

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 fi

our general education program. Again, when we laid the groundwork for a major

semi-finals. We also had students win awards for _____ and for
_____. Many of Millikin's core educational skills are

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:

| | |
|---|---------|
| | |
| 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 *practic*

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

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.

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

Dr. Money serves 40 first-year honors students each fall by offering two sections of Honors University Seminar. He also coordinates the "first week" introduction to ethical reasoning, a program that impacts on all incoming freshmen. Dr. Money regularly teaches an honors seminar in humanities, typically in the spring semester. He serves philosophy majors and minors, and the general student body, by offering a variety of philosophy courses. He serves political science majors and minors, and the general student body, by offering a variety of courses either as political science courses (e.g., Constitutional Law) or as cross-listed courses (e.g., Political Philosophy, Philosophy of Law). All of these are 300-level courses. He serves students who need to meet the Historical Studies requirement by offering both Modern Philosophy and Contemporary Philosophy on a regular basis. He serves pre-law students as Director of the Pre-Law Program, and as faculty director to the Moot Court Team.

Dr. Roark teaches two sections of IN183/140 each fall, serving 40 students. He also helps deliver the first week introduction to ethical reasoning program. Dr. Roark also teaches the business ethics course required within Tabor's MBA program. During his

first year, Dr. Roark taught IN203, Honors Seminar in Humanities, twice. We anticipate that he will continue making regular contributions to the honors program going forward. Dr. Roark taught an applied ethics course on "just war theory" during his first year. He is scheduled to teach PH217, Bioethics during the fall 2009 semester and PH219, Environmental Ethics during the spring 2010 semester. He is already making substantial contributions to the delivery of our new ethics minor. In addition, Dr. Roark teaches a variety of courses within the philosophy program. Our students will benefit immensely from the increased diversity of course offerings that our three-person department will be able to offer going forward.

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

As of the spring 2012 semester, the Philosophy Department had 28 majors and 10 minors. This is the third consecutive year that the philosophy program has had over 30 students involved as either majors or minors. The department has grown considerably over the past decade. This growth is all the more impressive given that few students come to Millikin (or any college) as announced philosophy majors.

The Department is in the process of securing a formal philosophy club on campus. This will likely develop over the next year.

Along with Interdepartmental courses such as IN140, IN203, IN250, and IN251, Philosophy Department faculty teach over 12 different courses from 100- through 400-level, including one course in the MBA Program.

In terms of new initiatives and improvements, the Philosophy Department recently expanded to three faculty members starting fall 2008 and then replaced a retiring faculty member in 2010. The changes required that we review our curriculum to ensure that our curriculum is aligned with the teaching interests and abilities of the philosophy faculty. Significant changes were made. Most significantly, we created an "ethics minor" within our program. As part of this new program, we offer three additional courses under the broad category of "applied ethics." These courses include PH215, Business Ethics; PH217, Bioethics; and PH219, Environmental Ethics. We have intentionally designed two of these "applied ethics" courses to connect to other major academic units. PH215, Business Ethics, connects to Tabor; PH217, Bioethics, connects to the pre-med, medical technology, and nursing programs. We believe that the ethics minor will be a way to attract more students to philosophy. Early indications are that

this is, indeed, the case. We have gone from 4 minors in spring 2008 to 13 minors in 2011. The ethics minor also coheres with and reinforces the recently revised University Studies program, which emphasizes three skill sets over the course of the sequential elements: reflection, writing, and *ethical reasoning*. Every course that we offer in the area of value theory generally, including the applied ethics courses, engage students in all three of these skills. The learning goals of the ethics minor program are as follows:

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

We believe it to be self-evident that ethical reasoning and reflection on ethical issues and topics are 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.

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

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

A number of changes have occurred in the philosophy curriculum in the last several years. In addition to the creation of the ethics minor (see above), the Department constructed an "ethics track" within the major. In addition, the Department modified

the history of philosophy sequence, changing from a requirement that students take 3 out of 5 courses in the Department's historical sequence to a requirement that students take 3 of 4. PH302, Medieval Philosophy, was eliminated. In addition, the entire history sequence is now taught only at the 300 level; cross-listing of those courses as 200/300 level courses was eliminated. (See "Appendix Two" for an overview of requirements within the major.) Finally, both minors are now aligned at 18 in terms of the total credit hours required to complete them. The Department regularly meets to review its curriculum and identify ways in which it can be improved. In fact, we plan additional modifications. We will propose these modifications during the fall 2012 semester and hope to have them formally in the books in time for the start of the 2013-2014 academic year.

