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

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 fi

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

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:

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

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

> 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.

The Philosophy Department has three full-time faculty members: Dr. Robert Money (Chair), Dr. Eric Roark, and

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,

reinforces the recently revised University Studies program, which emphasizes three skill sets over the course of the sequential elements: reflection, writing, and *ethical reasoning*. Every course that we offer in the area of value theory generally, including the applied ethics courses, engage students in all three of these skills. The learning goals of the ethics minor program are as follows:

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

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

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

The Philosophy Department rotates or modifies the content of its upper-level seminars on an ongoing basis. The Department also makes some modifications in its normal courses, rotating content in and out. Doing so allows philosophy faculty to keep courses fresh and exciting for the students, and helps to keep faculty interest and enthusiasm high. For example, Dr. Money had taught the PH 381 seminar as a course on Nietzsche, as a seminar on personal identity, as a course on the intelligent design-evolution controversy, and as a course on ethical naturalism. The title of the course is

out of 5 courses in the Department's historical sequence to a requirement that students take 3 of 4. PH302, Medieval Philosophy, was eliminated. In addition, the entire history sequence is now taught only at the 300 level; cross-listing of those courses as 200/300 level courses was eliminated.

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):

> 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.
>
> This course is essential for critical thinking.
>
> 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.

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

In addition, the Department offers a range of electives, many under the umbrella of "value theory": political philosophy, ethical theory and moral issues, meta-ethics and the like. These elective courses provide philosophy students with a chance to encounter a range of normative issues, and challenge them to think not only in descriptive terms (e.g., what is the case) but also in normative terms (e.g., what *should* be the case). Students are required to take four electives (12 credits).

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

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.
>
> _____
>
> _____ Among his better written work to date were his essays in Modern Philosophy, the most difficult upper division course that

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

1. All majors will submit a copy of their thesis. The thesis will offer a basis to assess student learning in the Philosophy Major in relation to all three stated learning goals. First, it (along with the oral presentation) will allow us to assess a student's ability "to express in written and oral form their understanding of major concepts and intellectual traditions within the field of philosophy." (Goal 1) The presentation of arguments in the writing will allow us to assess the student's "ability to utilize the principles of critical thinking and formal logic in order to produce a sound and valid argument, or to evaluate the soundness and validity of the arguments of others." (Goal 2) Finally, the thesis and weekly advisory sessions will allow us to assess our student's ability "to complete research on a philosophy-related topic, analyze objectively the results of their research, and present arguments to support their point of view in a variety of venues. (Goal 3).
2. Philosophy faculty will continue to track the post-graduate placement of our majors. Acceptance into quality postsecondary educational programs is evidence that we are fulfilling our educational mission. (Goals 1, 2, and 3). Information on the post-graduate placement of graduates since 2000 is included in Appendix One.

Three students completed PH400 during the 2010-

never in fact necessary to justify a belief or alternatively explain how forgetting can be understood as an intellectual virtue. But in either event the issues that #1 explores in his paper are well worth increased attention by epistemologists and in particular virtue epistemologists.

Overall, #1's critique of Sosa's influential epistemic account through his attack on the Jane case is both inventive and adds nicely to the present literature on the topic.

Abstract: Coherence based justification is based in the understanding that justification for a belief is derived from its ability to fit together with already established beliefs. Through my paper, I attempt to demonstrate that beliefs do not stand alone in the mind, but instead relate to one another in a meaningful way. Using the analogy of a spider web, I describe how such relations are formed and evolve as individuals experience episodes that come into conflict with already established beliefs. In such cases, the more justified belief will triumph and will remain in that individual's web of beliefs. By constantly comparing new information to one's established belief system, individuals create a stable but changeable view of the world that allows for a prudent way to come to terms with new information and judgments about the world while also creating an effective way to understand how others can be justified in holding entirely different beliefs.

:

#2 begins her ambitious project (which straddles the philosophical line between epistemology and metethics) by offering a very nice explanation of epistemic coherentism. Epistemic coherentism is the view that, roughly, a belief is epistemically justified if and only if the belief coheres which other beliefs held by the subject together in some coherent set of beliefs. #2's project grew out of a clear blending for the senior seminar course reviewing matters of epistemic justification and the metaethics upper level philosophy course. The project was also able to incorporate #2's double major in psychology by appealing in places to the network model of memory.

