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APPENDIX AA: REQUIRED TABLES

Table B-1 Number of faculty by rank, tenure status, gender, and minority status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Prof.</th>
<th>Assoc.</th>
<th>Asst.</th>
<th>Prof.</th>
<th>Assoc.</th>
<th>Asst.</th>
<th>Perm FT*</th>
<th>Visiting</th>
<th>PT**</th>
<th>Other*** (specify)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2006</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>3M</td>
<td>1M</td>
<td>5M,2F</td>
<td>1M, 1F</td>
<td>5M</td>
<td>1M, 1F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2007</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>2M</td>
<td>1M</td>
<td>5M,3F</td>
<td>1M, 1F</td>
<td>6M,1F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2008</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>2M</td>
<td>1M</td>
<td>5M,3F</td>
<td>1M, 1F</td>
<td>5M,1F</td>
<td>1M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minority 1

Source: Institutional Research
*Includes instructor, lecturer, clinical, research
**Includes PTI and partial contract
***includes academic professional, academic administrator, general administrator, adjunct

Table B-2 Faculty research productivity 2005-2007 (Source: Faculty Self-Reporting)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Prof.</th>
<th># Refereed Publications</th>
<th># Invited Publications</th>
<th># Scholarly Books</th>
<th>Amt. Of External Funding</th>
<th>Amt. Of Internal Funding</th>
<th>Conference Presentations</th>
<th>Other Presentations</th>
<th>Book Reviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4200</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (edited)</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3500 (UNCW)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>119,060</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Tot.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>123,260</td>
<td>15,500</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Avg.</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>8217.33</td>
<td>1033.33</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table B-2 Faculty research productivity 2005-2007 (Source: Faculty Self-Reporting) (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prof</th>
<th># Refereed Publications</th>
<th># Invited Publications</th>
<th># Scholarly Books</th>
<th>Amt. Of External Funding</th>
<th>Amt. Of Internal Funding</th>
<th>Conference Presentations</th>
<th>Other Presentations</th>
<th>Book Reviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. CY 2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>30000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30000 (UNCW)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Tot.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36000</td>
<td>57,500</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Avg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>2400.00</td>
<td>3833.33</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. CY 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>111,837</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2500</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Tot.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>126,737</td>
<td>70500</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Avg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>8449.13</td>
<td>4700.00</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Year Tot.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>285997</td>
<td>143500</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Year Avg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>19066.47</td>
<td>9566.67</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table B-3: Student Enrollment in Our Programs  
Program Types by Majors and Concentration and Unduplicated Number (Headcount) of Major Students and Degrees Conferred, FY 2006-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program/Major</th>
<th>Concentration</th>
<th>FY 2006</th>
<th>FY 2007</th>
<th>FY 2008</th>
<th>3 Yr. Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Majors</td>
<td>Degrees Conferred</td>
<td>Majors</td>
<td>Degrees Conferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*B.A./Philosophy</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Law</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A./Philosophy</td>
<td><strong>Traditional</strong></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brains &amp; Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.D./M.A</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Institutional Research.  
*These numbers may not include students whose second major is in philosophy.  
**Numbers in the “Traditional” Graduate Student Track totals include students registered in the “AEI” track and those registered in no track; the AEI track has been phased out.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.4</th>
<th>Retention and Graduation Rates for All Phi Majors (Juniors)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FALL 01</strong></td>
<td><strong>RETAINED</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JUNIORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FALL 02</strong></td>
<td><strong>RETAINED</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JUNIORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FALL 03</strong></td>
<td><strong>RETAINED</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JUNIORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FALL 04</strong></td>
<td><strong>RETAINED</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JUNIORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FALL 05</strong></td>
<td><strong>RETAINED</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JUNIORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FALL 06</strong></td>
<td><strong>RETAINED</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JUNIORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Retention and Graduation Rates for MA Phi Majors**

| **FALL 01** | **RETAINED** | **GRAD BY 1 YR RET** | **RETAINED** | **GRAD BY 2 YR RET** | **RETAINED** | **GRAD BY 3 YR RET** | **RETAINED** | **GRAD BY 4 YR RET** |
| **JUNIORS** | | FALL 02 | RATE | FALL 03 | RATE | FALL 04 | RATE | FALL 05 | RATE | FALL 06 | RATE | FALL 07 | RATE | FALL 08 | RATE |
| N = 7 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 5 |
| **FALL 02** | **RETAINED** | **GRAD BY 1 YR RET** | **RETAINED** | **GRAD BY 2 YR RET** | **RETAINED** | **GRAD BY 3 YR RET** | **RETAINED** | **GRAD BY 4 YR RET** |
| **JUNIORS** | | FALL 03 | RATE | FALL 04 | RATE | FALL 05 | RATE | FALL 06 | RATE | FALL 07 | RATE | FALL 08 | RATE | FALL 09 | RATE |
| N = 13 | 10 | 0 | 10 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 1 | 6 | 7 |
| **FALL 03** | **RETAINED** | **GRAD BY 1 YR RET** | **RETAINED** | **GRAD BY 2 YR RET** | **RETAINED** | **GRAD BY 3 YR RET** | **RETAINED** | **GRAD BY 4 YR RET** |
| **JUNIORS** | | FALL 04 | RATE | FALL 05 | RATE | FALL 06 | RATE | FALL 07 | RATE | FALL 08 | RATE | FALL 09 | RATE | FALL 10 | RATE |
| N = 15 | 14 | 0 | 14 | 3 | 3 | 12 | 3 | 10 | 13 | 2 | 11 | 13 | 1 | 13 | 13 |
| **FALL 04** | **RETAINED** | **GRAD BY 1 YR RET** | **RETAINED** | **GRAD BY 2 YR RET** | **RETAINED** | **GRAD BY 3 YR RET** | **RETAINED** | **GRAD BY 4 YR RET** |
| **JUNIORS** | | FALL 05 | RATE | FALL 06 | RATE | FALL 07 | RATE | FALL 08 | RATE | FALL 09 | RATE | FALL 10 | RATE | FALL 11 | RATE |
| N = 11 | 11 | 0 | 11 | 5 | 3 | 8 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 6 |
| **FALL 05** | **RETAINED** | **GRAD BY 1 YR RET** | **RETAINED** | **GRAD BY 2 YR RET** | **RETAINED** | **GRAD BY 3 YR RET** | **RETAINED** | **GRAD BY 4 YR RET** |
| **JUNIORS** | | FALL 06 | RATE | FALL 07 | RATE | FALL 08 | RATE | FALL 09 | RATE | FALL 10 | RATE | FALL 11 | RATE | FALL 12 | RATE |
| N = 17 | 15 | 0 | 15 | 3 | 8 | 13 | 1 | 12 | 13 | 0 | 12 | 13 | 0 | 12 | 13 |
| **FALL 06** | **RETAINED** | **GRAD BY 1 YR RET** | **RETAINED** | **GRAD BY 2 YR RET** | **RETAINED** | **GRAD BY 3 YR RET** | **RETAINED** | **GRAD BY 4 YR RET** |
| **JUNIORS** | | FALL 07 | RATE | FALL 08 | RATE | FALL 09 | RATE | FALL 10 | RATE | FALL 11 | RATE | FALL 12 | RATE | FALL 13 | RATE |
| N = 17 | 15 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 6 | 11 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 6 |

| **FALL 07** | **RETAINED** | **GRAD BY 1 YR RET** |
| **JUNIORS** | | FALL 08 | RATE |
| N = 25 | 22 | 0 | 22 | 85 | 0 | 85 |
### Table B-5a
FY 2006 Credit Hours Taught by Philosophy Faculty by Level and Faculty Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACULTY TYPE</th>
<th>UGRD</th>
<th>UGRAD</th>
<th>UGRAD</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Track</td>
<td>1,512</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>3,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenure Track</td>
<td>4,439</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>6,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTI</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTA</td>
<td>4,304</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>10,321</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>2,721</td>
<td>14,776</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table B-5b
FY 2007 Credit Hours Taught by Philosophy Faculty by Level and Faculty Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACULTY TYPE</th>
<th>UGRD</th>
<th>UGRAD</th>
<th>UGRAD</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Track</td>
<td>1,651</td>
<td>1,181</td>
<td>1,401</td>
<td>4,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenure Track</td>
<td>3,183</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>5,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTI</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTA</td>
<td>4,278</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>4,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>9,403</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>3,459</td>
<td>15,142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table B-5c
FY 2008 Credit Hours Taught by Philosophy Faculty by Level and Faculty Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACULTY TYPE</th>
<th>UGRD</th>
<th>UGRAD</th>
<th>UGRAD</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Track</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,283</td>
<td>1,547</td>
<td>4,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenure Track</td>
<td>2,950</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>5,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTI</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTA</td>
<td>5,065</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>10,846</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>3,638</td>
<td>16,890</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table B-6: Summary Table: Faculty Numbers, Credit Hours, and Scholarly and Creative Productivity, Three-Year Average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average annual number of faculty members by rank and status</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenured professors</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured associate professors</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-track associate professors</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-track assistant professors</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tenure-track faculty members</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-tenure-track faculty members (fulltime)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total fulltime faculty members</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time instructors</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate teaching assistants</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for part-time faculty</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average annual number and type of staff**
- Administrative staff (fulltime equivalents): 3*
- Student assistants (half-time equivalents): 0

**Average annual credit hours by level**
- Undergraduate: Core: 10190.0
- Undergraduate: Lower division: 451.0
- Undergraduate: Upper division: 3272.7
- Graduate: 1689.0

**Average annual credit hours by faculty type**
- Tenured and tenure-track: 4175.0
- Non-tenure track (fulltime): 6070.7
- Total for fulltime faculty: 10245.7
- Part-time instructors: 86.0
- Graduate teaching assistants: 4762.0
- Total for part-time faculty: 4848.0

**Scholarly and creative productivity**
- Total number of refereed publications: Unduplicated: 24
- Total number of refereed publications: By author: 24
- Total number of other scholarly books: Unduplicated: 6
- Total number of other scholarly books: By author: 7
- Average annual number of refereed publications per tenure-track faculty: Unduplicated: 1.6
- Average annual number of refereed publications per tenure-track faculty: By author: 1.6
- Average annual number of other scholarly/creative books per tenure-track faculty: Unduplicated: 0.4
- Average annual number of other scholarly/creative books per tenure-track faculty: By author: 0.5

**Funding from grant and other sources**
- Total external direct funding: $249,000
- Total external indirect costs: $20,000
- Total internal funding: $99,000
- Total funding from other sources: $0
- Average annual external funding per tenure-track faculty: $20,750
- Average annual internal funding per tenure-track faculty: $8,250
Notes for Table B-6:
*These three staff lines are shared between Philosophy and Religious Studies
1 For works with multiple authors from the unit, count the work only once.
2 For works with multiple authors from the unit, count the work once for each author in the unit.
3 For multi-participant grants, include only the amounts allocated to unit faculty members.

Table E-1: Mean Standardized Graduate Admission Test Scores, FY 2006-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Academic Program</th>
<th>Applied</th>
<th>Accepted</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>GRE VERB</td>
<td>GRE QUANT</td>
<td>TOTAL VERB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>MA, PHI</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>1231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>MA, PHI</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>1287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>MA, PHI</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>1266</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Institutional Research

Table E-2: Selection Ratio of Applicant/Accepted Graduate Students, FY 2006-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Academic Program</th>
<th># of Applicants</th>
<th># of Accepted</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>PHI</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>PHI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>PHI</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>PHI AEI</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>PHI AEI</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>PHI AEI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>PHI JD</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>65.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>PHI JD</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>PHI PTT</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Institutional Research

Table G-1: Student/Faculty Ratios, FY 2006-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2006</th>
<th>FY 2007</th>
<th>FY 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># TT Faculty</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Undergraduate Majors</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Graduate Majors (All)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG/TT Ratio</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/TT Ratio</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Graduate Faculty</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Institutional Research
Appendices
B1 through B5
Appendix B1  Rationale for choices of peer programs

Please see Main Report, Section B-7.

Appendix B2  Organization of unit governance and committees

The Department is lead by its Chair who appoints Committee Chairs, Coordinators, and Committee Members. Directors appointed by the Dean upon advice of the Chair.

Officers
Chair: George Rainbolt  
Director of Graduate Studies: Timothy O’Keefe 
Director of Undergraduate Studies: Eddy Nahmias  
Coordinator of Graduate Teaching: Sandra Dwyer 
Assessment Coordinator: A. J. Cohen  
Coordinator, Program for Retention, Progress, and Graduation: A. J. Cohen 
Honors Advisor: Eddy Nahmias  
Pre-Law Advisor: Andrew I. Cohen 
Colloquium Coordinator: Sebastian Rand 
Department Secretary: Sebastian Rand 
Library Liaison: Sebastian Rand  
Coordinator of the Sorbonne Exchange Program: George Rainbolt 
Coordinator of the Bielefeld Exchange Program: Sebastian Rand

Committees
Executive Committee: George Rainbolt, Tim O’Keefe, Andrew I. Cohen, Andrew J. Cohen 
Promotion and Tenure Committee: All tenured faculty above the rank of the candidate 
Program Committee: Sebastian Rand, Andy Altman, Andrew J. Cohen  
Assessment Committee: A. J. Cohen, Sandra Dwyer, George Graham, and Andy Altman 
Graduate Committee: Tim O’Keefe, Andrea Scarantino, Andrew I. Cohen 
Undergraduate Committee: Eddy Nahmias, George Graham, Sandra Dwyer

Administrative Staff
Business Manager: Ellen Logan 
Senior Administrative Coordinator: Claire Murata Kooy 
Administrative Coordinator: Felicia Thomas

Appendix B3  By-laws of the department of philosophy

The Department operates by Robert's Rules of Order constrained by the University and College bylaws.
Appendix B4  Current faculty roster  hire date, entry rank, current rank, tenure status, and full or part-time status of faculty members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Hire Date</th>
<th>Entry Rank</th>
<th>Current Rank</th>
<th>Tenure Status</th>
<th>Full or Part Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Altman</td>
<td>8/01</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandie Bedard</td>
<td>8/08</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Non-tenurable</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Berry</td>
<td>8/06</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>Untenured</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew I. Cohen</td>
<td>8/05</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>Untenured</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew J. Cohen</td>
<td>8/05</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>Assoc</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Cox</td>
<td>8/08</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>Non-tenurable</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ness Creighton</td>
<td>8/08</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Non-tenurable</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Dwyer</td>
<td>8/04</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>Non-tenurable</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Edmundson</td>
<td>4/01 joint</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Graham</td>
<td>8/08</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christie Hartley</td>
<td>8/05</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>Untenured</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Jacobson</td>
<td>8/00</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>Non-tenurable</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Julian</td>
<td>8/08</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Non-tenurable</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Lindsay</td>
<td>11/01 joint</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>Assoc</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Merritt</td>
<td>8/04</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>Untenured</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eddy Nahmias</td>
<td>8/05</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>Assoc</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim O'Keefee</td>
<td>8/03</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>Assoc</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Rainbolt</td>
<td>8/93</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastian Rand</td>
<td>8/06</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>Untenured</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Scarantino</td>
<td>8/05</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>Untenured</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B-5 Jean Beer Blumenfeld Ethics Center Report

GSU Research Center Review Survey

Name of Center: Jean Beer Blumenfeld Center for Ethics

Center Director: Andrew Altman

Associate Director: Andrew I. Cohen

A. General Information

1. When was the center created and to which department/college/office was it originally designated? If the designation has changed, in which department/college/office does the center currently reside?

The Center was created in the Department of Philosophy in 1995.

2. To whom does the center’s director report?

The Center’s Director reports to the chair of the Department of Philosophy.

3. If there is an advisory board to this center, describe its function and composition.

Rather than an advisory board, the Center has “Affiliated Faculty.” Affiliated Faculty are essentially friends of the Center who often initiate, plan, publicize and participate in our events. They are drawn primarily from the Philosophy Department and other departments within the College of Arts and Sciences, and from the Law School. See Appendix F.

4. If the center is considered interdisciplinary, describe the interdisciplinary focus.

While the Center is housed in the Department of Philosophy, it belongs to the University as a whole. Accordingly, we cosponsor programs with other centers and departments and we seek to include faculty from across the college and university in our own programs.

5. Describe in detail the amount of start-up support available.

There is no start-up support available for the Center.

B. Goals and Objectives

1. Please enumerate the initial goals and objectives and describe the current goals and objectives if they have changed.

The previous self-study (2004) described the goals and objectives of the Center in these terms:
Mission: Inspired by the conviction that universities have a responsibility, not only to their students and faculty, but also to the broader intellectual and social communities, the Jean Beer Blumenfeld Center for Ethics seeks to enhance moral reflection, dialogue and constructive action on campus, in greater Atlanta and beyond. Universities should provide intellectual and moral leadership by example and through innovative programming designed to foster fruitful thinking about the ethical issues inherent in our personal, professional and civic lives. To that end, the Center sponsors conferences, lectures, and a variety of theoretical and practical programs tailored to specific constituencies, all designed to support faculty, students and members of the larger community who wish to advance ethical understanding and construct lives of personal integrity and responsible citizenship.

Principal Aims: (1) Conferences, Lectures and Workshops: The Center hosts events ranging from academic symposia whose papers are published in scholarly journals, to applied programs designed expressly for a particular campus or community organization, to lectures meant to heighten awareness of a specific issue, (2) Faculty and Staff Resource: The Center supplies counsel for faculty throughout the university interested in incorporating ethical components into their courses, and it offers workshops for faculty and administrative groups contending with difficult moral issues, (3) Student Engagement: In an effort to inspire students to undertake ethical inquiry and constructive action, the Center sponsors events such as essay contests, open forums on selected topics, and grant contests for student projects that address pressing moral concerns, (4) Community Outreach: By delivering lectures, answering questions, and sponsoring programs that explore moral issues and combat social ills, the Center serves as a prominent and accessible resource for individuals and groups in the metropolitan area.

There are no material changes in the Center’s current conception of its mission or its aims. The Center has been very successful since the last Research Center Review. See Appendices A and B for a full list of Center activities (including publications). We have continued doing the work that led the Center to be awarded the 2003 American Philosophical Association/Philosophy Documentation Center Prize for Excellence and Innovation in Philosophy Programs. However, it is important to underscore several new initiatives that the Center has undertaken in recent years and to make note of a shift in emphasis in the programs that are envisioned for the next five years.

One new initiative was a collaboration with the University of Cape Town in which we cosponsored two major international conferences held in Cape Town. We plan to continue this collaboration.

A second new initiative was the inauguration of a series entitled, “What Humanists Should Know About…,” bringing a world-class scholar each year to Georgia State to direct a full day seminar on her/his own work for a small group of faculty engaged in humanistic research (see appendix E). The inaugural event brought to campus Jared Diamond, Pulitzer Prize winning
author of *Guns, Germs, and Steel* and Professor of Geography at UCLA. His topic was “What Humanists Should Know About Science, Sex, Race, and Violence.” Faculty from philosophy, political science, history, women’s studies, and geography, prepared for the seminar by doing readings assigned by Professor Diamond and then discussed the readings with him in four 90-minute sessions. The second event in the series is planned for 2009, with Professor Juan Cole, who is Richard P. Mitchell Collegiate Professor History at the University of Michigan. He will conduct a seminar on “What Humanists Should Know About Islam and the Middle East.”

A third new initiative is currently underway, involving collaboration with the Jewish Studies Program, the Middle East Institute, and the Democracy and Human Rights area of focus group that was recently formed within the College of Arts and Science. We are planning a conference, to be held in March 2009, on the topic, ‘Human Rights in an Age of Global Insecurity’, and the Center plans continuing work in the area of human rights with its partners in the project.

These new initiatives reflect the change in emphasis alluded to above. Over the past five years, a major emphasis of the Center has been large conferences devoted to topics mainly of interest to philosophers, sponsored solely by the Center, and published in a prestigious journal. The proceedings of these conferences have been published in the journals, *Ethics* and *Legal Theory*. *Ethics* is generally regarded as one of the two top scholarly journals in the English-speaking world covering ethical, political, and legal philosophy. *Legal Theory* is the most highly respected, peer-reviewed journal devoted to issues of law and philosophy. Accordingly, the conferences sponsored by the Center have been notable successes. However, it is envisioned that in the next five years there will be fewer of these large conferences and more collaboration with others divisions in the College and University and with other universities. This change is, in part, a response to financial constraints. Increases in airfare and lodging expenses make it less feasible to sponsor conferences of the size we had been doing up through 2005 (roughly eight main speakers and six discussants) and more advisable to leverage our limited funds by collaborating with other units within the university. However, the change also reflects a desire of the Center to engage in a greater number of more robustly interdisciplinary conferences, seminars, and symposia.

The Center plans to continue its annual book manuscript workshop, which has come to be well known and highly regarded in the philosophy profession. The workshop brings to campus an internationally prominent philosopher who is writing a new book and who provides a working manuscript of the book to a small group assembled by the Center. The group normally consists of approximately eight Georgia State faculty, along with two prominent outside scholars who are recommended by the manuscript’s author. The group reads the manuscript in advance and then meets at Georgia State for a day and a half of sessions devoted to going over each chapter. These annual workshops have been very successful. Since the last Research Center Review, four books from the workshops have been published, three with Oxford University Press and one with Cambridge University Press. Those two publishers are regarded by professional consensus as the two best philosophy presses in the world.

2. What are the major institutional, administrative, and/or financial resources that facilitate achieving the center’s goals and objectives?
Dr. Altman’s teaching reduction and summer stipend (5% of summer salary); Dr. Cohen’s teaching reduction and summer stipend (5% of summer salary); a staff member shared by the Center with the Philosophy and Religious Studies departments; and $30K budget

3. What are the major institutional, administrative, and/or financial constraints that interfere with achieving the center’s goals and objectives?

The Center’s existing programs are limited in size and number mainly by financial considerations. However, within the current budget, it is perfectly possible for the Center to carry out its essential tasks, albeit on a smaller scale than would otherwise be possible.