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 _____. What this shows is that assessment efforts cannot demand a "one size fits all" approach. Assessment demands must respect disciplinary autonomy, as well as the practical realities of "the situation on the ground." Assessment of philosophy may be a worthy goal, but it must be assessment of *philosophy*. Respect for disciplinary autonomy comes first and assessment tools must be constructed that respect that autonomy. The following makes clear why the demand for a "structural plan" in the Philosophy Major is both impractical and inappropriate.

A structural plan in philosophy is impractical. Students rarely come to Millikin as

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

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

The only exception to our curricular flexibility is the philosophy capstone course: PH400 Seminar in Philosophy. That course can only be taken during the junior or senior years. In that course, philosophy faculty identify a topic or philosopher of interest and design a seminar course based on the graduate school model to explore the topic/philosopher. A major research paper is required of each student. (This paper is the equivalent of the prior senior thesis.) Faculty work one-on-one with each of our junior and/or senior majors to help them produce some of the best work of their career at Millikin. The student is responsible (in consultation with a faculty adviser) for choosing the topic. Hence, we insist that this particular course come near the end of the student’s

undergraduate philosophical exploration. We want our students to have exposure to a wide range of philosophical issues, topics, and texts before they select a topic of

The

The Philosophy Department also hant

Philosophy Major. The thesis provides us with an opportunity to assess our effectiveness in delivering on each of our key learning goals. There are three "aspects" or "elements" in the development of a thesis.

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

Second, students complete a substantial written essay (generally, between 25-30 pages). This essay is the basis for their course grade. We assess the quality of the written work by employment of the "writing rubric for senior thesis" (see Appendix Three) in conjunction with our own intuitive trained judgments regarding the quality of the writing, the difficulty of the subject matter, etc. (Learning Goals 1 and 2).

Finally, each student makes a formal presentation of their thesis to philosophy majors and faculty members. We assess the quality of the oral presentation by employment of the "rubric for assessment of oral communication" (see Appendix Four) (Learning Goal 1).1284(.)3(p)6m[(re)-3(la)4(t)4(ion2(.))3(t)7.t)5(i4(me)-3-8()) 6(t)4(h)S5(rdingnin)-4(g)6(in)] TJE

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

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.

_____ 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)

_____ (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.

- 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

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

Regarding the written product, in general, if a student earns an A or B on the senior thesis, this will be taken to indicate a "green light" in terms of assessment of student learning. If a student earns a C, this will be taken to indicate a "yellow" light in terms of assessment. Finally, if a student earns a D or an F, this will be taken to indicate a "red" light in terms of assessment. The data for philosophy seniors graduating during the 2011-2012 academic year is provided below.



#1 produced a solid thesis in which he defended a form of reductionism in which he

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

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

#2's thesis is this: "if Parfit's theory of personal identity is rationally accepted, it requires a moral theory granting non-human animals equal moral standing with humans" (p.10). I am not sure about this, but it may be that the real focus of her thesis is not on what follows from Parfit's theory of personal identity, but from his defense of reductionism. The core of the paper seems to be pushing more along these lines. However, I am not sure about whether it is reductionism alone that is doing the real work. Another point is that it seems that her thesis can more clearly be stated as the claim that non-

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

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

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

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

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

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

#3 attempts to explore the degree to which R would need to be disrupted/changed in an example involving a person who becomes drunk and then commits a crime. Unfortunately, it is not persuasive for the simple fact that in the vast number of instances, there is plenty of connectedness remaining between the pre-drunk stage, the drunk stage, and the post-drunk stage. To make his case persuasive, #3t needs to develop his examples in much greater depth and detail. The lack of development hurts his argument. Similar conce-re

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

If #3 were clearer on this point, then h7 Tmcl.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

After the presentation of Parfit's theory, #6

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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 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 _____ 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.

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

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 _____ 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 Lager.

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 Lager, 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, "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).

Both Moot Court and HURF provide compelling _____ 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.

The Philosophy Department is pleased with the results in our fifth year of formal assessment.

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!

Philosophy tends to attract students who are committed to the life of the mind. Accordingly, most of our graduating majors eventually pursue further educational opportunities. We have graduated a total of 59 philosophy majors over the past 13 years. Of our graduates, almost one-fourth have been accepted to law school. Approximately a one-third have been accepted to a masters or Ph.D. program of some sort.

The following list provides information regarding the post-graduate activities of each of our graduating majors over the last 13 years. Taken as a whole, this information clearly demonstrates an exceptional post-graduate success rate for our majors. It also demonstrates the ability of our faculty members to attract and retain high quality students, and their ability to grow and maintain a vibrant and essential major. In light of the totality of the circumstances (i.e., the nature of our discipline, the nature of our institution, the size of our Department, etc.), our trend line is extremely positive.

