

**Assessment of Student Learning in the Philosophy Major
Academic Year 2012-2013
Formal Report (Due July 1, 2013)**

(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 eight 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. 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**. Once again in 2013, Millikin won the competition. In fact, the entire semi-final rounds consisted of Millikin teams. Our teams took first, second, third, and fourth place. This is the *sixth* consecutive year a Millikin team has won the competition. In addition, two students won individual awards. Emma Prendergast was honored with the Most Outstanding Attorney award, while Kolton Ray was honored with the runner up Most Outstanding Attorney award. 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 scarce resources be distributed within society?
- Are there universal moral principles? Or are all moral principles relative either to cultures or individuals?
- What does it mean to judge a work of art beautiful? Is beauty really in the eye of the beholder?

The description of the philosophy program that appears in the Millikin Bulletin is crafted to emphasize the relevance of philosophical study to students with diverse interests and goals. According to the 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 2013 semester, the Philosophy Department had 25 majors and 8 minors. This is the fourth 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. When I first started at Millikin (fall 1999), there were two majors and two or three minors. Indeed, the degree to which we have grown over the past decade is clearly visible to see. For example, the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences recently sent department chairs a document reviewing numbers of majors over the past decade and he explicitly noted the growth of philosophy. He wrote:

As you prepare annual assessment reports (due July 1) I want to provide you with some data about majors in your programs. Attached is a chart from Institutional Research based on annual fall census counts. This chart provides trend information from 2001 to Fall 2012. Here's a couple of trends & talking points I've noticed...(3) Seven majors are at the record high numbers: biology allied health, history, human services, **philosophy**, physics, sociology, and organizational leadership. (4) Four majors have had significant increases: human services, **philosophy**, sociology, organizational leadership...

This recognized and celebrated growth in philosophy is all the more impressive given that few students come to Millikin (or any college) as announced philosophy majors. Indeed, most students have little understanding of exactly what the philosophy major is or what philosophical activity is.

The Department has completed its process of securing a formal philosophy club on campus. Dr. Hartsock has taken leadership over this initiative. We hope that a formal club will provide our majors and other students with an interest in philosophy to bond and reinforce our philosophy community. We hope this will be another avenue by which to reinforce our growth.

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. Realizing that few students come to Millikin with an expressed interest in philosophy, we must actively recruit our majors and minors. One way we do this is by teaching across the curriculum. I doubt faculty in any other department teach the range of courses that we teach. Fortunately for all involved, we not only teach a wide range of courses, but we deliver high quality teaching. Every member of our department is an award winning teacher and our excellence in the classroom is universally acknowledged.

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 over the course of two rounds of changes. Most significantly, during the first round of changes (2010), 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 and consistently have at least twice the minors we had before we enacted these changes. The ethics minor also coheres with and reinforces the recently revised University Studies program, which emphasizes three skill sets over the course of the sequential elements: reflection, writing, and *ethical reasoning*. Every course that we offer in the area of value theory generally, including the applied ethics courses, engage students in all three of these skills. The learning goals of the ethics minor program are as follows:

1. Students will use ethical reasoning to analyze and reflect on issues that impact their personal lives as well as their local, national, and/or global communities; and
2. Students will be able to express in written form their understanding of major ethical concepts and theories and demonstrate competency in the application of those concepts and theories to specific topics (business, medicine, environment, politics, etc.).

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

The second round of changes (2012) was enacted to align better our curriculum with the best practices of quality undergraduate programs across the country in terms of curricular structure. Three main changes were made. First, we incorporated PH211 Ethical Theory and Moral Issues into the core requirements for the major. This ensures that every philosophy major have a basic introduction to ethics. While almost all majors were receiving this exposure as a matter of practice, this change requires that the exposure be guaranteed to all majors. Second, we reformed our history of philosophy sequence, providing the courses with appropriate names and reducing the history requirement by one course. The reduction was made in order to set the stage for our third major change: the creation of a “metaphysics/epistemology” requirement. Each major must now take one course in metaphysics or epistemology, and we have created two new courses to deliver this requirement: PH312, Minds and Persons and PH313, Ways of Knowing.

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 2 of 3. PH300, Ancient World Wisdom and PH302, Medieval Philosophy, were eliminated. We now have three courses in our history of philosophy sequence: PH300, Ancient Philosophy (Hartsock), PH301, Modern Philosophy (Money, Hartsock), and PH302, Contemporary Philosophy (Money, Hartsock). 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.

(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. Indeed, it is only when this is the case that it becomes realistic to expect faculty members to take ownership of assessment practices; after all, we are professors of philosophy, not professors of assessment! 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

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 PH211 (Ethics) and PH213 (Logic), then complete the history sequence in order (PH300, 301, 302), 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.

