting them die’. The traditional interpretation of just war theory tells us that the state being ‘starved’ has no right to engage in a war against the state doing the ‘starving’. #3 argued that result of just war theory is in error. #3 did this by arguing that there is no moral distinction between the aggressive action of killing (or threatening to kill) and the non-aggressive action of ‘letting die’. In this way, #3 argued, that just war theory places a morally arbitrary importance to aggressive action and fails to appreciate that, in certain cases, non-aggressive action can also serve as a moral reason for engaging in war. At times the paper lacked clear organization transitions from one idea to another. Also, the paper could have been aided if #3 had spent more time examining more of the philosophical literature concerning the killing and letting die distinction. Having said this, I am impressed that a student at the undergraduate level prepared a very good paper that exploits an important distinction in modern ethical theory (the killing and letting die distinction) in order to critically evaluate an influential philosophical doctrine such as just war theory. This is precisely where one should be at the conclusion of an undergraduate philosophy major.

B. Oral Defense of Thesis

All senior philosophy majors present an oral defense of their senior thesis. Their oral defense is assessed using the “Rubric for Assessment of Oral Communication,” provided in Appendix Four to this report. The rubric provides for an available total point range of between 55 and 11. A total score of 34-55 will indicate a green light regarding assessment. A total score of 23-33 will indicate a yellow light regarding assessment. Finally, a total score of 11-22 will indicate a red light regarding assessment. The original assessment sheets will be stored by the Chair of the Philosophy Department.

The data for philosophy seniors graduating during the 2007-2008 academic year is provided below.
C. Post-Graduation Placement (If Known)

Our report will indicate the post-graduation placement of our graduating seniors, if known. This information is also posted on our website and is updated as new information becomes available. At this point, both Jessica and Tom are completing additional course work in preparation for graduation. Kenny’s post-graduation status is currently unknown.

Our full placement record (as known to us) since 2000 can be found in Appendix One. However, we believe it important to emphasize in the body of this report our incredible success in this regard. Philosophy tends to attract students who are committed to the life of the mind. Accordingly, most of our graduating majors eventually pursue further educational opportunities. We have graduated a total of 38 philosophy majors over the past 10 years. **Amazingly, these majors have been accepted into and/or completed a total of 29 programs at the level of M.A. or above (including J.D.).** The range of areas within which our majors find success is impressive. A sense of the post-graduation educational accomplishments of our majors can be gleaned from consideration of the following:

- Our majors have been accepted into and/or completed four Ph.D. programs in philosophy.
- Our majors have been accepted into and/or completed four M.A. programs in philosophy.
- Our majors have been accepted into and/or completed three Ph.D. programs in fields other than philosophy.
- Our majors have been accepted into and/or completed eleven M.A. programs in fields other than philosophy.
- Our majors have been accepted into and/or completed seven J.D. programs.
Acceptance into M.A., J.D., and Ph.D. programs provides compelling external evidence and validation of student learning in the philosophy major. Moreover, this evidence shows a consistent trend line over time: exceptional performance by our students over a decade. We believe this is compelling evidence that our program is vibrant and delivering on the promise of education. Student learning in the philosophy program is strong and demonstrable.

D. Additional Evidence of Student Learning in the Philosophy Major

Another source of evidence for student learning in the philosophy major is the outstanding performance over the past four years of philosophy majors who have chosen to participate in the Moot Court competition that is held each spring as part of the Model Illinois Government simulation in Springfield, Illinois. Universities and colleges of all sorts (four year public, four year private, community colleges, etc.) from all over Illinois send teams to the competition. The simulation is educational in the best and fullest sense of the word. For the six to seven weeks leading up to the competition, Dr. Money meets with participating students three to four hours per week, typically in the evenings. During these meetings, the “closed brief” materials are collectively analyzed. In addition, students work on the formulation of arguments representing both sides of the case, practice oral delivery of those arguments, and practice fielding questions from justices. Many of Millikin’s core educational skills are facilitated in this practical simulation: critical and ethical reasoning, oral communication skills, and collaborative learning, among others. This is a paradigmatic example of the “theory-practice” model endorsed by Millikin. Philosophy majors have played a substantial and active role in the Moot Court program over the past four years (coinciding with Dr. Money’s service as faculty advisor). Consider:

- At the 2008-09 competition, Millikin teams took first and second place in the competition, having to face each other in the final round of competition. Two of the four students were philosophy majors: Justin Allen and Kenny Miller. The team of Allen and Miller took first place. In addition, Justin was honored as “most outstanding attorney.”
- At the 2007-08 competition, Millikin teams took first and third place. Both attorneys on the first place team were philosophy majors: Dustin Clark and Kenny Miller.
- At the 2006-07 competition, Millikin teams took second and third place. Two of the four attorneys were philosophy majors: Justin Allen and Dustin Clark.
- At the 2005-06 competition, a Millikin team took third place. Both students on that team were philosophy majors: Nichole Johnson and Gregg Lagger.
- At the 2004-05 competition, Millikin’s two teams took first and second place in the competition, having to face each other in the final round of
The success of our students as judged by external evaluators at the Moot Court competition, including faculty from other institutions as well as attorneys and law students, is clear external evidence and validation of the quality of our program. Yet another source of evidence for student learning in the philosophy major is the outstanding performance of philosophy majors at HURF (Humanities Undergraduate Research Forum). HURF began in 2000 and was held for four consecutive years: 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003. It was then discontinued until this past spring (2008), when it was reborn with renewed energy and commitment from humanities faculty. An independent screening committee comprised of one faculty member from each of the humanities disciplines evaluates HURF submissions. Of the six HURFs held to date, philosophy majors have been awarded top prize in four, second prize in one, and third prize in one. Philosophy majors awarded recognition at HURF include:

- Tom Fowle, “Deterministic Utilitarianism” (2009, third place)

The evaluative judgments of the independent screening committee provide yet another external validation of student learning in the philosophy major.

Both Moot Court and HURF provide compelling external evidence and validation of student learning in the philosophy major. Moreover, this evidence shows a consistent trend line over time: exceptional performance by our students. We believe this is compelling evidence that our program is vibrant and delivering on the promise of education. Student learning in the philosophy program is strong and demonstrable.

(7) Trends and Improvement Plans

The Philosophy Department is pleased with the results in our third year of formal assessment.
All three of our seniors (100%) were assessed in the “green” for their oral defense of their senior thesis. The data reveals consistently high performance by our majors and is evidence that the philosophy program is strong. The data we have collected over the past three years reveals a consistency in the oral competencies of our students. We attribute this primarily to the intensely discussion-driven format of our courses, a format that encourage and rewards student engagement and student contributions. Given our emphasis on this pedagogical style, it is not a surprise that our majors are adept at communicating their views orally. They essentially receive the opportunity to engage in oral communication each and every class meeting!

All three of the seniors (100%) were assessed in the “green” for their written senior thesis. The data reveals consistently high performance by our majors and is evidence that the philosophy program is strong.

Given these results and the fact that this is our third year of data collection for formal assessment purposes, we do not anticipate making any changes in our program as a result of our assessment review. We are extremely pleased with the performance of our students and we continue to believe that our program facilitates the intellectual growth and development of the critical thinking skills that are essential to delivering on “the promise of education.” The high quality work produced by our students is compelling evidence in support of this claim.

APPENDIX ONE: POST-GRADUATE INFORMATION ON RECENTLY GRADUATED MAJORS
Philosophy tends to attract students who are committed to the life of the mind. Accordingly, most of our graduating majors eventually pursue further educational opportunities. We have graduated a total of 38 philosophy majors over the past 10 years. **These majors have been accepted into and/or completed a total of 29 programs at the level of M.A. or above (including J.D.).** What may be surprising to some, however, is the range of areas within which our majors find success. To give you a sense of their post-graduation educational accomplishments of our majors, consider the following:

- Our majors have been accepted into and/or completed **four** Ph.D. programs in philosophy.
- Our majors have been accepted into and/or completed **four** M.A. programs in philosophy.
- Our majors have been accepted into and/or completed **three** Ph.D. programs in fields other than philosophy.
- Our majors have been accepted into and/or completed **eleven** M.A. programs in fields other than philosophy.
- Our majors have been accepted into and/or completed **seven** J.D. programs.
- Our majors have been accepted into and/or completed **one** medical school program.

The following list provides information regarding the post-graduate activities of each of our graduating majors over the last 10 years. Taken as a whole, this information clearly demonstrates an exceptional post-graduate success rate for our majors. It also demonstrates the ability of our two faculty members to attract and retain high quality students, and their ability to grow and maintain a vibrant and essential major. In light of the totality of the circumstances (i.e., the nature of our discipline, the nature of our institution, the size of our Department, etc.), our trend line is extremely positive.