#2's project goes beyond a mere explanation or description of coherentism, she addresses major objections to the view and does a convincing job of dealing substantively with these major objections and leaves coherentism bruised but still standing as a viable theory of epistemic justification. This was no easy task given just how badly the view has been beaten up in the epistemic literature. It is clear that #2 spotted the relevance of coherentism and stuck with the view despite strong philosophical objections (it is fair to say that a wide majority of epsitemologists reject coherentism).

#2 stresses three ways in which a belief can be justified in a coherentist fashion: consistency, entailment, and explanation. Logical consistency and entailment can create the coherence bond between beliefs which a subject holds. But beyond logical relations a subject's belief can cohere with the beliefs she holds because of the explanatory power offered by the belief in question. For instance, the belief that the only other person in the house must have eaten the piece of cake in the fridge is 'typically' a more coherent belief than the belief that a random stranger came in the house at 3AM simply to devour the last piece of chocolate cake. The belief that your only roommate ate the cake offers greater and more likely explanatory power than other beliefs about the whereabouts of the last piece of cake than do alternative explanations. But this is the case given the consistency of the other beliefs in your belief set. If, for instance, random people did typically walk into your house at 3AM and eat your leftover cake, then a coherent belief set would take such a belief seriously as the whereabouts of your cake are concerned.

After defending coherentism generally #2 offers a very sharp analogy that allows for a better way of understanding coherentism. #2 asks us to imagine a spider web that is connected to a window. The web represents our belief set, while the window represents the physical world. The case of the natural spider web is extremely helpful to #2's defense of coherentism because it allows for an imagery of beliefs that are unequal in strength and importance to the subject. Some of the threads are thick and as such could not be lost without the web breaking or becoming much weaker, but other threads are thin and could break without breaking the web. The threads, just like the beliefs in the belief set of an epistemic subject, differ greatly in their importance to the survival of the overall web. Thus with this analogy we see that the idea of epistemic coherentism has room to make certain beliefs central to the survival of one's existent belief set, while other beliefs can be inconsequential or nearly so to the survival of a belief set.

#2, exerts a great deal of well spent energy in her project describing the advantage of coherentism allowing children to have epistemically justified beliefs. #2 argues that one downfall of many standard views of epistemic justification is that they do not allow children to possess justified beliefs. Some standard views of epistemic justification do allow children to have justified beliefs, but #2 is right to point out that a fair number do not. One example that #2 uses a number of times throughout her project is that of a child's belief in the existence of Santa. #2 argues that such a belief can be epistemically justified for a child (if the belief does in fact cohere with the other beliefs that the child holds). #2's approach does rely upon a great deal of internalist assumptions that she does not allows make clear in her paper, but this is a slight concern.

On the topic of children or unsophisticated adults #2 makes the excellent point that within a coherentist framework a child's belief set will typically be structured to place a

great deal of an importance on any one belief. This is because in such cases there will be fewer beliefs in the set to rely upon, thus making any particular belief in the belief set extremely important. Imagine, for instance, that an epistemic subject literally only has four beliefs in his entire belief set. In such a case it is very likely that all of these beliefs will be extremely important for the subject as he forms any new beliefs about the world and interprets and digests empirical evidence presented by the world. As the beliefs increase in number, it will typically be the case that any one particular belief will become less important to the subject, since they have a greater number of beliefs to lean on when interpreting the world around them. The implications of this plausible

discuss her progress and any questions she might have, the responsibility of reading the text and digesting it was largely her own.

#3 not only worked from Sidgwick's *Methods*, she also utilized his shorter *History of Ethics* to provide historical context for the major concepts and ideas that were ultimately utilized by Sidgwick in his systematization of the three major theories he examined in *Methods*. We encourage our students to think about philosophical issues in historical context; to see philosophy as organic and evolving; to see current topics and issues as having historical precursors and roots. #3's approach was an interesting approach as it utilized the history of ethics as interpreted and presented by Sidgwick, the author of the primary text under analysis. #3's goal was to make clear that Sidgwick did not spin these theories out of air, but that he drew from a rich historical landscape to create his influential work. Sidgwick's greatness as an ethical philosopher lies not in his creation of original substantive theories, but in his analytical and systematizing talents. In large part, these talents were brought to bear on historically extant ethical theories.

As the abstract included above makes clear, after #3 identified and characterized the major concepts and ideas in the history of ethics as that history was presented by Sidgwick, she turned to an examination of the three methods of ethics Sidgwick examines – egoism, intuitionism, and utilitarianism. She argued that these theories could best be compared by examining them through the lens of the classic ethical issue of "duty vs. interest." That is, each theory was reviewed with the gh l Ɋ howing (h ħ how Sidgwick utilized existing ideas and concepts from the history of ethics to develop and present them, and (b) how each theory approaches those situations in which an agent's interests conflict with that agent's mora] Ɋ uty.