4. What is your assessment of your achievement of your goals?

The Center has been successful in organizing conferences, lectures, and workshops for ethical philosophers, thereby supporting research and publication. These conferences have generally led to publications. (See Appendix B for a list of the publications.) The Center has also been instrumental in securing two grants of over $100,000 each from the National Endowment for the Humanities in order to summer seminars for college faculty from around the country. The seminars have brought to Georgia State 15 participants in each of two summers in order to study and research with Center Director Dr. Andrew Altman and Dr. Christopher Heath Wellman (Washington University- St. Louis).

The Center has had increasing success in engaging students. For example, an annual Ethics-in-Film Movie series, devoted to a different ethical theme each year, has become a major success due to the hard work of Dr. Cohen. Additionally, many events have been coordinated with specific philosophy classes, leading to greater student attendance than in the past. (See Appendix A for a complete list of student-centered events.)

Community outreach has not been extensive, although the Center has sponsored a number of events in which representatives of various community organizations, such as religious institutions and environmental groups, have participated. Additionally, the Associate Director has given talks to local business and leadership groups. (See Appendix A for a list of these events.)

C. Research of the Center

1. What research is currently being conducted in the center? Describe the major areas/topics of research. How has the center increased productivity of the faculty?

The Center’s principal research role is to assist Georgia State and outside faculty with their own research by providing forums in which they can present and discuss their ideas in depth. Accordingly, the Center sponsors such events as conferences, a book-manuscript workshop, professional talks, and similar events oriented toward research-active members of the academy. Appendix B contains the list of publications that have from these activities.

2. What are the major impediments for conducting research in the center?
The Center would need substantially more resources to undertake any significant long-term research programs.

3. What percentage of the center’s funding has been paid out of Fund Code 10? List amounts for the last five years.

All of the Center’s funding, $30k per annum for the past five years, has been paid out of fund code 10.

4. Attach a list of all research activities and other activities (e.g. workshops/programs/conferences/seminars/symposia/etc.) of the center.

See Appendix A

5. Attach separate bibliographies of refereed and nonrefereed publications which have resulted from research activities of the center. List publications for three years only.

See Appendix B.

6. Attach a list of grants submitted in the last three academic years and list all sources of funding. Click here for the format to use. For funded grants, give title, funding source, amount, type of grant (research or instruction), GSU project number, and period funded. Specify the amount of funds received from each category (research or instruction) for each of the last three years.

See Appendix C.

D. Center Personnel

List all personnel funded through the center for the prior fiscal year. Use this format. Faculty who receive course releases or full or partial summer pay should be counted as center members.

See Appendix D.

Appendix A
Jean Beer Blumenfeld Center for Ethics
List of Activities By Year, 2004-2008

2004:

Conference on disability, involving 14 speakers from universities across the country.

Lecture on International Aid; Speaker: Neera Badhwar, University of Oklahoma

Ethics-in-Film Movie Series for students; Topic: Hollywood Goes to Washington

Undergraduate Ethics Essay Contest
A film Series and two colloquia for students, faculty and community to commemorate and reflect on the 50th Anniversary of Brown v. Board of Education

2005:

Conference on the work of renowned philosopher, Joel Feinberg, involving 14 distinguished speakers from universities around the country

Host (along with the Philosophy Department) to a five-week summer seminar for college teachers, funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities

Book manuscript workshop on Thomas Christiano’s (University of Arizona) manuscript on democracy

Ethics-in-Film Movie Series for students; Topic: Business and Ethics

Symposium for students and faculty on Religion and Natural Disasters

Symposium for students and faculty on Tsunami Relief

Lecture for students and faculty on Religious Pluralism; Speaker: Jonathan W. Malino, Guilford College

Lecture for students and faculty on Democratic Distributive Justice: Speaker: Rex Martin, University of Kansas

Lecture for students and faculty on Human Rights and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.; Speaker: Michael Sullivan, Emory University

Lecture for students and faculty on Why Life is So Much Worse than You Think; Speaker: David Benatar, University of Cape Town

2006:

Cosponsor (with University of Cape Town) of an international conference with 35 speakers, held in Cape Town, South Africa; Topic: Ethics and Africa

A conference on the work of renowned philosopher, Bernard Williams, involving 12 speakers from universities in the United States and the United Kingdom

Ethics-in-Film Movie Series for students; topic: Biotechnology
Symposia for students, faculty, and community on: Globalizing the American Way and Religion, Globalization, and Public Health

Lecture for students, faculty, and community on Forced Sterilization Laws (cosponsored with the law school)

Book manuscript workshop on John Simmons’ (University of Virginia) manuscript on political philosophy

Book manuscript workshop on Joseph Carens’ (University of Toronto) manuscript on immigration

2007:

Host (along with the Philosophy Department) to a four-week summer seminar for college teachers, funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities

Conference on the Rules of War, including four distinguished participants from universities across the country

Ethics-in-Film Movie Series for students; topic: Immigration

Undergraduate Ethics Essay Context

Conference on the work of the renowned philosopher John Finnis, involving ten distinguished philosophers from universities in the United States and the United Kingdom

Lecture for students and faculty on the Separateness of Persons

Colloquium on Pluralism and Values; Speaker: Alan Carter, University of Glasgow

Symposium on Ethics and Traffic

Presentations by Associate Director at two national conferences and a talk to GSU graduate students

2008:

Cosponsored (with the University of Cape Town) an international conference with 25 speakers, held at Cape Town, South Africa; Topic: The Ethics of Bearing and Rearing Children

Ethics-in-Film Movie Series; Topic: Voting, Government and the Media

Undergraduate Ethics Essay Contest
Talk for students and faculty on Attention Deficit Democracy; Speaker: James Bovard

Lecture for students and faculty on Reproductive Freedom; Speaker: David Benatar, University of Cape Town

Book manuscript workshop on Arthur Ripstein’s (University of Toronto) manuscript on Kant’s legal philosophy

Appendix B
Jean Beer Blumenfeld Center for Ethics
List of Publications 2004-2008

All publications are peer-reviewed.

I. Publications resulting from conferences sponsored by the Center for Ethics.

Conference on Terrorism, War, and Justice, held 2003, resulted in six articles and an introduction published in Ethics 114: 4 (2004).


II. Publications resulting from summer seminars sponsored by the National Endowment for the Humanities and hosted by the Ethics Center and Department of Philosophy.


### III. Publications from Book Manuscript Workshops.


### Appendix C: Summary of Grants Submitted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Submitted</th>
<th>Date Funded</th>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Project Director</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Type of Grant Submitted</th>
<th>Period Funded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 2006</td>
<td>Sept 2006</td>
<td>4234</td>
<td>Altman and Wellman</td>
<td>Democracy, Law, and Human Rights</td>
<td>111,837</td>
<td>NEH</td>
<td>Summer Seminars for College Teachers</td>
<td>10/1/06-9/30/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2004</td>
<td>Sept 2004</td>
<td>2454</td>
<td>Altman and Wellman</td>
<td>Political Obligation, Democratic Legitimacy, and Human Rights</td>
<td>119,060</td>
<td>NEH</td>
<td>Summer Seminars for College Teachers</td>
<td>10/1/04-9/30/05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix D: Center Personnel
For each individual, list center funding provided for the categories below*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>College &amp; Department</th>
<th>Load Allocated to the Center</th>
<th>Amount of Funding-External (Grants, contracts, Other)</th>
<th>Amt of Funding-Internal (College/Dept.)</th>
<th>Amount of Funding-CIP**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Altman</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Arts and Sciences; Philosophy</td>
<td>2 course reduction</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew I. Cohen</td>
<td>Associate Director</td>
<td>Arts and Sciences; Philosophy</td>
<td>1 course reduction</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Arts and Sciences; Philosophy; Religious Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix E

*The Jean Beer Blumenfeld Center for Ethics announces a faculty seminar series:*

“What Humanists Should Know About…”

➢ What the Series About:

Each academic year we plan to bring to Georgia State an internationally renowned scholar who works across several disciplines in the natural or social sciences. Our guest scholar will lead a day-long seminar with a group of fifteen to twenty Georgia State faculty working in the humanities; the discussions will be organized around readings that our guest selects from her/his works along with others that may be judged appropriate. The topics to be addressed—such as the environment, human nature, and social change—are crucial to the work we do as ethically aware humanists. The aim of the seminar series is thus to help humanities faculty develop a broad-based understanding of history, society, and nature that will inform their future teaching and research. Interested faculty will meet with each other several times prior to the visit of our guest scholar, in order to become familiar with, and to discuss with one another, selected aspects of the
The scholar's work. These meetings will prepare us for an intensive and fruitful interchange during the visit.

The Purpose of the Series:

Scholars in the humanities often find themselves disconnected from important research in the social and natural sciences. We are not wholly ignorant of other fields, but our understandings are often outdated or otherwise inadequate in ways that are ultimately limiting for humanistic research itself. In particular, the ethical and intellectual context that frames our work carries the risk of becoming narrow and cramped. While we cannot and should not try to revive a long bygone era when humanities scholars aspired to know “all” the disciplines, we can and must try to repair crucial gaps in our understanding of other scholarly fields. To do so, we need a concerted and collective effort to put our work in touch with the social and natural contexts in which all humans live – and in which humanistic research and teaching find much of their meaning and purpose. The seminar series “What Humanists Should Know About …” contributes to such an effort by creating a setting in which humanists can engage with the best work being done outside the humanities and begin to explore its implications for their own work.

Appendix F
Jean Beer Blumenfeld Center for Ethics
Faculty Affiliates

Jessica Berry, Philosophy
David Blumenfeld, Philosophy (emeritus)
Henry Carey, Political Science
Andrew J. Cohen, Philosophy
Sandra Dwyer, Philosophy
William Edmundson, Law and Philosophy
Jonathan Herman, Religious Studies
Christie Hartley, Philosophy
Stephen Jacobson, Philosophy
Charles Jones, African-American Studies
Peter Lindsay, Political Science and Philosophy
Kathryn McClumond, Religious Studies
Eddy Nahmias, Philosophy
Timothy O’Keefe, Philosophy
George Rainbolt, Philosophy
Sebastian Rand, Philosophy
Timothy Renick, Religious Studies
Andrea Scarantino, Philosophy
Charity Scott, Law
Roy Sobelson, Law
Appendix C1
2003 Strategic Plan and Goals
Appendix C1 Philosophy strategic plan & goals as of the beginning of self-study period

Philosophy Program Action Plan, 2003

The Action Plan for the Philosophy Program is based on the Departmental Self-Study (January 2003), the Chair’s Overview letter (January 2003), the Dean's Overview letter (February 2003), the Consulting Team Report (February 2003), and the APACE report (June 2003).

According to the external evaluators, "the Philosophy Department at Georgia State University has done an amazing job of building a strong, internationally recognized Department" and "the University, at relatively little cost, can turn a very strong Department into a truly premier Department within a major urban research University." This document sets out a plan to do just that.

Progress Report

As of the Spring 2003 semester, the department has 10 tenured and tenure-track faculty who teach philosophy. This is the same number of tenured and tenure-track faculty that the program had in 1993. The philosophy program also has 3 lecturers and 10 visiting instructors. One of the visiting instructors is one-third in philosophy and two-thirds in religious studies. As of Fall 2002, there were 3,972 students enrolled in philosophy courses, 103 philosophy majors and 44 philosophy graduate students. (Due to problems in Institutional Research, the Department does not have more recent data.) In the year following semester conversion, the department produced 11,870 credit hours. In the year just ended, the department produced 21,623 credit hours, an increase of 9,753 credit hours or over 80%.

The Philosophy Program is presently:

A. Working to improve undergraduate education. The Philosophy Program has responded effectively to the amazing growth in enrollment which has occurred since semester conversion. The curricular revisions done at semester conversion did not anticipate this increasing demand so the program has, over the past two years, revised its curriculum from top to bottom—revising Critical Thinking, adding a pre-law concentration in the major, introducing a new course (Philosophical Thinking) to the major, and revising the prerequisites for all upper level courses.

B. Working to improve graduate education. We have more students than any of the top-10 philosophy M.A. programs and we are growing rapidly in both quantity and quality. We are responding to this growth by revising our M.A. program's admissions requirements to give the Religious Studies track more independence, adding a J.D./M.A. program, and revising our graduate offerings. Of particular note is that in Spring 2004 our graduate students will have the opportunity to study at the University of Paris IV (La Sorbonne). We will welcome our first students from the Sorbonne in the Fall of 2004. The program is proud that the faculty of the Sorbonne have concluded that our instruction is of such high quality that they will count our courses towards their graduate degrees. We are greatly expanding the instruction on teaching which our graduate students receive. We are implementing a three course sequence of instruction in teaching and have appointed Dr. Tullos as Coordinator of Graduate Teaching. We were also able, by converting visiting instructor positions to GTAships, to significantly increase our stipends. The stipends now range between $6,000 and $12,000. Last fall, they ranged from $2,000 to $12,000. Our progress has been noted by students. The yield on offers to enter the M.A. program in the Fall of 2003 was so high that, unless we get additional resources, we will not be able to make any supported offers of admission in the Spring of 2004.
C. Working to improve research. While continuing the publication record which is the best in the country among philosophy M.A. programs, faculty are aggressively applying for external funding. In Spring of 2003, less than four months after the department changed summer funding policies to encourage grant applications, three faculty members applied for NEH funding and we anticipate that almost everyone in the philosophy program will have applied for a significant external grant before the Summer of 2004. Departmental faculty have been invited to give papers in Europe, had symposia focused on their books at the national meetings of the American Philosophical Association, and seen the publication of articles devoted exclusively to their work in the very best philosophy journals.

D. Working to improve service to the university, Atlanta and the broader philosophy community. Recognizing the excellent service of Jean Beer Blumenfeld Center for Ethics's and the need to provide faculty office space to respond to the Department's increase in credit hours, the College of Arts and Sciences and CBSAC have found new space to house the Center for Ethics, thus freeing up space to reduce the number of faculty sharing offices. The College of Arts and Sciences further recognized the excellence of the Center for Ethics by approving the hire of a new Managing Director for the Center. He is developing programs targeted beyond the academic community and spearheading an effort to increase the external funding of the Center. The Center's spring conference this year was on Terrorism and Justice. The program included sixteen participants from Australia, Israel, England, as well as all over the United States. Upon their publication, we expect the papers to be of enduring value to those working on this important topic. The papers from last year's conference on G.E. Moore's *Principia Ethica* were published this year as a special symposium in the academic journal, *Ethics*, other of the five most prestigious journals in philosophy. The papers from the previous year's conference on Urban Environmental Ethics also appeared this year in *The Journal of Social Philosophy*.

Action Plan Priorities

1. Increase the number of tenured and tenure-track faculty teaching philosophy courses from the 10 we had in the Spring of 2003 to 14 over the next five years. Hire a new distinguished full professor to anchor an area of concentration in a field of contemporary analytic philosophy.

   **Rationale:** The external evaluators wrote: "Our main recommendation for the next five years is that the Philosophy Department -- that is, the Philosophy Program -- expand to include five new lines, including at least one senior appointment." In light of budget realities, the program will hire only four. This will have three important benefits. First, it will allow us to replace two visiting instructors. Currently, 43% of the philosophy faculty are visiting instructors. The University was forced to respond to our dramatic increase in enrollments by hiring visiting instructors. It is time to convert some of them to tenure-track faculty. The addition of four new tenured/tenure-track is the minimum required to teach enough graduate students to bring the percentage of visiting faculty down to less than 25%. (See Priority 3 below.) Second, it will make the department the best philosophy M.A. program in the country. The M.A. program is currently tied for second in the country. To become the nation's best M.A. program, the department needs to develop an area of excellence to complement its international reputation in ethics. To do this, we will follow the external evaluator's recommendation and hire the best possible full professor in contemporary analytic philosophy (excluding ethics). Contemporary analytic philosophy includes such fields as philosophy of science, philosophy of mind, and philosophy of language. For example, hiring someone in philosophy of mind would create exciting links to neuroscience, psychology, and artificial intelligence. Then we will build on that strength by hiring two junior faculty structured to support the full professor. Third, we will fill in one of the crucial gaps in our coverage of philosophy: continental, feminism, philosophy of mind, philosophy of science, and early modern or Kant. (The Program has made the strategic decision not to pursue an doctoral program. Because there is an over-supply of philosophy Ph.D. programs, the Program attracts better graduate students by occupying the
market-niche of offering M.A. students faculty of a quality superior to that found in the vast majority of philosophy Ph.D. programs.)

Resources: A new full professor line and three new assistant professor lines. These are in addition to replacing any faculty departures from among those faculty who currently teach in the philosophy program. The department assumes that replacements, no matter what the level of the departing faculty member, would be made at the assistant professor level. Additional office space would be required for these four faculty members.

2. Establish Religious Studies as a separate department "linked" to Philosophy.

Rationale: All expert parties, including both the Philosophy and Religious Studies external review teams and the faculty of both programs, agree that the most desirable circumstance for Philosophy and Religious Studies would be to establish separate departments. The Dean’s Office, as well as APACE, concur in this assessment.

Establishing separate departments would accomplish multiple goals. It would improve recruitment and retention of philosophy faculty by removing the stigma of teaching within what is, in substance, a philosophy/religious studies program. Due to the fact that philosophy departments often grew historically and painfully out of theology programs, there is a view in both professions that a combination of the two disciplines represents an antiquated and outmoded approach which compromises the intellectual integrity of both disciplines. It would benefit the Religious Studies faculty by allowing them to be identified in an accurate way professionally, and would greatly enhance faculty recruitment and retention efforts in the area. This is of particular importance when it comes to the Suttles Chair of Religious Studies because many important donors will be looking to see that we hire an outstanding scholar. Separating into two departments would greatly benefit the students--many of whom do not even know that Religious Studies exists at Georgia State--by giving much greater visibility to Religious Studies. (Currently, for instance, a student has to know to look for Religious Studies within Philosophy to find it on the university web site or in the phone directory—both of which list academic programs according to departments only.) This would increase enrollments in Religious Studies at both the undergraduate and graduate level. Most importantly, it would be honest: the two disciplines are utterly distinct, are founded on very different methodological and epistemological assumptions and the faculties of the two programs at Georgia State already have established and adhere successfully to procedures for independent decision-making on all substantive curricular, hiring, and promotion issues. The establishment of separate departments would, then, merely recognize what already is.

The argument most often heard against such a split is that small departments are inefficient. But because of the positive working relationship between the two programs—including the fact that they currently share work space, staff members, and a single budget—there are possibilities for a creative solution here that may be unique on campus. The faculties of both programs, with the support of the outside evaluators and the Dean’s Office, think that the objection can be addressed by establishing “linked departments”—independent administrative units that share office space, resources, and staffing while continuing to operate under a single budget.

Resources: In the “linked departments” scenario, staffing and supply budgets would not change at all. No new space would be needed under the proposal since the two departments would continue to share the same space. (That said, it is important to point out that the hires being proposed by both Philosophy and Religious Studies inevitably will create new space needs regardless of whether or not the departments are separated.) Costs under the “linked departments” plan thus would be limited to the additional monies needed for a Chair of Religion Studies. The cost would equal the amount required to turn a .75 faculty position into a 1.0 minus the savings from eliminating the position of Associate Chair of Philosophy (a post currently occupied by the Director of the Religious Studies Program). This would indicate that the separation could be effected for between $10,000 and $15,000.

3. As the M.A. program grows, replace visiting instructors with graduate teaching assistants to
decrease the number of visiting instructors to 24% of the faculty and increase graduate student stipends.

**Rationale:** As noted above, 43% of philosophy faculty are currently visiting instructors. The hiring of four new faculty will allow the program to teach enough graduate students to replace significant numbers of visiting faculty. This will benefit the undergraduates (who will receive better teaching from the higher quality GTAs we attract), our graduate students (who will receive instruction on teaching and larger stipends) and allow us to make progress towards the University goal of reducing reliance on visiting instructors. At the end of the five year plan, the philosophy program will have 14 tenured/tenure-track faculty, 2 lecturers and 5 visiting instructors. One of the current lecturers has resigned and will be replaced in 03-04 by a VI for budgetary reasons. Three of the current visiting instructors are converted to tenured/tenure-track slots and three more are converted to GTAships. (One of the visiting instructor conversions does not appear in the plan below because it converts into a position in religious studies.)

**Resources:** No additional resources required.

4. **Build on the success of the Bielefeld and Sorbonne agreements to develop more international programs for philosophy majors and graduate students.**

**Rationale:** One goal of the department is to become the most internationally active of any philosophy department with a top-ten M.A. program. We currently have a successful program with Bielefeld University in Germany and a new program with the Sorbonne. As suggested by the external evaluators, we are seeking to develop a graduate student exchange program with Britain and possibly one with Australia and/or Korea.

**Resources:** No additional resources required.
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Department learning outcomes & assessment plans
Learning Goals and Assessment Policy
Department of Philosophy
Philosophy Program
Georgia State University
January, 2006

Section: Contents:
Intro Mission Statements for Philosophy and Religious Studies
Section 1 Learning Goals for Phil 1010 and Phil 2010
Section 2 Assessment Plan for Phil 1010 and Phil 2010
Section 3 Learning Goals for the B.A. in Philosophy
Section 4 Assessment Plan for the B.A. in Philosophy
Section 5 Learning Goals for the M.A. in Philosophy
Section 6 Assessment Plan for the M.A. in Philosophy

Introduction

At the request of the Office of the Provost, The Program in Philosophy has developed this policy to clearly set out its student learning goals and assessment procedures. From 2002 to 2005 (academic years) and in conjunction with the Academic Program Review process, the Program reviewed its entire curriculum and revised it from top to bottom. We have put in place many changes: deleting many courses, adding others, modifying the content of others, renumbering to make the curriculum clearer to students, and adding a comprehensive system of prerequisites. We reviewed the general education learning goals as well as discussing the learning goals for general education, philosophy majors and graduate students. Data was collected in broad and wide-ranging discussions among the faculty. Instructors reflected on what material and methods worked best to reach the learning goals. We also had in-depth discussions regarding assessment methods. This document does not list all the changes but rather is a report of the learning goals of new curriculum and how we plan to assess student progress towards those goals. A particular challenge in the Philosophy Program is insuring quality instruction in our core courses many of which are taught by a constantly changing group of visiting instructors and graduate students. Therefore the Program developed The Handbook for Teachers of Phil 1010, Critical Thinking and Phil 2010, Great Questions of Philosophy. A copy of the Handbook is included as an appendix to this document.