¹ During the 2005-2006 academic year, one senior student declared a major in philosophy *during his senior year!* He had to take courses in the summer in order to complete the major. It is wildly implausible to suppose that he could complete the major by following some structural plan of study. Yet, the fact remains that he was an outstanding student, who produced high quality exemplary work. An electronic copy of his senior thesis is posted on our website (Jordan Snow).

The only exception to our curricular flexibility is the philosophy capstone course: PH400 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 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. Indeed, all three faculty members have been recognized and honored with teaching awards. Dr. Money has received both the Alpha Lambda Delta Teacher of the Year award and the Teaching Excellence Award. Dr. Roark has received the Teaching Excellence Award. Dr. Hartsock has received the Alpha Lambda Delta Teacher of the Year award. The department prides itself on exceptional undergraduate teaching. 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. Faculty also make 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 211, Ethical Theory and Moral Issues.** This course exposes students to major ethical theoretical frameworks (utilitarianism, deontological positions, virtue theory, etc.) and at least one applied issue (e.g., capital punishment, suicide, etc.).
- **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 two out of the following three courses (9 credits):

- **Philosophy 300, Ancient Philosophy**
- **Philosophy 301, Modern Philosophy**
- **Philosophy 302, 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.

Finally, the Department has a requirement that each student take one course in either metaphysics

- **Philosophy 312, Minds and Persons**
- **Philosophy 313, Ways of Knowing**

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 three electives (9 credits).

An overview of the requirements for completion of the Philosophy Major is offered as an appendix to this document (see Appendix Two).

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

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

We believe that given the peculiar nature of our discipline and the nature of “recruitment” to our major, the natural point for formal “data” collection and analysis is PH400, 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 20-30 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 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. This oral presentation and thesis defense is now part of our community tradition of “celebration of scholarship.” 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 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 (and on all other written papers for that matter!), 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. One of the great benefits of being a small department is the fact that this ensures that we will get to interact with many of our students repeatedly over time. This puts us in an excellent position to make judgments about the growth of their learning while at Millikin and positions us to engage in excellent advising and mentoring. 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 many graduates since 2000 is included in Appendix One.

(6) Analysis of Assessment Results

Three students completed PH400 during the 2012-2013 academic year. In this public version of our report, these students will be referred to as:

- Student #1
- Student #2
- Student #3

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 2012-2013 academic year is provided below.

This year, we continued the new process for the production of a philosophy thesis that we initiated the previous year. Among the curricular revisions we enacted, we enacted a revision that essentially resulted 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 and to ensure that this essential capstone teaching was appropriately counted as part of faculty workload.

This year, the topic of the course taught by Dr. Hartsock was the experiential foundations of beliefs, specifically the nature of and the relationship between the contents of experience and belief. The course covered the views of three prominent contemporary philosophers, Bill Brewer, John McDowell, and Michael Tye. We surveyed seminal works by those authors and read extensive criticisms by other professional philosophers, as well as our central authors' replies to that criticism. The students wrote argument reconstructions for each reading, critical summaries for each central author, and then used those reconstructions and summaries to develop their thesis research paper. Each graduating senior orally defended their work at "Celebration of Scholarship," and juniors will do so next year after their project enjoys further revision and development. One student will dovetail this project into her JMS project, and another is developing it as a writing sample for graduate study in philosophy.

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 2012-2013 academic year is provided below.

Student #1**Title: "Permaculture and a New Global Ethic"****Grade: A (green) (Dr. Money)**

Drawing from work in contemporary metaethical theory, #1 argues that we should embrace a global ethic under which the non-sentient natural environment is viewed as having intrinsic value. This should be done by utilizing assorted "fictions" in ways that will increase the likelihood that our affective mechanisms are expanded so that the non-sentient environment is able to come within the scope of our moral systems. #1 provides the following overview of his objectives:

In this essay, I will first explore the idea that categorical moral imperatives are a beneficial fiction; that there is an evolutionary precedence to moral thinking...an evolutionary advantage to having a capacity for thinking in terms of moral imperatives. Specifically focusing on the "sentimental rules" theory espoused by Nichols, I will seek to support the idea that we have evolved a natural "affective mechanism" which allows us to engage in role-reversal and empathize with others which has been beneficial to our species. I will then seek to demonstrate that the ways in which our technological advancement and emergence into a global civilization have at this juncture far exceeded our natural affective mechanism's capacity to adjust to our widening impact and influence on the planet. It is my assertion that the speed of our social and technological development has far outpaced the evolutionary scope of our affective mechanisms. I will argue that this scenario creates the need for a new order of normative conventions that can aid in extending the natural boundaries of our "affective mechanism" to encompass other types of "ecosystem participants" and perhaps the planet as a whole. In doing so I will attempt to demonstrate the egoistic benefits of extending moral consideration to other "ecosystem participants" at this time, and show how the harm principle would apply to them. Lastly, I will detail certain aspects of Permaculture ethics from the literature and why I feel they would be an appropriate guide for extending our normative conventions in such a way, relating them whenever possible to current normative conventions we have toward fellow human beings.

