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)

"moot court" or "Introduction to Philosophy," the same skills sets – skills sets that are inherently practical – are being engaged and developed.

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

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

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

The third core element of Millikin's mission is "to prepare students for a personal life of meaning and value." Clearly this is exactly what philosophy does. That Millikin's mission includes this goal along with the first distinguishes us from a technical institution. We are not a glorified community college willing to train students for the first job they will get, and leaving them in a lurch when they struggle to understand death, or agonize

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:

 tudents will der(s)

Philosophy Department Learning Goal	Corresponding Millikin University Learning Goal Number(s)
1. Students will be able to express in oral and written form their understanding of major concepts and intellectual traditions within the field of philosophy.	1, 2, 3
2. Students will demonstrate their ability to utilize the principles of critical thinking and formal logic in order to produce a sound and valid argument,	

r(s)l9c/Ectduce a Dectrre for p

students with the courses that emphasize the skills and the knowledge content that will make it both likely that they will get into law school and that they will succeed both there and later as lawyers. (p.74)

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

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

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

The Philosophy Department has three full-time faculty members: Dr. Jo Ellen Jacobs, Dr.

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

students to philosophy. Early indications are that this is, indeed, the case. We have gone from 4 minors in spring 2008 to 13 minors in 2009. The ethics minor also

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. Given the retirement of Dr. Jacobs, we will once again be reviewing our internal curriculum this summer (2010). We expect to make several key changes in order to better align our curriculum with the expertise of our faculty and needs of our students. Next year's assessment report will include a review of those changes.

(3) The Learning Story. Explai

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

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

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

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

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

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

Students are expected to read challenging texts, and philosophy faculty use those texts, and subsequent discussions of those texts, to help students spot the assumptions behind arguments – especially the unstated assumptions that inform a particular

outlook or worldview. The philosophy curriculum is unlike nearly every other in that the

courses. Moreover, this course allows students truly to lead the direction of the course. The course goes where students' questions in response to readings take the course. Philosophy faculty also use the course to "rotate in" materials and subjects that are of current interest.

Philosophy 400, Senior Thesis. This independent research paper allows students to pursue in depth a topic of their choosing, and to bring together the research and writing skills that they have acquired over the course of their Philosophy Major at Millikin.

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

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

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

In addition, the Department offers a range of electives, many under the umbrella of "value theory": political philosophy, ethical theory and moral issues, meta-ethics, aesthetics, and the like. These elective courses provide philosophy students with a chance to encounter a range of normative issues, and challenge them to think not only in descriptive terms (e.g., what is the case) but also in normative terms (e.g., what *should* bETn>600440052005600520 and the like. 519.i6r8mbrel(b)-3(t)76>msRPPL0ŏ1JŜ℟H℥℺Ḋ℮P0

each student spends an entire semester doing nothing but working on mastering the principles of critical thinking and formal logic and applying them. The grade earned in the course signifies our "assessment of student learning" relative to that specific learning goal. While we also assess this learning goal in reference to the arguments constructed in the student's senior thesis, the point is that our students are assessed on each learning goal continuously in numerous courses as they work to complete the major.

Perhaps an even more powerful illustration of the continuous and pervasive nature of our assessment of student learning can be seen in reference to Departmental Learning Goal #1: Students will be able to express in oral and written form their understanding of major concepts and intellectual traditions within the field of philosophy. The following appeared in my letters of recommendation for three philosophy majors who applied to law school during the 2009 fall semester:

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

> Across the six courses he has taken with me to this point, Justin has written a total of <u>twenty-nine</u> (29) essays of 4-8 pages in length. His <u>average</u> grade on these assignments is an excellent <u>92.93</u>%. (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 <u>seven</u> of my classes. In each course, Dustin has earned an "A." He has excelled across a wide range of assignments including reading quizzes, oral presentations, in-class exams, take-home essay exams, and research papers. His writing, in

#4
#5
#6
#7
#8

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

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

Analysis of assessment results for each key learning outcome goal, with effectiveness measures established on a green-light, yellow-light, red-light scale, occurs for each academic year. We see no reason to reinvent the wheel. We correlate letter grades with this "colored-light" schema.

Student: #1
Thesis Title: "Error Theory and Evolution"
Grade: ██ (Green Light) (Dr. Money)

#1's thesis involves a substantial extension of ideas and essays that he generated in PH381, Seminar in Philosophy (where the focus was on naturalism in ethics) and PH311, Metaethics. The first part of the thesis focuses on laying out the basic components of error theory and defending it from certain key objections or criticisms. The second part of the thesis focuses on providing an evolutionarily grounded explanation for why human beings would evolve to make this sort of pervasive error.