The Mission of the Philosophy Program

Philosophy has traditionally had a central role in the liberal arts. The writings of Aristotle, Descartes, Hume, and Kant are among the greatest products of the human mind. They are worth studying for their inherent value as well as for their impact on subsequent intellectual history. Much philosophical work is concerned with abstract and fundamental questions: What is real? Can we know anything about the external world? Are there objective moral truths? Is there a God? Although some of these issues are unlikely to have practical consequences, they
are no less important. In fact, it is difficult to conceive of an educated person who has not systematically grappled with these questions.

At the same time, philosophy is deeply involved with practical issues, such as the nature of the good life and what constitutes a just society. In the last two decades there has been an explosion of activity in applied philosophy with the result that philosophers now work in numerous cross-disciplinary fields such as business ethics, medical ethics, philosophy of law, philosophy of science, philosophy of language and philosophy of mind.

Despite its wide range of applications, philosophy as currently practiced in this country has one overarching theme: it is fundamentally concerned with good reasoning. Although philosophers by no means have a monopoly on logical argumentation, the systematic study of what distinguishes good arguments from bad is central to the philosophical enterprise. Consequently, those who teach philosophy are as much concerned with fostering reasoning skills as with imparting information.

Both ethics and critical reasoning are stressed in GSU’s strategic plan, which states: “In the twenty-first century, Georgia State University's curricular and co-curricular activities must prepare students who are critical thinkers, creative problem solvers, and responsible citizens who make ethical choices.” Likewise, the strategic plan of the College of Arts and Sciences states: “Central goals in Humanities include enhancing the communication and critical thinking abilities of all Georgia State students . . . .”

The Philosophy Department serves the citizens of Georgia in several complementary ways. In addition to its highly ranked M.A. program, it plays a significant role in undergraduate education. In Critical Thinking (Phil 1010 in Area B) students honing reasoning skills that are applicable to any endeavor. Furthermore, because it is a writing intensive course, each section of Phil 1010 focuses developing the essential skill of writing lucid argumentative essays. In Great Questions of Philosophy (Phil 2010 in Area C) offers students the opportunity to confront big questions and to learn what history’s most original thinkers have said about issues fundamental to existence as a human being.

Section 1 Learning Goals for Phil 1010 and Phil 2010

A. Phil 1010

A.1. As indicated in the chart below, Phil 1010 aims to contribute significantly to GSU’s Learning Goals for General Education. Thus, the learning goals indicated in the chart below are learning goals for Phil 1010. There are some additional learning goals which the department has adopted as a further clarification, specification and application of GSU’s Learning Goals for General Education to this particular course.

A.2. Phil 1010 is a skills course. There is little emphasis on content knowledge (although the line between skills and content knowledge can be hard to draw.)

Students successfully completing Phil 1010 should be able to:

(i) distinguish arguments from non-arguments,
(ii) identify the premises and conclusion,
(iii) understand the relation between main and subordinate arguments,
(iv) critically evaluate the arguments of others, and
(v) construct their own argumentative essays.*
B. Phil 2010

B.1. As indicated in the chart below, Phil 2010 aims to contribute significantly to GSU’s Learning Goals for General Education. Thus, the learning goals indicated in the chart below are learning goals for Phil 2010. There are some additional learning goals which the department has adopted as a further clarification, specification and application of GSU’s Learning Goals for General Education to this particular course. Moreover, Phil 2010 also contributes to the attainment of the learning goals for the B.A. in philosophy. See Section 3 below.

B.2. Phil 2010 addresses problems and proposed solutions through lecture, analysis of arguments, and selected readings of philosophers of historical import, but is neither a history of philosophy course nor one that focuses exclusively on just a few philosophers or just a few topics. It establishes a basic vocabulary of issues, positions, and terms foundational for the course and for further work in philosophy. Finally, it stimulates an interest in the value of philosophy as an integral part of the liberal arts curriculum and as relevant for personal meaning and decision-making.

Students successfully completing Phil 2010 should

(i) have a basic understanding of central problems in metaphysics (What is real?)
(ii) have a basic understanding of central problems in epistemology (What do we know?)
(iii) have a basic understanding of central problems in ethics (What should we do?)
(iv) have a basic understanding of how to apply ethical theory to practical ethical problems.
(v) have a basic familiarity with some classical and some contemporary authors.
(vi) have a basic ability to think and write philosophically.*

*For further details, see the Handbook for Teachers of Phil 1010, Critical Thinking and Phil 2010, Great Questions of Philosophy.

Alignment of Phil 1010 (Critical Thinking) and Philosophy 2010 (Great Questions of Philosophy) with GSU Learning Goals for General Education

(“M” and “P” defined at end of chart.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Goal</th>
<th>1010</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal I. Communication-- Students use writing effectively for different audiences and purposes.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurable Outcomes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Students develop their ideas in written formats.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Elements:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Statements of purpose</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Integration of ideas into a larger body of knowledge</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Clarity of organization</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Quality of argument</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Students use appropriate writing conventions and formats.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Elements:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Selection of mode appropriate for audience</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Proper use of documentation</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Coherence</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Style, syntax, punctuation</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Diction, pronunciation</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Students use writing as a tool for learning.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Elements:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Writing that leads to and reflects subject mastery</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Writing that reflects on the learning process</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Writing that is formal and/or informal</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Students communicate orally in group settings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Elements:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Classroom presentations and discussions</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Internet-based chat rooms and bulletin boards</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Group work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Listening skills</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Presentation skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Students demonstrate ability to incorporate written feedback into revised work.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Elements:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Sequential drafts</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Sequence of related, but brief, written assignment</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Reflection on the writing process</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Revision of work based on feedback</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal II. Analysis of Information** Students collect, analyze, and interpret data effectively in a variety of settings.

**Measurable Outcomes:**

1. Students collect and weigh evidence.
   **Assessment Elements:**
   a. Consideration of authority | M |
   b. Differentiation between primary and secondary and popular and scholarly | M |
   c. Proper attribution and citation | M |
   d. Use of appropriate information technology sources | P |

2. Students distinguish the relationships among evidence, hypothesis and theory
   **Assessment Elements:**
   a. Use of observation and experimentation |
   b. Testing and application of hypotheses and theories |

3. Students draw inferences from written, quantitative, qualitative, data.
   **Assessment Elements:**
   a. Arrangement of data |
   b. Explication of inference | M | M |
   c. Consideration of alternative interpretations | M | M |
Goal III. Critical Thinking-- Students identify important questions and formulate hypotheses and arguments to answer them effectively.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurable Outcomes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Students identify, select, and analyze questions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Elements:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Context for question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Breaking question into parts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Options for answering the question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Students use basic qualitative, or logical methods to formulate answers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Elements:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Appropriate method selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Application of method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Appropriate interpretation of the results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Utility of proposed answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Consideration of alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Students use their proposed answer to generate &amp; explore new questions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Elements:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Examination of proposed answers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Explication of new questions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goal IV. Students analyze important contemporary questions effectively  

<p>| 1. Students analyze contemporary issues within the context of diverse disciplinary perspectives. | M |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Elements:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Explication of question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Context for question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Awareness of aesthetic dimensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Students analyze contemporary multicultural, global, and international questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Elements:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Explication of question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Context for question</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"M" indicates that the course makes a major contribution to the attainment of this goal/outcome. In the case of an "M," the indicated assessment elements are explicitly required to be considered in considerable depth. "P" indicates that the courses makes a partial contribution to the attainment of this goal/outcome. In the case of a "P," the indicated assessment elements are not required to be considered in considerable depth but they may be optional features of the course or required to be considered in less-than-considerable depth.
Section 2  Assessment Plan for Phil 1010 and Phil 2010

Phil 1010

Every fall, five sections of Phil 1010 taught by different instructors will be selected at random. Four final papers will be selected at random from each of these five sections. (It will be the papers of the first four students on the roll who turn in papers.) A committee of three continuing faculty (tenured, tenure-track or lecturers) will assign each paper a letter grade (A+, A, A-, B+, B, etc.) on each of the follow three criteria:

1. Writing ability
2. Philosophical skills, more particularly, the analysis of information and arguments by
   (I) distinguishing arguments from non-arguments,
   (ii) identifying the premises and conclusion,
   (iii) understanding the relation between main and subordinate arguments,
   (iv) critically evaluating the arguments of others, and
   (v) constructing their own argumentative essays.
3. Application of this ability and these skills to contemporary problems.

Every Spring, the faculty of the philosophy program will meet to discuss how well the students in Phil 1010 are meeting the learning outcomes, using the materials collected the previous Fall.

Phil 2010

Every Fall, five sections of Phil 2010 will be selected at random. Four final exams will be selected at random from each of these five sections. (It will be the papers of the first four students on the roll who turn in papers.) The instructor of the course will assign each exam a letter grade (A+, A, A-, B+, B, etc.) on each of the follow three criteria:

1. Mastery of content knowledge, more particularly
   (I) have a basic understanding of central problems in metaphysics.
   (ii) have a basic understanding of central problems in epistemology.
   (iii) have a basic understanding of central problems in ethics.
   (iv) have a basic understanding of how to apply ethical theory to practical ethical problems.
   (v) have a basic familiarity with some classical and some contemporary authors.
2. Philosophical skills, i.e, a basic ability to think and write philosophically.
3. Application of this knowledge and these skills to contemporary problems.

Every Spring, the faculty of the philosophy program will meet to discuss how well the students in Phil 2010 are meeting the learning outcomes, using the materials collected the previous Fall.
Section 3 Learning Goals for the B.A. in Philosophy

A. Content Knowledge
1. General knowledge of a variety of philosophical systems and movements from the different periods in the history of Western philosophy (ancient/medieval and modern) and detailed knowledge of at least one system or movement in each of these two periods.
2. General knowledge of the thought of various major philosophers from the different periods in the history of Western philosophy and detailed knowledge of at least one philosopher from each of the two periods.
3. Familiarity with representative philosophers and movements in contemporary philosophy and in-depth understanding of at least one philosopher in at least two of the movements.
4. Knowledge of the fundamental concepts, principles, and issues found in at least three of the following concentrations: ethics, aesthetics, metaphysics, epistemology, and logic. (These concentrations are to be defined broadly so as to exhaust all fields of philosophy.)
5. Knowledge of the distinctive contributions made by philosophy to intellectual inquiry.
6. Knowledge of the relevance of philosophy to contemporary American culture and life.

B. Philosophical Skills
1. Ability to read critically and with comprehension.
2. Ability to think critically and to write clearly and persuasively.
3. Ability to apply principles and techniques of logic to philosophical discussions.
4. Ability to conduct philosophical research effectively.

Matrix for the Student Learning Goals for the B.A. in Philosophy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Student Learning Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1010, Critical Th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010, Great Qs 2050,</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000, Moral Qs</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3010, History I</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3020, History II</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3030, History III</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3050, Analytic</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3060, Existential</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3080, His Af-Amer</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3200, Conscious</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3230, Religion</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3700, Clas Political</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3710, Mod Political</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3720, Moral Prob</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3730, Business</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued on the next page. (“M” and “P” defined at end of chart.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A3</th>
<th>A4</th>
<th>A5</th>
<th>A6</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B3</th>
<th>B4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4010, Plato</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4020, Aristotle</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4030, Ancient</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4040, Augus/Aq</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4050, Modern</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4060, Kant</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4070, Marxism</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4080, Witt</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4090, Continental</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4100, Epistem</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4130, Science</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4300, Metaphysics</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4330, Mind</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4520, Logic</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4530, Language</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4610, Hinduism</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4615, Buddhism</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4620, Confusian</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4625, Zen</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4630, Mysticism</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4650, Rel &amp; Ethics</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4670, Church/State</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4700, Ethics</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4710, Biomedical</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4800, Soc/Pol</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4820, Law</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4830, Art</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4850, Af-Amer</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4860, Women</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4900, Issues</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4950, Research</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"M" indicates that the course makes a major contribution to the attainment of this goal/outcome. In the case of an "M," the indicated assessment elements are explicitly required to be considered in considerable depth. "P" indicates that the courses makes a partial contribution to the attainment of this goal/outcome. In the case of a "P," the indicated assessment elements are not required to be considered in considerable depth but they may be optional features of the course or required to be considered in less-than-considerable depth.
Measurable Outcomes

A. Content Knowledge

1. Knowledge of systems and movements such as the following:

2. Knowledge of philosophers such as the following:

3. Knowledge of representative philosophers and movements such as the following:

4. Knowledge of fundamental concepts, principles, and issues such as the following:
   a. Ethics: Problem of freedom and moral responsibility, problem of egoism, relativism, the is-ought controversy, hedonism, act and rule utilitarianism, deontology versus consequentialism, contractarianism, issues in feminist ethics, concepts of justice, concepts of rights, intrinsic and extrinsic value, cognitivism versus noncognitivism, definitions of morality, and justifications of morality, the nature of justice, political obligation, conceptions of the state, liberty and its limits, the nature of rights, Marxist and feminist political theory, contract theory, relationship between law and morality, punishment, racism and sexism, censorship, civil disobedience, the nature of democracy.
   b. Aesthetics: The creative imagination, metaphoric and metonymic signs, kinaesthetic and bodily movement, existential self-actualization, primary devices of poetic language (sound, word order, rhythm, and images), relation of imaginative experience to emotional and cognitive experience, main aesthetic theories, comparison of various kinds of art works from different historical periods, the aesthetics of modernism.
   c. Metaphysics: The problem of universals, causality, free-will, substance/accident, nature of
time and space, nature of mind, dualism, monism, pluralism, materialism, idealism, process philosophy, phenomenenalism, arguments for and against the existence of God, the problem of evil, conceptions of the nature of God(s), faith and reason, the nature of religious experience, sense and reference, analyticity, a priority and necessity, speaker-meaning, speech acts, semantics and pragmatics, conversational implicature, definite description, proper names, and natural-kind terms, the nature of time, critiques and defenses of metaphysics.

d. Epistemology: Rationalism and empiricism (classical and contemporary), classical definition of knowledge and Gettier-type counter-examples, theories of epistemic justification, theories of truth, certainty, theories of perception, problem of induction, naturalized epistemology, the deductive-nomological model of explanation, Kuhn and scientific revolutions, demarcation between science and pseudo-science, verifiability and falsifiability, holism, reductionism, distinction between natural sciences and human sciences.

e. Logic: Truth values, truth tables, formal languages, propositional logic, prepositional logic, modal logic, meta-logic, completeness, consistency.

5. Knowledge of the distinctive contributions made by philosophy to intellectual inquiry
a. Ability to define at least two contrasting conceptions of philosophy and to distinguish philosophy, according to each conception, from natural science, social science, literature and the fine arts, and religious studies.
b. Appreciation of the role of philosophy in providing methodological and substantive models for scientific disciplines, social and political movements, and artistic movements.

6. Knowledge of the relevance of philosophy to contemporary American culture and life
a. Understanding and appreciation of the contributions of philosophers in areas such as medical ethics, business ethics, communication ethics, governmental ethics, animal ethics, and environmental ethics.
b. Ability to interpret the history of philosophy in terms of the contributions it has made to contemporary domains of society and culture such as science, art, literature, religion, and government.
c. Appreciation of the Socratic dictum that the unexamined life is not worth living.

B. Philosophical Skills
1. Ability to read critically and with comprehension.
a. Ability to outline, with clarity and succinctness, any essay or book one wishes to evaluate critically.
b. Ability to identify premises and conclusions in arguments.
c. Ability to identify fallacies in reasoning.
d. Ability to detect vague and ambiguous terms,

2. Ability to think critically and to write clearly and persuasively.
a. Ability to identify premises and conclusions in arguments.
b. Ability to identify fallacies in reasoning.
c. Ability to avoid fallacies in one's own reasoning and writing.
d. Ability to avoid vagueness and ambiguity in one's own reasoning and writing.
d. Ability to write in a grammatically correct fashion.

3. Ability to apply principles and techniques of logic to philosophical discussions.
a. Same abilities as listed in 2. as these abilities apply to philosophical reasoning and writing.

4. Ability to conduct philosophical research effectively.
a. Ability to use the library and other information resources effectively.
b. Ability to distinguish useful from non-useful information.
c. Ability to synthesize data from various sources.
d. Ability to use primary and secondary sources effectively to interpret texts and argue for one's views.

Section 4  Assessment Plan for the B.A. in Philosophy

Assessment Method: Mixed final paper, communication and technology evaluation

Data Collection:
Every Fall, all philosophy majors who are seniors in 4000-level courses will be asked to submit their papers at the end of the semester. Each instructor must include on her/his syllabus the requirement that seniors send their paper electronically to the professor. (Professors are responsible to note which students are seniors based on GOSOLAR or by consultation with Ellen Logan or the Assessment Coordinator.) The instructor of each of these classes will report a letter grade (A+, A, A-, B+, B, etc.) for each student indicating: (1) how well she “communicate[s] ... using appropriate oral or signed conventions and formats” and (2) how well she “participate[s] effectively in collaborative activities” (the latter would include how well she takes part in discussions with classmates and the instructor). The professor will then e-mail the papers with an assessment form to the Assessment Coordinator. If there are more than 20 papers, the Assessment Coordinator will use a random number generator (such as that found at www.random.org) to select 20 of the papers to be evaluated as indicated below.

Review:
Every Spring, the department will calculate the percentage of philosophy majors who are seniors who successfully e-mailed in their materials, using the numbers from the previous Fall. This will indicate the percentage of philosophy major graduates who “effectively use computers and other technology appropriate to the discipline” of philosophy. The department will calculate the average oral communication score (1). This will indicate how well philosophy major graduates “communicate ... using appropriate oral or signed conventions and formats.” The department will calculate the average collaboration score (2). This will indicate how well philosophy major graduates “participate[s] effectively in collaborative activities.” A committee of three continuing faculty (tenured, tenure-track or lecturers) will assign each paper a letter grade (A+, A, A-, B+, B, etc.) on each of the follow two criteria: (3) mastery of content knowledge, and (4) philosophical skills. These are the two broad areas identified in the learning outcomes in Section 3 above. When the grading is complete, the department will calculate the average grade on each criterion. Then the faculty of Philosophy will meet to discuss how well the B.A. students are meeting the learning outcomes.
Section 5  Learning Goals for the M.A. in Philosophy

The learning goals for the M.A. in philosophy are the same the learning goals for the B.A. in philosophy with one crucial difference—the goal of the M.A. program is for graduates to have a greater mastery of the content knowledge and a higher level of philosophical skills that graduates of the B.A. program.

Section 6  Assessment Plan for the M.A. in Philosophy

Assessment Method: Thesis

Data Collection:
Each masters thesis will be read by at least three faculty members. Before reading a thesis, the faculty members will review the learning goals for the M.A. in Philosophy. Each member of the committee will assign each thesis a letter grade (A+, A, A-, B+, B, etc.) on each of two criteria: mastery of content knowledge, philosophical skills. The Assessment Coordinator will collect all of this data on a continuing basis.

Review:
Each Spring, the graduate faculty will meet to review the survey responses and their grades and discuss whether the M.A. students are meeting the learning outcomes. They will do so by considering the Assessment Forms for all MA theses from the previous Fall, Summer, and Spring.
Phase in: For 2006 we would only use data from the summer and fall of 2005.
Appendix D2
Current course syllabi for all approved writing intensive courses
I. What this course promises you:

If the business world seems to have an ethic, it might be: “make as much money as possible.” But many people correctly believe that we should treat other human beings with fairness, decency, and justice. Is it possible to reconcile these two seemingly incompatible views? Is it even possible to speak coherently of an ethic of business? These sorts of issues are the focus of this course.

This course presupposes no prior experience in philosophy. But it does promise to introduce you to a study of ethical themes specific to business contexts. We will start by examining competing accounts of justice. We will then study how ethical considerations such as loyalty, obedience, honesty, and other moral principles, may bear on the choices of persons who lead (or are a part of) businesses, and how such principles may conflict. The course will also discuss how dispersed knowledge impacts organizational structures, and so we will consider the ethical considerations capitalist markets raise for business organizations (including the ethics in advertising and marketing). The course will also consider competing accounts of human rights and how such rights might shape organizational structures in light of personal privacy and institutional needs.

The course draws heavily on classics from literature and intellectual history. Thinkers such as Plato, Aristotle, Sophocles, Mark Twain, Karl Marx and others have had profound influence, both on western culture and on the ways we think about the world. Getting a handle on their views gives us a context for our contemporary intellectual climate. Although an author may be long dead, his or her ideas might still enrich our own lives.

By the end of the course, you should be better able to critically analyze philosophical arguments for certain key social norms and business policies, and you should be in a better position to formulate, present, and defend arguments of your own about these and related issues.

II. Ways to fulfill these promises:

What you as the student must do:

Step 1:
There are certain course materials that you will need:

Regular access to a computer with Microsoft Explorer, an Internet link, an Adobe Acrobat Reader, and a printer. Most course materials are either available off the web or from Adobe files that have been scanned and loaded to the class website.

If you don’t already have one, get a good pocket dictionary. Merriam-Webster, American Heritage, Webster’s New World, Random House-Webster’s—all of these are good pocket dictionaries. Sometimes you’ll come across words or terms in our readings that you might not understand. Get into a habit of looking up words you don’t recognize. You’re responsible for understanding the
basics of our readings—including easily referenced words. Sometimes on quizzes you might find unfamiliar words. You’ll be permitted to look such words up during quizzes. If you have no dictionary handy (there’s no borrowing from others during quizzes), that would be a bummer.


There are also some recommended texts that would help you in your learning experiences in this course:

Weston, Anthony, _A Rulebook for Arguments_ Third Edition (Indianapolis: Hackett, 2001). 96 pp. Paper:$5.95 new (0-87220-552-5). This book is available for purchase, new or used, from [http://www.amazon.com](http://www.amazon.com), from [http://www.half.com](http://www.half.com), and elsewhere. This is a useful primer on philosophical arguments: recognizing them, analyzing them, and constructing some of your own. It might be a good idea to look at this for some additional background on philosophical reasoning. The book also gives pointers on writing philosophy essays.