#1 takes as well established the fact that the health of the natural environment is under great pressure due to human activity (e.g., industry, technology, population growth, pollution, etc.). We remain, however, biological creatures and, hence, dependent on our natural environment for our very survival. #1 argues that while we have the cognitive abilities to understand our situation and the dangers we confront, we seem to lack the ability to become sufficiently concerned so as to underwrite moral action to address the problems we confront. #1 notes that one strategy that some "environmentalists" adopt is to link the health of the natural environment as directly as possible to the well-being

of human (or sentient) creatures. This can take an egoistic or non-egoistic form. Regardless of which form it takes, however, the approach views the environment as having instrumental value only. #1 does not argue for the abandonment of this approach, but for its supplementation. In short, #1 argues that we should also pursue another strategy in which we attribute direct value to the non-sentient environment. This would be to treat the natural environment as having intrinsic value. The problem that such an approach faces is that our affective mechanisms, those mechanisms that underlie our capacity to experience concern, evolved in ways that make this difficult. #1 writes:

It can be argued that it once may have been beneficial to have strictly human centered empathetic mechanisms. As I postulated before, our affective mechanisms developed in an environment where we were more so in direct struggle with other animals for food and resources. Additionally, our tools and scope of influence were small enough that our actions could not have a significant enough impact on plants and other organisms that were co-participants of our ecosystems to damage them at the extinction or endangerment level of severity. If at this juncture our survival depends on the health of other ecosystem participants, and even the unfettered operation of material exchange through entire bioregions that we do not even regard as living entities, how can we possibly utilize our affective mechanisms to curtail behaviors and routines that are destructive?

#1's proposal is to engage in a "fictionalized anthropomorphism" that builds off of and extends our naturally evolved altruistic affective mechanism in ways that bring within its scope the non-sentient natural environment. Here is #1's presentation of this key idea:

Luckily, our affective mechanisms are not entirely human-centered. We do have a capacity for empathizing and having altruistic feelings toward a variety of other living creatures, especially ones whose makeup and behaviors resemble our own. Good evidence of this is our attraction to other mammals, especially young ones. I would speculate that most humans would have an instinctual adoration of wolf pups for example, creatures that could likely be our natural predators in the wild. We respond to the injured cries of wounded animals, we respond to suffering in many types of animals. What we seem less equipped to do is respond to the collective distress of a rainforest being clear-cut for agriculture or a coral reef being destroyed by trawling nets. I feel the solution is to anthropomorphize these other ecosystem participants, both at the individual level and at the population and ecosystem levels. Additionally, through the use of something like the Gaia imagery, we should anthropomorphize the planet. Whether or not this has valid scientific merit (after reading the works of James Lovelock I'm convinced that it does) is

not strictly important. It can stand as an instrumental fiction which allows us to turn our human-centered affective mechanisms toward new normative conventions that are more concerned with the state of the environment.

#1 engages in excellent digestion of the crucial elements of contemporary metaethical theory that are most relevant to his objectives, as well as source material related to permaculture. #1's central creative idea is his contention that many of the problems that confront any ethical theory that attempts to "extend" moral consideration beyond human or sentient beings are a function of the limitations imposed by our naturally evolved moral capacities. Rather than adopt a pessimistic position, #1 contends that understanding the key elements of moral thinking and understanding various limitations on our thinking flow from these evolved elements provides pragmatic justification for a reintroduction of anthropomorphic projections onto the natural world; perhaps even a re-deification of nature. The claim is not that such projections would be true; rather, they would be useful fictions, justified on pragmatic grounds.

One place where the reasoning and analysis could be tighter is when #1 examines the concept (from Kant) of a categorical imperative. #1 tends to focus on the idea that a categorical imperative is distinguished from a hypothetical imperative by not making reference to some outcome that would be produced or realized by the action. While this is clearly part of what Kant means, the more fundamental claim is that categorical imperatives, unlike hypothetical imperatives, are not contingent and dependent on the presence of an inclination (desire) in the agent. The outcome that #1 seems to focus on is relevant precisely because of the presence in the agent of an inclination or desire for that outcome. It is the inclination that provides the goal, not vice versa.

Another place #1 could strengthen his argument would be by laying out more support for the contention that Nichols should be read as an error theorist, as opposed to simply a proponent of a (broadly) Humean naturalistic ethic. #1 is a bit too quick in his characterization of Nichols as an error theorist. If the "error" identified by error theory is the commitment of moral thinking to the existence of strong categorical imperatives, and strong categorical imperatives are problematic precisely because they do not make reference to the agent's desires or inclinations, then it is difficult to see how Nichols, who goes to great length to emphasize the crucial importance of what he terms the "affective mechanism," could be an error theorist. After all, Nichols is building into his account of the capacity for core moral judgment an affective element.