**2009: One Graduating Senior**

Kenny Oonyu (2009): plans unknown

**2008: Four Graduating Seniors**

Ali Aliabadi (2008): Ross Medical School

[Redacted] (2008): plans unknown


Giuliana Selvaggio (2008): plans unknown
2007: Seven Graduating Seniors


Mark Fredricksen (2007): Unknown

Kyle Fritz (2007): Ph. D. program in philosophy, University of Florida (starting fall 2008); Assistant Editor for Human Kinetics' Scientific, Technical, and Medical Division, Champaign, Illinois; Ph.D. in Philosophy, University of Florida (starting fall 2008).

Colette Gortowski (2007): Teaching at the Wuhan Yucai Primary School in China.

Nichole Johnson (2007): Attending University of Iowa, College of Law.


2006: Five Graduating Seniors

Corey Bechtel (2006): Ph.D. in Political Science, Purdue University (starting fall 2008); MA in International Studies (with concentration in International Politics), Graduate School of International Studies, University of Denver.

Ashley Goodson (2006): Peace Corp (working in Senegal, West Africa); Indiana University, MA program in social work.


Shaun Miller (2006): University of Houston, MA program in philosophy.


2005: Six Graduating Seniors

Erika Cornelius (2005): Ph.D. program in history, Purdue University (starting fall 2007). MA in Political Science, Eastern Illinois University, where she received an Award of Excellence for her thesis, "Unilateral Executive Power: Bush Push or Congressional Cave?"

Zach Godsil (2005): Web Developer, Archer Daniels Midland, Decatur


Jessica Revak (2005): Operations Manager at White Lodging Services; Western Illinois University, MA program in Experimental Psychology.

Amanda Russell (2005): University of Iowa, Dual MA programs in Health Administration and Public Health where she was recipient of The John and Wendy Boardman/Amenity Foundation Exceeding Expectations Scholarship.

2004: **Five** Graduating Seniors

Kim Keplar (2004): Working in St. Louis area. Was accepted to the MA program in philosophy at the University of Missouri Saint-Louis, but declined to attend.

Danielle LaSusa (2004): Temple University, Ph.D. program in philosophy.

Louis Manetti (2004): Chicago-Kent Law School, where he was awarded the first Dolores K. Hanna Trademark Prize. The prize was established last year by the law firm of Bell, Boyd & Lloyd. Awarded at the end of the school year to a Chicago-Kent student based on outstanding performance in an intellectual property course, recipients are selected by intellectual property law Chicago-Kent faculty.

Paul Scherschel (2004): Associate Director of Major Gifts, Millikin University; Program Specialist with the Office of the Speaker in the Illinois House of Representatives, Springfield; State Service Representative/Writer with the Governor’s Office of Citizens Assistance, Springfield.


2003: **Three** Graduating Seniors


Katherine Guin (2003): Florida State University, Ph.D. program in philosophy.

Meghan Haddad-Null (2003): Case Western Reserve University for graduate study in French.
2002: **Four** Graduating Seniors

Rob Lininger (2002): University of Illinois, MA program in journalism OR Marquette University, MA program in public relations and advertising. Completed a M.A. in Human Resources and Industrial Relations from the Institute for Labor and Industry Relations, University of Illinois; Visiting Assistant Director of Student Development at Campus Recreations, University of Illinois; currently working in human resources, University of Illinois; currently in the process of applying to several masters programs in communication and education (Depaul, Loyola).

Carrie Malone (2002): Louisiana State University, Ph.D. program in psychology.

Jason Maynard (2002): Western Michigan University, MA program in philosophy.

Jace Hoppes (2002): Dallas and Company, Champaign, IL

2001: **One** Graduating Senior


2000: **Two** Graduating Seniors


**APPENDIX TWO: REQUIREMENTS FOR THE PHILOSOPHY MAJOR**

**Major in Philosophy**
A major consists of a minimum of 30 credits and leads to the B.A. degree. The following courses are required:
PH 110, Basic Philosophical Problems
PH 213, Critical Thinking: Logic  
PH 381, Seminar in Philosophy  
PH 400, Senior Thesis

Plus three of the following courses:  
PH 300, Ancient World Wisdom  
PH 301, The Golden Age of Greece  
PH 303, The Modern World (17th-18th centuries)  
PH 304, The Contemporary World of Philosophy (19th-21st centuries)

In addition, the philosophy major must take at least nine credits of electives within the Department.