Harvey, Gordon, _Writing with Sources: A Guide for Students_ (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1998). 60 pp. Paper $4.95 new (0-87220-434-0). This book is also available for purchase, new or used, online. It is an excellent guide on responsible citation practices, and is useful for any course.

If you don’t already have one, also consider getting a thesaurus to help when writing papers. But be careful using these. Speak with me for pointers.

**Step 2: (a step with many parts…)**

Though this is a philosophy course with no prerequisites, it is designed with high expectations. You must take responsibility for your own learning and participate as an active learner. The best way to do this is to devote yourself to the readings with sincerity, focus, and time, and to understand that this is a university environment where self-direction, maturity, integrity, and responsibility are vital for your success. The class constitutes (and is part of a larger) community of learners. Here’s what all this means:

**During class discussions:** The class will incorporate much discussion on controversial themes; we can learn from one another best when we participate with mutual respect, civility, and openness.  
**Outside the classroom:** To take responsibility for your education, you need to keep up with the readings. Our discussions in class are based on them. The readings for this course will vary in length, but they will usually be on the moderate side. Readings will average about twenty pages per class, though some readings may be longer or require a bit more time. Since the material is often a bit dense, you may find that an assignment of six pages demands a bigger commitment than one for forty pages. Many of you are unfamiliar with philosophical writing; here as always cultivate the virtue of patience. Reading philosophy, just like doing it, is a skill you must nurture. Reading written philosophy is seldom like reading a novel (and it’s hardly like watching TV). When reading philosophy best we do not absorb a story so much as critically engage with a text. So roll up your intellectual sleeves and get into it: write all over the texts with your reflections, inspirations, and criticisms.

**Academic integrity:** Your enrollment at this university and your participation in this course presuppose that you follow principles of academic and personal integrity whereby you live honestly and respect the work of others as inviolably theirs. Your instructor regards the work you submit as presented on such terms. Your instructor takes this quite seriously, and so must you. The GSU Academic Misconduct Code is available to students both in printed form and on the GSU Web site. Academic misconduct is any activity that inappropriately affects how a professor evaluates the work you submit for a course. Examples are: plagiarism, submission of work for more than one class, fabrication, or fraud, as well as attempting to commit such acts or assisting others in doing so. Your
instructor will make clear what this means for this class. Should you ever have any doubts about this, speak with the instructor.

Eliminating unnecessary distractions from the classroom. (a) Showing up late or leaving early is inconsiderate to the instructor and to your classmates. Please: don’t do it. (b) The noises we make when we’re getting ready to leave (such as shoving things in backpacks and zipping them up) are distracting when class is not yet over. You’ll always be dismissed promptly at the end of class. Please: do not rustle your things beforehand. (c) Any electronic devices (watches, cell phones, pagers, Sega games) that could be heard by others must be turned off before class. If any of your devices becomes activated during class, you thereby agree to surrender the device for the remainder of the class, and you agree to forfeit five points off of your end-of-semester course average. Your presence in the classroom counts as consent to this condition.

Keeping on top of the course and the course expectations: You must know the terms of this syllabus, and must not impose inappropriate demands on others’ time when stuff happens. If you miss class, make the best use of the professor’s time by avoiding the dreaded question, “Did I miss anything?” You can be sure you did. Find out from a classmate what you missed, and check the class website for updates and daily outlines.

III. Ways for the student and professor to know whether the student is achieving the promises: This course is designed to get you to think philosophically and enjoy doing so—and not just in our classroom. Philosophy is something you must not merely study. You must become a philosopher, and that means you have got to practice the craft. You can do this privately in your own thoughts and acts. Still, it helps to concretize your thoughts in some public medium such as in conversation or on a piece of paper. This course will get you thinking about philosophy, and you’ll come to think and talk about how you think.

We will evaluate your progress in reaching learning goals (and provide you with feedback on your learning) by focusing on the following items:

1. - 4-5 page essay on a philosophical theme of your choosing. The short version of the instructions is this: find a philosophical argument in one of our readings. Critically reconstruct it and critically assess it in light of likely objections. More detailed guidelines will follow later. You email this as an attachment in word, from your GSU email account only, both to aicohen@gsu.edu and to jray14@student.gsu.edu. Drafts are due to course staff and the peer review group by Friday, September 23 at 9 A.M. Comments on peer papers mailed to peer review group and to course staff by Monday, September 26 at 5 P.M. Your final revisions are to be emailed to course staff by Friday September 30 at 9 A.M. This will count for 20% of your overall course grade.

2. - 4-5 page essay #2 on a philosophical theme of your choosing. Again: more details to follow, but the basic instructions for essay #1 apply here, too. Your paper must be on a topic different from what you discussed in your first essay. The dates: drafts due Sat 11/12 @ Noon; comments on peer papers due Wed 11/16 @ 9 AM; final revisions due Mon 11/21 @ 9 AM. This will count for 20% of your overall course grade.

(5) - Occasional brief quizzes/entrance or exit tickets/writing assignments. This counts for 25% of your overall course grade.

(6) - Class participation and participation in web-based discussions. This counts for 10% of your overall course grade.

(7) - Cumulative final examination, Tuesday Dec. 13: 12:30 – 2:30 PM. This counts for 25% of your overall course grade. This exam cannot be rescheduled except because of the recent death of an immediate family member (within two weeks prior to the scheduled examination) or your complete incapacitation (e.g., excusable dismemberment, coma, or emergency surgery). Documentation is required in any case.

Your course grade may also be rounded up or down depending upon considerations such as (but not limited to) your progress (or regress) throughout the term, your general attitude, or your observable
commitment to succeeding in the course.

Incomplete course grades may be given only in the most dire, unavoidable, and exceptional circumstances. Requests for incompletes will be considered only with all relevant documentation (attesting to the temporary emergency in question) and must be made both in person and in writing, no later than Thursday November 17 at 3 PM. No requests for incompletes will be honored after that time.

**Brief Quizzes:** Since discussions (both in-class and web-based) will build on prior knowledge, it is essential to keep up with the readings. As a way to encourage you to do that and give you some feedback on your understanding of the material, the course will be punctuated with at least 10 (and no more than 20) brief quizzes/entrance or exit tickets/writing assignments. Some will be multiple choice; others will require a short narrative response. Of these quiz scores, you may drop the lowest two grades. Because of this provision, no make-up quizzes will be given under any circumstances. A missed quiz (for whatever reason, including the most dire you can imagine) should be considered a dropped quiz. The third (or more) missed quiz counts as a zero. The quizzes will often (but not always) begin promptly at the beginning of class and will last (on average) five minutes. In some cases you’ll be asked to work on them outside class.

**Participation:**
You are a member of a community of learners. You get the greatest benefit from this membership by participating actively and constructively in class discussions, both in and out of class. Sometimes we’ll ask you to offer some narrative reflections/comments on a philosophical theme from the class. These may also be assessed as part of class participation.

**The class website:**
The web site will include postings of study questions regarding upcoming readings. These will often be the focus for class discussions. The study questions ask you to explain or critically evaluate some point from the readings. They bring your attention to key critical and expository issues and might be the basis for your own written essays (the topics for which you select). You might also see such questions later on quizzes and exams. For these reasons, you can improve your understanding and performance in the course if you know how to answer the study questions. Though these will not be collected, it would be a good idea to keep answers of these for your studies. (At the end of the term, you’d then have your own study guide.) You may find studying in groups to be helpful, so feel free to gather with classmates to exchange thoughts on the study questions or on the written work you will be putting together.

The daily outlines/study questions will be posted to our class web site. To obtain your log-in for WebCT instructions, first go to [http://lyceum.gsu.edu/students/login.html](http://lyceum.gsu.edu/students/login.html). Then, get to our class website at [http://webct.gsu.edu](http://webct.gsu.edu), log in to VISTA, and roam around.

The website will also serve as a forum for discussion of the issues we raise in class. You’ll be expected to contribute in some constructive way to these discussions. These web-based postings will be an opportunity for you to exchange questions or thoughts about issues we raise in class.

**IV. The Course Staff’s Promises to the Students:**
In order to provide for an atmosphere that nurtures learning, I commit myself to the following:

We shall contribute to, and strive to maintain, an open, civil, and constructive learning environment in the classroom.

We shall maintain regular office hours and make ourselves available at a mutually convenient time for appointments outside those hours.

We shall convene and dismiss the class at the stated times. Cohen’s watch is set to WSB radio’s clock, which is linked to some atomic clock, God, or both.
We shall evaluate your work fairly in line with the proportions indicated earlier, and only according to the strength of your arguments and not the content of your views. But, more generally: how do grades get assigned in a course such as this? This is a philosophy course, and just like any other course, you will be expected to demonstrate an understanding of the material in the readings and what we cover in class. That’s part of it. In this course, however, you are expected to think philosophically. You will see what this is from the tone of class discussions and the readings. We will encourage clear and critical thinking about philosophical themes, and we will use some classics as a springboard for discussion. You will be evaluated based on how well you can argue about the issues we discuss. What matters is not so much the content of your views but how well you express and justify them. So you will be asked to demonstrate proficiency with the material and show a critical grasp of it. You will have specific criteria for assignments when the times come. If you do the readings with the study questions in mind, you should find the material more accessible, written work easier to compose, the quizzes entirely obvious, and the course altogether more rewarding. As always, if you ever have any questions about the readings or anything else, do not hesitate to ask in class or speak with course staff during office hours.

We promise to demand excellence from you and to help you to achieve it.

The University requires that the syllabus include an attendance policy. Here it is. We do not take attendance. But, you obviously cannot participate in class on missed days, and you risk missing quizzes, and you certainly lose opportunities for learning.

We strive to make this course relevant. Why should you care about the issues we will study? There are at least two reasons. First, who else but the philosopher discusses what properly roots a theory of justice, or why and how equality is morally significant? Lawyers do not do these things, nor do scientists, bureaucrats, nor anyone in the audience of a TV talk show. (At least, those folks do not do such things _primarily._) So we have got our jobs cut out for us. Second, getting a handle on the themes we will explore can be rewarding in its own right. Understanding is something we seek for its own sake. Besides, philosophical reflections can help you to organize your thinking about particular goals you might have. The course is developed to stress why it all matters. If we ever seem to lose sight of this, do not shirk responsibility. Throw up a hand and ask why you should care. Nobody should waste your time.

We shall uphold and enforce the honor system. Prof. Cohen and Jeannie Ray shall make clear what are the expectations and guidelines for any given assignment. Cohen, in particular, makes it his personal mission to see that any academic misconduct in my courses is prosecuted to the fullest extent the rules allow. He devotes an _immense_ amount of energy to any cases that are cause for concern. The result is psychologically unhealthy for the professor, personally devastating for the “morally challenged” student, and entirely disturbing to onlookers who see the wreckage the student becomes. So save the instructor’s sanity and your career, and do the right thing.

We will not burden you with any of our personal problems, nor will we take them as an excuse not to fulfill reasonable expectations of our conduct as instructors for this course. We expect reciprocity in this regard for your case.

The course syllabus provides a general plan for the course; deviations may be necessary. We will post any changes to the class schedule and syllabus to the class website.

We will return all graded work in a timely fashion, which for quizzes usually means within one week, and for papers, within twenty days.

Disability policy: Students who have a disability documented by the appropriate university authorities will be accommodated according to the relevant legal and university guidelines. If the circumstances surrounding the administration of in-class quizzes pose a problem, we will make mutually agreeable alternate arrangements that comply with the relevant legal and university guidelines.
Tentative schedule

NOTE: This schedule and the terms of this syllabus are subject to change in order to adapt to the pace and needs of the course. The final word on the readings will always be the daily class outlines posted to the web. Other changes to the syllabus will be indicated in daily outlines and on updated syllabus files loaded to WebCT. All readings are either available from our class website in Adobe files or through web links. PRINT OUT each reading for your study and future reference.

T 8/23 Introductory remarks

Justice and virtue – some classic accounts and contemporary applications
TH 8/25 Plato, Republic I
T 8/30 Republic II (excerpts up to 367e)
TH 9/1 Excerpts from William Golding's Lord of the Flies; Excerpts from Thomas Hobbes's Leviathan
T 9/6 Golding/Hobbes, cont'd; begin Kant, excerpts from Groundwork
TH 9/15 Desjardins, "Virtues and Business Ethics"
T 9/20 Selections from Aristotle: Happiness and the Virtues; Habit and Virtue

Leadership and character
TH 9/22 Hallie, "From Cruelty to Goodness"

Fri 9/23 Draft of paper #1 emailed to course staff and peer review group by 9 A.M.
Mon 9/26 Comments on peer papers emailed to course staff and paper authors by 9 A.M.

TH 9/29 McCoy, "The Parable of the Sadhu"

Fri 9/30 Final revisions of paper #1 due to course staff by 9 A.M.

T 10/4 Langewiesche, American Ground
TH 10/6 Langewiesche, American Ground: cont'd

Loyalty, authority, and moral conflict
T 10/11 Soles, "Four Concepts of Loyalty"
TH 10/13 Antigone
T 10/18 Boccacio, from the Decameron: read his intro at http://www.stg.brown.edu/projects/decameron/engDecShowText.php?myID=proem&expand=; then read the tenth novel on the tenth day at http://www.stg.brown.edu/projects/decameron/engDecShowText.php?myID=nov1010&expand=day10; Baier, "Trust and anti-trust"

Lying, honesty, and promise-keeping
TH 10/20 Kant, "On the supposed right to tell lies from benevolent motives"; Hill, "Autonomy and Benevolent Lies"
T 10/25 Twain, "On the decay in the art of lying" see http://www.boondocksnets.com/twaintexts/art_of_lying.html. This may not take you directly to the essay. If not, click on "writings" on the left, then select for "o", and it's listed there. Harry Frankfurt, "Reflections on Bullshit"
Knowledge, production, distribution: preliminaries

Markets, organizations, and moral issues

Sat 11/12  Draft of paper #2 emailed to course staff and peer review group by Noon.
T 11/15  James Q. Wilson, "Capitalism and Morality," The Public Interest 121, (Fall 1995), pp. 52-71;
Wed 11/16  Comments on peer papers emails to course staff and paper authors by 9 A.M.
TH 11/17  TBA
Mon 11/21  Final revisions of paper #2 emailed to course staff by 9 A.M.

Individual rights and business practices – advertising
T 11/29  Ayn Rand, “Man’s Rights” from Capitalism: The Unknown Ideal; Robert Nozick, excerpts from Anarchy, State, and Utopia; Amitai Etzioni: “Too many rights, too few responsibilities”
T 12/13  12:30 - 2:30: cumulative final examination – see the syllabus for policy on rescheduling.
The Department of Philosophy requires that the next two pages be included in all department syllabi.

Department of Philosophy
General Syllabus Statement Fall 2005

This syllabus provides a general plan for the course. Deviations may be necessary.

The last day to withdraw from a course with the possibility of receiving a W is _Friday October 14._

Students are responsible for confirming that they are attending the course section for which they are registered. Failure to do so may result in a WF or F for the course.

_Involuntary withdrawals:_ After Friday, October 14, instructors must give a WF to all those students who are on their rolls but no longer taking the class and report the last day the student attended or turned in an assignment.

Students who are involuntarily withdrawn may petition the department chair for reinstatement into their classes.

By University policy and to respect the confidentiality of all students, _final grades_ may not be posted or given out over the phone. To see your grades, check the web (student.gosolar.gsu.edu), email your instructor or give your instructor a stamped, selfaddressed envelope.

While the penalty for _academic dishonesty_ is a matter of the instructor's discretion in the Department of Philosophy, the customary penalty for a violation of the academic dishonesty rules is an "F" in the course. See the University Policy on Academic Honesty on the reverse of this sheet.

Subscribe to one of our department listservs for current information and events:

Philosophy Majors:  mailbox.gsu.edu/mailman/listinfo/philmajor
Philosophy Grad Students:  mailbox.gsu.edu/mailman/listinfo/philgrad

Messages will go to the address from which you send the message, so you need to resubscribe every time you change email addresses.

For more information on the philosophy program visit:

www.gsu.edu/philosophy

Policy on Academic Honesty, from the GSU Catalog

As members of the academic community, students are expected to recognize and uphold standards of intellectual and academic integrity. The university assumes as a basic and minimum standard of conduct in academic matters that students be honest and that they submit for credit only the products of their own efforts. Both the ideals of scholarship and the need for fairness require that all dishonest work be rejected as a basis for academic credit. They also require that students refrain from any and all forms of dishonorable or unethical conduct related to their academic work.

The university’s policy on academic honesty is published in the _Faculty Handbook_ and _On Campus: The Student Handbook_ and is available to all members of the university community. The policy represents a core value of the university, and all members of the university community are responsible for abiding by its tenets. Lack of knowledge of this policy is not an acceptable defense to any charge of academic dishonesty. All members of the academic community—students, faculty, and staff—are expected to report violations of these standards of academic conduct to the appropriate authorities. The procedures for such reporting are on file in the offices of the deans of each
college, the office of the dean of students, and the office of the provost.

In an effort to foster an environment of academic integrity and to prevent academic dishonesty, students are expected to discuss with faculty the expectations regarding course assignments and standards of conduct. Students are encouraged to discuss freely with faculty, academic advisers, and other members of the university community any questions pertaining to the provisions of this policy. In addition, students are encouraged to avail themselves of programs in establishing personal standards and ethics offered through the university’s Counseling Center.

Definitions and Examples

The examples and definitions given below are intended to clarify the standards by which academic honesty and academically honorable conduct are to be judged. The list is merely illustrative of the kinds of infractions that may occur, and it is not intended to be exhaustive. Moreover, the definitions and examples suggest conditions under which unacceptable behavior of the indicated types normally occurs; however, there may be unusual cases that fall outside these conditions that also will be judged unacceptable by the academic community.

**Plagiarism:** Plagiarism is presenting another person’s work as one’s own. Plagiarism includes any paraphrasing or summarizing of the works of another person without acknowledgment, including the submitting of another student’s work as one’s own. Plagiarism frequently involves a failure to acknowledge in the text, notes, or footnotes the quotation of the paragraphs, sentences, or even a few phrases written or spoken by someone else. The submission of research or completed papers or projects by someone else is plagiarism, as is the unacknowledged use of research sources gathered by someone else when that use is specifically forbidden by the faculty member. Failure to indicate the extent and nature of one’s reliance on other sources is also a form of plagiarism. Any work, in whole or in part, taken from the Internet or other computer-based resource without properly referencing the source (for example, the URL) is considered plagiarism. A complete reference is required in order that all parties may locate and view the original source. Finally, there may be forms of plagiarism that are unique to an individual discipline or course, examples of which should be provided in advance by the faculty member. The student is responsible for understanding the legitimate use of sources, the appropriate ways of acknowledging academic, scholarly or creative indebtedness, and the consequences of violating this responsibility.

**Cheating on Examinations:** Cheating on examinations involves giving or receiving unauthorized help before, during, or after an examination. Examples of unauthorized help include the use of notes, computer-based resources, texts, or "crib sheets" during an examination (unless specifically approved by the faculty member), or sharing information with another student during an examination (unless specifically approved by the faculty member). Other examples include intentionally allowing another student to view one’s own examination and collaboration before or after an examination if such collaboration is specifically forbidden by the faculty member.

**Unauthorized Collaboration:** Submission for academic credit of a work product, or a part thereof, represented as its being one’s own effort, which has been developed in substantial collaboration with another person or source or with a computer-based resource is a violation of academic honesty. It is also a violation of academic honesty knowingly to provide such assistance. Collaborative work specifically authorized by a faculty member is allowed.

**Falsification:** It is a violation of academic honesty to misrepresent material or fabricate information in an academic exercise, assignment or proceeding (e.g., false or misleading citation of sources, falsification of the results of experiments or computer data, false or misleading information in an academic context in order to gain an unfair advantage).

**Multiple Submissions:** It is a violation of academic honesty to submit substantial portions of the same work for credit more than once without the explicit consent of the faculty member(s) to whom the material is submitted for additional credit. In cases in which there is a natural development of research or knowledge in a sequence of courses, use of prior work may be desirable, even required; however the student is responsible for indicating in writing, as a part of such use, that the current work submitted for credit is cumulative in nature.
Print out this syllabus and bring this last page with you to class.

Georgia State University
Georgia State University – Fall 2005
Business Ethics
~ a Writing Across the Curriculum course ~
Phil 3730 (81569)

Agreement:

Now that you have read the syllabus, if you decide to stay in the class, you must sign this form stating that you have read, understood, and agreed to the conditions of the syllabus. We will keep this on file and will pull it out for referral, should the need arise later in the semester.

I, __________________________________,  
(print your name)

have read, understood, and agree to adhere to the conditions of this syllabus.

_________________________________  Dated: ______________
(sign your name)

I, Andrew I. Cohen, agree to the terms of this syllabus:

_________________________________  Dated: ______________

I, Jeannie Ray agree to the terms of this syllabus:

_________________________________  Dated: ______________
Appendix D2b  Current course syllabi for approved writing intensive courses: 4070

MARXISM
FALL 2007

PROFESSOR:  Jessica N. Berry  COURSE NUMBER:  PHIL 4070
E-MAIL:  jberry@gsu.edu  MEETING TIME:  TR 2:30-3:45
OFFICE LOCATION:  34 Peachtree St., #1131  LOCATION:  Sparks Hall 326
OFFICE PHONE:  404-413-6101  OFFICE HOURS:  TR 11:00-12:30
& by appointment

COURSE DESCRIPTION:
In 1848, Marx and Engels announced that “a specter is haunting Europe — the specter of Communism.” Over the past 160 years, that specter has been transformed from a looming, terrifying threat to a lingering, embarrassing ghost. What is left of this “defeated” and “surpassed” moment in the history of Western thought? How can this specter still haunt us when we’ve so thoroughly disposed of the body? In this course we will examine central and enduring strains of Marxism across its history, in politics, economics, philosophy, and cultural criticism. Readings will include seminal writings by Marx and Engels, Vladimir Lenin, Rosa Luxembourg, Leon Trotsky, Georg Lukacs, Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer. Prerequisite: One 2000- or 3000-level philosophy course, or consent of instructor.

