Assessment of Student Learning in the Philosophy Major
Academic Year 2011-2012
Formal Report (Due July 1, 2012)

(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 problem solve by thinking critically and analytically about philosophical puzzles and issues, puzzles and issues that often require students to wrestle with ambiguity and think from different perspectives and points of view.
- 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. Again, when we laid the groundwork for a major overhaul of the general education program in 2007, the Philosophy Department faculty proposed that along with writing and reflection, ethical reasoning be made one of the central "skill threads" developed in the University Studies program. The "practice" of delivering the University 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. Over the past seven years, Millikin students have performed exceptionally well. At the 2005 competition, Millikin teams took **first** and **second** place in the competition, having to face each other in the final round of competition. In addition, one of our three student justices won the award for "**most outstanding justice**." We continued our success at the 2006 competition where one of our teams took **third** place in the competition. In addition, one of our student justices was elected to serve as **Chief Justice** for the 2007 competition. Millikin students continued to excel at the 2007 competition. Millikin teams took **second** and **third** place and the Millikin student serving as Chief Justice was re-elected for the 2008 competition. At the 2008 competition, Millikin teams once again performed well, taking **first** and **third** place in the competition. In 2009 Millikin teams again took **first** and **second** place, and a Millikin student was honored as "**most outstanding attorney**." In 2010, Millikin teams again took **first** and **second** place, and a Millikin student was again honored as "**most outstanding attorney**." Again in 2011, a Millikin team again took **first** place. In addition, a Millikin student was runner up for most outstanding attorney. In 2012, Millikin again took **first** place. This is the **sixth** consecutive year we have won the competition. We had a total of five teams in the quarterfinals and three teams in the

semi-finals. We also had students win awards for **most outstanding attorney** and for **runner up 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:

Philosophy Department Learning Goal	**Corresponding Millikin University Learning Goal Number(s)**
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.	1, 2, 3
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.	1, 2, 3
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.	1, 2, 3

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 scare 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 2011-12 *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.56)

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. Robert Money (Chair), Dr. Eric Roark, and Dr. Michael Hartsock.

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 director to the Moot Court Team.

Dr. Roark teaches two sections of IN183/140 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 and PH219, Environmental Ethics during the spring 2010 semester. He is already making substantial contributions to the delivery of our new ethics minor. In addition, Dr. Roark teaches a variety of courses within 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.

Dr. Hartsock teaches two sections of IN183/140 each fall, serving 40 students. He also helps deliver the first week introduction to ethical reasoning program. He teaches PH213, Logic, providing an option for students to take to meet the university's quantitative reasoning requirement. In addition, he teaches in the honors program, delivering an honors version of his philosophy and history of science course. Dr. Hartsock regularly teaches Basic Philosophical Problems as well as some of the components of our history of philosophy sequence (e.g., Golden Age of Greece, Modern Philosophy, Contemporary Philosophy, etc.).

As of the spring 2012 semester, the Philosophy Department had 28 majors and 10 minors. This is the third consecutive year 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 is in the process of securing a formal philosophy club on campus. This will likely develop over the next year.

Along with Interdepartmental courses such as IN140, IN203, IN250, and IN251, 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 recently expanded to three faculty members starting fall 2008 and then replaced a retiring faculty member in 2010. The changes 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 offer 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 2011. 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 indispensible 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.

Furthermore, with the addition of Dr. Hartsock, we are also offering more courses that will intersect with topics and issues in the natural sciences. Dr. Hartsock's area of expertise, philosophy and history of science, permits the Department to forge additional connections to programs in the natural and social sciences. These links will be forged by way of formal philosophy course offerings (PH223, History and Philosophy of Science) as well as by way of offering in IN courses and by way of content included in some of our upper level philosophy offerings.

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, as a course on the intelligent design-evolution controversy, and as a course on ethical naturalism. 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 several years. 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. The Department regularly meets to review its curriculum and identify ways in which it can be improved. In fact, we plan additional modifications. We will propose these modifications during the fall 2012 semester and hope to have them formally in the books in time for the start of the 2013-2014 academic year.

(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."[1]

[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).

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 finally take PH400 (Seminar in Philosophy), 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.

The only exception to our curricular flexibility is the philosophy capstone course: PH400 Seminar in Philosophy. That course can only be taken during the junior or senior years. In that course, philosophy faculty identify a topic or philosopher of interest and design a seminar course based on the graduate school model to explore the topic/philosopher. A major research paper is required of each student. (This paper is the equivalent of the prior senior thesis.) Faculty work one-on-one with each of our junior and/or 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 near 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. Roark utilizes a case-study approach in many of his applied ethics courses. Under this pedagogical strategy, students are responsible for presenting analysis and engaging in normative reasoning regarding the case study, with class debate and interaction intentionally woven into the experience. Similarly, Dr. Money has students engage in the oral delivery of legal arguments in his Appellate Legal Reasoning course. These arguments are delivered to the class, with Dr. Money and the other students roll playing as justices – peppering the students with questions, etc.

Similarly, all philosophy faculty employ 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 three required courses (9 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 400, 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. Students also write a major research paper. This paper is collected and analyzed for purposes of assessing student learning.

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 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) but also in normative terms (e.g., what *should* be the case). Students are required to take four electives (12 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, Seminar in Philosophy. This course, toward the end of the student's career, involves the writing of a major research paper (thesis) and is, therefore, an important key opportunity for assessing the student's growth and learning over the course of the

Philosophy Major. The 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 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 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 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.

While we have chosen to focus on the thesis, we want to emphasize that we assess student learning (we call it "grading") on multiple assignments in every class as they work to complete the major. **We assess student learning in every class, on every assignment. In this context, grading is assessing student learning.** The fact that we have assigned each student a grade in each course is already to engage in an extensive assessment of "student performance in all other courses." For example, one of our Departmental Learning Goals (#2) is: 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. Each philosophy major must complete PH213, Critical Thinking: Logic. Here, each student spends an entire semester doing nothing but working on mastering the principles of critical thinking and formal logic and applying them. The grade earned in the course signifies our "assessment of student learning" relative to that specific learning goal. While we also assess this learning goal in reference to the arguments constructed in the student's senior thesis, the point is that our students are assessed on each learning goal continuously in numerous courses as they work to complete the major.

Perhaps an even more powerful illustration of the continuous and pervasive nature of our assessment of student learning can be seen in reference to Departmental Learning 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. The following appeared in my letters of recommendation for three philosophy majors who applied to law school during the 2009 fall semester:

> I want to emphasize the extent of my familiarity with Kenny's academic work. To this point, I have had Kenny in eight philosophy courses. He has excelled across a wide range of assignments including reading quizzes, oral presentations, in-class exams, take-home essay exams, and research papers. His writing, in particular, is outstanding. His papers and exams are models of analytical clarity and compelling reasoned argumentation. **Across the eight courses he has taken with me to this point, Kenny has written a total of thirty-eight (38) essays of 4-8 pages in length. His average grade on these assignments is an outstanding 95%.** Among his better written work to date were his essays in Modern Philosophy, the most difficult upper division course that I teach. Two of his essays for that course focused on Hume's critique of natural theology in the *Dialogues on Natural Religion* and Kant's "Copernican revolution" in philosophy as set forth in the *Critique*; difficult topics to say the least! Kenny demonstrated his digestion of these difficult readings as well as his ability to offer clear analysis and creative evaluations of the central claims made by each thinker. (Letter for Kenny Miller)
>
> **Across the six courses he has taken with me to this point, Justin has written a total of twenty-nine (29) essays of 4-8 pages in length. His average grade on these assignments is an excellent 92.93%.** (Letter for Justin Allen)
>
> I want to emphasize the extent of my familiarity with Dustin's academic work. To this point, I have had Dustin as a student in seven of my classes. In each course, Dustin has earned an "A." He has excelled across a wide range of assignments including reading quizzes, oral presentations, in-class exams, take-home essay exams, and research papers. His writing, in particular, is outstanding. His papers and exams are models of analytical clarity and compelling reasoned argumentation. **Across the seven courses he has taken with me to this point, Dustin has written a total of thirty-two (32) essays of 4-8 pages in length. His average grade on these assignments is an astonishing 95.66%.** (Letter for Dustin Clark)

The point is that this degree of familiarity with our students and the depth of our assessment of their learning are substantial and pervasive. This is the **NORM** in our Department. Thus, it should be abundantly clear that while we have elected to focus on the senior thesis, we assess student learning continuously and rigorously.