**Ethics Track within the Philosophy Major**

Philosophy offers an “ethics track” within the philosophy major. The ethics track reinforces and substantially extends Millikin’s emphasis on ethical reasoning and issues of social justice. A student seeking to complete the ethics track within the philosophy major must complete 30 credits. The following courses are required:

PH 110, Basic Philosophical Problems  
PH 211, Ethical Theory and Moral Issues  
PH 213, Critical Thinking: Logic  
PH 215, Business Ethics  
PH 217, Bioethics  
PH 219, Environmental Ethics  
PH 300, Ancient World Wisdom or PH 301, Golden Age of Greece  
PH 305, Philosophy of Law or PH 310, Political Philosophy or PH 311, Metaethics  
PH 400, Senior Thesis  
Plus one elective 300-level philosophy courses

**Pre-Law Track within the Philosophy Major**

Philosophy also offers a “pre-law track” within the philosophy major. According to the American Bar Association, after physics the major with the highest percentage of acceptance into ABA approved law schools is philosophy. We have developed a track within our philosophy major to provide students with the courses that emphasize the skills and the knowledge content that will make it both likely that they will get into law school and that they will succeed both there and later as lawyers.

The pre-law track of the philosophy major will consist of a minimum of 30 credits and leads to the B. A. degree. The following courses are required:

PH 110, Basic Philosophical Problems  
PH 211, Ethical Theory and Moral Issues  
PH 213, Critical Thinking: Logic  
PH 301, Golden Age of Greece or PH 311 Metaethics  
PH 305, Philosophy of Law  
PH 310, Political Philosophy  
PH 400, Senior Thesis  
Plus 3 elective courses from among any philosophy courses, PO 234 Civil Liberties, or PO 330 Constitutional Law.

**Minors in Philosophy**

A student seeking a philosophy minor is required to complete 18 credits. The student can elect to complete either the standard philosophy minor (“philosophy minor”) or the philosophy ethics minor (“ethics minor”). The standard philosophy minor emphasizes the history of philosophy. The ethics minor emphasizes ethical reasoning, the understanding of ethical theory, and the application of ethical theory to specific domains (e.g., business, medicine, the environment, politics, etc.). Both minors are described below.

**Philosophy Minor**

A student seeking the philosophy minor is required to complete 18 credits. 9 credits must come from among the following courses in the history of philosophy:

PH 300, Ancient World Wisdom  
PH 301, Golden Age of Greece  
PH 303, Modern Philosophy (16th-18th centuries)  
PH 304, Contemporary Philosophy (19th-21st centuries)

In addition, the student must complete 9 credits of electives in philosophy.

**Ethics Minor**

A student seeking the ethics minor is required to complete 18 credits. The following course is required:  
PH 211, Ethical Theory and Moral Issues (3 credits)

Two of the following “applied ethics” courses are also required:

PH 215, Business Ethics  
PH 217, Bioethics  
PH 219, Environmental Ethics

In addition, the student must take nine credits from among the following courses:

Any additional applied ethics course offered by the Philosophy Department (i.e., PH 215, PH 217, or PH 219)  
PH 301, Golden Age of Greece
PH 305, Philosophy of Law
PH 310, Political Philosophy
PH 311, Metaethics
PH 381, Seminar in Philosophy (with appropriate content and approval of the Chair)
Any one course outside the Philosophy Department focusing on ethics, including: CO 107, Argument and Social Issues; CO 308, Communication Ethics and Freedom of Expression; SO 325, Social Work Ethics; BI 414, The Human Side of Medicine; or another course in ethics outside the Department and approved by the Chair of the Philosophy Department.

APPENDIX THREE: RUBRICS

“Rubric for Senior Theses”
The purpose of the Philosophy Major is stated in three Philosophy Department goals:

- **Department Goal 1**: Students will be able to express in oral and written form their understanding of major concepts and intellectual traditions within the field of philosophy.
- **Department Goal 2**: Students will demonstrate their ability to utilize the principles of critical thinking and formal logic in order to produce a sound and valid argument, or to evaluate the soundness and validity of the arguments of others.
- **Department Goal 3**: Students will demonstrate their ability to complete research on a philosophy-related topic, analyze objectively the results of their research, and present arguments to support their point of view in a variety of venues.