TEXTS:    In addition to selected readings made available electronically, the following texts will be required:

C    Karl Marx, Capital: Volume 1 (Penguin); ISBN 01404445684
M*   Ernesto Che Guevara, Karl Marx & Friedrich Engels, Rosa Luxemburg, Manifesto: three classic essays on how to change the world (Ocean Press); ISBN 1876175982
EW*  Lenin, Essential Works of Lenin: "What Is to Be Done?" and Other Writings (Dover);
     ISBN 0486253333
HCC* Georg Lukacs, History & Class Consciousness (MIT Press); ISBN 0262620200
ODM* Herbert Marcuse, One-Dimensional Man (Routledge); ISBN 0415289777
     OR Herbert Marcuse, One-Dimensional Man (Beacon Press) ISBN 0807014176
DE*  Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno, Dialectic of Enlightenment (Continuum); ISBN 0826400930

The following texts will be optional, since our selections will be available either online, on reserve, or both:

MT* Leon Trotsky, Marxism & Terrorism (Pathfinder); ISBN 087348813X

All these books have been ordered through the GSU Bookstore, but ISBN numbers are provided for those who wish to order books through online sources. Texts marked with an asterisk (*) indicate books also reserved for our course in the University Library. All selections by Marx from the Tucker anthology will be available on electronic reserve (password and other information available on the course uLearn / WebCT site). You can also find all the readings by Marx on the Marxists Internet Archive (http://www.marxists.org), which I encourage you to browse for a wealth of other valuable writings and information.

EVALUATION:
This class will have a writing consultant, Melissa Strahm. You are strongly encouraged to consult with her about your written work throughout the semester, and you will be required to submit to her a draft version of your term paper; please note deadlines as marked on syllabus.
40% 4 response papers (500 words each)
During the 2nd, 5th, 8th, and 11th weeks of class, I will distribute an essay question. Your response to this question is to be turned in the following week, on the dates listed on the syllabus. Papers are to be typewritten and double-spaced in a standard font, with one-inch margins. No late papers accepted.

These short essays may be re-written for a higher grade. You will be required to meet with our writing consultant during the re-writing process. Also, the re-write must be substantial; more than cosmetic changes will be required. (NOTE: Your grade will never be lowered on a rewrite, but there is no guarantee that it will be raised.)

30% 1 term paper (10 pages)
Your term paper, also typewritten and double-spaced, in a standard font and with one-inch margins, will be due on the last day of class, December 6th. I will distribute a list of topics on November 6th, when you turn in your last short essay.

You will be required to turn in a draft of this paper to our writing consultant by November 27 at the latest, but earlier submission is very strongly encouraged. If you have received an A (not an A-, but an A) on all four short papers, you will be exempt from this requirement. (NOTE: For departmental assessment purposes, seniors who are philosophy majors must also submit an electronic version of their final paper.)

25% 1 final exam
The final exam will be an open-book, open-note, essay-format exam written in a blue book. Prior to the exam, I will distribute three questions. Of these, I will select one for you to answer in your bluebook on the exam.

5% contributions to discussions on suggested topics
I will regularly post discussion topics to our uLearn class site. This portion of your grade for the course will be determined by the quality, and not the quantity, of your participation in these discussions. You may raise questions about the discussion topic, about the reading, or about the class lectures, suggest discussion topics of your own, offer analyses of relevant materials from outside of class (films, ideas from other courses, and so on), or add your comments to the ongoing discussion. It goes without saying that these discussions will always be conducted in a constructive, respectful tone appropriate to the academic environment; no anonymous posts.

SCHEDULE:
This course syllabus provides a general plan for the course; deviations may be necessary. All readings are required unless otherwise stated. Abbreviations in square brackets refer to ‘Texts’ section, above.

For E-RESERVE readings: Go to http://www.library.gsu.edu/ and click on ‘Course Reserves’ on the ‘Find Information’ menu. Next, click the ‘Search Reserves’ button, and search for this class by course number or my name. When prompted, enter password: __________. Be sure to PRINT a copy for your personal use. Note that you may need your GSU Panther Card library number to access these readings from off campus. If you have problems, contact the Circulation Desk immediately at 404-413-2800.

AUG 21 & 23: “The philosophers have only interpreted the world...; the point, however, is to change it.”
Marx, Preface to A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy [ME pp. 3-6] [HANDOUT]
Marx, “Theses on Feuerbach” [ME pp. 143-45] [HANDOUT]
**AUG 28 & 30:** “Workers of the world, Unite!”
Rich, Preface to *Manifesto* [M pp. 1-10] [RECOMMENDED]
Marx, *Manifesto of the Communist Party* [M pp. 29-67]

**SEPT 4 & 6:** ‘The Bible of the Working Class’
**SHORT PAPER #1 DUE ON SEPT. 4**
Marx, *Capital* Part One, Ch. 1 “The Commodity” [C pp. 125-77]

**SEPT 11 & 13:** “…the object confronts him as something hostile and alien.”
Marx, “Wage Labor and Capital” [ME pp. 203-217] [E-RESERVE]
Marx, *Capital* Part Two “The Transformation of Money Into Capital,”
Chs. 4-6 [C pp. 247-80]
Marx, “Estranged Labor” [ME pp. 70-81] [E-RESERVE]

**SEPT 18 & 20:** “The instrument of labor strikes down the worker.”
Marx, *Capital* Part Four, Ch. 15 §1 “The Development of Machinery” [C pp. 492-508]
[RECOMMENDED]
Marx, *Capital* Part Four, Ch. 15 “Machinery and Large Scale Industry,” §§3-5 [C pp. 517-64]

**SEPT 25 & 27:** “…written in the annals of mankind in letters of blood and fire.”
**SHORT PAPER #2 DUE ON SEPT. 25**
Marx, *Capital* Part Eight, Ch. 26 §1 “The Secret of Primitive Accumulation” [C pp. 873-76]

**OCT 2 & 4:** “…the smashing of the bourgeois state machine.”
Lenin, *State and Revolution*, Chs. IV-VI [EW pp. 313-64]

**OCT 9 & 11:** Marxism and Terrorism
Marx, “The Possibility of Non-Violent Revolution” [ME pp. 522-24] [E-RESERVE]
Trotsky, *Marxism & Terrorism* [MT pp. 7-30]
Guevara, “Socialism and Man in Cuba” [M pp. 149-68]

**OCT 16 & 18:** “…only with the help of the arms furnished us by Marx.”
**SHORT PAPER #3 DUE ON OCT. 16**
Luxemburg, “Reform or Revolution” [M pp. 71-146]

**OCT 23 & 25:** “...an ever-renewed struggle against the insidious effects of bourgeois ideology on the thought of the proletariat.”
Lukacs, “What is orthodox Marxism?” [HCC pp. 1-26]
Lukacs, “The Marxism of Rosa Luxemburg” [HCC 27-45]

**OCT 30 & NOV 1:** “What is the meaning of class consciousness?”
Lukacs, “Class Consciousness” [HCC pp. 46-82]

**NOV 6 & 8:** “The curse of irresistible progress...”
**SHORT PAPER #4 DUE ON NOV. 6**
Horkheimer & Adorno, “The concept of enlightenment” [DE pp. 3-42]

**NOV 13 & 15:** “…the freedom to choose what is always the same.”
Horkheimer & Adorno, “The culture industry: enlightenment as mass deception” [DE pp. 120-67]
THANKSGIVING BREAK (NOV. 20-24)
Marcuse, “One-Dimensional Society,” §§1 and 3 [ODM pp. 1-18, 56-83]

[RECOMMENDED]

NOV 27 & 29: “...that which is cannot be true.”
Marcuse, “One-Dimensional Thought” [ODM pp. 123-99]

DEC 4 & 6: “...the labyrinthine basement under the Snack Bar”

FINAL EXAM
Tuesday, December 11
2:45 p.m. in Sparks 326

POLICIES:

Attendance will be taken at the beginning of each class. Students who are absent more than four times for any reason may be advised to drop the course. Lateness will be treated as absence.

Grades for this course will be assigned with the following criteria in mind:

An ‘A’ (90-93 = A-, 94 and up = A) indicates excellent work in the course. Such work will not only demonstrate a solid grasp of the central philosophical ideas and distinctions and show that you can apply them appropriately, but will also reflect creativity and insight. In addition, ‘A’ work will be technically proficient (organized, clear, free of error, and so on).
A ‘B’ (80-83 = B-, 84-86 = B, 87-89 = B+) indicates very good work. You understand the concepts introduced in class and produce clear, interesting, and technically competent work.
A ‘C’ (70-73 = C-, 74-76 = C, 77-79 = C+) reflects average or satisfactory work, and may indicate either some minor confusions with respect to the concepts discussed in class or difficulty with getting ideas across clearly. Any work that is not carefully produced, well-organized and error-free may automatically fall into this category.
A ‘D’ (60-63 = D-, 64-66 = D, 67-69 = D+) indicates work that is only fair. Any writing in which grammatical and spelling errors and lack of coherent organization are a hindrance to comprehending the work will certainly fall into this category.
A grade below 60 total points is a failing grade and can reflect unsatisfactory work, missed assignments, or a poor attendance record.

You should be aware that I take academic dishonesty very seriously. Plagiarism and scholastic dishonesty harm the individual, all students, and the integrity of the University. Policies on scholastic dishonesty will be strictly enforced in this course, and in any case of scholastic dishonesty, I will pursue the maximum penalty allowable under the University’s policy. It is every student’s responsibility to understand the methods for properly citing texts (including websites) in your written work. For more information on the policy at this institution, please see On Campus: The Undergraduate Co-Curricular Affairs Handbook. For further information on plagiarism in general, go to http://www.plagiarism.org.

If you have a specific medical, psychiatric or learning disability and require accommodation in this class, please let me know at the end of the first class meeting or as soon as you are eligible so that your learning needs may be appropriately met. You will need to notify me in writing and provide me with a copy of your accommodation letter, available through the Margaret A. Staton Office of Disability Services in the Student Center (http://www2.gsu.edu/~wwods/).
Appendix D2c  Current course syllabi for approved writing intensive courses: 4800

A. General Information: SOCIAL AND POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

Phil 4800/6800-005 (CRN 86453 & 4) & Pols 4555-005 (CRN 87293), Fall 2008  Professor A.J. Coher

Class Meets: 1:00-2:15, Tuesday and Thursday in Classroom South 501
(Graduate students will have additional course meetings. See D.1.d)

Prerequisite: One 2000 or 3000-level philosophy course, or consent of instructor.

Prof. Cohen’s Office: 34 Peachtree Street, 11th floor, #1121 (404-413-6128; e-mail: cohenaj@gsu.edu)

Office Hours: Tuesday & Thursday 2:30-3:30

Other times: Feel free to drop by, I may be in (or make an appointment).

Writing Consultant for 4800 & 4555: Elizabeth Sund (esund1@student.gsu.edu). See D2f below.

B. Required Texts

John Rawls  Justice as Fairness: A Restatement  Harvard
T. Nagel/L. Murphy  The Myth of Ownership  Oxford
Michael Otsuka  Libertarianism without Inequality  Oxford
Anthony Weston  A Rulebook for Arguments (suggested)  Hackett
Michael Harvey  Writing With Sources (suggested)  Hackett

C. Course Description

Drawing on selected recent works in social and political philosophy, we will discuss the Ethics of Political Redistribution of Welfare Goods. The Rawls book serves us as an introduction to the dominant mode of contemporary political philosophy by its most important writer. The others will give us much to discuss regarding the moral status of welfare redistribution programs. Our goal will be to determine if the state should engage in redistribution of resources and, if it should, how it should (and how much it should). This will involve discussing various fundamental moral questions regarding society and government. Generally, I want you to think about the way the social and political order is and the way it could and should be.

The objectives of this course are: to introduce you to an important part of social and political philosophy, to improve your ability to think clearly and critically about difficult and emotional issues, to improve your ability to defend your views with reasons, and to improve your writing ability.

In this class, you will be encouraged to develop the skills and virtues of open and intellectually honest inquiry. These include the charitable interpretation of others’ views; clarity and rigor in formulating, evaluating, and expressing beliefs; tolerance of complexity, and the willingness to suspend judgment until all sides of an issue have been examined. You will also be encouraged to clarify and critically analyze your own beliefs and values.

D. Assessment

1a. (i) FOR 4800 & 4555: Your class grade will presumptively have 3 components: a paper, worth 60% of your grade and 2 exams, each worth 20%. (ii) FOR 6800: Your class grade will presumptively have 3 equally weighted components: 2 papers and a final exam. (iii) FOR BOTH: There will be ample opportunity for active participation in this class. I value that highly, so I reserve the right to increase your final grade by as much as 2/3 of a letter grade (e.g., moving you from a C+ to a B or from a B- to a B+). Put simply: class participation can help your grade significantly and cannot hurt it.

1b. Evaluation procedures in this course attempt to determine whether you truly understand and can explain the strengths and weaknesses of the various viewpoints discussed as well as your own, developing, view. You will be required to do readings and perform written assignments that
strengthen your skills at analyzing and synthesizing materials into coherent, carefully reasoned essays. (FOR 6800: Grad students will be held to standards that would be expected of those continuing from an M.A. to a PhD program.) I will assume some familiarity with philosophical thought and practice, but not with any particular author or theory.

1c. Obviously, I expect you to be on time for class and to not do things that distract me or your classmates (e.g., talking to classmates, noisily eating or drinking, using a cell phone, coming in late). Please sit toward the front of the room. See also all of E.1 below.

1d. FOR 6800: Graduate students will have extra class meetings that will be conducted as a seminar. At each of these, one or two of you will be expected to give the rest a presentation. This need not be overly formal, but you do need to send me notes 48 hours in advance. I will ask for volunteers to get this started, but if needed, will assign the tasks in random order. All grad students will do at least one presentation. The rest of the participants will submit, via email at least 12 hours in advance of the meeting, 3 questions or comments and be prepared to discuss them at the meeting. These should be about the week’s readings, discussion from the other sessions, or broader issues related (however peripherally) to our readings & discussions.

1e. The grading scale:

   Grade | Range
---|---
   A+ | 93 <= X < 100
   A | 88.5 <= X < 93
   A- | 84 <= X < 88.5
   B+ | 79.5 <= X < 84
   B | 75 <= X < 79.5
   B- | 70.5 <= X < 75
   C+ | 66 <= X < 70.5
   C | 61.5 <= X < 66
   C- | 57 <= X < 61.5
   D | X <= 57

2a (i) FOR 4800 & 4555: The papers will be 6 to 8 pages long and will be a considered treatment of a fairly narrow topic of your choosing (related to the class). See 2d below. (ii) FOR 6800: The papers will be 9 to 12 pages long and will be a considered treatment of a fairly narrow topic of your choosing (related to the class and checking its appropriateness with me before proceeding). (iii) Submit papers via email, as .doc or .rtf attachments only. NEVER hand in a paper you started less than a week before it was due.

2b. I will grade papers (for 4800 & 4555, that’s for the final draft only) with a grading matrix. One is supplied here for 4800 & 4555 and another for 6800 (pages 7 and 8). Each indicates now what is valued in the paper writing assignment; filled out, it helps you to see where you need to improve. As the matrix makes clear, I expect you to carefully proofread your papers and for them to be of high quality.

2c. Before writing a paper you are advised to read the Weston (esp. 53-70) and Harvey books as well as Jim Pryor’s “Guidelines on Writing a Philosophy Paper” and my own Paper Tips (both available on uLearn). The latter especially are meant to provide guidance for what is expected and should be helpful (my PTs are referenced on the grading matrix). See D5 below on plagiarism.

2d. FOR 4800 & 4555: First, the Writing Consultant will be available throughout the semester to help you with your philosophy paper-writing skills. You should also feel free to talk to me about your papers. Though I won’t be reading drafts, I am happy to discuss the arguments you are working with and outlines of papers as you develop them. Second, you will do the paper in the following parts, all of which should be well-written as the quality of the writing is a major grading criteria. Do not fall into the trap of assuming that because the first parts are short, you don’t need to spend much time with them—they all require much work. (Due dates to be announced):

(i) Topic description (0%, but required; 10 point penalty if not done). This a statement of the issue you will consider in your paper. It does not have to state your view on the issue (although it may), but it should indicate you have read the relevant text(s) and considered the argument you will be addressing. It should be no more than a page and is to be emailed to the professor, not as an attachment but in the body of the email.

(ii) List of Sources (0%, but required; 10 point penalty if not done). This is a simple list of sources you are considering using for your paper and is to be emailed to the professor, not
as an attachment but in the body of the email.

(iii) Research overview (0%, but required; 10 point penalty if not done). Here you will provide a one to two page explanation of at least two articles, not covered in this class, that discuss your topic. Your discussion should include a brief summary and your reaction to each piece. The articles must be from sources listed in The Philosopher’s Index and they must have been written since 1970. You must provide the complete citation for each article in Chicago or MLA style format (not APA). Hard copy to be submitted to the Writing Consultant.

Note: We may engage in a peer-review process for this component where you would give your research overview to another student for feedback.

(iv) Thesis statement (10%, and required; 10 point penalty if not done): This states your view on the issue you have chosen. It should be no more than half of a page and is to be emailed to the professor, not as an attachment but in the body of the email.

(v) First draft (0%, but required; 20 point penalty if not done): This is not a rough draft; it is complete and finished product with a hard copy to be turned in to the Writing Consultant. If it is unpolished, she will return it for further work before giving feedback—and a 10 point penalty will be assessed. Elizabeth is available to read more than one draft. Note that in some cases, she will raise concerns about your arguments that you can turn into good objections to consider.

Note: We may engage in a peer-review process for this component where you would give your draft to another student for evaluation using the grading matrix.

(vi) Final draft (90%): The final draft of your paper should carefully respond to all of the comments the Writing Consultant makes on your earlier draft(s). Read those comments seriously and assume each will take substantial and substantive work to address (see 2g). Some may not; some may require minor changes, but many will require large revisions. You will turn in the draft with the Writing Consultant’s comments when you submit the final draft. If I see that she has given you good useful feedback and you have ignored it, your grade will suffer because you will have squandered an opportunity to improve your writing and philosophical skills. The point here is two-fold: first and foremost, it should help you become a better philosophical writer; second, it should help you earn a better grade.

2e. FOR 6800: For the papers, you will have to find, in the library, at least four (4) philosophical writings that you must cite in each paper (you may use on-line sources in addition). These must be from sources listed in The Philosopher’s Index and they must have been written since 1970. You must provide the complete citation for each article in Chicago or MLA style format (not APA).

2f. ALSO FOR 6800: I am happy to look over first pages of, outlines for, or drafts of, your paper. If you do any of these it (with my notations), must be submitted with the final version; if it’s a draft, it should be fairly polished (of course, you should expect to change and polish it further—perhaps re-doing it entirely). If you do a draft and make no substantive changes—see 2g—simply hand in the earlier version with my comments.

2g. Substantive revisions are changes that affect the substance or content of your argument—not the form—they don’t include the rewriting of problematic sentences; spelling, grammar, and the like, are about form rather than substance. One typical revision I will consider non-substantive: changing phrases like “all X are Y” to “many [or most or some or whatever] X are Y” in response to a comment that “this is too strong.” Of course, when you make substantive changes you may also make formal (i.e., non-substantive) changes.

3a. FOR 4800 & 4555: You will be allowed to use the course texts during the exam, but no other
books, notes, or study aids will be permitted. You must not copy any of your notes into the course texts or e-handouts. The instructions for the exams will read: “Answer each question as it relates to this course with direct succinct answers—no thesis statement, no introduction, no conclusion, etc. Be as informative as possible within the brief space provided [about _ a page, without quotes]. For each of these questions, preface your answer with a short quotation (one or two sentences) from the author in question. You must handwrite the quotation. You can use ellipses (“…”) if you want, but must be sure the written material gets the author’s point across. The quotation should be directly relevant to the question and should help show your understanding of the readings. You should cite the author & page number of the quote. There may well be more than one quotation that is appropriate for a particular question. As long as you use one that is appropriate, you will receive credit for it.” There will be 8-10 questions from the list I will provide as a study guide.

3b. FOR 6800: On the days of the 4800/4555 exams, you will not need to attend. Your one exam will cover the entire semester, will be composed of essays, and completed on your own time, due 72 hours after I assign it on the last day of class (by email). What I say about papers in D5 below applies to the exam.

4a. Attendance and Participation: Philosophy is a team sport involving verbal discussion as much as written argument and it requires practice. Moreover, discussion facilitates understanding, so participation is helpful. You will get the most out of this class if you push yourself and are willing to take intellectual risks and make mistakes. Try to be involved in class discussion and always feel free to come to me with questions or comments.

4b. Although regular attendance is expected and to your benefit, it is only a prerequisite to participation. Nonetheless, excessive (say 5 total) absences or latenesses will seriously lower your grade and absence from any 3 classes in a row may result in my withdrawing you from the class (that is not a promise to withdraw anyone; if you want to withdraw, it is your responsibility to do so).

4c. The midpoint of the semester is October 1; this is the last day to withdraw yourself with a W. Note that you can now have only 6 Ws total.

5. Plagiarism: Plagiarism is a form of stealing. It occurs when an author uses the words or ideas of others—whether a famous philosopher, an on-line source, or a friend—as if they were her own original thought. This may be unintentional. It can be avoided by always acknowledging one’s debt to others by citing the exact source of a quotation or paraphrase. You are morally and legally obligated to give the original author credit. Doing so is a matter of fairness and is expected in academic writing. Plagiarism is such a serious violation of academic honesty, that my chosen penalty for it is almost always at least an “F” for the course.

6. I don’t “curve” grades. If everyone deserves an A, everyone will get an A. More likely there will be a normal distribution of grades.