A final weak point worth noting is that #1 tends to characterize the affective mechanism in an overly cognitive manner. This may be why he is prone to treat Nichols as an error theorist (see weakness above). For example, #1 writes:

The affective mechanism is the sort of empathetic capacity of people. It is the ability to perform a profound sort of perspective shifting wherein you

imagine how an action or its consequences are perceived by others, and anticipate whether it causes them harm.

This is overly cognitive in its characterization. It would seem to be more accurate to say that the affective mechanism, in order to serve as the motivation for action, requires (minimal) capacities for mind-reading. After all, if you cannot appreciate that another person is in distress, you would not undertake action to alleviate that distress even if you were concerned for them and their well-being. (Or your concern would not be triggered unless you had the capacity to recognize distress cues in others.) Nevertheless, the affective mechanism itself is not a cognitive capacity, but is posited as an evolved affective-emotional structure that has as its object concern for others. This seems to be supported by the following passage from #1's thesis:

As Nichols writes, "The normative theory that prohibits harming others...does depend on some capacity for mind reading. For it requires some mind reading abilities to properly categorize harm and to recognize the distinction between genuine and superficial distress cues" (pg 17).

The "normative theory" depends on (minimal) cognitive capacities like mind-reading, but the affective mechanism itself is not cognitive, but affective (emotional). Maintaining a sharp distinction between cognitive and affective elements is crucial, not simply for accurate interpretation of Nichols, but for #1's overall argument. This is because one crucial point of his argument turns on the claim that while our cognitive abilities permit rapid modification and change (e.g., we can amend or modify normative rules), our affective mechanism is much more limited in its ability to attach "concern" for the objects of those cognitively modified normative rules. #1 emphasizes this in the following passage:

We have become a global civilization of billions of people inhabiting nearly every landmass on the planet. We have equipped ourselves with the technological powers to level mountains, create weather, travel in outer space, and even manipulate genetic material. We remain however in the hunter gatherer tribes as to the state of our affective mechanisms. It is my feeling that while we may somewhat have the cognitive capacity to understand this level of impact and the risk to our own survival, we are far from possessing the properly tuned affective mechanism to respond to things so large and remote from our immediate surroundings.

Despite these (minor) weaknesses, #1's overall thesis is excellent. It is well written, well structured, demonstrates digestion of key source material, and includes a creative original core idea that serves to anchor the thesis as a whole. #1's thesis is well crafted and exemplary of the kind of work our seniors are able to produce.

Student #2

Title: "A Metaethical Comparative Analysis of Fictionalism and Hinduism Philosophical Systems"

Grade: C (yellow) (Dr. Money)

At a general level, the topic identified for exploration is interesting and represents an effort by #2 to engage in truly interdisciplinary thinking. In addition, the project certainly fits well with Millikin's aspiration that our students become "global" citizens. At a more specific level, there are some places where the essay does a fairly good job of distilling core claims and presenting them in a precise and clear manner. For example, #2's discussion and summary of Mackie's position, while very brief, is quite good. Unfortunately, however, the essay suffers from several weaknesses that, in conjunction with one another, undermine the overall effectiveness of the essay as a thesis. I will identify a few of these weaknesses.

First, there are some initial weaknesses in the categorization of metaethical positions in relation to one another. For example, #2 asserts that "moral fictionalism is specifically a class of constructivism known as error theory." Viewing error theory as a species of constructivism is problematic. Constructivism is typically understood as a metaethical approach that removes one source of the temptation to embrace an error theory. Standard constructivist positions in metaethics seek to avoid overly robust ontological claims, the kinds of claims that provide the impetus for error theories to take root. For example, constructivist positions reject the claim that there are objective moral truths that hold independently of the beliefs, attitudes, or choices of (suitably characterized) subjects. Constructivists maintain that such "hyper objectivism" tends to elicit skeptical responses by many, some of whom go on to endorse an error theory – perhaps moral judgments *mean* to assert the existence of such truths, but none exist and, therefore, all moral judgments are false. Constructivist positions, by holding that the truth-makers of moral judgments are the beliefs, attitudes, or choices of (idealized) subjects, seek to undercut this basis for skepticism and, thereby, the temptation to embrace an error theory. Categorization for the sake of categorization is not very important. However, since the essay seeks to demonstrate connections between Joyce's metaethical position and Hindu philosophy and is by its very nature comparative, a proper understanding and categorization of the former is important in helping to position the reader to appreciate certain similarities or differences.