The following rubric connects our three learning goals to our assessment of the senior thesis, completion of which is a requirement for all majors.

**A**: In light of Department learning goals, a senior thesis earning an “A” grade should meet the following criteria of assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presentation Goal 1</th>
<th>Very few grammatical errors or misspellings, if any.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sentence structure is appropriately complex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vocabulary is used correctly. Work reflects a college level use of words and understanding of their meanings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity Goal 1</td>
<td>Each sentence clearly expresses an idea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Each paragraph forms a coherent whole. Paragraphs do not include several unrelated sentences without any overarching structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The logic used in the analysis is explicitly stated or clearly implied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The overall structure and organization of the introduction and the analysis is appropriate, logical and coherent. The organization adds to the strength of the arguments being presented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Goals 1, 2, 3</td>
<td>Analysis reflects a high level of integration of information from multiple questions and multiple sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analysis reflects consideration of multiple causes and alternative explanations, while maintaining a clear focus on the explanations utilized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In addition to there being no flaws in the reasoning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
presented, it is also clear that the most effective arguments are being made. The arguments being presented are compelling.

The analysis elicits substantive questions regarding your interpretation.

**B**: In light of Department learning goals, a senior thesis earning a “B” grade should meet the following criteria of assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presentation Goal 1</th>
<th>Few grammatical errors or misspellings.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall, sentence structure is appropriately complex, incorrect sentence structures occur rarely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vocabulary is used correctly. Overall, work reflects a college level use of words and understanding of their meanings. Occasional incorrect use of vocabulary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity Goal 1</td>
<td>Overall, each sentence expresses an idea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall, each paragraph forms a coherent whole. Level of coherence is varied. Paragraphs may include some unrelated sentences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The logic used in the analysis is generally clear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The overall structure and organization of the introduction and the analysis is appropriate, logical and coherent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Goals 1, 2, 3</td>
<td>Analysis reflects integration of information from multiple questions and multiple sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analysis occasionally reflects consideration of multiple causes and alternative explanations. A clear focus on the explanations utilized is generally present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are no glaring flaws in the reasoning presented. Effective arguments are being made.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C: In light of Department learning goals, a senior thesis earning a “C” grade should meet the following criteria of assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presentation Goal 1</th>
<th>Some grammatical errors or misspellings.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occasionally sentence structure is appropriately complex. Simplistic sentence structures are used. Common errors in sentences such as run-on sentences occur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity Goal 1</td>
<td>Some vocabulary is used correctly. Work minimally reflects a college level use of words and understanding of their meanings. Frequent use of simplistic vocabulary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Goals 1, 2, 3</td>
<td>More sentences clearly express ideas than do not. Rambling sentences or unclear structure occurs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of coherence in paragraphs is varied. Paragraphs may include some unrelated sentences. Paragraphs may be too long or too short.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The logic used in the analysis is occasionally clear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The overall structure and organization of the introduction and the analysis reflects some logic and coherence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analysis reflects occasional integration of information from multiple questions and sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analysis rarely reflects consideration of multiple causes and alternative explanations. Occasional clear focus on the explanations utilized present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are few glaring flaws in the reasoning presented. Occasional effective arguments are being made.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D: In light of Department learning goals, a senior thesis earning a “D” grade should meet the following criteria of assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presentation Goal 1</th>
<th>Grammatical errors or misspellings occur, penalties for affect final grade.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sentence structure is rarely complex. Simplistic sentence structures are used. Common errors in sentences such as run-on sentences occur. Non-sentences occur occasionally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity Goal 1</td>
<td>Minimal appropriate use of the language. Work only rarely reflects a college level use of words and understanding of their meanings. Frequent use of simplistic vocabulary. When sophisticated vocabulary appears, it is often incorrect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sentences occasionally clearly express ideas. Rambling sentences or unclear structure occurs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low levels of coherence in paragraphs. Paragraphs frequently include some unrelated sentences. Paragraphs may be too</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The logic used in the analysis is rarely clear.

Structure and organization of the introduction and the analysis do not reflect logic and coherence, they are simply strung together.

Analysis reflects little or no integration of information from multiple questions or sources.