E. Other things (aka “the fine print”)

1a. Respecting someone does not require respecting their views. While everyone has a right to their opinion, that does not mean their opinion is right or that we should pretend it is. While we should assume everyone at GSU is intelligent and worthy of our respect, we should not be surprised to find that sometimes they hold views we cannot respect. There are good reasons why people—including very smart people—sometimes hold false views. (I hold several views that many people, some far smarter than I, think are wrong.)

1b. I highly value honest and unimpaired, but respectful (and hopefully friendly), dialogue. You should not pretend to think I (or anyone else you respect) am right when you don’t; I will extend you the same courtesy. To do otherwise, I think, is to fail to show respect. If you don’t indicate your disagreement, it would seem that you think your interlocutor is not worth correcting—i.e., that you do not respect her. As I come to the class assuming that you are worthy of respect, I
will indicate when something you say is questionable, leaves you committed to something I reject, or even that you are simply wrong (but feel free to challenge me!). I expect you to do the same (and I may challenge you!). I expect this sort of respectful behavior of all in the class. It is my hope that this will allow for a maximally tolerant, open, and honest, discussion.

1c. There are issues where no one opinion can (thus far) be deemed correct; I will not pretend otherwise, but may indicate why a particular view is wrong. Even if no one view can be deemed “the right view” about a topic, it may be that other views can be shown to be wrong. See Appendix A to my Paper Tips.

2a. Reading philosophy is a difficult & active process. Philosophy may be brief but it is never simple. Don’t underestimate the authors; you must work to understand the texts (see Kemerling, McLaughlin, & Pryor handouts on how to read). My lectures are (in part) meant to help guide you in understanding the texts, but they cannot replace a good reading. (And they may include ideas not in the texts.) In general, you should read the material twice before class and again after class. First, read the work through quickly to get the general idea and to circle any words you don’t understand. Then look up all the words you don’t know and read the work again slowly. Third, after we cover the reading in class, read it again, slowly. In general, if you are reading more than five pages an hour, you are not reading well enough.

2b. If you do the reading in the way just indicated, take good notes while doing it, and participate and take good notes when in class, you should do well. Given that, I expect you to put 9 hours a week into the course (3 in class).

3. On occasion, I may ask a colleague to read over an assignment you submit to help me assess it.

4. From time to time, I find a student’s assignment that can be instructive, either as an example of what to do or what not to do. If yours is one of those, I may use it for instructional purposes, now or in the future. (Your name would be removed.)

5. “Handouts” will generally be made available on uLearn (https://gsu.view.usg.edu).

6. Should software be available that would require electronic submission of assignments to check for plagiarism, I may decide to use it. This may mean that your submitted work would be stored in a database (whether by the university or a third party) for comparison with other papers (not for other people’s use as assignments or publications).

7. This course syllabus provides a general plan for the course; deviations may be necessary. On such occasions, I will make an in-class announcement and send an email announcement via GOSOLAR. Though I will always strive to provide at least a week’s notice of such changes, I expect that you will check your official GA State email at least every other day.

8. All of your work must be in accordance with the rules of the GSU Policy on Academic Honesty (see the GSU Catalog). That policy, as well as the Department of Philosophy General Syllabus Statement, is part of this syllabus and is attached (pages 9 and 10).

***Staying in this class amounts to consent to everything on this syllabus.***

NOTE: As per E7, dates are subject to change.
F. Schedule

I intend for us to carefully read the indicated sections of the texts and to discuss them in class—where we will, of course, bring other ideas to bear on the topics. You are expected to read the material before we discuss it (see E.2). Throughout, if you think we need more time on a particular reading or topic, please say so. From time to time, I may announce a change in readings; I shall try do so with at least a week’s notice. If at any point you are not sure where in the ordering we are, please ask.

1. T 8/19: First day. Intro; objectivity and relativism.

Rawls’ *Justice as Fairness* (~3 weeks)
2. R 8/21: Part I: Fundamental Ideas: sections 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, and 11
3. T 8/26: Part II: Principles of Justice: sections 13, 15, 16, 17, 19.3-5, 21, and 22
4. R 8/28: Part III: The Argument from the Original Position: sections 25, 26, 32, 33, 36, 37, and 38.2
5. T 9/2: Part IV: Institutions of a Just Basic Structure: sections 41, 42, 45, 48, 49, 50, and 51.6
   R 9/4 and T 9/9: Time to catch up.

Murphy’s and Nagel’s *The Myth of Ownership: Taxes and Justice* (~4 weeks)
6. T 9/16: Chapter 1: Introduction
8. T 9/23: Chapter 3: Economic Justice in Political Theory: all except section V
9. R 9/25: Chapter 4: Redistribution and Public Provision: all except sections VI & VII
10. T 9/30: Chapter 5: The Tax Base: especially sections V & VI, but really all
11. R 10/2: Chapter 6: Progressivity: all
12. T 10/7: Chapter 7: Inheritance: sections I, II, & III
13. R 10/9: Chapter 8: Tax Discrimination: all
   T 10/14: Time to catch up.

Schmidtz’s and Goodin’s *Social Welfare and Individual Responsibility* (~3 weeks)
14. R 10/23: Schmidtz’s Introduction and Chapter 1.1 The Tide of Wealth
15. T 10/28: Chapter 1.2 Why Isn’t Everyone Destitute? and Chapter 1.3 Responsibility and Community
16. R 10/30: Chapter 1.4 Mutual Aid and Chapter 1.5 But Is It Just?
   T 11/4: Goodin’s Introduction and Chapter 2.1 The Policy Context
   R 11/6: Chapter 2.2 Some Key Words in Context and Chapter 2.3 Collective Responsibility
   T 11/11: Chapter 2.4 The Classic Case for Collectivization Restated and Chapter 2.5 The Morality of Incentives and Deterrence
20. R 11/13: Chapter 2.6 The Point of Politics & Time to Catch up.

Otsuka’s *Libertarianism without Inequality* (~3 weeks)
   R 12/4: Time to Catch Up and Wrap Up

Note: 11/25-11/27 is Thanksgiving Day Break
Department of Philosophy  
General Syllabus Statement Fall 2008

This syllabus provides a general plan for the course. Deviations may be necessary.

The last day to withdraw from a course with the possibility of receiving a W is **Wednesday, October 1.**

Students are responsible for confirming that they are attending the course section for which they are registered. Failure to do so may result in an F for the course.

**Involuntary withdrawals:** After Wednesday, October 1st, instructors must give an F to all those students who are on their rolls but no longer taking the class and report the last day the student attended or turned in an assignment.

Students who are involuntarily withdrawn may petition the department chair for reinstatement into their classes.

By University policy and to respect the confidentiality of all students, **final grades** may not be posted or given out over the phone. To see your grades, check the web (student.gosolar.gsu.edu).

The customary penalty for a violation of the academic dishonesty rules is an "F" in the course. See the University Policy on Academic Honesty on the reverse of this sheet.

A student may be awarded a grade of "W" no more than 6 times in their careers at Georgia State. After 6 Ws, a withdrawal is recorded as a WF on the student's record. A WF counts as an F in a GPA.

**Subscribe to one of our department listservs for current information and events:**

Philosophy Majors:  mailbox.gsu.edu/mailman/listinfo/philmajor  
Philosophy Grad Students:  mailbox.gsu.edu/mailman/listinfo/philgrad

Messages will go to the address from which you send the message, so you need to resubscribe every time you change email addresses.

**For more information on the philosophy program visit:**  [www.gsu.edu/philosophy](http://www.gsu.edu/philosophy)

**Policy on Academic Honesty, from the GSU Catalog**

As members of the academic community, students are expected to recognize and uphold standards of intellectual and academic integrity. The university assumes as a basic and minimum standard of conduct in academic matters that students be honest and that they submit for credit only the products of their own efforts. Both the ideals of scholarship and the need for fairness require that all dishonest work be rejected as a basis for academic credit. They also require that students refrain from any and all forms of dishonorable or unethical conduct related to their academic work.

The university’s policy on academic honesty is published in the *Faculty Handbook* and *On Campus: The Student Handbook* and is available to all members of the university community. The policy represents a core value of the university, and all members of the university community are responsible for abiding by its tenets. Lack of knowledge of this policy is not an acceptable defense to any charge of academic dishonesty. All members of the academic community—students, faculty, and staff—are expected to report violations of these standards of academic conduct to the appropriate authorities. The procedures for such reporting are on file in the offices of the deans of each college, the office of the dean of students, and the office of the provost.
In an effort to foster an environment of academic integrity and to prevent academic dishonesty, students are expected to discuss with faculty the expectations regarding course assignments and standards of conduct. Students are encouraged to discuss freely with faculty, academic advisers, and other members of the university community any questions pertaining to the provisions of this policy. In addition, students are encouraged to avail themselves of programs in establishing personal standards and ethics offered through the university’s Counseling Center.

**Definitions and Examples**

The examples and definitions given below are intended to clarify the standards by which academic honesty and academically honorable conduct are to be judged. The list is merely illustrative of the kinds of infractions that may occur, and it is not intended to be exhaustive. Moreover, the definitions and examples suggest conditions under which unacceptable behavior of the indicated types normally occurs; however, there may be unusual cases that fall outside these conditions that also will be judged unacceptable by the academic community.

**Plagiarism:** Plagiarism is presenting another person’s work as one’s own. Plagiarism includes any paraphrasing or summarizing of the works of another person without acknowledgment, including the submitting of another student’s work as one’s own. Plagiarism frequently involves a failure to acknowledge in the text, notes, or footnotes the quotation of the paragraphs, sentences, or even a few phrases written or spoken by someone else. The submission of research or completed papers or projects by someone else is plagiarism, as is the unacknowledged use of research sources gathered by someone else when that use is specifically forbidden by the faculty member. Failure to indicate the extent and nature of one’s reliance on other sources is also a form of plagiarism. Any work, in whole or in part, taken from the Internet or other computer-based resource without properly referencing the source (for example, the URL) is considered plagiarism. A complete reference is required in order that all parties may locate and view the original source. Finally, there may be forms of plagiarism that are unique to an individual discipline or course, examples of which should be provided in advance by the faculty member. The student is responsible for understanding the legitimate use of sources, the appropriate ways of acknowledging academic, scholarly or creative indebtedness, and the consequences of violating this responsibility.

**Cheating on Examinations:** Cheating on examinations involves giving or receiving unauthorized help before, during, or after an examination. Examples of unauthorized help include the use of notes, computer-based resources, texts, or “crib sheets” during an examination (unless specifically approved by the faculty member), or sharing information with another student during an examination (unless specifically approved by the faculty member). Other examples include intentionally allowing another student to view one’s own examination and collaboration before or after an examination if such collaboration is specifically forbidden by the faculty member.

**Unauthorized Collaboration:** Submission for academic credit of a work product, or a part thereof, represented as its being one’s own effort, which has been developed in substantial collaboration with another person or source or with a computer-based resource is a violation of academic honesty. It is also a violation of academic honesty knowingly to provide such assistance. Collaborative work specifically authorized by a faculty member is allowed.

**Falsification:** It is a violation of academic honesty to misrepresent material or fabricate information in an academic exercise, assignment or proceeding (e.g., false or misleading citation of sources, falsification of the results of experiments or computer data, false or misleading information in an academic context in order to gain an unfair advantage).

**Multiple Submissions:** It is a violation of academic honesty to submit substantial portions of the same work for credit more than once without the explicit consent of the faculty member(s) to whom the material is submitted for additional credit. In cases in which there is a natural development of research or knowledge in a sequence of courses, use of prior work may be desirable, even required; however the student is responsible for indicating in writing, as a part of such use, that the current work submitted for credit is cumulative in nature.
Appendix D2d  Current course syllabi for approved writing intensive courses: 4820

A. General Information: PHILOSOPHY OF LAW
Phil 4820/6820-005 (CRN 87393 and 4), Fall 2007  Professor A.J. Cohen

Class Meets: 3:00-4:15, Monday and Wednesday in Sparks Hall 306
(Graduate students will have additional course meetings. See D.1.f)
Prerequisite: One 2000 or 3000-level philosophy course, or consent of instructor.

Prof. Cohen’s Office: 34 Peachtree Street, 11th floor, #1121 (404-413-6128;
e-mail: cohenaj@gsu.edu)

Office Hours: Mondays 1:30-2:30 and Wednesdays 10:30-11:30 and 1:30-2:30
Other times: Feel free to drop by, I may be in (or make an appointment).

Writing Consultant for 4820: Richard Latta (rlatta@student.gsu.edu). See D2e below.

B. Required Texts

Susan Dimock  Classic Readings and Cases in the Philosophy of Law  Longman
Anthony Weston  A Rulebook for Arguments (suggested)  Hackett
Michael Harvey  Writing With Sources (suggested)  Hackett

C. Course Description
This course is a survey of three fundamental topics in the philosophy of law: the nature of law
(and its relation to morality), the appropriate (i.e., moral) limits of legal interferences in liberty,
and theories of punishment. Put differently, we will discuss three questions: “what makes law
law?,” “when should the government be allowed to coercively prevent citizens from doing as
they wish?,” and “what sorts of punishments (the death penalty, for example) are morally
permissible and why?” The first of these is a purely conceptual question, even when the
relationship to morality is considered. The latter two questions are normative. We will read
classic and contemporary philosophers and I will recommend some important court decisions
(required reading for 6820).

The objectives of this course are: to introduce you to the philosophy of law, to improve your
ability to think clearly and critically about difficult and emotional issues, to improve your ability
to defend your views with reasons, and to improve your writing ability.

In this class, you will be encouraged to develop the skills and virtues of open and intellectually
honest inquiry. These include the charitable interpretation of others’ views; clarity and rigor in
formulating, evaluating and expressing beliefs; tolerance of complexity; and the willingness to
suspend judgment until all sides of an issue have been examined. You will also be encouraged to
clarify and critically analyze your own beliefs and values.

D. Assessment

1a(i). FOR 4820: Your class grade will presumptively have 4 equally weighted components: 2
papers and 2 exams.

1a(ii). FOR 6820: Your class grade will presumptively have 3 components: 2 papers and a final
exam.

1a(iii). FOR BOTH: As per #4 below, there will be ample opportunity for active participation in
this class. I value that highly, so I reserve the right to increase your final grade by as much as
2/3 of a letter grade (e.g., moving you from a C+ to a B or from a B- to a B+). Put simply: class
participation can help your grade significantly and cannot hurt it.

1b(i). Evaluation procedures in this course attempt to determine whether you truly understand and
can explain the strengths and weaknesses of the various viewpoints discussed as well as your own,
developing, view. You will be required to do readings and perform written assignments that strengthen your skills at analyzing and synthesizing materials into coherent, carefully reasoned essays.

1b(ii). FOR 6820: Graduate students will be held to standards that would be expected of those continuing from an M.A. to a PhD program.

1c. Obviously, I expect you to be on time for class and to not do things that distract me or your classmates (e.g., talking to classmates, noisily eating or drinking, using a cell phone, coming in late). Please sit toward the front of the room. See also all of E.1 below.

1d. “Different Credit” possibilities: Generally, people do the same quality work on extra assignments as they do on the regular assignments but, if you honestly believe you can better showcase your philosophical skills on an assignment other than those laid out here, I will consider it (we would then work out how its value would replace—not supplement—some portion of your class grade). Absent my prior agreement or an extreme circumstance, though, this will only be allowed if you have done all of the regular assignments. The purpose is to help you become better philosophers.

1e. I will assume some familiarity with philosophical thought and practice, but not with any particular author or theory.

1f. FOR 6820: Graduate students will often have a third class meeting during the week that will be conducted as a seminar. Each participant will submit, via email at least 12 hours in advance of the meeting, 3 questions or comments and be prepared to discuss them at the meeting. These should be about the week’s readings, the relevant court cases, discussion from the other sessions, or broader issues related (however peripherally) to our readings & discussions.

1g. The grading scale:

- B+: 84<=X<88.5
- C+: 70.5<=X<75
- A: 93<=X<100
- B: 79.5<=X<84
- C: 66<=X<70.5
- D: 57<=X<61.5
- A-: 88.5<=X<93
- B-: 75<=X<79.5
- C-: 61.5<=X<66
- F: below 57

2a(i). FOR 4820: The papers will be 5 to 7 pages long and will be a considered treatment of a fairly narrow topic. You should seek to determine your own topic, checking its appropriateness with me before proceeding.

2a(ii). FOR 6820: The papers will be 8 to 10 pages long and will be a considered treatment of a fairly narrow topic. You should seek to determine your own topic, checking its appropriateness with me before proceeding.

2b. Before writing a paper you are advised to read the Weston (esp. 53-70) and Harvey books as well as Jim Pryor’s “Guidelines on Writing a Philosophy Paper” and my own Paper Tips (both available on WebCT Vista). The latter especially are meant to provide guidance for what is expected and should be helpful (my PTs are referenced on the grading matrix—see 2f). See D5 below on plagiarism.

2c. For the papers, you will have to find, in the library, at least two (FOR 6820: 4) other philosophical writings that you must cite in each paper (you may use on-line sources in addition). GSU subscribes to the on-line version of Philosopher’s Index which is the single best means available to find works that will be helpful. I highly recommend you use it. If you’ve never tried and would like a brief introduction, let me know.

2d. We may engage in a peer-review process for the papers where you would give your paper to another student (not a friend) for evaluation using the grading matrix. After that evaluation, you
would have several more days to rewrite the paper before submitting it.

2e(i). FOR 4820: We are very lucky to have a Writing Consultant for your class. Richard Latta will be available throughout the semester to help you with your paper-writing skills. Indeed, you will be required to submit your paper (not a rough draft) to him for review before you submit it to me. When you submit a later version to me, I will look at it with the version that Richard commented on. If I see that he has given you good useful feedback and you have ignored it, I will stop reading and return the paper to you for further work. The point of this is two-fold: first and foremost, it should help you become a better writer; second, it should help you earn a better grade.

NOTE: You should also feel free to talk to me about your papers. Though I won’t be reading drafts, I am happy to discuss the arguments you are working with and outlines of papers as you develop them.

NOTE2: I may allow you to rewrite a paper. Rewrites must have substantive changes (see 2e(iii)).

2e(ii). FOR 6820: I am happy to look over first pages of, outlines for, or drafts of, your paper. If you do any of these—or a rewrite—it (with my notations) must be submitted with the final version; if it’s a draft, it should be complete and fairly polished (of course, you should expect to change and polish it further—perhaps re-doing it entirely). If you do a draft—or a rewrite—and make no substantive changes—see 2e(iii)—simply hand in the earlier version with my comments.

2e(iii). Substantive revisions are changes that affect the substance or content of your argument—not the form—they don’t include the rewriting of problematic sentences; spelling, grammar, and the like, are about form rather than substance. One typical revision I will consider non-substantive: changing phrases like “all X are Y” to “many [or most or some or whatever] X are Y” in response to a comment that “this is too strong.”) Of course, when you make substantive changes you may also make formal (i.e., non-substantive) changes.

2f. I will grade papers with a grading matrix. One is supplied here for 4820 and another for 6820. It indicates now what is valued in the paper writing assignment; filled out, it helps you to see where you need to improve. As the matrix makes clear, I expect you to carefully proofread your papers and for them to be of high quality. NOTE: the use of the matrix is still an experiment for me; if it doesn’t work well on the first paper, I may not use it again.

2g. Papers must be submitted via email, as .doc or .rtf attachments.

3(i). FOR 4820: The exams will be composed of short essays. I will provide a study guide before the exams that will include all of the possible essay questions. The first will be in class; the second will be during the exam period: Wednesday, December 12, at 2:45 p.m.

3(ii). FOR 6820: On the day of the first 4820 exam, you will not need to attend. Your one exam will cover the entire semester, will be composed of essays, and completed on your own time, due 72 hours after I assign it on the last day of class (by email). What I say about papers in D5 below applies to the exam.

4a. Attendance and Participation: Philosophy is a team sport involving verbal discussion as much as written argument and it requires practice. Moreover, discussion facilitates understanding, so participation is helpful. You will get the most out of this class if you push yourself and are willing to take intellectual risks and make mistakes. Try to be involved in class discussion and always feel free to come to me with questions or comments.

4b. Although regular attendance is expected and to your benefit, it is only a prerequisite to participation. Nonetheless, excessive (say 5 total) absences or latenesses will seriously lower your grade.
4c. Absence from any 3 classes in a row may result in my withdrawing you from the class (that is not a promise to withdraw anyone; if you want to withdraw, it is your responsibility to do so). See 4e below.

4d. The midpoint of the semester is October 15; this is the last day to withdraw yourself with a W rather than a WF. See 4e below.

4e. Note that you can now have only 6 Ws total.

5. Plagiarism: Plagiarism is a form of stealing. It occurs when an author uses the words or ideas of others—whether a famous philosopher, an on-line source, or a friend—as if they were her own original thought. This may be unintentional. It can be avoided by always acknowledging one’s debt to others by citing the exact source of a quotation or paraphrase. You are morally and legally obligated to give the original author credit. Doing so is a matter of fairness and is expected in academic writing. Plagiarism is such a serious violation of academic honesty, that my chosen penalty for it is almost always at least an “F” for the course.

6. I don’t “curve” grades. If everyone deserves an A, everyone will get an A. More likely there will be a normal distribution of grades.

E. Other things (aka “the fine print”)

1a. Respecting someone does not require respecting their views. While everyone has a right to their own opinion, that does not mean their opinion is right or that we should pretend it is. While we should assume that everyone at GSU is intelligent and worthy of our respect, we should not be surprised to find that sometimes they hold views we cannot respect. There are good reasons why people—including very smart people—sometimes hold false views. (I hold several views that some very smart people think are wrong.)

1b. I place a high value on honest and unimpaired, but respectful (and hopefully friendly), dialogue. You should not pretend to think I (or anyone else you respect) am right when you don’t: I will extend you the same courtesy. To do otherwise, I think, is to fail to show respect. If you don’t indicate your disagreement, it would seem that you think your interlocutor is not worth correcting—i.e., that you do not respect her. As I come to the class assuming that you are worthy of respect, I will indicate when something you say is questionable, leaves you committed to something I reject, or even that you are simply wrong (but feel free to challenge me!). I expect you to do the same (and I may challenge you!). Not to do so is disrespectful. I expect this sort of respectful behavior of all in the class. It is my hope that this will allow for a maximally tolerant, open, and honest, discussion.