(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 thesis. The 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 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

Eight students completed PH400 during the 2011-2012 academic year. These students were:

- #1
- #2
- #3
- #4
- #5
- #6
- #7
- #8

Assessment of student learning in the Philosophy Major focuses on the following:

1) The written thesis produced by each graduating philosophy major.
2) The oral defense of the 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 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 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 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 theses will be obtained and stored by the Chair of the Philosophy Department. In addition, electronic copies of all 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 2010-2011 academic year is provided below.

This year, the Philosophy Department instituted a new process for the production of senior thesis. We revised our curriculum resulting in a combination of the old PH400 Senior Thesis course with the old PH381 Seminar in Philosophy course. We now have a single course, PH400, Seminar in Philosophy. Our majors produce their "senior theses" (i.e., a major research paper engaging in argument based thesis defense) within the context of the newly created (modified) course. We did this to provide better guidance to students as they work to produce this major paper.

This year, the topic of the course was personal identity and it was taught by Dr. Money. The course was divided into three parts. The first part examined historical writings related to the topic. These writings came primarily from the modern period (e.g., Locke, Hume, etc.). The second part focused on a sustained and in-depth treatment of Part

Three of Derek Parfit's classic work, *Reasons and Persons*. The third part examined a series of contemporary essays and articles on the topic, many responding to Parfit's work on the topic. All students (except one) wrote their thesis on this general topic. By design, all student theses included a section providing an analysis of Parfit's theory, a section presenting two criticisms of Parfit's theory, and a section including their own evaluation of Parfit's theory (or statement and defense of their own view). All students not only produced a thesis research paper, but each also presented and defended their thesis orally during the campus wide "Celebration of Scholarship."

Regarding the written product, 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. The data for philosophy seniors graduating during the 2011-2012 academic year is provided below.

Student: #1
Title: Personal Identity
Grade: [redacted] (Green Light) (Dr. Money)

#1 produced a solid thesis in which he defended a form of reductionism in which he argued that "the most plausible view of personal identity is a subjective combination of the physical body and the widest psychological criteria wherein true survival matters" (p.3).

#1 takes his point of departure with John Locke's discussion of identity and diversity. #1 argues that Locke embraces different identity conditions for non-living and living things. #1 utilizes Locke because #1 eventually argues that persons are a function of living things. Thus, whatever additional identity conditions are required for persons, they must meet the identity conditions for living things. #1 argues that under Locke's view, "identity for living things is matter composed in such a way that supports the continued life of the thing through time." The essential points are that these identity conditions permit change and require a physical body. #1 eventually exploits this to support his contention that the identity conditions for persons also require reference to physical bodies. #1's discussion of Locke is well done and he uses it strategically in his larger argument. #1's use of Locke also shows his ability to forge connections between courses (#1 was taking Dr. Hartsock's Modern Philosophy course simultaneously with taking PH400).

#1 then discusses Locke on personal identity. #1 argues that Locke can be read as holding that persons are living things and, thus, must meet the identity conditions of the latter. This would require reference to a physical body. In this section, there are a couple of weaknesses. One is #1's claim that under Locke's view, a fetus would not qualify as a living thing. This is counter-intuitive. #1 seems to believe Locke would have

to hold this because "the fetus cannot support life until birth actually takes place." For starters, fetuses (children?) can be removed prior to birth and survive. If this is done very early on, then technological assistance would be required. It is unclear why this sort of dependency on the mother or technology would require Locke to hold that the fetus is not a living thing. Would a man on life-support no longer be a living thing because he is dependent on technology? This seems counter-intuitive and I am not convinced Locke would hold such a view. A second weakness is #1's lack of clarity (or consistency) with the invocation of "consciousness," which is central to Locke's account of personhood. In some places, this seems little more than awareness. Animals, of course, are conscious in this sense; it is not clear that they are persons. In other places, however, consciousness becomes a much richer concept, including "thinking, reflecting, reasoning, etc." It is important to clarify how rich the concept is because, for example, a brain could support consciousness but little of the richer functionings mentioned above. This could impact on the issue of whether what was in front of us was a person. Finally, #1 could consider two cases that might pose problems for some of his claims. First, God. Surely, Locke would admit God as a person. However, is God a living thing? And would this undermine the claim that persons must meet the conditions for living things – i.e., have a body. Locke would likely view God as a non-corporeal person, a pure spirit. Second, #1 should have discussed the famous example Locke gives of the "body transfer" between the prince and the cobbler. This would at least mean that if a physical body is required, it is simply a body and not the numerically identical body that is required. For in this case, if we follow Locke in saying that the Prince is in the body of the Cobbler, then the person of the Prince seems totally distinct from the body of the Prince. No part of the Prince's body, not even his brain, is moved over to the Cobbler's body. This would seem to indicate that person is distinct from any particular body, even if not distinct from some body.

Next, #1 examines Parfit's view and two contemporary critics of Parfit: Sosa and Unger. The basic core ideas are well done and accurate. In several places, however, the views are underdeveloped and strike the reader as rushed. Despite these weaknesses, the core elements of Parfit's view are presented. (This was required of all papers.)

In the final section, #1 lays out and defends (provisionally and somewhat tentatively) his own view of personal identity. Reconnecting to the earlier discussion of Locke, #1's view requires the physical body as an element in personal identity. He considers an argument against his view that starts with the truism that the survivor of an organ donation is the recipient, not the donor. He imagines a series of such donations and replacements, ending with a totally numerically distinct body. #1 nicely responds by drawing from Parfit's own spectrum arguments – essentially admitting that as a reductionist, there are going to be cases where indeterminacy arises. At one end is a normal human being. At the other is a totally inorganic robot. #1 denies the robot would be a person (since it lacks a body and is not a living thing), but he refuses to bite on the "where do you draw the line" question. This is classic parity of reasoning. Since Parfit utilized the same strategy, he can not object to #1 doing so!

#1 argues that not only is a physical body required for personal identity but, for him, this physical body is required. #1 has been concerned since the start of the semester with the implications of Parfit's view for the body. Using a nice analogy to model making, #1 argues that at least some of us (most of us) value the process of crafting the body that our particular psychology is "running" on. At least some of us (#1, for example) would not be happy with a replica body because that body would not be this body – the body he has worked to fashion and shape. It would be like receiving the finished model and not the model that one actually worked to construct. Something important would be lost. Anticipating that not everyone would view this as significant, he wisely follows Nozick's incorporation of a subjective valuing component to personal identity. This permits #1 (and other like him) to insist that their identity would be lost if their body (this body) was lost or replaced, yet also permits others (Parfit, Dr. Money) to maintain that their identity would be preserved if their body (this body) was replaced with an exact replica – or a new and improved model! Thus, assuming that a body is required to be a living thing, and a brain is required to support consciousness, and that the body-brain that one has supports relation R, whether this is "you" depends on what you value. If you value this body, then you must know that the body-brain combination running R is, in fact, the continuer of this body. If you don't, then you do not need to know this information. Any body (though not no body) will do, so long as R is preserved in a non-branching fashion. A nice move by #1.