Analysis does not reflect consideration of multiple causes and alternative explanations. Clear explanations are missing.

Many glaring flaws in the reasoning presented. Only rarely are effective arguments are being made.

F: In light of Department learning goals, a senior thesis earning an “F” grade does not meet the standards for a “D” and is totally unacceptable work for a college senior, much less a philosophy major.

Critical Thinking in the Philosophy Major

1. Identifies, summarizes (and appropriately reformulates) the problem, question, issue, or creative goal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RED, 1 to 2 Points</th>
<th>YELLOW, 3 Points</th>
<th>GREEN, 4 to 5 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does not attempt to or fails to identify and summarize issue/goal accurately.</td>
<td>Summarizes issue/goal, though some aspects are incorrect or confused. Nuances and key details are missing or glossed over.</td>
<td>Clearly identifies the challenge and subsidiary, embedded, or implicit aspects of the issue/goal. Identifies integral relationships essential to analyzing the issue/goal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Identifies and considers the influence of context and assumptions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RED, 1 to 2 Points</th>
<th>YELLOW, 3 Points</th>
<th>GREEN, 4 to 5 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approach to the issue is in egocentric or socio-centric terms. Does not relate issue to other contexts (cultural, political, historical, etc.).</td>
<td>Presents and explores relevant contexts and assumptions regarding the issue, although in a limited way.</td>
<td>Analyzes the issue with a clear sense of scope and context, including an assessment of audience. Considers other integral contexts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not recognize context or surface assumptions and</td>
<td>Provides some recognition of context and consideration of</td>
<td>Identifies influence of context and questions assumptions,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
underlying ethical implications, or does so superficially. | assumptions and their implications. | addressing ethical dimensions underlying the issue, as appropriate.

3. Develops, presents, and communicates OWN perspective, hypothesis, or position.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RED, 1 to 2 Points</th>
<th>YELLOW, 3 Points</th>
<th>GREEN, 4 to 5 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position or hypothesis is clearly inherited or adopted with little original consideration.</td>
<td>Position includes some original thinking that acknowledges, refutes, synthesizes, or extends other assertions, although some aspects may have been adopted.</td>
<td>Position demonstrates ownership for constructing knowledge or framing original questions, integrating objective analysis and intuition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses a single source or view of the argument, failing to clarify the established position relative to one’s own.</td>
<td>Presents own position or hypothesis, though inconsistently.</td>
<td>Appropriately identifies own position on the issue, drawing support from experience and information not available from assigned sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fails to present and justify own opinion or forward hypothesis.</td>
<td>Presents and justifies own position without addressing other views, or does so superficially.</td>
<td>Clearly presents and justifies own view or hypothesis while qualifying or integrating contrary views or interpretations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position or hypothesis is unclear or simplistic.</td>
<td>Position or hypothesis is generally clear, although gaps may exist.</td>
<td>Position or hypothesis demonstrates sophisticated integrative thought and is developed clearly throughout.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Presents, assesses, and analyzes sources appropriate to the problem, question, issue, or creative goal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RED, 1 to 2 Points</th>
<th>YELLOW, 3 Points</th>
<th>GREEN, 4 to 5 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No evidence of search, selection, or source evaluation skills.</td>
<td>Demonstrates adequate skill in searching, selecting, and evaluating sources to meet the information need.</td>
<td>Evidence of search, selection, and source evaluation skills; notable identification of uniquely salient resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources are simplistic,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
inappropriate, or not related to topic. | Appropriate sources provided, although exploration appears to have been routine. | Information need is clearly defined and integrated to meet and exceed assignment, course, or personal interests.

5. Integrates issue/creative goal using OTHER disciplinary perspectives and positions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RED, 1 to 2 Points</th>
<th>YELLOW, 3 Points</th>
<th>GREEN, 4 to 5 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deals with a single perspective and fails to discuss others’ perspectives.</td>
<td>Begins to relate alternative views to qualify analysis.</td>
<td>Addresses others’ perspectives and additional diverse perspectives drawn from outside information to qualify analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treats other positions superficially or misrepresents them.</td>
<td>Analysis of other positions is thoughtful and mostly accurate.</td>
<td>Analysis of other positions is accurate, nuanced, and respectful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little integration of perspectives and little or no evidence of attending to others’ views.</td>
<td>Acknowledges and integrates different ways of knowing.</td>
<td>Integrates different disciplinary and epistemological ways of knowing. Connects to career and civic responsibilities, as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