As her efforts in comparative thinking unfolded, #3 came to º elieve that Sidgwick's three methods overlooked an important and implicit fourth method

First, #3 tends to emphasize the way in which an intuitionist position would likely give greater weight to duties regarding intimates. This works to situate intuitionism between egoism and utilitarianism in terms of its scope. While this is likely accurate, a greater emphasis should be placed on the way in which intuitionism asserts the existence of several independent duties, duties which are not unified under a broader principle, but are presented as independent duties. In addition, some of these duties are duties not on the grounds that fulfilling them will have good consequences (for society, for intimates, etc.), but simply because they are intrinsically right to do. Sidgwick, of course, argues that intuitionism can be largely subsumed under utilitarianism – that utility is the implicit organizing principle behind the plurality of intuitionist duties. But it still seems to me that intuitionism itself is not utilitarianism. In addition, intuitionism should be presented to make clear that it does not always vindicate intimates over self or others. For example, my duty to keep my promises is a duty independently of its impact on my intimates. In some cases, duties to my intimates might outweigh my duty to keep my promise, but my duty to keep my promise is not void in situations in which keeping my promise would fail to advance or even actually impede the interests of my intimates. Absent a some other duty, I would have an obligation to keep my promises even if doing so worked against the interests of my intimates.

Second, in places, #3 does not adequately or consistently distinguish rational action and moral action. Her discussion of Hume is one place where this happens. Standard interpretation of Hume is that he embraces an instrumental picture of rational action. On this view, rational action is action that maximizes the satisfaction of the agent's desires, whatever the content of those desires. This, however, cannot be identified with moral action. For example, to use an example from Hume, if my strongest desire is to scratch my finger, then it can be rational for me to do so, even if the causal effect of that would be the destruction of the world. While it may be *rational* to scratch my finger, Hume would not view it as *moral*. Moral action, then, requires a link to specific sorts of desires: humanity, sympathy, benevolence, fellow feeling, etc. It is the altruistic part of our nature that provides the substantive goal of moral action. Hume argues that moral action can be rational – and this is a clear advance away from Hobbes' egoism. Nevertheless, under an instrumental conception of rationality, immoral action can also be rational.

well-being of a rock? Finally, is there a reasoned rational basis for maintaining that the well-being of a human child overrides, say, the well-being of a squirrel?

Fourth, related to the third, it sometimes seems that ecoitionism essentially affirms the value of what is, regardless of the nature of what is. That is, it seems the view refuses to recognize any ideal under which actual extant being can be criticized as lacking, defective, worthy of being changed, needing to be improved, etc. In some places, ecoitionism looks to simply affirm the value of what is, whatever it is that is. Any change to being looks to "disrespect" the extant being in favor of the alternative being, what we might call a future possible being. #3's example of environmental restoration could be used to make this point. If we intervene in nature to restore a particular environmental habitat, we are in some sense destroying the current habitat in order to bring about a possible future habitat. Does this have ethical implications? Are we wrong to act in this fashion on the grounds that our action destroys the extant habitat? But if being is affirmed without qualification, then my being as the intervening agent must also be affirmed, and so the initial objection seems to lose traction. To object to my intervention is to object to my being! This problem might be extended in the context of consideration of moral progress. So, for example, action to end slavery is an action (or set of actions extended over time) that seeks to change the existent norms that partly constitute a social structure. But surely, doing this "destructive" work is morally justified and represents a progression, an advancement, etc. Indeed, trying to convince me to change my current theoretical frame of operation from rational egoism to, say, utilitarianism is to seek to change the existent state of affairs; it is to change being. Is this objectionable?

That #3's thesis elicited these sorts of reflective criticisms and comments is good evidence that she produced a high quality work. Her thesis is the kind of work that we aim to have our seniors produce.

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 2009-2010 academic year is provided below. Dr. Roark was off-campus on a scholarship activity. Hence, the oral defenses were assessed by Dr. Money and Dr. Hartsock.

Student: #1

Total Score on Rubric: 54, 49
Color-Code: Green

Student: #2
Total Score on Rubric: 53, 53
Color-Code: Green

Student: #3
Total Score on Rubric: 50, 49
Color-Code: Green

Our report will indicate the post-graduation placement of our graduating seniors, if known. This information is also posted on our website and is updated as new information becomes available.