In general, #1's paper is well written. There are few grammatical flaws. It is very well organized, with each section building on the prior section and setting up points that will be capitalized on in subsequent sections. While a few spots are underdeveloped, the paper is a solid senior thesis.

Student: #2
Title: Senior Thesis
Grade: [redacted] (Green Light) (Dr. Money)

In a word, #2's thesis is outstanding. It is precisely what we are hoping to see. It is grammatically well written, structured and organized, presents a clear thesis and defends that thesis with arguments that draw from secondary literature as well as original ideas and thoughts. All criticisms I make are the result of the thesis making me think hard and so, far from being weaknesses, are additional strengths of the thesis.

As a paper generated for PH400, it includes all key elements of the assignment. In particular, it has a crystal clear presentation of Parfit's theory and a detailed development of two criticisms of his theory – one coming from Olson and one from Johnston. All of this is well executed and represents a model of analytical precision and solid digestion of the crucial texts utilized in the seminar.

#2's thesis ranges over a number of issues and I have more questions or comments than I include here. The balance of my remarks will simply try to provide #2 with substantive feedback on a few issues.

#2's thesis is this: "if Parfit's theory of personal identity is rationally accepted, it requires a moral theory granting non-human animals equal moral standing with humans" (p.10). I am not sure about this, but it may be that the real focus of her thesis is not on what follows from Parfit's theory of personal identity, but from his defense of reductionism. The core of the paper seems to be pushing more along these lines. However, I am not sure about whether it is reductionism alone that is doing the real work. Another point is that it seems that her thesis can more clearly be stated as the claim that non-human animals must be granted equal moral standing with *non-person* humans. This is made clear in the body of the paper, but making it clear in the initial statement of the thesis would be helpful to the reader, particularly given our tendency to assume that humans are persons…something that #2 makes clear is not always true, especially under Parfit's theory.

On page 6, numerical identity is not "when two objects are one and the same." The point of numerical identity is that there is only one object. Perhaps better to say that it involves the claim that one object given at two times is the same object. Or one object given under two modes of presentation is one object.

On page 11, #2 notes that she uses 'inside' loosely in reference to the idea of person being 'inside' the body. Perhaps better to say associated with? Minor suggestion.

On pages 14 and 24, there are claims that led me to want to push the distinction between (a) being *permitted* to treat an entity a given way and (b) my being *obligated* or *required* to treat an entity a given way. So, even if it is true that I am permitted to treat non-person humans the same way that I treat non-human animals, it does not follow that I am obligated or required to treat them similarly. I would violate no rights or moral obligations if I treated them the same, but I remain free not to do so. Why would I *not* treat them the same if they possess the same moral status? Perhaps because of my own preferences, or feelings, or emotions, or attachments, etc. Consider. I am permitted to rip down the Magic Johnson poster and the Bear Bryant poster. I own them both, etc. However, I leave the latter in place. Why? Because of my preferences and attitudes. So long as I am not violating any moral obligations or transgressing against anyone's moral rights, I am free to act in ways that I am permitted to do so. This does not mean that I must act in the same way across the board. Another example. An officer has legal grounds to stop several speeding motorists. He is permitted to stop any of them. He selects one and pulls it over. The others continue along. The pulled motorist cannot complain that the officer is acting outside of his authority; he has the legal grounds to stop her. The fact that he did not treat others the same way does not mean he is not permitted to treat her the way he is treating her. There are replies that might be made to these examples, but the main

point is to suggest that nothing seems to immediately follow in terms of actual practices from the fact that non-person humans and non-human animals have the same moral standing. I can say that the moral standing in question does not provide them with the right not to be used as a means (for example), and yet only use the latter as means and not the former. I can use them both as means, but I am not obligated to do so. To be fair, the claim #2 makes on page 14 is "then we must be willing to accept that we ***<u>can</u>*** treat young children…the same way we treat non-human animals." But some of her later moves play off of the fact that we will not (in her view) be even remotely tempted to actually treat them the same way: "I find it hard to believe that any even minimally ethical, reasonable person could go along with such extreme treatment of human beings" (p.14). The distinction I am making is the distinction between (a) going along with the claim that we could treat both that way, and (b) going along with the actual practice of treating both that way. Just because I have the right to treat x a certain way does not mean that I will (or even that I should). On page 24, this is in the context of the claim that we should not lower the moral standing of human beings, but raise the moral standing of animals. I tend to think that #2's focus here is not on theoretical questions of what rights these beings have, but on the practical issue of how we, in fact, treat them. Perhaps the only point is that more can be done to help bridge these dimensions of the argument.

Page 20, the primitive consciousness block quote. I would tend to think that whether any being has any of these three features, even in primitive forms, is an empirical question. I am very skeptical that a human infant has *any* of these. I think there is abundant evidence that infants do not "differentiate between self and others" and that self-awareness begins to emerge quite some time after birth. So, I would think that #2 could push harder on the idea that human infants possess this primitive consciousness in a much more reduced fashion than do many non-human animals. That point can be made without attributing the primitive consciousness (defined in this way) to infants. The animals are not brought up by having what infants have (or having more of what infants have). Rather, animals are already far beyond infants, which have none of this.

Page 20: "Certainly no one would allow that a third party could verify that psychological continuity is preserved after some teletransportation case." I just find this statement false. We can test for memory. We can test for intention preservation. If just before teletranportation, I know that you ate a bowl of Crispix and formed the firm intention to drink a cup of coffee when you arrive on Mars, then when you arrive on Mars, my assistant could ask you: "what did you eat just be transportation?" Your response would permit the assistant to verify memory. And we could then ask you "would you like something to drink?" or just observe your behavior in the presence of drink options that include coffee and verify the preservation of the intention.

Page 23 and the issue of higher level functions that rest on lower level functions. I wonder if #2 is assuming the following: if higher level functions have value, then the lower level functions that are compounds in the production of the higher level function

must have value too. I am not sure this is true at all. Perhaps value comes about out of non-value. For example, I doubt that atomic particles have value of any sort; but their arrangements can produce or realize things with immense value. At some point, the trickle down trickles out. · And even if one argued some value trickled all the way down, it would seem that the lower level bits would/could get only a very very little value. I, myself, would adopt this attitude in cases well beyond atomic parts. A very seriously defective infant where there is no possibility of higher level consciousness and you basically have a living organism in a vegetative state…I think that very very little value. #2 might consider G.E. Moore's doctrine of organic unities, where the value of the whole is not simply a result of the values of the parts added together. (rough approximation of the idea)

Page 33: claim that what Parfit asks us to do is "more far fetching than any of the Non-Reductionist assumptions we are meant to reject." Really? · Parfit does not just use hypotheticals; actual cases where severing hemispheres produce two independent streams of consciousness. These are actual cases. The unity of consciousness is not a deep fact, etc. And my understanding (very primitive) is that quantum physics and theories associated with it suggest that "teletransportation" is possible and would not violate the laws of nature. I would urge more care/caution here.

Page 34: "I would be more inclined to accept a Narrow Psychological criterion." I think access to this depends on how seriously you take Olson's argument. The brain is just an organ of an animal; it is not an animal. If I take your brain (and R with it) out of you and put it into the body of a brainless replica (or even your twin whose body is fine but brain is destroyed), then you cannot think that you survive if you also believe that you are essentially an animal. When the organ is transplanted, the animal is not. This is true of the brain no less than the heart, liver, etc.