6. Identifies and assesses conclusions, implications, and consequences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RED, 1 to 2 Points</th>
<th>YELLOW, 3 Points</th>
<th>GREEN, 4 to 5 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fails to identify conclusions, implications, and consequences, or conclusion is a simplistic summary.</td>
<td>Conclusions consider or provide evidence of consequences extending beyond a single discipline or issue. Presents implications that may impact other people or issues.</td>
<td>Identifies, discusses, and extends conclusions, implications, and consequences. Considers context, assumptions, data, and evidence. Qualifies own assertions with balance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions presented as absolute, and may attribute conclusion to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
external authority. | Presents conclusions as relative and only loosely related to consequences. Implications may include vague reference to conclusions. | Conclusions are qualified as the best available evidence within the context. Consequences are considered and integrated. Implications are clearly developed and consider ambiguities.

7. Communicates effectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RED, 1 to 2 Points</th>
<th>YELLOW, 3 Points</th>
<th>GREEN, 4 to 5 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In many places, language obscures meaning. Grammar, syntax, or other errors are distracting or repeated. Little evidence of proofreading. Style is inconsistent or inappropriate. Work is unfocused and poorly organized; lacks logical connection of ideas. Format is absent, inconsistent, or distracting. Few sources are cited or used correctly. Final product/piece does not communicate the intended issue or goal.</td>
<td>In general, language does not interfere with communication. Errors are not distracting or frequent, although there may be some problems with more difficult aspects of style and voice. Basic organization is apparent; transitions connect ideas, although they may be mechanical. Format is appropriate although at times inconsistent. Most sources are cited and used correctly. Final product/piece communicates the intended issue or goal in a general manner.</td>
<td>Language clearly and effectively communicates ideas. May at times be nuanced and eloquent. Errors are minimal. Style is appropriate for audience. Organization is clear; transitions between ideas enhance presentation. Consistent use of appropriate format. Few problems with other components of presentation. All sources are cited and used correctly, demonstrating understanding of economic, legal, and social issues involved with the use of information. Final product/piece communicates the intended issue or goal effectively.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Criteria Scores

___ 1. Identify problem, question, issue, creative goal.
___ 2. Consider context and assumptions
___ 3. Develop own position or hypothesis
___ 4. Presents, assesses, and analyzes sources appropriate to the problem, question, issue or creative goal.
___ 5. Integrate other perspectives
___ 6. Identify conclusions and implications
___ 7. Communicate effectively

___ TOTAL SCORE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RED</th>
<th>YELLOW</th>
<th>GREEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total score of 7-20</td>
<td>Total score of 21-27</td>
<td>Total Score of 28-35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX FOUR: RUBRIC FOR ASSESSMENT OF ORAL COMMUNICATION

Student Name: ______________________________    Date:  _______________

Presentation Context: __________________________

Evaluator: _______________________________

Rating Scale:
5 = sophisticated communication skills
4 = advanced communication skills
3 = competent communication skills
2 = marginal communication skills
1 = profound lack of communication skills

I. Formal Presentation

5 4 3 2 1  1. Uses notes effectively.

5 4 3 2 1  2. Shows an ability to handle stage fright.

5 4 3 2 1  3. Communicates a clear central idea or thesis.

5 4 3 2 1  4. Communicates a clear and coherent organizational pattern (e.g., main supporting points are clearly connected to the central thesis).

5 4 3 2 1  5. Exhibits reasonable directness and competence in delivery (e.g., voice is clear and intelligible, body is poised, eye contact with audience, etc.).

5 4 3 2 1  6. Avoids delivery mannerisms that detract from the speaker’s message.

5 4 3 2 1  7. Meets time constraints.

5 4 3 2 1  8. Overall Evaluation

WRITTEN COMMENTS:
II. Informal Classroom Discussions

5 4 3 2 1 1. Is able to listen to perspectives that differ from one’s own.

5 4 3 2 1 2. Uses language and nonverbal clues appropriately.

5 4 3 2 1 3. Displays appropriate turn-taking skills.

WRITTEN COMMENTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GREEN</th>
<th>YELLOW</th>
<th>RED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total score of 55-34</td>
<td>Total score of 33-23</td>
<td>Total Score of 22-11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>