Second, there are weaknesses in the clarity and accuracy of the presentation. A specific example of this can be found in #2's review of the motive internalism issue. That discussion would be more effective if the section was better organized and the importance of the issue better explained to the reader. For example, it could have been organized and guided by the idea, following Joyce, that there are two paths one might follow to arrive at an error theory. The first is related to motive internalism, the second to categorical imperatives. #2 moves too seamlessly from Joyce's discussion of how motive internalism could serve as a basis for moral error theory to the discussion of

how categorical imperatives could serve as a basis for moral error theory. The rapidity with which he moves from the one to the other almost suggests that these are not distinct and independent pathways to error theory. Joyce views these as two distinct potential pathways to error theory and argues that the latter is the more effective path to take.

A third weakness concerns #2's language choices which, in places, make his presentation difficult to follow (e.g., "Such imperatives are thus dependent upon the subjection of the proposer..."). In other places, the presentation is such that the reader is simply unable to comprehend a clear meaning (e.g., "Here lies the pivotal problem of practical rationality, for no content of moral reasoning could ever lie completely beyond an agent's ends so as to account for underlying rationality that an agent is unaware of.>").

A fourth weakness concerns the manner in which the essay is carried out. While a comparative approach will tend to result in a more descriptive style of writing, a very large section of #2's essay seems more or less equivalent of a descriptive review of Joyce's book. This review takes up pages 4-12, nearly half of the overall essay. While review and summary presentation of source material is certainly important, it must be done in a way that effectively advances the student's thesis. Here, the length of the review and its manner of presentation in which one element of Joyce is discussed, then the next, then the next, etc. without any clear connection forged between what is reviewed and the overall thesis makes it difficult for the reader to see the connection between the presentation of material and the thesis. The forest is lost for all the trees. Perhaps an organizational structure in which key elements of fictionalism were placed more immediately side-by-side with elements of the Advaita Vedantan would have been more effective. Since no drafts were submitted, the weakness could not be identified in advance and addressed.

A fifth weakness is that the review #2 engages in, both with respect to Joyce and the Hindu texts, seem to be under selective in terms of focus. This is very pronounced in the review of the Hindu philosophical system. This view seems focused the history of Hindu thought, comparative claims regarding relations between Hindu thought and western religion (Christianity), and general matters of ontology and metaphysics (e.g., dualism, the nature of the self, etc.). While this presentation is perhaps not inaccurate, the reader is left wondering about its relevance to the stated goal of the essay. Rather than discuss general metaphysical features of Hindu thought, the essay needs to forge a connection between Hindu thought and moral fictionalism. To that end, the essay should turn much more quickly than it does to whatever elements of Hindu ethical theorizing there are so as to carry out the goal of the essay. Alternatively, it should much more strongly insist on a "selective reading" in which key elements of Hindu thought are discussed precisely because of their relevance to moral fictionalism. The essay does not propose to be a general view of the metaphysics of Hindu thought, nor

does it seek to simply discuss factionalist stances generally. The essay needs to be more strongly and consistently moored in its thesis.

A final concern is the degree to which fictionalism, at least as presented and defended by Joyce, can be viewed as readily congruent with Advaita Vedanta. If one of the central contentions of the latter is that "attainment of oneness with Brahman lies beyond moral distinction," then one wonders how "practically advantageous" maintaining moral discourse is going to be. Joyce argues that we should embrace fictionalism because moral discourse is important and that something valuable would be lost if we were to abandon it (at least at this stage in our cultural development). This sits uneasily with the Advaita Vedanta claim that "attainment of oneness with Brahman lies *beyond moral distinction*." If attainment of such oneness is the goal and this goal lies beyond moral distinction, then it would seem that maintaining a moral discourse would get in the way of the effective pursuit of that goal. In short, instead of fictionalizing moral discourse, why not simply abandon it?

Student #3

Title: "Moral Precedence"

Grade: A (green) (Dr. Money)

#3's thesis involves a substantial extension of ideas and essays that he explored in PH311, Metaethics. In his thesis, #3 defends what is basically a Humean position regarding ethics. #3 follows Hume in arguing that pure reason is not sufficient for moral agency (though it is necessary). #3 also follows Hume in defending an instrumental conception of reason: reason figures out means to ends, but it does not set the ends. This applies to all ends, including self-interested ends and moral ends. Moral reasoning is a kind of practical reasoning about what to do. It is differentiated by its end or goal – namely, the well-being of others (altruism). On the Humean view, all ends are ultimately provided to an agent by her passions, or in #3's words, internal emotional states. In the case of moral action, the crucial internal emotional states are other-regarding or altruistic. In #3's words, "Moral reasons are subject to morally desired ends, and morally desired ends are subject to a certain class of our emotional states regarding the well being of others."