Student: #3
Title: Who's to Blame
Grade: [redacted] (Green Light) (Dr. Money)

#3's paper begins with background reflections on the genealogy of his topic. While this is appropriate in some contexts, there is really no need for this in the paper. It amounts to four pages of "filler" material that is in no way directly relevant to the actual thesis that the paper sets out and, in some measure, explores.

#3 identifies his thesis on page five: "in the cases involving the criminally insane, it is morally acceptable to acquit certain defendants based on the notion that the identity of the person who committed the crime differs from the identity of the person being punished." As stated this is a fine thesis. Unfortunately, the paper fails to really zero in on this topic. There are no examinations and explorations of actual legal cases involving defendants pleading insanity – something one would think an obvious avenue for research and directly relevant to the thesis. In addition, there is no mention of Locke in

the entire paper – despite the fact that Locke directly reflects and writes about this very topic! Given that we read excerpts from Locke that included this material, this is a glaring omission.

The basis idea is that if relation R is significantly changed and continuity significantly disrupted, then according to views that adopt the psychological criterion of personal identity (e.g., Locke, Parfit) the person being punished might well not be the same person as the person who did the crime. Quite obviously, much turns on the claim that R has been, in fact, disrupted sufficiently to undermine personal identity. #3 should focus much more on speaking to that issue. Quite clearly, in normal cases like you or me, relation R is allowed to modify. Modification does not destroy either connectedness or continuity. Additionally, there is no doubt but that social factors can play a role in causing R to modify and change over time. Again, this is true in normal cases where persons persist. None of this amounts to a change in personal identity. #3 it too quick to move from changes in R to change in personal identity.

#3 attempts to explore the degree to which R would need to be disrupted/changed in an example involving a person who becomes drunk and then commits a crime. Unfortunately, it is not persuasive for the simple fact that in the vast number of instances, there is plenty of connectedness remaining between the pre-drunk stage, the drunk stage, and the post-drunk stage. To make his case persuasive, #3t needs to develop his examples in much greater depth and detail. The lack of development hurts his argument. Similar concerns arise when #3 speaks of R jumping from Person A to Person C and seemingly jumping over the intervening Person B. Details are needed, but they are not provided.

On page 10, #3 discusses a case where the impaired state is not brought on by the intentional action of A, but by A's unknown ingestion of a "roofie." He says that "Person B [the person affected by the roofie and the person who drives over someone killing them] should be punished, but not Person A/C." Yet a few lines later, #3 writes that the criminally insane defendant should not be punished because he "had no cause in creating the split in identity." This seems inconsistent. B in the roofie example had no cause in creating the split, if by "cause" we mean undertaking an intentional course of action known to have such risks associated with it: B did not intentionally take roofie, but ingested one unknowingly. It is hard to see why B should be punished at all!

Finally, #3 continues to show confusion as to exactly what Parfit is claiming about relation R. Repeatedly, #3 writes that according to Parfit, "it is impossible for Relation R to split" (p. 12; see also 14, 15, etc.). This is confused. Parfit provides numerous examples where the key point is that Relation R can branch. Parfit's claim is that when/if R branches, then the non-branching requirement for Personal Identity is not complied with and, hence, Personal Identity is destroyed. What matters, relation R, remains; indeed, twice over in branching cases! But personal identity is "technically" lost because identity is a one to one relation, and branching involves one to many. It is

simply not accurate to say that "Parfit is adamant about how there is no circumstance in which Relation R can be branched" (p.14). Parfit is very clear that relation R can branch; many of his examples depend on this fact about relation R. What he is adamant about is that in such cases, identity is lost. He is equally adamant that this does not (should not) matter very much – there are ways of dying that are about as good as ordinary survival.

If #3 were clearer on this point, then he would be in a position to offer up a nice interpretation of Martin's criticism of Parfit. Martin's view could then be understood as claiming that branching can occur and identity still be preserved, so long as certain restrictions are complied with (e.g., very short temporal overlap between the conscious fission products).

The final paragraph returns to the purported thesis of the paper (e.g., about the insane and issues of responsibility), but it seems contrived. Much of what is included in the paper simply does not address this topic. Much of what is in the thesis is relevant to the topic and could be made to intersect with it…but that would take more work to impose order than is present in this thesis.

At a more general level, the paper has only a few grammatical errors and places where clear flow is not present. It could use greater editing and polishing. More importantly, it could use a lot more development of ideas and examples (including the obvious case studies and research into actual cases mentioned above) that are more directly related to the stated thesis.

Student: #4
Title: A Theory of Fully Developed Romantic Love
Grade: [redacted](Green Light) (Dr. Hartsock)

#4 wrote on the philosophy of love, a topic of his own choosing. He thoroughly researched classical and contemporary theories of love, and this is evident throughout #4's paper. #4's thesis is excellent, and well-above the ordinary standards for undergraduate philosophical work. His thesis is both original and relevant, taking into account the history and tradition of philosophical works, in addition to contemporary work in the field. His paper is well-organized, clear, and grammatically and stylistically sound.

#4 clearly asserts his thesis in the first paragraph: A physical/sexual, psychological, and spiritual relationship between two self-aware individuals is a necessary condition for those individuals attainment of higher levels of personal flourishing. This thesis is novel and #4's own. Conversations with philosophy faculty about this helped #4 crystallize and clarify it, but the insight was his own.

#4 then goes on to give a clear and effective road-map and clarify key distinctions. In the first body section of the paper, #4 overviews the classical history of philosophical treatments of Love, identifying the concepts cultural and philosophical heritage to frame the theory he develops.

As #4 begins to develop this theory, he distinguishes between two kinds of love, internal and external. Thus he clarifies the relational nature of love, so that internal love is reflexive, love of one's self and external love is love of another. #4 goes on to explain that 'love' in general is manifested by a recognition of value, or human dignity, so we either recognize our own or other's dignity.

Internal and external love, #4 clarifies, can be immature or mature. Maturity, #4 argues, is a measure of "awareness of your authentic self and acceptance of one's aloneness." This, #4 argues, is a precondition for *mature external love*. This is the crux of #4's thesis. He argues:

"The acceptance of their aloneness frees the individual from the desire to be loved to complete them so they are no longer alone, instead they love for someone guard over their solitude. This is because they are no longer looking to have others complete them, like they do in immature relationships, e.g., immature love. Instead, they know who they are but can flourish through another. An example of an individual who has mature internal love is one who is self-confident in their self and practice of self-reflection and acceptance."

This is a remarkable and reflective example of #4's writing. #4 goes beyond the usual undergraduate practice of reconstructing and responding to another's account. Instead, he is making positive contributions to the understanding of a significant and fundamental philosophical concept, romantic love.

#4's analysis of romantic love culminates with the formal presentation of his central argument.

1. Full maturation of character takes an awareness of self, your authentic self, and the ability to develop further through others.
2. Internal, mature love provides an awareness of authentic self.
3. Fully developed love allows for the bridging of solitudes between
4. two individuals, the bridging allowing for the development of psychological mirrors.
5. The use of psychological mirrors is necessary to develop further through others.
6. Therefore, fully developed love is necessary for the full maturation of character.

#4's forgoing analysis motivates the first two premises, which #4 accepts as principles. The remainder of this paper is devoted to the defending the remaining premises and replies to possible objections. He makes good on these tasks, but with perhaps less

interest and attention than the analysis that developed the first two principles. Nevertheless, his work in these sections is excellent and well-above the standards for excellent undergraduate work. The evaluation of the last sections of #4's paper only suffers from having followed more outstanding sections.