2012: _____ Graduating Seniors

Haley Carr (20y CaefBT/F3BT/F3 12 Tf1 0 0 1 72.0240243408.1i 430P-o60 0 1 72.024 415.99 Tm[(Tr

2010: _____ Graduating Seniors

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

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: _____ 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 TBT1

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: _____ 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 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: _____ Graduating Senior

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

2000: _____ 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).

Philosophy

Robert E. Money, Jr. (Chair)

Philosophy Department Faculty

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

The philosophy major is designed to meet the requirements of four classes of students: (a) those who have no professional interest in philosophy but who wish to approach a liberal education through the discipline of philosophy; (b) those who want a composite or interdepartmental major in philosophy and the natural sciences, behavioral sciences, humanities, or fine arts; (c) those who want an intensive study of philosophy preparatory to graduate study in some other field, e.g. law, theology, medicine, or education; and (d) those who are professionally interested in philosophy and who plan to do graduate work in the field and then to teach or write. Students with a professional interest in philosophy are urged by the Department to give early attention to courses in the history of philosophy sequence, logic, and ethics.

Major in Philosophy

A major consists of a minimum of 30 credits and leads to the B.A. degree. The following courses are required:

PH 110, Basic Philosophical Problems

PH 213, Critical Thinking: Logic

PH 400, Seminar in Philosophy

Plus three of the following courses:

PH 300, Ancient World Wisdom

PH 301, The Golden Age of Greece

PH 303, The Modern World (17th-18th centuries)

PH 304, The Contemporary World of Philosophy (19th-21st centuries)

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

Ethics Track within the Philosophy Major

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

PH 110, Basic Philosophical Problems

PH 211, Ethical Theory and Moral Issues

PH 213, Critical Thinking: Logic

PH 215, Business Ethics

PH 217, Bioethics

PH 219, Environmental Ethics

PH 300, Ancient World Wisdom or PH301, Golden Age of Greece

PH 305, Philosophy of Law or PH310, Political Philosophy or PH311, Metaethics

PH 400, Seminar in Philosophy

Plus one elective 300-level philosophy course

Pre-Law Track within the Philosophy Major

Philosophy also offers a "pre-law track" within the philosophy major. We have developed a track within our philosophy major to provide students with the courses that emphasize the skills and the knowledge content that will make it both likely that they will get into law school and that they will succeed both there and later as lawyers.

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

PH 110, Basic Philosophical Problems

PH 211, Ethical Theory and Moral Issues

PH 213, Critical Thinking: Logic

PH 221, Appellate Legal Reasoning

PH 305, Philosophy of Law

PH 310, Political Philosophy

PH 400, Seminar in Philosophy

Plus 3 elective courses from among any philosophy courses, PO 234 Civil Liberties, or PO 330 Constitutional Law.

Minors in Philosophy

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

Philosophy Minor

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

PH 300, Ancient World Wisdom

PH 301, Golden Age of Greece

PH 303, Modern Philosophy (16th-18th centuries)
PH 304, Contemporary Philosophy (19th-21st centuries)

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

Ethics Minor

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

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

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

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

Any additional applied ethics course offered by the Philosophy Department (i.e., 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

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | 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 coherence is varied. Paragraphs may include some unrelated sentences. | |
| | The logic used in the analysis is generally clear. | |

: In light of Department learning goals, a senior thesis earning a "C" grade should

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | 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

| | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|
| underlying ethical implications, or does so superficially. | assumptions and their implications. | addressing ethical dimensions underlying the issue, as appropriate. |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|

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

| RED, 1 to 2 Points | YELLOW, 3 Points | GREEN, 4 to 5 Points |
|---|---|---|
| Position or hypothesis is clearly inherited or adopted with little original consideration. | Position includes some original thinking that acknowledges, refutes, synthesizes, or extends other assertions, although some aspects may have been adopted. | Position demonstrates ownership for constructing knowledge or framing original questions, integrating objective analysis and intuition. |
| Addresses a single source or view of the argument, failing to clarify the established position relative to one's own. | Presents own position or hypothesis, though inconsistently. | Appropriately identifies own position on the issue, drawing support |
| Fails to present and justify own opinion or forward hypothesis. | Presents and justifies own position without addressing other views, or does so superficially. | |
| Position or hypothesis is unclear or simplistic. | Position or hypothesis is generally clear, although gaps may exist. | |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | 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> | |

- ____ 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 |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|

- 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 |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|