This approach makes morality a product of human nature. #3 explores this implication by looking at evolutionary biology and the claims by some working within that field that precursors to the basic elements that are required for morality and moral agency can be found (observed) in non-human animals. As #3 writes, "Since moral agency is a function of human nature, it is natural to suppose that an evolutionary account of our nature would produce the building blocks of moral agency." Exploring the ways in which a naturalistic moral position can be fit alongside biological evolutionary theory is part of what drew #3 to this project. The project allows him to explore two of his primary intellectual interests: philosophy and science, particularly evolutionary biology. His exploration of this intersection is very well done, and involves some very sophisticated

writing. For example, after discussing the causal basis of internal emotional states in the organism's physiology and biochemistry, #3 writes:

If these physiological mechanisms govern our other-regarding internal emotional states, which in turn motivate us to act morally, then our moral sense is ultimately a consequence of our evolved physiology. Considering hormones are found in primitive flatworms and many other organisms, it seems that these physiological mechanisms evolved well before the advent of *Homo sapiens*. If this is true, then the current set of chemical messengers found in humans must have successively evolved to guide cellular and organismal behavior as well. If these chemical messengers were naturally selected to guide our behaviors, then ultimately, morality is a complex adaptation.

In addition to utilizing sources from the field of evolutionary biology, #3 utilizes works in contemporary metaethics (e.g., Richard Joyce, Shaun Nichols) to explore these issues further and defend his naturalistic position. A particular strength of the thesis is the way #3 incorporates into his own reflections Nichols' analysis and explanatory hypotheses regarding psychopaths and their inability to make a basic moral judgment. For example, here is one place #3 utilizes discussion of the psychopath to support his contention that genuine moral judgment are not a function of "pure reason," but instead require possession and activation of an internal emotional state that has as its object concern for the well-being of others:

Psychopaths possess all the intellectual faculties for making moral decisions: They can make value claims, anticipate consequences, and choose a course of action. But when a psychopath says, "Hurting other people is wrong," they are not making a moral judgment. They are using the term wrong in an inverted comma sense, such that "Hurting other people is wrong," amounts to "Not hurting other people is required to conform to norms others accept," or perhaps "If I hurt people I will end up in jail."

In earlier drafts of his thesis, #3 had been tempted to suggest that evolution could not produce genuinely or "real" altruistic internal emotional states, but only "selfish" ones. This is the common but in my view mistaken idea that the truth of evolutionary theory somehow threatens morality by suggesting that all human motivations are ultimately "selfish." After repeated discussions and examination of various texts, #3 has grown more sophisticated on this issue. Consider:

Natural selection works by favoring physiological mechanisms of an organism which advance the survival of that organism. Natural selection is a filter. It filters out genes ill equipped for survival and allows the passage of genes equipped for survival on to the next generation. What sorts of

genes would be best equipped for survival, and therefore naturally selected? The simplistic answer is ones that work to enhance the fitness of the organism given its environmental conditions and needs. If self-interested emotional states work to enhance an organism's fitness, they will be selected for. Conversely, if other-regarding emotional states enhance an organism's fitness, these traits will be selected for. It is a terrible misapprehension to assume self-interested genes are best equipped for individual survival....Although the selective result of kin selection was increased reproduction and genetic survival, the underlying mechanism by which increased genetic survival came about was simply a physiologically based emotional concern for others. In short, the goal of altruism is to care for others, and one aftereffect has been the increased survival and reproductive success of altruists.

And later, he writes:

Without understanding this vital distinction between the goal of altruism and its selective effect, the evolution of altruism can paint a bleak picture for some. Those who believe passing genes into subsequent generations is the goal of altruism, rather than an unintended side effect, tend to find little salvation in morality and feel it loses its majesty. Why be good to others if only for selfish genetic ends? Although from an evolutionary standpoint the end result of altruism may have been to propagate genes, natural selection works on motivations and physiology which favor genetic ends. Without a true motivation to help others, kin selection would have never worked. It still feels good to be altruistic. No one can take that away. Even under an evolutionary account of its development, altruism is a genuine practice; altruists contain no selfish hidden agenda. In fact, if the development of altruism had not provided the unintended effect of gene propagation, we would very likely still be selfish individuals with no concern for one another whatsoever. As put by Simon Blackburn in his book *Being Good*, "*The explanation may be perfectly correct. It may provide the reason why we ourselves have inherited altruistic tendencies. The confusion strikes again, however, when it is inferred that altruism doesn't really exist, or that we don't really care disinterestedly for one another – we care only to maximize our chance of getting a return on our helping behavior. The mistake is just the same – inferring that the psychology is not what it seems because of its functional explanation...*" (39-40). The goal of altruism is simply to help others, nothing more, and nothing less. Yes, natural selection made use of our emotions to help our genes more capably survive, but what natural selection also did was make us care about others. Evolution may have its own agenda, and because of that we tend to give it a bad rap, but that doesn't change the fact that thanks to evolution we truly care about each other, and gaining scientific

knowledge about where our altruistic tendencies come from should not change the way we treat each other as human beings.