In #4's thesis benefited from significant revisions in light of his own reflection and many detailed comments from Dr. Hartsock and other members of the department. His hard work is evident in the final product. He presents a clear and detailed thesis, demonstrates a critical understanding of the relevant issues, supports his thesis with excellent arguments and analysis, and anticipates possible objections and critically evaluates opposing views. He does this with an effective, well-structured, and grammatically and stylistically sound paper.

Student: #5
Title: Personal Identity: The Dilemma of Mankind
Grade: [redacted] (Red Light) (Dr. Money)

The quality of #5's paper is *severely* undermined by pervasive grammatical problems. The problems are numerous and they infect the entire paper, from start to close. Indeed, there are multiple grammatical problems on each of the twenty pages of work. This is *unacceptable* for university level writing. Perhaps more worrisome, however, is that the grammatical problems prevent the reader from following #5's presentation and appreciating his lines of reasoning, in particular, his two key examples (p.8 and 10). Based on personal conversations and his oral presentation during Day of Scholarship, I believe that both of his central examples raise interesting issues and could be the basis of some very good philosophical reflection on some of the central issues in personal identity. Unfortunately, the lack of clarity with which they are presented prevents the reader from appreciating this. I have warned #5 *repeatedly* that his writing tends to have these problems and that he would have to undertake a concerted effort to edit, proofread, and polish his writing. His thesis does not demonstrate that such efforts were undertaken.

While the grammatical problems make it nearly impossible to follow #5's substantive claims, a few problems at the substantive level can be identified. I will note two. First, on page 2, #5 moves without any hesitation from an epistemological claim ("since no idea of what makes that person R themselves exist") to an ontological claim ("then connection to the previous person R is impossible") to a normative claim ("thus, the present person should hold not responsibility"). To move *without hesitation* between three distinct kinds of claims like this is a major problem. Second, #5 continues his prior misunderstanding of Johnston's criticism of Parfit. #5 references Johnston's minimalism in which "metaphysical pictures of the justificatory undergirding of our practices do not represent the real conditions of justification of these practices." During #5's in-class presentation on Johnston and now in his thesis, he misunderstands this as a claim about the value of hypothetical examples. This is not what Johnston means.

Metaphysical claims/pictures are not the same as hypothetical claims/pictures. In the context of Parfit's theory, what Johnston aims to challenge is Parfit's argument that we are forced to seriously revise our ideas and practices in light of the falsity of non-reductionism. Non-reductionism is a metaphysical position under which my identity is a function of a metaphysical entity, a 'soul' or 'ego.' Parfit believes and argues that once we reject non-reductionism, we must make some serious revisions in other areas of belief and practice. What we normally say to justify our practices (e.g., personal identity really matters or one's identity is always determinate) can no longer be said given the falsity of non-reductionism. Johnston's minimalism rejects this. Johnston argues that we can agree with Parfit that non-reductionism is false (i.e., abandon that false metaphysical picture), yet also hold that we are not thereby forced to revise our other beliefs/practices (e.g., that identity matters, that identity is always determinate, etc.). #5 complains that Johnston is inconsistent because he embraces minimalism, but continues to employ thought experiments and/or hypothetical examples. Unfortunately, this entirely misses Johnston's point by confusing metaphysical pictures with hypothetical pictures. Quite obviously, these are different. If I say, "Imagine that my house is on fire and my kids are yelling out the second floor window," this is a hypothetical example. None of this is actually happening, but I would like you to think of it *as if* it were happening. While it is a hypothetical example, there is quite clearly nothing "metaphysical" about it. It is as plain an ordinary set of facts/events as there can be.

Student: #6
Title: Personal Identity
Grade: [redacted] (Green Light) (Dr. Money)

#6's paper is largely centered around the application of Parfit's theory to cases of Dissociative Identity Disorder (DID), as represented in the film "The Three Faces of Eve," itself based in part on a true case.

#6 begins by reviewing Parfit's theory. While the review is generally accurate, there are a couple of problems. The most pronounced problem is a confusion between the non-reductionist view that personal identity is a function of the "soul" or Cartesian Ego and egoism, i.e., the view that we do (psychological egoism) or should (normative egoism) pursue self-interest. This confusion is pronounced on page 3. Another weakness in this section is the failure to be very explicit in connecting up Parfit's claims about relation R to the analogies used. For example, there should be a very clear and explicit parallel treatment of the biological eye as causal basis of vision and the biological brain as the causal basis of relation R. Parfit is trying to convince us that we value the former (eye, brain) only because of their causal-functional properties (vision, relation R). If correct, then if we could get vision/Relation R by some other cause or lose them altogether, we will opt for the former. This helps him support the widest psychological criterion.

After the presentation of Parfit's theory, #6 spends considerable time looking at DID and how Parfit's theory would apply to and characterize such cases. #6 uses an extended analogy to multiple persons in a car (or bus), taking turns driving. The idea is that there are multiple persons in the car, just as there are multiple person in one body. The treatment of this is solid, but it could be strengthened in terms of the contribution it makes to the thesis #6 is trying to defend, i.e., "I will…argue in favor for [sic] Derek Parfit's theory of Relation R…" (p.2). #6 could not simply apply Parfit's theory to the case, but also argue that his theory when applied yields that same characterization of the situation as those that most viewers have (i.e., multiple persons in one body). Indeed, in the Appendix, #6 has some quotations from media as well as from Chris Sizemore that seem characterize the situation in a way that fits nicely with Parfit's theory. For example, Garry Clifford is quoted as noting that "'Jane' was in reality No. 12 in a parade of 22 separate personalities who lives as 'strangers' in Sizemore's body" (p.25). And Sizemore says, "they were entities, whole in their own rights, who coexisted with my birth personality before I was born. They were not me, but they remain intrinsically related to what it means to be me" (p.26).

#6's thesis contains (per the assignment) a couple of criticisms of Parfit's theory. The one drawn from Schechtman seems to be an extension of Parfit's theory (or can be read that way), essentially requiring not simply that psychological connectedness and continuity be present, but that the "newer self" (p.20) have adopted a certain sort of attitudinal stance (empathic access) to that connection/continuity. The criticism from Olson is not particularly developed.

In general, the paper is organized well, though distinct headings would have made the breaks flow better. There are periodic grammatical problems, the most prevalent of which is the improper use of the expression "in which" (see pages 8, 16, 17), or "which" more generally. These problems, however, do not undermine the reader's ability to follow the content of the paper.

Student: #7
Title: Personal Identity
Grade: [redacted] (Green Light) (Dr. Money)

#7's paper is extremely well written. There are very few grammatical flaws. It is very well organized, with each section building on the prior section and setting up points that will be capitalized on in subsequent sections. While a few spots are underdeveloped, the paper is a solid senior thesis.

#7's thesis is that Parfit's emphasis on Relation R must be supplemented by a variant of the physical criterion focusing on the importance of homeostasis.

After opening with a catalogue of issues typically deemed important in discussions of personal identity, #7 turns to an examination of Parfit's work. #7's overview of Parfit's

position is very good. Of particular strength is his extended treatment of non-reductionism and Parfit's reasons for rejecting it. #7 aptly captures one source of Parfit's hostility to non-reductionism when he says, "the metaphysical luck involved for a non-reductionist to maintain their theory requires too many assumptions with too little evidence" (p.7). #7 also does a solid job emphasizing the way in which any reductionist position encounters indeterminacy in a range of cases. The section could be strengthened by a somewhat greater specification of exactly what relation R is (#7 more or less assumes the reader knows this) and some emphasis on the fact that Parfit still insists on non-branching for personal identity, though he also argues that personal identity is not what matters. Nevertheless, the section is solid. The writing is crisp and clear and it shows digestion of the course material.