1c. There are issues where no one opinion can (thus far) be deemed correct; I will not pretend otherwise, but may well indicate why a particular view is wrong. Even if no one view can be deemed “the right view” about something, it may be that other views can be shown to be wrong. See Appendix A to my Paper Tips.

2a. Be aware that reading philosophy is a difficult & active process. Philosophy may be brief but it is never simple. Don’t underestimate the authors; you must work to understand the texts (see Kemerling, McLaughlin, & Pryor handouts on how to read). My lectures are (in part) meant to help guide you in understanding the texts, but they cannot replace a good reading. (Similarly, they may include ideas not in the texts.) In general, you should read the material twice before class and again after class. First, read the work through quickly to get the general idea and to circle any words you don’t understand. Then look up all the words you don’t know and read the work again slowly. Third, after we cover the reading in class, read it again, slowly. In general, if you are reading more than five pages an hour, you are not reading well enough.

2b. If you do the reading in the way just indicated, take good notes while doing it, and participate and take good notes when in class, you should do well. Given that, I expect you to put 9 hours a week into the course (3 in class).
3. On occasion, I may ask a colleague to read over an assignment you submit to help me assess it.

4. From time to time, I find a student’s assignment that can be instructive, either as an example of what to do or what not to do. If yours is one of those, I may use it for instructional purposes, now or in the future. (Your name would be removed.)

5. “Handouts” will generally be made available on WebCT Vista / uLearn (https://d.view.usg.edu).

6. Should software be available that would require electronic submission of assignments to check for plagiarism, I may decide to use it. This may mean that your submitted work would be stored in a database (whether by the university or a third party) for comparison with other papers (not for other people’s use as assignments or publications).

7. This course syllabus provides a general plan for the course; deviations may be necessary. On such occasions, I will make an in-class announcement and send an email announcement via GOSOLAR. Though I will always strive to provide at least a week’s notice of such changes, I expect that you will check your email at least every other day.

8. All of your work must be in accordance with the rules of the GSU Policy on Academic Honesty (see the GSU Catalog). That policy, as well as the Department of Philosophy General Syllabus Statement, is part of this syllabus and is attached.

9. ***Staying in this class amounts to consent to everything on this syllabus.***

F. Schedule
Throughout, if you think we need more time on a particular reading or topic, please say so. I’ll try to announce any changes, but if I don’t, you’re expected to have read the material (twice) before we discuss it (see E.2).

NOTE: As per E7, dates are subject to change.

I. What is Law?
1. M8/20: First day.
3. W8/29: p. 38-52, Holmes and Frank on Legal Realism

4. W9/5: p. 53-68, Hart’s Legal Positivism

Note: 9/3 is off for Labor Day

PAPER #1 Assigned

II. Law and Morality
Cases worth considering: Riggs v. Palmer (257-261) & Raich v. Ashcroft (270-3)

Note: Reading Riggs before our discussion of the following will be very helpful.

7. M9/24 & W9/26: p. 205-228, Dworkin’s Integrity view

***M10/8: 4820 Exam #1

III. Law and Liberty
11. W10/24 & M10/29: p. 397-408, Devlin’s Legal Moralism
Cases worth considering: *Griswold v. CT, Roe v Wade*, and *Planned Parenthood of SE Penn v Casey, Bowers v Hardwick* and *Lawrence v Texas* (all between 477 and 513)

PAPER #2 Assigned

IV. Punishment
16. W11/7 & M11/12: p. 531-540, Bentham’s Utilitarian View

Note: 11/21 is off for Thanksgiving

16. W12/5: p. 571-582, Barnett on Restitution
Cases worth considering: *Payne v TN, Furman v GA, Woodsen v NC, Miranda v AZ* and *Gregg v GA* (the first 3 available as handouts; the last two on 601-620)

***6820 Exam Distributed

***4820 Exam #2, Wednesday, December 12, at 2:45 p.m.

Department of Philosophy
General Syllabus Statement Fall 2007

This syllabus provides a general plan for the course. Deviations may be necessary.

The last day to withdraw from a course with the possibility of receiving a W is Monday October 15.

Students are responsible for confirming that they are attending the course section for which they are registered. Failure to do so may result in a WF or F for the course.

**Involuntary withdrawals:** After Monday October 15th, instructors must give a WF to all those students who are on their rolls but no longer taking the class and must report the last day the student attended or turned in an assignment.

Students who are involuntarily withdrawn may petition the department chair for reinstatement into their classes.

By University policy and to respect the confidentiality of all students, final grades may not be posted or given out over the phone. To see your grades, check the web (student.gosolar.gsu.edu), email your instructor or give your instructor a stamped, self-addressed envelope.

While the penalty for academic dishonesty is a matter of the instructor's discretion in the Department of Philosophy, the customary penalty for a violation of the academic dishonesty rules is an "F" in the course. See the University Policy on Academic Honesty on the reverse of this sheet.

**New Policy as of Fall 2006:** A student may be awarded a grade of "W" no more than 6 times in their careers at Georgia State. After 6 Ws, a withdrawal is recorded as a WF on the student's record. A WF counts as an F in a GPA.

Subscribe to one of our department listservs for current information and events:

Philosophy Majors: mailbox.gsu.edu/mailman/listinfo/philmajor
Philosophy Grad Students: mailbox.gsu.edu/mailman/listinfo/philgrad

Messages will go to the address from which you send the message, so you need to resubscribe every time you change email addresses.

For more information on the philosophy program visit: www.gsu.edu/philosophy
Policy on Academic Honesty, from the GSU Catalog

As members of the academic community, students are expected to recognize and uphold standards of intellectual and academic integrity. The university assumes as a basic and minimum standard of conduct in academic matters that students be honest and that they submit for credit only the products of their own efforts. Both the ideals of scholarship and the need for fairness require that all dishonest work be rejected as a basis for academic credit. They also require that students refrain from any and all forms of dishonorable or unethical conduct related to their academic work.

The university’s policy on academic honesty is published in the Faculty Handbook and On Campus: The Student Handbook and is available to all members of the university community. The policy represents a core value of the university, and all members of the university community are responsible for abiding by its tenets. Lack of knowledge of this policy is not an acceptable defense to any charge of academic dishonesty. All members of the academic community—students, faculty, and staff—are expected to report violations of these standards of academic conduct to the appropriate authorities. The procedures for such reporting are on file in the offices of the deans of each college, the office of the dean of students, and the office of the provost.

In an effort to foster an environment of academic integrity and to prevent academic dishonesty, students are expected to discuss with faculty the expectations regarding course assignments and standards of conduct. Students are encouraged to discuss freely with faculty, academic advisers, and other members of the university community any questions pertaining to the provisions of this policy. In addition, students are encouraged to avail themselves of programs in establishing personal standards and ethics offered through the university’s Counseling Center.

Definitions and Examples

The examples and definitions given below are intended to clarify the standards by which academic honesty and academically honorable conduct are to be judged. The list is merely illustrative of the kinds of infractions that may occur, and it is not intended to be exhaustive. Moreover, the definitions and examples suggest conditions under which unacceptable behavior of the indicated types normally occurs; however, there may be unusual cases that fall outside these conditions that also will be judged unacceptable by the academic community.

Plagiarism: Plagiarism is presenting another person’s work as one’s own. Plagiarism includes any paraphrasing or summarizing of the works of another person without acknowledgment, including the submitting of another student’s work as one’s own. Plagiarism frequently involves a failure to acknowledge in the text, notes, or footnotes the quotation of the paragraphs, sentences, or even a few phrases written or spoken by someone else.

The submission of research or completed papers or projects by someone else is plagiarism, as is the unacknowledged use of research sources gathered by someone else when that use is specifically forbidden by the faculty member. Failure to indicate the extent and nature of one’s reliance on other sources is also a form of plagiarism. Any work, in whole or in part, taken from the Internet or other computer-based resource without properly referencing the source (for example, the URL) is considered plagiarism. A complete reference is required in order that all parties may locate and view the original source. Finally, there may be forms of plagiarism that are unique to an individual discipline or course, examples of which should be provided in advance by the faculty member. The student is responsible for understanding the legitimate use of sources, the appropriate ways of acknowledging academic, scholarly or creative indebtedness, and the consequences of violating this responsibility.

Cheating on Examinations: Cheating on examinations involves giving or receiving unauthorized help before, during, or after an examination. Examples of unauthorized help include the use of notes, computer-based resources, texts, or "crib sheets" during an examination (unless specifically approved by the faculty member), or sharing information with another student during an examination (unless specifically approved by the faculty member). Other examples include intentionally allowing another student to view one’s own examination and collaboration before or after an examination if such collaboration is specifically forbidden by the faculty member.

Unauthorized Collaboration: Submission for academic credit of a work product, or a part thereof, represented as its being one’s own effort, which has been developed in substantial collaboration with another person or source or with a computer-based resource is a violation of academic honesty. It is also a violation of academic honesty knowingly to provide such assistance. Collaborative work specifically authorized by a faculty member is allowed.

Falsification: It is a violation of academic honesty to misrepresent material or fabricate information in an academic exercise, assignment or proceeding (e.g., false or misleading citation of sources, falsification of the results of experiments or computer data, false or misleading information in an academic context in order to gain an unfair advantage).

Multiple Submissions: It is a violation of academic honesty to submit substantial portions of the same work for credit more than once without the explicit consent of the faculty member(s) to whom the material is submitted for additional credit. In cases in which there is a natural development of research or knowledge in a sequence of courses, use of prior work may be desirable, even required; however the student is responsible for indicating in writing, as a part of such use, that the current work submitted for credit is cumulative in nature.
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Appendix D3a  Degree requirements B.A. prior to Fall 09

In addition to the Program Degree Requirements, students must fulfill the College of Arts and Sciences Degree Requirements (see section 3030) and the University Degree Requirements (see section 1400).

B.A. in Philosophy

Areas A-E: Core Curriculum Recommendations

1. Area B: The department strongly recommends that philosophy majors take Phil 1010, Critical Thinking.

Area F: Courses Appropriate to the Major (18)

1. Required Courses (9)
   - Phil 2010: Great Questions of Philosophy (3)
   - Phil 2050: Philosophical Thinking (3)
     The department recommends that Phil 2050 be taken before enrolling in 4000-level philosophy courses.
   - Lang 1002: Elementary Foreign Language II (3)

2. Recommended Courses (6)
   - Lang 2001: Intermediate Foreign Language I (3)
   - Lang 2002: Intermediate Foreign Language II (3)

3. Select additional 1000/2000-level courses from core curriculum Areas B, C, D, or E to complete the 18 hours required in Area F. (3-9)

Area G: Major Courses (24)

A grade of C or higher is required in all major courses.

To satisfy the requirements for the B.A. degree with a major in philosophy, students must take a total of 24 semester hours in philosophy courses at the 3000 level or above, including the following distribution requirements:

1. History of Philosophy Requirements (6)
   - Phil 3010: History of Western Philosophy I: Ancient and Medieval (3)
   - Phil 3020: History of Western Philosophy II: Modern (3)

2. Ethics Requirement: Select at least one of the following courses. (3)
   - Phil 3720: Contemporary Moral Problems (3)
   - Phil 3730: Business Ethics (3)
   - Phil 4700: Ethics (3)

3. Metaphysics and Epistemology Requirement: Select at least one of the following courses. (3)
   - Phil 4090: Topics in Continental Philosophy (3)
   - Phil 4100: Epistemology (3)
   - Phil 4130: Philosophy of Science (3)
   - Phil 4300: Metaphysics (3)
   - Phil 4330: Philosophy of Mind (3)
   - Phil 4530: Philosophy of Language (3)

Students preparing to apply to graduate programs in philosophy are encouraged to take the following courses while completing the normal requirements:

- Phil 4100: Epistemology (3)
- Phil 4300: Metaphysics (3)
- Phil 4520: Symbolic Logic (3)
- Phil 4700: Ethics (3)

Developing a relationship with one or more professors so that they know you well and can write good letters of recommendation is also an excellent idea.

Area H: Minor and Additional Courses

1. Students majoring in philosophy are not required to take a minor.
2. The department strongly recommends that philosophy majors take the fourth semester of a foreign language as an elective course.
Pre-Law Concentration

Area A-F requirements are the same for the B.A. in Philosophy and the B.A. in Philosophy with a Pre-Law Concentration

Areas A-E: Core Curriculum Recommendations
1. Area B: The department strongly recommends that philosophy majors take Phil 1010, Critical Thinking.

Area F: Courses Appropriate to the Major (18)
1. Required Courses (9)
   - Phil 2010 Great Questions of Philosophy (3)
   - Phil 2050 Philosophical Thinking (3)
   - Lang 1002 Elementary Foreign Language II (3)
   - The department recommends that Phil 2050 be taken before enrolling in 4000-level philosophy courses.
2. Recommended Courses (6)
   - Lang 2001 Intermediate Foreign Language I (3)*
   - Lang 2002 Intermediate Foreign Language II (3)*
3. Select additional 1000/2000 level courses from core curriculum Areas B, C, D, or E to complete the 18 hours required in Area F. (3-9)

*When considering foreign language courses to meet the Area F requirement indicated above, Pre-Law concentration students with no other language preference should consider that a grounding in Latin is useful in law school.

Area G: Major Courses (24)
A grade of C or higher is required in all major courses.
To satisfy the requirements for the B.A. degree with a major in philosophy with a pre-law concentration, students must take a total of 24 semester hours in philosophy courses at the 3000 level or above, including the following distribution requirements:
1. History of Philosophy Requirements (6)
   - Phil 3010 History of Western Philosophy I: Ancient and Medieval (3)
   - Phil 3020 History of Western Philosophy II: Modern (3)
2. Ethics Requirement: Select at least one of the following courses. (3)
   - Phil 3720 Contemporary Moral Problems (3)
   - Phil 3730 Business Ethics (3)
   - Phil 4800 Social and Political Philosophy (3)
   - Phil 4850 African-American Ethical and Legal Issues (3)
3. Metaphysics and Epistemology Requirement: Select at least one of the following courses. (3)
   - Phil 4090 Topics in Continental Philosophy (3)
   - Phil 4100 Epistemology (3)
   - Phil 4130 Philosophy of Science (3)
   - Phil 4300 Metaphysics (3)
   - Phil 4330 Philosophy of Mind (3)
   - Phil 4530 Philosophy of Language (3)
4. Pre-Law Concentration Requirement (12)
   - Phil 4700 Ethics (3)
   - Phil 4820 Philosophy of Law (3)
   - Two of the following courses (6)
     - AAS 3070 African-Americans in the Criminal Justice System (3)
     - Hist 3220 United States in the Twentieth century (4)
     - Hist 4240 American Labor and Working Class (4)
     - Hist 4532 Crime, Law, and Society in Early Modern Europe (4)
     - Hist 4540 Britain, Ireland, and the British Atlantic, 1485 to 1689 (4)
Hist 4620  Europe: Culture and Ideas (4)
LglS 3020  Introduction to the Law (3)
LglS 4050  Principles of Business Law (3)
Phil 4520  Symbolic Logic (3) This course is strongly recommended both for the mental abilities it
develops and because many feel that it improves performance on the LSAT.
PolS 3110  State Government (3)
PolS 3140  Judicial Process and Courts (3)
PolS 3170  American Legislative Process (3)
PolS 3700  Public Administration and Bureaucratic Politics (3)
PolS 3750  Public Policy Analysis (3)
PolS 4115  Urban Politics (3)
PolS 4130  American Constitutional Law (3)
PolS 4131  Civil Liberties and Rights (3)
PolS 4157  Politics of the Civil Rights Movement (3)
PolS 4180  American Chief Executives (3)
PolS 4420  International Law (3)
PolS 4425  Politics of International Criminal Justice (3)
PolS 4427  Politics of International Human Rights (3)
PolS 4570  American Political Thought (3)
PolS 4780  Administrative Law and Government (3)
PolS 4950  Practicum in Political Science (3)
ReIS 4670  Church and State (3)
Soci 3220  Activism, Protest, and Revolution (3)
Soci 3222  Deviant Behavior (3)
Soci 3224  Crime and Punishment (3)
Soci 4218  Power and Politics (3)
Soci 4366  Law and Society (3)

Other law-related 3000 level or 4000-level courses (in any College) approved in advance by the
Philosophy Pre-Law Advisor. No courses will be approved after a student has enrolled in the course.

**Area H: Minor and Additional Courses**
1. Students majoring in philosophy with a pre-law concentration are not required to take a minor.
2. The department strongly recommends that philosophy majors with a pre-law concentration take the fourth
   semester of a foreign language as an elective course.
Appendix D3b  Degree requirements B.A. as of Fall 09

In addition to the Program Degree Requirements, students must fulfill the College of Arts and Sciences Degree Requirements (see section 3030) and the University Degree Requirements (see section 1400).

B.A. in Philosophy

Areas A-E: Core Curriculum Recommendations
1. Area B: The department strongly recommends that philosophy majors take Phil 1010, Critical Thinking.

Area F: Courses Appropriate to the Major (18)
1. Required Courses (6)
   - Phil 2010  Introduction to Philosophy (3)
   - Lang 1002  Elementary Foreign Language II (3)
2. Recommended Courses (6)
   - Lang 2001  Intermediate Foreign Language I (3)
   - Lang 2002  Intermediate Foreign Language II (3)
3. Select additional 1000/2000-level courses from core curriculum Areas B, C, D, or E to complete the 18 hours required in Area F.

Area G: Major Courses (27)
A grade of C or higher is required in all major courses.
To satisfy the requirements for the B.A. degree with a major in philosophy, students must take a total of 27 semester hours in philosophy courses at the 3000 level or above, including the following distribution requirements:
1. Phil 3000  Introductory Seminar in Philosophy (CTW) (3)
2. History of Philosophy Requirements (6)
   - Phil 3010  History of Western Philosophy I: Ancient and Medieval (3)
   - Phil 3020  History of Western Philosophy II: Modern (3)
3. Ethics and Social/Political Requirement: Select at least one of the following courses. (3)
   - Phil 4650  Religion and Ethics (3)
   - Phil 4680  War, Peace, and Religion (3)
   - Phil 4700  Ethics (3)
   - Phil 4710  Biomedical Ethics (3)
   - Phil 4720  Environmental Ethics (3)
   - Phil 4750  Topics in Ethics (3)
   - Phil 4800  Social and Political Philosophy (3)
   - Phil 4820  Philosophy of Law (3)
   - Phil 4822  Topics in Philosophy of Law (3)
   - Phil 4850  African American Ethical and Legal Issues (3)
   - Phil 4855  Advanced Topics in Political Theory (3)
   - Phil 4860  Philosophical Perspectives on Women (3)
   - Phil 4890  Topics in Social and Political Philosophy (3)
4. Metaphysics and Epistemology Requirement: Select at least one of the following courses. (3)
   - Phil 4100  Epistemology (3)
   - Phil 4130  Philosophy of Science (3)
   - Phil 4150  Topics in Epistemology (3)
   - Phil 4300  Metaphysics (3)
   - Phil 4330  Philosophy of Mind (3)
   - Phil 4350  Topics in Metaphysics (3)
   - Phil 4530  Philosophy of Language (3)
5. Phil 4990  Senior Seminar in Philosophy (CTW) (3)
6. Three more philosophy courses (9 hours) at the 3000 or 4000-level
   - Phil 4520  (Symbolic Logic) is strongly recommended as one of these courses, and it is required in order to graduate with distinction.
Students preparing to apply to graduate programs in philosophy are encouraged to take the following courses while completing the normal requirements:

- Phil 4100 Epistemology (3)
- Phil 4300 Metaphysics (3)
- Phil 4520 Symbolic Logic (3)
- Phil 4700 Ethics (3)

Developing a relationship with one or more professors so that they know you well and can write good letters of recommendation is also an excellent idea.

**Area H: Minor and Additional Courses**

1. Students majoring in philosophy are not required to take a minor.

**Pre-Law Concentration**

Area A-F requirements are the same for the B.A. in Philosophy and the B.A. in Philosophy with a Pre-Law Concentration.

**Areas A-E: Core Curriculum Recommendations**

1. Area B: The department strongly recommends that philosophy majors take Phil 1010, Critical Thinking.

**Area F: Courses Appropriate to the Major (18)**

1. Required Courses (6)
   - Phil 2010 Introduction to Philosophy (3)
   - Lang 1002 Elementary Foreign Language II (3)

2. Recommended Courses
   - Lang 2001 Intermediate Foreign Language I (3)
   - Lang 2002 Intermediate Foreign Language II (3)
   - Econ 2105 Macroeconomics
   - Econ 2106 Microeconomics
   - Soci 1101 Introductory Sociology

3. Select additional 1000/2000 level courses from core curriculum Areas B, C, D, or E to complete the 18 hours required in Area F.

*When considering foreign language courses to meet the Area F requirement indicated above, Pre-Law concentration students with no other language preference should consider that a grounding in Latin is useful in law school.

**Area G: Major Courses (27)**

A grade of C or higher is required in all major courses.