#3 concludes his thesis by considering the objection that will come from those who defend the metaethical position known as “error theory,” the view that all moral judgments are false. Contemporary error theory, represented by the work of Richard Joyce, argues that the naturalistic approach put forward by #3 cannot succeed in vindicating morality because it leaves out of the picture an essential element of moral thinking and moral judgment: morality’s commitment to the existence of strong categorical imperatives – i.e., reasons for acting that are in no way dependent on the agent’s desires, passions, interests, goals, etc. #3 pushes back against this sort of criticism and closes his thesis with the following:

Those who cling to the traditional ideal that categorical objective values are a non-negotiable element of morality will not accept my moral sense theory as a true validation of morality. To those I urge: Why not reexamine the existence of evolved biological objective moral values? Why must our moral values require such a queer metaphysical law-like objective element to be true? Biological science surely does not hold such an element, yet most of us will generally agree that as a scientific discipline biology holds empirical objective truth. If one day we all can collectively acknowledge the objective nature of evolution, we could very well pursue the implementation of a truly objective and genuine morality grounded in scientific principle. Such a task could potentially put an end to religious wars, encourage cooperation between all peoples, and create a stable and well informed society aligned with our natural proclivities. In short, we could vindicate morality and implement moral codes supported by our very human nature.

#3’s thesis represents quite sophisticated writing and thinking from an undergraduate and represents the sort of quality that our undergraduate philosophy majors frequently achieve. Overall, #3’s thesis is well organized, well written, well argued. Moreover, #3’s thesis combines a wide range of sources demonstrating a firm grasp of the contemporary philosophical and scientific-biological sources. This is a well crafted thesis.

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 2012-2013 academic year is provided below. The score is the average score between the three faculty evaluators.

Student #1

Total Score on Rubric: 54

Color-Code: Green

Student #2

Total Score on Rubric: 36

Color-Code: Green

Student #3

Total Score on Rubric: 54

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. **Amazingly, the majors we have graduated over the past decade have been accepted into and/or completed a total of at least 35 programs at the level of M.A. or above (including J.D.).** The range of areas within which our majors find success is also incredibly 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 2012-2013 competition, five Millikin teams made the quarterfinal round. A total of seven philosophy majors were on those teams. Four of those five teams made the semifinal round, with five philosophy majors on those teams. The final round was between two Millikin teams, with a philosophy major on each team. Finally, two Millikin students, both philosophy majors, were awarded the top two individual honors for attorneys.
- 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 Lager.
- 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 Lager, 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 external evidence and validation of the quality of our program.

Yet another source of evidence for student learning in the philosophy major is the outstanding performance of philosophy majors at HURF (Humanities Undergraduate Research Forum). HURF began in 2000 and was held for four consecutive years: 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003. It was then discontinued until this past spring (2008), when it was reborn with renewed energy and commitment from humanities faculty. An independent screening committee comprised of one faculty member from each of the humanities disciplines evaluates HURF submissions. **Of the 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 sixth 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!

66% of our students 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 (33%) assessed in the "yellow." This result was a function of a lack of disciplined commitment by the student involved. This has no bearing on the strength of the philosophy program, but is a reflection on the work habits and attitudes of the individual student. The large percentage showing in "yellow" is, of course, simply a result of the small number of graduating seniors that we had this year.

Given these results and the fact that this is our seventh 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. 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 14 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.

2013: Three Graduating Seniors

Woody Boero (2013): unknown

Tyler Lamensky (2013): unknown

Michael Schloss (2013): applying to medical schools

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): working for the DOVE, Inc., Decatur, Illinois

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 (starting 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

"Unnamed Philosophy Student" (2008): applying to graduate school in chemistry (2010)

Gregg Lager (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 needs 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, metaphysics and epistemology, logic, and ethics.

Major in Philosophy

A major consists of a minimum of 30 credits and leads to the B.A. degree. There are three ways to complete the philosophy major: (1) The Traditional Track, (2) The Ethics Track, and (3) The Pre-Law Track.