The following section applies Parfit's theory by using an extended analogy to the driving of a car. The section does a nice job of raising issues related to what changes might lead third parties to no longer identify the car as "the same car." These changes include not only the obvious changes in physical constitution, but changes in the driving behavior of the car. Again, the primary point is to re-emphasize the way in which indeterminacy infests not simply re-identification claims regarding persons, but more ordinary objects like cars. By emphasizing the more general nature of indeterminacy issues, #7 implicitly strengthens the reductionist position by disarming concerns that folks might have about indeterminacy. One issue that could be discussed more in this section (and elsewhere) is the difference between the epistemic issue of how we tell or know it is the same contrasted with the ontological issue of what it takes for it to be the same.

The next section examines criticisms of Parfit's theory. The use of Williams is, again, done in a way that seems to presuppose familiarity with William's position. As such, it is underdeveloped. The introduction of homeostasis in this section is also somewhat underdeveloped. #7 could and should do more to elaborate on the homeostasis idea and, in particular, how it serves to raise concerns with Parfit's theory. For example, why isn't homeostasis just a property of the underlying causal mechanisms that support R. It may be important for those mechanisms in order to secure their proper functioning and, ultimately, R. But this simply does to causal reliability, something Parfit is already happy to admit with respect to the brain, etc. It is unclear how the invocation of homeostatis challenges Parfit's account of what constitutes identity, as opposed to simply pointing out an important element of the underlying causal structures that support what constitutes personal identity. The criticism section also includes a nicely done presentation of Unger's criticism based on "loss of focus" and "loss of singular goods." #7 does an excellent job giving a concise yet accurate presentation of the concerns raised by Unger.

#7's final section is short and quite obviously tentative in nature. His basic idea is that Parfit's theory would need supplementation with considerations relative to homeostasis. #7 writes as if changes to homeostasis might amount to "possible changes to Relation

R" (p.19). I believe the more natural expression would be to say that changes to homeostasis might cause changes to Relation R. Again, this seems to be something Parfit could admit. Cleary, for example, changes to the brain cause changes to R. The causal question and issue of causal relations is distinct, one might argue, from the question of what constituted identity of persons over time.

All in all, a solid thesis.

Student: #8
Title: Senior Thesis: Personal Identity
Grade: [redacted] (Yellow Light) (Dr. Money)

#8's paper has the basic elements that would permit development into a good thesis. Unfortunately, several of these elements are left underdeveloped in a way that makes their connection to the overall argument structure unclear. This is particularly true in the section that provides an overview of Parfit's theory and the discussion of the criticism from Korsgaard. The discussion of Olsen is unclear in places, but #8 does demonstrate understanding of the core claim in his argument and does a decent job of connecting it to her thesis. Indeed, I think her thesis could very well be that Olsen's view is correct. However, she hedges her bets and the reader is left unclear about how she intends her claim regarding the priority of the body.

#8's thesis seems to be that personal identity is constituted by the body, where this is understood not to be a reference to the brain, but to the physical body comprising the biological organism. The problem is that I have to say "seems to be" because it is sometimes not clear whether she is taking reference to the body to be necessary but not sufficient, or whether she is taking it to be necessary and sufficient.

I remain troubled by the claim that "the social" has some role to play in whether I am the same person today as I was last week. How others view me may well causally impact the way I view myself. So, for example, if others view me as fat and ugly, I may have little self-esteem regarding my body. But this seems to me to confuse a psychological sense of identity with the philosophical issue of personal identity. Moreover, #8's invocation of the film Freaky Friday seems to count against her thesis. Most people who watch that film rather easily treat the film as a case of "body swapping," very much in the spirit of Locke's example where the prince and the cobbler exchange bodies. Indeed, the film can motivate opposition not only to the claim that the body is necessary for identity, but also to the claim that how others view you is necessary for your identity. After all, suppose the husband wants to have sex with "his wife." What would be so disturbing here would be that while he believes that his wife is in the womanly body (where she has always been before), it is actually his daughter in that body now. And the disgust we would feel to a scene of this sort seems to be evidence that we are treating the person in the womanly body *not* as the wife, but as

the daughter. #8 might have good responses to this, but they are not given in the paper.

There are some claims and statements that need to be explained more fully than they are in the paper. I've marked these in my comments. An example would be the following: "If you don't have animals, then you don't have the things that are around as a result of them or the things that make them up." This is in reference to trying to explain Olsen's argument. However, the statement is very odd; indeed, quite obviously false. For example, animals are made up of carbon atoms (among other things). Quite obviously, at one point in time, there were carbon atoms but no animals. So, you can certainly not have animals yet still have "the things that make them up."

A final comment. At the end of the paper, #8 seems to allege that Parfit's argument is not compelling because it employs hypotheticals and thought experiments that are "not possible." Because Parfit's argument does rely on thought experiments, this is a serious charge. As such, it needs to be developed in greater depth. First, even if impossible, why can't they be helpful to our thinking. Plato's Ring of Gyges is not possible, but students typically do not complain to his use of it in his thought experiment. Second, Parfit addresses this issue head on in his text. Given this is the case, #8 quite obviously should have noted what he says about this matter and then responded clearly to him. Third, "impossible" in what sense? Technologically impossible? Violating known laws of science? Violating logic? More clarity is needed on exactly what is being alleged at this point.

At a more general level, the paper has quite a few grammatical errors and places where clear flow is not present. It could use greater editing and polishing. It strikes the reader more as a draft than a well polished final paper. The paper complies with the course requirements and includes the required elements. Unfortunately, it is not #8's best work.

B. Oral Defense of Thesis

All philosophy majors present an oral defense of their 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 2011-2012 academic year is provided below. The score is the average score between the three faculty evaluators.

Student: #1
Total Score on Rubric: 44.5
Color-Code: Green

Student: #2
Total Score on Rubric: 53.6
Color-Code: Green

Student: #3
Total Score on Rubric: 45.6
Color-Code: Green

Student: #4
Total Score on Rubric: 54.6
Color-Code: Green

Student: #5
Total Score on Rubric: 40.6
Color-Code: Green

Student: #6
Total Score on Rubric: 46.6
Color-Code: Green

Student: #7
Total Score on Rubric: 39.0
Color-Code: Green

Student: #8
Total Score on Rubric: 37.5
Color-Code: Green

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.

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 48 philosophy majors over the

past 10 years. **Amazingly, these majors have been accepted into and/or completed a total of 35 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 Ph.D. programs in philosophy.
- Our majors have been accepted into and/or completed M.A. programs in philosophy.
- Our majors have been accepted into and/or completed Ph.D. programs in fields other than philosophy (e.g., political science)
- Our majors have been accepted into and/or completed M.A. programs in fields other than philosophy (e.g., experimental psychology, chemistry, health administration, French, etc.)
- Our majors have been accepted into and/or completed 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 seven years (coinciding with Dr. Money's service as faculty advisor). Consider:

- At the 2011-12 competition, five Millikin teams made the quarterfinal round. A total of five philosophy majors were on those teams. In addition, the team of Ray and Spurling, both philosophy majors, made the semi-final round. Also, the team of Grimes and Hollis, the former being a philosophy major, made the semi-final round.
- At the 2010-11 competition, Millikin teams took **first** place. In addition, a Millikin student was honored as runner up for most outstanding attorney.
- At the 2009-10 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, Caitlin Harriman was honored as "most outstanding attorney."
- 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 competition. Three of the four students on those teams were philosophy majors: Gregg Lagger, Nichole Johnson, and Colleen Cunningham.