#1 begins with an overview of contemporary error theory, drawing from John Mackie and Richard Joyce. Error theory holds that all moral judgments, though cognitive, are false. It comes to this position by defending both a conceptual and substantive claim. The former, the conceptual claim, is that ordinary moral judgments embody a commitment to a form of objectivity such that moral reasons for acting apply to and are authoritative for all agents, irrespective of their subjective preferences, desires, goals, interests, etc. The latter, the substantive claim, argues that there are no such objective reasons of that kind and, hence, no moral reasons. As such, ordinary moral judgment proceeds on the basis of a presupposition that does not, in fact, obtain. So, for example, the ordinary moral judgment, "It would be wrong for Jim to molest children"

judgments are false, while still remaining philosophically interesting. (After all, the view that some moral judgments are false is not very philosophically interesting.)

#1 also reviews and defends an explanation for why we make the error that error theorists accuse us of making when we make moral judgments. Drawing from a range of contemporary philosophers (Joyce, Nichols, Stich, etc.), #1

#2 argues that the conceptual claim by the error theorist is not plausible. His argument turns on two main claims. First, #2 defends the claim that the meaning of a judgment or concept is determined by the way in which it is used by the linguistic community. Here, #2 was influenced by the later Wittgenstein. Second, #2 argues that empirical evidence is relevant to determining how moral concepts (like right, wrong, etc.) are used and that the evidence does not support the error theorist's claim that all moral judgments embody a commitment to objective reasons for acting.

As part of his argument, #2 reviews the distinction Foot (and others) makes between an institutional categorical imperative on the one hand, and an institutionally transcendent categorical imperative on the other hand. It is the latter sort of categorical imperative (or reason for acting) to which the error theorist argues ordinary moral thought is committed. Moreover, if the error theorist is going to maintain that <u>all</u> moral judgments are false, then all moral judgments must be committed to institutionally transcendent categorical imperatives as their source or ground. #2 mounts a sustained argument against this conceptual claim by using empirical evidence to suggest that ordinary moral thought means at least some moral judgments to involve institutional categorical imperatives. These moral judgments, then, can be true even if there are no institutionally transcendent categorical imperatives. Hence, contrary to the position defended by error theory, not all moral judgments are false.

The thesis brings together multiple areas of philosophical investigation and reflection including metaethics and philosophy of language. In addition, it serves as the location wherein #2 could combine and then substantially extend some of his prior philosophical interests. Finally, the thesis stands as a compelling example of what our best students are able to produce. It has a central thesis supported by clear arguments, is organized, and is well written grammatically. #2 has always produced outstanding work for us. His senior thesis is no exception.

Student: #3
Thesis Title: "Pascal's Wager: The Problem with Gambling on God"
Grade: ■ (Green Light) (Dr. Roark)

In his senior thesis, <u>Pascal's Wager: The Problem with Gambling on God</u>, #3 introduces a number of convincing objections to Pascal's well-known work defending the rationality of believing in the existence of God. #3 begins by nicely outlining Pascal's argument defending the view that our only rational choice is to 'bet' that God exists. Pascal argues that the benefits of betting on God –assuming God exists- (the gains of heaven) obviously outweigh any benefits of betting against God –assuming God does not exist (the gains of getting to live a life that one desires without a care for eternal judgment). It should be noted that the style of # 3's paper is a model for a well done thesis paper. He clearly outlines the position he is considering (along with the assumptions of the author's position he is examining), next he systematically outlines his own position,

4's thesis seeks to bring together a wide range of concepts, issues, and line of thought from a range of areas of inquiry: philosophy, psychology, neurophysiology, and theology. While interconnected interdisciplinary thinking is to be encouraged, one of the dangers of this sort of approach is that it ends up either biting off more than can be chewed, or treats too superficially or quickly concepts or issues deserving of more attention. In places, the thesis runs into these difficulties. If one is going to cover the number of areas and domains #4 tried to cover, the tendency to simplify is almost unavoidable.

The paper is not without its merits. It is clear that #4 has enjoyed investigating a wide range of domains during his time of study here at Millikin. Moreover, some of the items discussed in his thesis have clear implications for (or are clearly relevant to) classic well documented debates within philosophy. One of the more obvious is the issue of whether 'pure reason' can serve as a motive to action. Hume famously answered 'no.' Kant 'yes.' This perennial issue has its contemporary voices as well. The thesis certainly has within it elements that would lend themselves well to a more sustained treatment of this sort of issue. The use of evidence from neurology as well as the case study of Phineas Gage would be well suited for this sort of contextualization. # 4's defense of morality as fundamentally about social cognition makes it look as if he defends the Kantian position. However, he acknowledges the need for a link between the rational and the emotional. My understanding is that #4 would propose that there are certain affective-emotional states or capabilities which require a pre-existing affective part of the brain (limbic system) but which are not reducible to that pre-existing affective element. In short a motivated affect or an emergent affect. This is an interesting spin on the classic debate. Unfortunately, it is not pursued in great depth and the reader is left to make the connection on his or her own, rather than being guided by the thesis in the consideration of it.