Traditional Track

The traditional track ensures exposure to the core areas of philosophy, including the history of philosophy. The requirements for the traditional track are as follows:

Four Core Courses (12 credits):

PH110, Basic Philosophical Problems

PH211, Ethical Theory and Moral Issues

PH213, Critical Thinking: Logic

PH400, Seminar in Philosophy

Two Courses in the History of Philosophy (6 credits):

PH300, Ancient Philosophy
PH301, Modern Philosophy
PH302, Contemporary Philosophy

One Course in Metaphysics/Epistemology (3 credits):

PH312, Minds and Persons
PH313, Ways of Knowing

Three Electives in Philosophy (9 credits)

Ethics Track

The ethics track reinforces and substantially extends Millikin's emphasis on ethical reasoning and issues of social justice. The requirements for the ethics track are as follows:

Seven Core Courses (21 credits):

PH110, Basic Philosophical Problems
PH211, Ethical Theory and Moral Issues
PH213, Critical Thinking: Logic
PH215, Business Ethics
PH217, Bioethics
PH219, Environmental Ethics
PH400, Seminar in Philosophy

One of the following courses (3 credits):

PH305, Philosophy of Law
PH310, Political Philosophy
PH311, Metaethics

Two additional 300-level electives in philosophy (6 credits)

Pre-Law Track

The pre-law track provides students with the courses that emphasize the skills and the knowledge content that will make it both more likely that they will get into law school and more likely that they will succeed in law school and later as lawyers. The requirements for the pre-law track are as follows:

Seven Core Courses (21 credits):

PH110, Basic Philosophical Problems
PH211, Ethical Theory and Moral Issues
PH213, Critical Thinking: Logic
PH305, Philosophy of Law
PH310, Political Philosophy
PH366, Appellate Legal Reasoning – Moot Court
PH400, Seminar in Philosophy

Three electives from among any philosophy courses, PO234 Civil Liberties, or PO330 Constitutional Law (9 credits)

Minors in Philosophy

A student seeking a philosophy minor is required to complete 18 credits. The student can elect to complete either the traditional philosophy minor or the ethics minor. Both minors are described below.

Traditional Philosophy Minor

The requirements for the traditional philosophy minor are as follows:

Two Core Courses (6 credits):

PH110, Basic Philosophical Problems
PH213, Critical Thinking: Logic

One Course in the History of Philosophy (3 credits):

PH300, Ancient Philosophy
PH301, Modern Philosophy
PH302, Contemporary Philosophy

One Course in Metaphysics/Epistemology (3 credits):

PH312, Minds and Persons
PH313, Ways of Knowing

Two Electives in Philosophy, One of Which Must be at the 300-level (6 credits)

Ethics Minor

The requirements for the ethics minor are as follows:

One Core Course (3 credits):

PH 211, Ethical Theory and Moral Issues

Two Courses in Applied Ethics (6 credits):

PH215, Business Ethics

PH217, Bioethics

PH219, Environmental Ethics

Three of the Following Courses (9 credits):

PH213, Critical Thinking: Logic

Any additional applied ethics course offered by the Philosophy Department (i.e., PH215, PH217, or PH219)

PH300, Ancient Philosophy

PH305, Philosophy of Law

PH310, Political Philosophy

PH311, Metaethics

PH366, Appellate Legal Reasoning – Moot Court

PH400, Seminar in Philosophy (if content appropriate and with approval of the Chair)

Any one course outside the Philosophy Department focusing on ethics, including: CO107, Argument and Social Issues; CO308, Communication Ethics and Freedom of Expression; SO325, Social Work Ethics; BI414, 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	Overall, each sentence expresses an idea.	

Goal 1		
	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.).	Presents and explores relevant contexts and assumptions regarding the issue, although in a limited way.	Analyzes the issue with a clear sense of scope and context, including an assessment of audience. Considers other integral contexts.
Does not recognize context or surface assumptions and	Provides some recognition of context and consideration of	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
<p>Position or hypothesis is clearly inherited or adopted with little original consideration.</p> <p>Addresses a single source or view of the argument, failing to clarify the established position relative to one's own.</p> <p>Fails to present and justify own opinion or forward hypothesis.</p> <p>Position or hypothesis is unclear or simplistic.</p>	<p>Position includes some original thinking that acknowledges, refutes, synthesizes, or extends other assertions, although some aspects may have been adopted.</p> <p>Presents own position or hypothesis, though inconsistently.</p> <p>Presents and justifies own position without addressing other views, or does so superficially.</p> <p>Position or hypothesis is generally clear, although gaps may exist.</p>	<p>Position demonstrates ownership for constructing knowledge or framing original questions, integrating objective analysis and intuition.</p> <p>Appropriately identifies own position on the issue, drawing support from experience and information not available from assigned sources.</p> <p>Clearly presents and justifies own view or hypothesis while qualifying or integrating contrary views or interpretations.</p> <p>Position or hypothesis demonstrates sophisticated integrative thought and is developed clearly throughout.</p>

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
<p>No evidence of search, selection, or source evaluation skills.</p> <p>Sources are simplistic, inappropriate, or not</p>	<p>Demonstrates adequate skill in searching, selecting, and evaluating sources to meet the information need.</p>	<p>Evidence of search, selection, and source evaluation skills; notable identification of uniquely salient resources.</p>

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

Comments:

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

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

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

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
-------------------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------