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 <u>external</u> 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 eight HURFs held to date, philosophy majors have been awarded top prize in five, second prize in two, and third prize in one.** Philosophy majors awarded recognition at HURF include:

- Adam Moderow, "Shooting the Moon" (2010, first place).

- McKenzie VanBeest, "The Identity of One: Personal Identity in Science Fiction" (2010, second place).
- Klay Baynar, "Nietzsche on the Values of Religion" (2009, first place).
- Tom Fowle, "Deterministic Utilitarianism" (2009, third place)
- Dustin Clark, "Nietzsche's Metaphysical Error" (2008, first place).
- Katherine Guin, "Establishing Values: Nietzsche and the Relationship of Truth to Values" (2003, first place).
- Robert Lininger, "Passion and Paradox: An Investigation of Kierkegaard's View of Faith" (2002, second place).
- Christopher Wood, "The Ontological Argument: 1000 Years of Debate" (2001, first 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 fifth year of formal assessment.

100% of our students were assessed in the "green" for their oral defense of their senior thesis. The data is in line with the consistently high performance by our majors and is evidence that the philosophy program is strong. The data we have collected over the past five 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!

75% of our seniors were assessed in the "green" for their written thesis. The data reveals consistently high performance by our majors and is evidence that the philosophy program is strong. We are confident that student learning in the philosophy major is strong. One student (12.5%) assessed in the "yellow" and one student (12.5%) assessed in the "red." In both cases, the results were in large measure a function of a lack of disciplined commitment by the students involved. This has no bearing on the strength of the philosophy program, but is a reflection on the work habits and attitudes of these individual students.

Given these results and the fact that this is our sixth 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.

Much is made of the need to "close the loop" in assessment. While it is important to work to ensure that the information gained by assessment makes a meaningful impact on Department pedagogy and teaching practices, it is a mistake to assume that effective use of assessment information can only be demonstrated if review of assessment results in **changes** to curriculum and/or pedagogy. We reject this assumption. If analysis and review of assessment data reveal positive student learning achievements, then there is no reason to change what is clearly working. We use assessment; it is simply that the results have confirmed our strategy and approach in terms of curriculum and/or pedagogy. Absent **evidence** presented by others to us that we are in need of changing our curriculum and pedagogy, we will not undertake action to change what, in our considered judgment—judgment informed by being trained in philosophy, interacting daily with our students, grading numerous assignments, etc.—is clearly working. The members of the Department are ready to listen to those who have **evidence** that our pedagogy/curriculum could be improved. In the absence of that evidence, however, no changes will be made. If no reasons whatsoever are given for why we should change pedagogy and/or curriculum, and if all evidence points to the success of our students in terms of learning and achievement (Does anyone have evidence to the contrary? If so, then present it to us.), then the loop is closed by continuing with our tried and true approach. Our assessment efforts to date have revealed no issues or concerns that would justify instituting changes in our pedagogy/curriculum.

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 59 philosophy majors over the past 13 years. Of our graduates, almost one-fourth have been accepted to law school. Approximately a one-third have been accepted to a masters or Ph.D. program of some sort.

The following list provides information regarding the post-graduate activities of each of our graduating majors over the last 13 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 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.

2012: **Seven** Graduating Seniors

Haley Carr (2012): planning on attending graduate school in philosophy; delaying for one year

Garrett Derman (2012): unknown

Dylan Howser (2012): M.Ed. College Student Affairs, Penn St. University

Jean Hurst (2012): Southern Illinois University Law School.

Alex Kralman (2012): unknown

Kyle McAllister-Grum (2012): unknown

Taryn Veasy (2012): Horace Mann Insurance Company, Annuity Specialist

2011: **Three** Graduating Seniors

Klay Baynar (2011): University of Minnesota College of Law

Jessy Sivak (2011): Boston University, Masters in Occupational Therapy (accepted and deferred enrollment until 2012)

Kenzie VanBeest (2011): University of Kansas, MA program in literature

2010: **Eight** Graduating Seniors

Justin Allen (2010): Washington University Law School, St. Louis

- Update: Justin did outstanding work during his first year. His work was of sufficient quality that he made **Law Review**. In addition, Justin was a member of the winning Environmental Law Moot Court team. He will be representing Washington University Law School at the national competition in NYC.

Dustin Clark (2010): working for a year, retaking LSAT, law school following year (was accepted at Cardoza Law School, NYC, but decided not to attend).

- Update: Dustin was accepted to law school at both Wisconsin and Illinois. He received significant scholarship offers at both. He has decided to attend the University of Wisconsin. He starts fall 2011.
- Dustin, as a first year law student and as part of a practicum for a non-profit group, wrote a legal brief for an appeal in a case involving a denial of unemployment benefits. The appellate court ruled in favor of his client. Here is his description of his work:

> The case was based on a denial of unemployment insurance benefits because of an initial determination of misconduct by the department of workforce development. My client (without representation) then appealed this decision to an administrative tribunal run by an administrative judge. That judge determined that my client had indeed committed misconduct as defined by a Wisconsin statute and a ruling case explaining the statute. The client came to the clinic, and upon speaking with the client about what had occurred up to the point of our meeting, I identified a number of potentially arguable points. Since the client had a reasonable chance at success in an appeal, I agreed to be retained by the client as counsel (we have limited resources, so we try to filter out the cases that are lost causes). The appeal court, known as the Labor and Industry Review Commission (LIRC), is a three administrative law judge panel that reviews written appeals. They can request oral argument, but they did not. My brief argued three points. First, I argued that, contrary to the rules of evidence, the lower court had relied solely on hearsay to establish a material fact. Second, my client was never given an opportunity to view security footage either before the initial appeal or during the initial appeal, but a witness for the employer testified about the contents of said video. I argued that because my client was unable to confront the evidence against him/her, this was a violation of his/her due process rights. Finally, I argued that no reasonable person, based on the weight of the evidence, could conclude that my client had committed misconduct. The employer did not file a timely response brief, so I'm sure that helped

my client's position. I am not sure which of my arguments LIRC agreed with, but I will let you know if they publish the opinion on their website.

Khris Dunard (2010): John Marshall Law School, Chicago

- Update: Khris did outstanding work during his first year. He is ranked 7th in class of 345 and made **Law Review.**

Gordon Gilmore (2010): Gordon was accepted to Sonoma State University's program in depth psychology. He starts fall 2011.

Kenny Miller (2010): University of Colorado Law School, Boulder

Adam Moderow (2010): obtained teaching certificate and taught in public school system

Dan Nolan (2010): plans unknown

Anna Stenzel-Kuehn (2010): Attending Northern Illinois University Law School (staring fall 2012)

2009: **Three** Graduating Seniors

Jessica Colebar (2009): plans unknown

Tommy Fowle (2009): plans unknown

Kenny Oonyu (2009): plans unknown

2008: **Four** Graduating Seniors

Ali Aliabadi (2008): Ross Medical School

[redacted] (2008): applying to graduate school in chemistry (2010)

Gregg Lagger (2008): John Marshall Law School, Chicago.

Giuliana Selvaggio (2008): plans unknown

2007: **Seven** Graduating Seniors

Bjorn Bollig (2007): Director of Christian Education, Gloria Dei Lutheran Church, Downers Grove, Illinois.