Our full placement record (as known to us) since 2000 can be found in Appendix One. However, we believe it important to emphasize in the body of this report our incredible success in this regard. Philosophy tends to attract students who are committed to the life of the mind. Accordingly, most of our graduating majors eventually pursue further educational opportunities. We have graduated a total of 48 philosophy majors over the past 10 years.

The range of areas within which our majors find success is impressive. A sense of the post-graduation educational accomplishments of our majors can be gleaned from consideration of the following:

Our majors have been accepted into and/or completed Ph.D. programs in philosophy.

Our majors have been accepted into and/or completed M.A. programs in philosophy.

Our majors have been accepted into and/or completed Ph.D. programs

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 2010-11 competition, Millikin teams took place. In addition, a Millikin student was honored as runner up for most outstanding attorney.
> At the 2009-10 competition, Millikin teams took and 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 and 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 and place. Both attorneys on the first place team were philosophy majors: Dustin Clark and Kenny Miller.
> At the 2006-07 competition, Millikin teams took and place. Two of the four attorneys were philosophy majors: Justin Allen and Dustin Clark.
> At the 2005-06 competition, a Millikin team took place. Both students on that team were philosophy majors: Nichole Johnson and Gregg Lagger.
> At the 2004-05 competition, Millikin's two teams took and place in the competition, having to face each other in the final round of competition. Three of the four students on those teams were philosophy majors: Gregg Lagger, Nichole Johnson, and Colleen Cunningham.

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.

Philosophy majors awarded recognition at HURF include:

Adam Moderow, “Shooting the Moon” (2010, first place).

McKenzie VanBeest, “T M ز “

and is evidence that the philosophy program is strong. The data we have collected over the past four

Philosophy tends to attract students who are committed to the life of the mind. Accordingly, most of our graduating majors eventually pursue further educational opportunities. We have graduated a total of 51 philosophy majors over the past 12 years. Of our graduates:

12 (23.5%) have been accepted to law school
15 (29%) have been accepted to a masters program of some sort
7 (13.7%) have been accepted to a doctoral program of some sort
1 (2%) has been accepted to a medical school

The following list provides information regarding the post-graduate activities of each of our graduating majors over the last 12 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

Gordon Gilmore (2010): Gordon was accepted to Sonoma State University's program in

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: ____ 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: _____ 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: ____ 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

Philosophy

Robert E. Money, Jr. (Chair)

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

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

Philosophy Minor

A student seeking the philosophy minor is required to complete 18 credits. 9 credits must come from among the following courses in the history of philosophy:
PH 300, Ancient World Wisdom
PH 301, Golden Age of Greece
PH 303, Modern Philosophy (16^{th}-18^{th} centuries)
PH 304, Contemporary Philosophy (19^{th}-21^{st} centuries)

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

Ethics Minor

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

Two of the following "applied ethics" courses are also required:
PH 215, Business Ethics
PH 217, Bioethics
PH 219, Environmental Ethics

In addition, the student must take nine credits from among the following courses:
Any additional applied ethics course offered by the Philosophy Department (i.e., PH215, PH217, or PH219)
PH 221, Appellate Legal Reasoning
PH 301, Golden Age of Greece
PH 305, Philosophy of Law
PH 310, Political Philosophy
PH 311, Metaethics
PH 400, Seminar in Philosophy (with appropriate content and approval of the Chair)
Any one course outside the Philosophy Department focusing on ethics, including: CO 107, Argument and Social Issues; CO 308, Communication Ethics and Freedom of Expression; SO 325, Social Work Ethics; BI 414, The Human Side of Medicine; or another course in ethics outside the Department and approved by the Chair of the Philosophy Department.

"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.

: 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.	

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

Presentation Goal 1	Few grammatical errors or misspellings.	
	Overall, sentence structure is appropriately complex, incorrect sentence structures occur rarely.	
	Vocabulary is used correctly. Overall, work reflects a college level use of words and understanding of their meanings. Occasional incorrect use of vocabulary.	
Clarity Goal 1	Overall, each sentence expresses an idea. Overall, each paragraph forms a coherent whole. Level of	

[illegible]

: 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.	

: 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.	

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

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

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

7. Communicates effectively.

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

Criteria Scores

____1. Identify problem, question, issue, creative goal.

____2. Consider context and assumptions
____3. Develop own position or hypothesis
____4. Presents, assesses, and analyzes sources appropriate to the problem, question, issue or creative goal.
____5. Integrate other perspectives
____6. Identify conclusions and implications
____7. Communicate effectively

____ TOTAL SCORE

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

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

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

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