One of the primary weaknesses of the thesis given its goal and basic orientation was that it did not address explicitly the classic philosophical concern with the "is-ought gap" and the issue of whether one can derive a normative conclusion from a set of purely empirical premises. It is not clear why the fact that our brain has evolved in a certain

#7 then pursues some commonly explored 'contradictions of God'. For instance, #7 considers the infamous puzzle asking if it is possible for God to create a rock so big that He cannot lift it. Whatever answer is given to this question is seems as if a limitation of God's power is stated. But how can this be if God is omnipotent? #7 nicely uses his previous treatment of the eleven dimensions to address this question. The suggestion made by #7 is that an eleven dimension being God might have a different 'rulebook' by which to play and that it might simply be that case that what appears a contradiction to humans is a real possibility for God. #7 then considers other paradoxes involving free will and the problem of evil.

One additional point of inquiry that could have been explored is the greater epistemic and metaphysical significance in respect to human ps

naturalistic framework that contextualizes underlies #8's primary thesis: namely, that the U.S. should move away from a retributive theory of punishment toward a rehabilitative model. The vast majority of criminals are not affectively defective; hence, their crimes (wrong actions) are the result of an inappropriate or incorrect normative theory intersecting with the normal affective mechanisms. Correcting the normative theory would then "liberate" the affective mechanism to fire in the "moral" way. There are, of course, some criminals with defective affective mechanisms. Until we reach the point in time where we can modify the affective mechanism (e.g., via drugs, surgery, etc.) so as to "normalize" it, we must deter these individuals from committing further crimes.

Thus, the crux of the

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 <u>external</u> evidence and validation of student learning in the philosophy major. Moreover, this evidence shows a consistent trend line over time: exceptional performance by our students over a decade. We believe this is compelling evidence that our *program* is vibrant and delivering on the promise of education. Student learning in the philosophy program is strong and demonstrable.

D. Additional Evidence of Student Learning in the Philosophy Major

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

At the 2009-10 competition, Millikin teams took first and second place in the competition, having to face each other in the final round of competition. Two of the four students were philosophy majors: Justin Allen and Kenny Miller. The team of Allen and Miller took first place. In addition, Caitlin Harriman was honored as "most outstanding attorney."

At the 2008-09 competition, Millikin teams took first and second place in the competition, having to face each other in the final round of competition. Two of the four students were philosophy majors: Justin Allen and Kenny Miller. The team of Allen and Miller took first place. In addition, Justin was honored as "most outstanding attorney."

At the 2007-08 competition, Millikin teams took first and third place. Both attorneys on the first place team were philosophy majors: Dustin Clark and Kenny Miller.

At the 2006-07 competition, Millikin teams took second and third place. Two of the four attorneys were philosophy majors: Justin Allen and Dustin Clark.

At the 2005-06 competition, a Millikin team took third place. Both students on that team were philosophy majors: Nichole Johnson and Gregg Lagger.

At the 2004-05 competition, Millikin's two teams took first and second place in the competition, having to face each other in the final round of competition. Three of the four students on those teams were philosophy majors: Gregg Lagger, Nichole Johnson, and Colleen Cunningham.

The success of our students as judged by external evaluators at the Moot Court competition, including faculty from other institutions as well as attorneys and law students, is clear <u>external</u> evidence and validation of the quality of our program.

Yet another source of evidence for

place. 1.867m00 1 2]TJ 5[pl)-7(a)5(ce)-2(.)3(7T1m00 1 2]TJ.03 563.02 TmTJETB71.467m00 1 2]TJ.184 l4(r)4(nal]

T

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 11 years. These majors have been accepted into and/or completed a total of <u>35</u> programs at the level of M.A. or above (including J.D.).

The following list provides information regarding the post-graduate activities of each of our graduating majors over the last 11 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.

2010: <u>Eight</u> Graduating Seniors

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

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

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

Gordon Gilmore (2010): plans unknown

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

Adam Moderow (201⁊106.〖-)nFgp(fBT4 Tm〖 72a48 900.75(s)-3( )]TJETBT1 0 0 1 72.0o-5(de3024 329

2003: <u>Three</u> Graduating Seniors

APPENDIX TWO: REQUIREMENTS FOR THE PHILOSOPHY MAJOR

<u>Major in Philosophy</u>
A major consists of a minimum of 30 credits and leads to the B.A. degree. The following courses are required:
PH

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

APPENDIX THREE: RUBRICS

"Rubric for Senior Theses"

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

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

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

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

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.	

	alternative explanations, while maintaining a clear focus on the explanations utilized.
	In addition to there being no flaws in the reasoning presented, it is also clear that the most effective arguments are being made. The arguments being presented are compelling.
	The analysis elicits substantive questions regarding your interpretation.

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

Presentation Goal 1	Few grammatical errors or misspellings.	
	Overall, sentence structure is appropriately complex, incorrect sentence structures occur rarely.	

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

Presentation Goal 1	Some grammatical errors or misspellings.	

	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.	

In light of Department learnin8(r)-hey are simply s8(r)n1onsid56thBT/F25 of De

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

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

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

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.

_____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

APPENDIX FOUR: RUBRIC FOR ASSESSMENT OF ORAL COMMUNICATION

II. Informal Classroom Discussions

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

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

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

WRITTEN COMMENTS:

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