Colleen Cunningham (2007): State-wide coordinator for Missourians to Abolish the Death Penalty; accepted and attending University of Chicago's Liberal Studies MA program (2010)

Mark Fredricksen (2007): working in the IT department at the University of Illinois.

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): Graduate University of Iowa, College of Law. Attorney with Reno and Zahm LLP, in Rockford, Illinois.

Cole Pezley (2007): Performing music, Chicago.

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

Stephanie Janecke (2006): Southern Illinois University Law School.

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

Jordan Snow (2006): Completed his MA in Urban Planning and Policy from the University of Illinois-Chicago. His main course of study was Urban Transportation with a focus on transportation policy and finance. After graduation he was offered and accepted a full time position as a visiting researcher at the Urban Transportation Center at UIC. He has been working on a wide variety of projects from monitoring federal policy to consulting with local transportation organizations about revenue generation systems/policies and how they can benefit from specific federal and state programs.

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?"

Nick Curry (2005): St. John's College, M.A. in Asian Philosophy.

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

Nick McLenighan (2005): Northern Illinois University, MA program in Philosophy.

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.

Kelli Willis (2004, Dec.): Working on organic farms in California.

2003: **Three** Graduating Seniors

Jon Bassford (2003): Ohio Northern Law School.

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; accepted into another MA program in religious studies at WMU (2009)

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

2001: **One** Graduating Senior

Chris Wood (2001): University of Kansas, Ph.D. program in philosophy.

2000: **Two** Graduating Seniors

Aaron Margolis (2000): Washington University School of Law. University of Chicago, M.A. Program in Social Science. Hebrew University of Jerusalem, M.A. in Israeli Politics and Society.

Michiko Tani (2000): Lewis and Clark Law School (Portland, Oregon).

APPENDIX TWO: REQUIREMENTS FOR THE PHILOSOPHY MAJOR

Philosophy

Robert E. Money, Jr. (Chair)

Philosophy Department Faculty
Full-Time: Michael D. Hartsock, Robert E. Money Jr., Eric S. Roark

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; and (d) those who are professionally interested in philosophy and who plan to do graduate work in the field and then to teach or write. Students with a professional interest in philosophy are urged by the Department to give early attention to courses in the history of philosophy sequence, logic, and ethics.

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 400, Seminar in Philosophy

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

In addition, the philosophy major must take at least twelve 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 PH301, Golden Age of Greece
PH 305, Philosophy of Law or PH310, Political Philosophy or PH311, Metaethics
PH 400, Seminar in Philosophy
Plus one elective 300-level philosophy course

Pre-Law Track within the Philosophy Major

Philosophy also offers a "pre-law track" within the philosophy major. 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 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 211, Ethical Theory and Moral Issues
PH 213, Critical Thinking: Logic
PH 221, Appellate Legal Reasoning
PH 305, Philosophy of Law
PH 310, Political Philosophy
PH 400, Seminar in Philosophy
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 (16^{th}-18^{th} centuries)
PH 304, Contemporary Philosophy (19^{th}-21^{st} 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., PH215, PH217, or PH219)
PH 221, Appellate Legal Reasoning
PH 301, Golden Age of Greece
PH 305, Philosophy of Law
PH 310, Political Philosophy
PH 311, Metaethics
PH 400, 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 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:

Presentation Goal 1	Very few grammatical errors or misspellings, if any.	
	Sentence structure is appropriately complex.	
	Vocabulary is used correctly. Work reflects a college level use of words and understanding of their meanings.	
Clarity Goal 1	Each sentence clearly expresses an idea.	
	Each paragraph forms a coherent whole. Paragraphs do not include several unrelated sentences without any overarching structure.	
	The logic used in the analysis is explicitly stated or clearly implied.	
	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.	
Quality Goals 1, 2, 3	Analysis reflects a high level of integration of information from multiple questions and multiple sources.	
	Analysis reflects consideration of multiple causes and	

	alternative explanations, while maintaining a clear focus on the explanations utilized.	
	In addition to there being no flaws in the reasoning 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:

Presentation Goal 1	Few grammatical errors or misspellings.	
	Overall, sentence structure is appropriately complex, incorrect sentence structures occur rarely.	
	Vocabulary is used correctly. Overall, work reflects a college level use of words and understanding of their meanings. Occasional incorrect use of vocabulary.	
Clarity Goal 1	Overall, each sentence expresses an idea.	
	Overall, each paragraph forms a coherent whole. Level of coherence is varied. Paragraphs may include some unrelated sentences.	
	The logic used in the analysis is generally clear.	
	The overall structure and organization of the introduction and the analysis is appropriate, logical and coherent.	
Quality Goals 1, 2, 3	Analysis reflects integration of information from multiple questions and multiple sources.	
	Analysis occasionally reflects consideration of multiple causes and alternative explanations. A clear focus on the explanations utilized is generally present.	
	There are no glaring flaws in the reasoning presented. Effective arguments are being made.	

C: In light of Department learning goals, a senior thesis earning a "C" grade should meet the following criteria of assessment:

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

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

Presentation Goal 1	Grammatical errors or misspellings occur, penalties for affect final grade.	
	Sentence structure is rarely complex. Simplistic sentence structures are used. Common errors in sentences such as run-on sentences occur. Non-sentences occur occasionally.	
	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.	
Clarity Goal 1	Sentences occasionally clearly express ideas. Rambling sentences or unclear structure occurs.	
	Low levels of coherence in paragraphs. Paragraphs frequently include some unrelated sentences. Paragraphs may be too	

	long or too short.	
	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.	
Quality Goals 1, 2, 3	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.

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

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

RED, 1 to 2 Points	YELLOW, 3 Points	GREEN, 4 to 5 Points
Approach to the issue is in egocentric or socio-centric terms. Does not relate issue to other contexts (cultural, political, historical, etc.). Does not recognize context or surface assumptions and	Presents and explores relevant contexts and assumptions regarding the issue, although in a limited way. Provides some recognition of context and consideration of	Analyzes the issue with a clear sense of scope and context, including an assessment of audience. Considers other integral contexts. Identifies influence of context and questions assumptions,

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.

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

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

RED, 1 to 2 Points	YELLOW, 3 Points	GREEN, 4 to 5 Points
No evidence of search, selection, or source evaluation skills. Sources are simplistic, inappropriate, or not	Demonstrates adequate skill in searching, selecting, and evaluating sources to meet the information need.	Evidence of search, selection, and source evaluation skills; notable identification of uniquely salient resources.

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.

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

Comments:

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

RED, 1 to 2 Points	YELLOW, 3 Points	GREEN, 4 to 5 Points
Fails to identify conclusions, implications, and consequences, or conclusion is a simplistic summary. Conclusions presented as absolute, and may attribute conclusion to external authority.	Conclusions consider or provide evidence of consequences extending beyond a single discipline or issue. Presents implications that may impact other people or issues. Presents conclusions as relative and only loosely	Identifies, discusses, and extends conclusions, implications, and consequences. Considers context, assumptions, data, and evidence. Qualifies own assertions with balance. Conclusions are qualified as the best available

	related to consequences. Implications may include vague reference to conclusions.	evidence within the context. Consequences are considered and integrated. Implications are clearly developed and consider ambiguities.

7. Communicates effectively.

RED, 1 to 2 Points	YELLOW, 3 Points	GREEN, 4 to 5 Points
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.	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.	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.

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

RED Total score of 7-20	YELLOW Total score of 21-27	GREEN Total Score of 28-35

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:

GREEN Total score of 55-34	YELLOW Total score of 33-23	RED Total Score of 22-11