To satisfy the requirements for the B.A. degree with a major in philosophy with a pre-law concentration, students must take a total of 27 semester hours in philosophy courses at the 3000 level or above, including the following distribution requirements:

1. Phil 3000 Introductory Seminar in Philosophy (CTW) (3)

2. History of Philosophy Requirements (6)
   - Phil 3010 History of Western Philosophy I: Ancient and Medieval (3)
   - Phil 3020 History of Western Philosophy II: Modern (3)

3. Ethics and Social/Political Requirement: Select at least one of the following courses. (3)
   - Phil 4650 Religion and Ethics (3)
   - Phil 4680 War, Peace, and Religion (3)
   - Phil 4700 Ethics (3)
   - Phil 4720 Environmental Ethics (3)
   - Phil 4740 Biomedical Ethics (3)
   - Phil 4750 Topics in Ethics (3)
   - Phil 4800 Social and Political Philosophy (3)
   - Phil 4822 Topics in Philosophy of Law (3)
   - Phil 4850 African American Ethical and Legal Issues (3)
   - Phil 4855 Advanced Topics in Political Theory (3)
Phil 4860  Philosophical Perspectives on Women (3)  
Phil 4890  Topics in Social and Political Philosophy (3)  

4. Metaphysics and Epistemology Requirement: Select at least one of the following courses. (3)
   Phil 4100  Epistemology (3)  
   Phil 4130  Philosophy of Science (3)  
   Phil 4150  Topics in Epistemology (3)  
   Phil 4300  Metaphysics (3)  
   Phil 4330  Philosophy of Mind (3)  
   Phil 4350  Topics in Metaphysics (3)  
   Phil 4530  Philosophy of Language (3)  

5. Phil 4820  Philosophy of Law (3)  
6. Phil 4990  Senior Seminar in Philosophy (CTW) (3)  
7. One more philosophy course (3 hours) at the 3000 or 4000-level  
   Phil 4520 (Symbolic Logic) is strongly recommended as one of these courses, both for the mental abilities  
   it develops and because it may improve performance on the LSAT, and this course is required in order to  
   graduate with distinction.  
8. One of the following courses (3-4)
   AAS 3070  African-Americans in the Criminal Justice System (3)  
   Hist 3220  United States in the Twentieth century (4)  
   Hist 4240  American Labor and Working Class (4)  
   Hist 4532  Crime, Law, and Society in Early Modern Europe (4)  
   Hist 4540  Britain, Ireland, and the British Atlantic, 1485 to 1689 (4)  
   Hist 4620  Europe: Culture and Ideas (4)  
   LglS 3020  Introduction to the Law (3)  
   LglS 4050  Principles of Business Law (3)  
   PolS 3110  State Government (3)  
   PolS 3140  Judicial Process and Courts (3)  
   PolS 3170  American Legislative Process (3)  
   PolS 3700  Public Administration and Bureaucratic Politics (3)  
   PolS 3750  Public Policy Analysis (3)  
   PolS 3770  Governmental Budgeting (3)  
   PolS 4115  Urban Politics (3)  
   PolS 4130  American Constitutional Law (3)  
   PolS 4131  Civil Liberties and Rights (3)  
   PolS 4157  Politics of the Civil Rights Movement (3)  
   PolS 4180  American Chief Executives (3)  
   PolS 4420  International Law (3)  
   PolS 4425  Politics of International Criminal Justice (3)  
   PolS 4427  Politics of International Human Rights (3)  
   PolS 4570  American Political Thought (3)  
   PolS 4780  Administrative Law and Government (3)  
   PolS 4950  Practicum in Political Science (3)  
   ReIs 4670  Church and State (3)  
   Soci 3220  Activism, Protest, and Revolution (3)  
   Soci 3222  Deviant Behavior (3)  
   Soci 3224  Crime and Punishment (3)  
   Soci 4218  Power and Politics (3)  
   Soci 4314  Complex Social Institutions (3)  
   Soci 4366  Law and Society (3)  

Other law-related 3000 level or 4000-level courses (in any College) approved in advance by the  
Philosophy Pre-Law Advisor. No courses will be approved after a student has enrolled in the course.
Appendix D3c  Degree requirements M.A.

(Requirements for students who entered the program before Fall of 2006, and before Fall of 2000.)

Download degree requirement worksheet for the Traditional and Brains & Behavior tracks. Documents are in Microsoft Word format.

With the exception of the J.D./M.A. track, our program is designed to be finished in two years.

Requirements which Apply to All Tracks

1. No 'double-counting.' Classes can count towards only one distribution requirement. Example: a person who takes Phil 8030, Seminar in Ancient Philosophy, can count it towards either the History or the Seminar requirement, but not both.
2. Only one Phil 8950, Directed Readings, course may be counted towards the degree. Additional Phil 8950 courses may be taken but they will not count towards the degree. (To register for this course you need to take this form to the faculty member with whom you wish to work.)
3. Thesis Submission Deadlines. The department has submission deadlines so that theses can receive the full consideration that they deserve. Students who do not meet these deadlines must postpone their graduation.
4. Other than the exceptions specifically indicated below, only six hours of credit earned outside the Department of Philosophy at Georgia State University may be applied towards the Georgia State M.A. in philosophy.
5. No student who has taken the 4000-level version of a course at Georgia State may take the 6000-level version of that course without advance permission of the Director of Graduate Studies. The Director will verify that the course content and requirements of the 6000-level course are different enough to warrant graduate credit for the course.
6. Students must be enrolled in the semester in which they graduate. Any students who are enrolled for no classes for a full academic year (3 semesters running, including summer semester) and are not on official leave or covered by other exceptions will automatically be made inactive in the program, and if they wish to continue, are required to follow reentry procedures. The graduate office has further details on this continuous enrollment policy, which goes into effect Fall 2006.
7. M.A. students whose course work is unsatisfactory may be subject to scholastic warning or scholastic termination.

Requirements of the traditional track

1. Twenty-seven hours of graduate coursework in philosophy. Courses numbered 8960 and higher do not count towards the 27-hour requirement.
2. Distribution requirements
   a. Logic requirement
      Phil 6520, Symbolic logic, is required of every full-time student in their first semester in the program (unless the requirement is waived). The text (as of Fall
Semester 2008) is Mates, Elementary Logic, Second Edition. If you are a part-time or special-status student, please consult with the Director of Graduate Studies about when to enroll in logic.

b. History Requirement
   At least one history course.
   See below for the list of courses in this area.

c. Ethics and Social/Political Requirement
   At least one course in ethics or social/political philosophy.
   See below for the list of courses in this area.

d. Metaphysics and Epistemology Requirement
   At least one course in metaphysics or epistemology.
   See below for the list of courses in this area.

e. Seminar requirement
   At least three courses with the word "Seminar" in the title.
   (Note that seminars used to satisfy other distribution requirements cannot also be used to satisfy this requirement.)

3. Six hours of thesis research, Phil 8999 (To register for this course you need to write and have approved by your thesis committee a thesis prospectus and to fill out this form).
4. A thesis which meets the departmental standards.
5. An oral thesis defense.

Students entering prior to Fall 2007 may take a general examination, which (if passed) counts for one seminar and three credit hours in the requirements above.

**History Courses**
Phil 6010 Plato
Phil 6020 Aristotle
Phil 6030 Topics in Ancient Philosophy
Phil 6040 Augustine and Aquinas (Formerly Phil 6120)
Phil 6050 Special Topics in Modern Philosophy (Formerly Phil 6150)
Phil 6055 Hume
Phil 6060 Kant (Formerly Phil 6160)
Phil 6070 Marxism (Formerly Phil 6790)
Phil 6075 Topics in 19th Century Philosophy
Phil 6080 Wittgenstein (Formerly Phil 6170)
Phil 6090 Topics in Continental Philosophy (Formerly Phil 6190)
Phil 6095 Topics in Analytic Philosophy
Phil 8030 Seminar in Ancient Philosophy
Phil 8050 Seminar in Analytic Philosophy
Phil 8060 Seminar in Modern Philosophy
Phil 8090 Seminar in Continental Philosophy

**Ethics and Social/Political Courses**
Phil 6650 Religion and Ethics
Phil 6680 War, Peace, and Religion
Phil 6700 Ethics
Phil 6720 Environmental Ethics
Phil 6740 Advanced Biomedical Ethics
Phil 6750 Topics in Ethics
Phil 6800 Social and Political Philosophy (Formerly 6760)
Phil 6820 Philosophy of Law (Formerly Phil 6720)
Phil 6822 Topics in Philosophy of Law
Phil 6830 Philosophy of Art
Phil 6850 African American Ethical and Legal Issues (Formerly Phil 6750)
Phil 6860 Topics in Political Theory
Phil 6870 Philosophical Perspectives on Women
Phil 6890 Topics in Social and Political Philosophy
Phil 8700 Seminar in Ethics
Phil 8710 Seminar in Bioethics
Phil 8810 Seminar in Social and Political Philosophy
Phil 8820 Seminar in Philosophy of Law
Phil 8860 Seminar in Political Theory
Phil 8870 Seminar in Feminist Philosophy

**Metaphysics and Epistemology Courses**

Phil 6100 Epistemology (Formerly Phil 6420)
Phil 6150 Topics in Epistemology
Phil 6130 Philosophy of Science (Formerly Phil 6430)
Phil 6300 Metaphysics (Formerly Phil 6600)
Phil 6350 Topics in Metaphysics
Phil 6330 Philosophy of Mind (Formerly Phil 6440)
Phil 6530 Philosophy of Language (Formerly Phil 6400)
Phil 8100 Seminar in Epistemology
Phil 8130 Seminar in Philosophy of Science
Phil 8300 Seminar in Metaphysics
Phil 8330 Seminar in Philosophy of Mind
Phil 8520 Seminar in Logic
Phil 8530 Seminar in Philosophy of Language

**A. The Neurophilosophy Track**

Neurophilosophy is one of the fastest growing subfields in contemporary philosophy. The Neurophilosophy Track offers students a unique opportunity to study philosophical issues at the intersection of philosophy and neuroscience, psychology, biology, and artificial intelligence. The Neurophilosophy Track is designed to take full advantage of the Neuroscience Institute (NI) at Georgia State University. The NI aims to take the neurosciences at Georgia State to a position of international prominence by promoting interdisciplinary collaboration between faculty and students from partnering departments. Successful completion of the Neurophilosophy Track, the first Masters program of its kind in the US, will provide students with a broad interdisciplinary background and prepare them to apply for graduate work in either philosophy or the relevant sciences.
The philosophy department has four Neurophilosophy Fellowships that are awarded to the most qualified students applying to the MA program with an interest in Track. The fellows receive a stipend of $15,000 plus tuition and do not have to serve as graduate assistants or instructors. Applicants who wish to receive this fellowship should indicate their interest in their personal statement, and they should include a brief description of why they feel well-qualified to receive the fellowship.

Visit the Department's Neurophilosophy web site.

In addition to meeting the requirements noted above for the Traditional Track, students on the Neurophilosophy track

1. must pass Phil 6330, Philosophy of Mind, or Phil 8330, Seminar in Philosophy of Mind. NB: this requirement is exempt from the usual 'no double-counting' rule for distribution requirements; e.g. Phil 8330 can count both toward this requirement and the seminar requirement.
2. must pass 6 hours at the graduate level in another department associated with the Neuroscience Institute, such as neuroscience, such as biology, psychology, etc. These hours will count towards the 27 hours required for the M.A. in philosophy. These courses must be approved, in advance, by the philosophy Brains and Behavior Faculty and the Philosophy Director of Graduate Studies.
3. must write a thesis on a topic related to empirically informed philosophy of mind (topic will be approved by the philosophy Brains and Behavior Faculty and the Philosophy Director of Graduate Studies).

B. The J.D./M.A. Track
The J.D./M.A. track, offered in conjunction with the College of Law at Georgia State University, allows students to receive the M.A. in philosophy and the J.D. in four years instead of the usual five.

The J.D./M.A. track is a demanding course of study. Each student in the track is assigned an advisor from the College of Law faculty and an advisor from the faculty of the Department of Philosophy. Students must work closely with their advisors to make sure that they correctly progress towards the degrees. Below are the requirements for the M.A. degree on the J.D./M.A. track. For the J.D. requirements, see the College of Law web site.

1. Nine hours of qualifying courses in law. In consultation with the student and law J.D./M.A. advisor, the philosophy J.D./M.A. advisor will select those law courses most appropriate to the M.A. program and to the student's interests.
2. Eighteen hours of graduate course work in philosophy with the following distribution requirements:
   3.
      A. Two courses which meets the seminar requirement.
      B. Either Phil 6700, Ethics or Phil 6800, Social and Political Philosophy (Formerly Phil 6760.).
C. In addition to the courses taken to fulfill requirements 2.B., at least one of the following courses:

D.  
1. Phil 6700, Ethics  
2. Phil 6710, Biomedical Ethics  
3. Phil 6820, Philosophy of Law (Formerly Phil 6720.) (If the student has already taken Law 7295, Jurisprudence, credit for Phil 6820, Philosophy of Law, will be given only if the J.D. advisor and the M.A. advisor determine that Phil 6820, Philosophy of Law, would not substantially duplicate Law 7295, Jurisprudence.)  
4. Phil 6800, Social and Political Philosophy (Formerly Phil 6760.)  
5. Phil 6822, Topics in Philosophy of Law  
6. Phil 6850, African-American Ethical and Legal Issues (Formerly Phil 6750.)  
7. Phil 6870, Philosophical Perspectives on Women (Formerly Phil 6770.)  
8. Phil 8700, Seminar in Ethics (Formerly Phil 8400.)  
9. Phil 8710, Seminar in Bioethics  
10. Phil 8802, Seminar in Classical & Early Modern Political Thought  
11. Phil 8804, Seminar in Modern Political Thought  
12. Phil 8810, Seminar in Social and Political Philosophy  
13. Phil 8820, Seminar in Philosophy of Law  
14. Phil 8870, Seminar in Feminist Philosophy (Formerly Phil 8500.)

E. Epistemology Requirement—at least one of the following courses:  
1. Phil 6100, Theory of Knowledge (Formerly Phil 6420.)  
2. Phil 6130, Philosophy of Science (Formerly Phil 6430.)  
3. Phil 8100, Seminar in Epistemology (Formerly Phil 8200.)  
4. Phil 8520, Seminar in Logic

F. Metaphysics Requirement—at least one of the following courses:  
1. Phil 6300, Metaphysics (Formerly Phil 6600.)  
2. Phil 6330, Philosophy of Mind (Formerly Phil 6440.)  
3. Phil 6530, Philosophy of Language (Formerly Phil 6400.)  
4. Phil 8300, Seminar in Metaphysics (Formerly Phil 8150.)  
5. Phil 8330, Seminar in Philosophy of Mind  
6. Phil 8530, Seminar in Philosophy of Language

G. The following courses do not count towards the 15-hour requirement:
1. Phil 8900, Internship  
2. Phil 8960, Research in Philosophy  
3. Phil 8970, Teaching Philosophy  
4. Phil 8980, Teaching Philosophy Practicum  
5. Six hours of thesis research, Phil 8999 (To register for this course you need to write and have approved a thesis prospectus and to fill out this form).

4. Either Phil 6820, Philosophy of Law or Law 7295, Jurisprudence. Phil 6820, Philosophy of Law, counts towards requirement 2.C. and Law 7295, Jurisprudence, counts towards requirement 1. (If one of these two courses has been taken, credit for the second will be
given only if the J.D. advisor and the M.A. advisor determine that the second would not substantially duplicate the first.)
5. A thesis which meets the departmental standards.

**Other Notes Concerning the J.D./M.A. Track**

Students must independently meet the admission requirements of the Department of Philosophy and the College of Law. Admission to the College of Law creates no presumption favoring admission to the Department of Philosophy. Admission to the Department of Philosophy creates no presumption favoring admission to the College of Law.

Students on the J.D./M.A. track may, if they wish, count one seminar course towards both the seminar requirement and one other requirement. For example, Phil 8150 might fulfill both the seminar requirement and the Metaphysics Requirement.

The Department of Philosophy will only grant credit for those law courses in which the student earns a grade of 80 or better.

Law students may not take any philosophy courses while completing the first-year law curriculum.

The J.D. degree must be completed within six years of the initial semester of enrollment in the J.D. program.

Students enrolled in the J.D./M.A. program may subsequently elect not to pursue both degrees and may remain in either the J.D. or M.A. program; but any hours earned in a degree program from which a student withdraws will not be credited toward a degree granted by the program in which the student remains.

**Frequently Asked Questions about the Joint J.D./M.A. Program.**

For more information about the J.D./M.A. track, please contact Dr. Andrew I. Cohen (aicohen(at)gsu.edu), Philosophy J.D./M.A. advisor or Dr. William Edmundson (wedmundson(at)gsu.edu), Law J.D./M.A. advisor.

**The M.A. with Distinction**

Students who meet all of the following requirements shall be awarded the M.A. with distinction:

1. A graduate Georgia State philosophy GPA of 3.85 or better.
2. A thesis that, upon vote of the committee grading the thesis, is judged to merit distinction.
3. The Director of Graduate Studies judges that the student's record at Georgia State is one of distinction.
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## Appendix D4  List of Courses (Table D-1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPT</th>
<th>FY</th>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>NUMBERS</th>
<th>NUMBER SECTIONS</th>
<th>NUMBER STUDENTS</th>
<th>AVERAGE NUMBER STUDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>CORE</td>
<td>PHIL 1010</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>2558</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>CORE</td>
<td>PHIL 2010</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1718</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>LOWER</td>
<td>PHIL 2050</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>LOWER</td>
<td>PHIL 2050/PHIL 2430</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>HON 4870</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 3030</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 3010/RELS 3010</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 3020/RELS 3020</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 3030</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 3230/RELS 3230</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 3830</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 3720</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 3730</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 4030</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 4050</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 4050</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 4130</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 4130</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 4300/RELS 4300</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 4520</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 4530</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 4730</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 4710</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 4830</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 4820</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 4870</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 4880</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 4950</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 3270</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 3350</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 4615/PHIL 4615</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 4670</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 4680</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 4650</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6030</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6050</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6030</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6130</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6300</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6520</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY06 GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6530</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY06 GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6615</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY06 GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6730</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY06 GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6830</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY06 GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6820</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY06 GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 8030</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY06 GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 8330</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY06 GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 8530</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY06 GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 8810</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY06 GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 8930</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY06 GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 8950</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY06 GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 8990</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY06 GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 8970</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY06 GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 8990</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY06 GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 8999</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| PHIL FY07 CORE | PHIL 1010 | 72 | 2207 | 30.7 |
| PHIL FY07 CORE | PHIL 2010 | 33 | 1663 | 43.8 |
| PHIL FY07 LOWER | ITAL 1001 | 2 | 66 | 33.0 |
| PHIL FY07 LOWER | PHIL 2030 | 5 | 104 | 20.8 |

| PHIL FY07 UPPER | AAS 4750/PHIL 4850 | 1 | 9 | 9.0 |
| PHIL FY07 UPPER | PHIL 3030 | 2 | 61 | 30.5 |
| PHIL FY07 UPPER | PHIL 3010/RELS 3010 | 4 | 110 | 27.5 |
| PHIL FY07 UPPER | PHIL 3020/RELS 3020 | 4 | 103 | 25.8 |
| PHIL FY07 UPPER | PHIL 3050 | 1 | 42 | 42.0 |
| PHIL FY07 UPPER | PHIL 3230/RELS 3230 | 1 | 42 | 42.0 |
| PHIL FY07 UPPER | PHIL 3720 | 4 | 125 | 31.3 |
| PHIL FY07 UPPER | PHIL 3730 | 9 | 272 | 30.2 |
| PHIL FY07 UPPER | PHIL 4010 | 1 | 15 | 15.0 |
| PHIL FY07 UPPER | PHIL 4050 | 1 | 11 | 11.0 |
| PHIL FY07 UPPER | PHIL 4090 | 2 | 33 | 16.5 |
| PHIL FY07 UPPER | PHIL 4095 | 1 | 6 | 6.0 |
| PHIL FY07 UPPER | PHIL 4100 | 2 | 31 | 15.5 |
| PHIL FY07 UPPER | PHIL 4130 | 1 | 16 | 16.0 |
| PHIL FY07 UPPER | PHIL 4300/RELS 4300 | 1 | 21 | 21.0 |
| PHIL FY07 UPPER | PHIL 4330 | 1 | 19 | 19.0 |
| PHIL FY07 UPPER | PHIL 4520 | 1 | 16 | 16.0 |
| PHIL FY07 UPPER | PHIL 4700 | 1 | 22 | 22.0 |
| PHIL FY07 UPPER | PHIL 4800 | 1 | 22 | 22.0 |
| PHIL FY07 UPPER | PHIL 4820 | 1 | 22 | 22.0 |
| PHIL FY07 UPPER | PHIL 4860/WST 4360 | 1 | 9 | 9.0 |
| PHIL FY07 UPPER | PHIL 4890 | 1 | 1 | 1.0 |
| PHIL FY07 UPPER | PHIL 4950 | 9 | 33 | 3.7 |
| PHIL FY07 UPPER | RELS 3050 | 1 | 45 | 45.0 |
| PHIL FY07 UPPER | RELS 3270 | 2 | 71 | 35.5 |

<p>| PHIL FY07 GRAD | PHIL 6010 | 1 | 4 | 4.0 |
| PHIL FY07 GRAD | PHIL 6060 | 1 | 10 | 10.0 |
| PHIL FY07 GRAD | PHIL 6090 | 2 | 23 | 11.5 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Product Code</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY07</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6095</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY07</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY07</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6130</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY07</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6300</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY07</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6330</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY07</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6520</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY07</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6700</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY07</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6800</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY07</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6820</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY07</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6850</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY07</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6870/WST 6770</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY07</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 8050</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY07</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 8100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY07</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 8300</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY07</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 8700</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY07</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 8950</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY07</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 8950</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY07</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 8970</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY07</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 8990</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY07</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 8980/RELS 8980</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY07</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 8985/RELS 8985</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY07</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 8999</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Product Code</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY08</td>
<td>CORE</td>
<td>PERS 2001</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY08</td>
<td>CORE</td>
<td>PHIL 1010</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2630</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY08</td>
<td>CORE</td>
<td>PHIL 2010</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY08</td>
<td>LOWER</td>
<td>ITAL 1001</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY08</td>
<td>LOWER</td>
<td>PHIL 2050</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 3000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 3010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 3010/RELS 3010</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 3020</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 3020/RELS 3020</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 3030</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 3050</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 3230/RELS 3230</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 3720</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 3730</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 4020</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 4055</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 4060</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 4070</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 4100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 4300/RELS 4300</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 4330</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 4520</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 4530</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 4620</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 4700</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 4830</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 4820/POLS 4590</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 4820</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 4830</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 4870</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 4880</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>PHIL 4950</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>RELS 3270</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6020</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6035</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6050</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6070</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6300/RELS 6300</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6330</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6520</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6530</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6730</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6800</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6820</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 6830</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 8030</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 8130</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 8330</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 8810</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 8950</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 8960</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 8970</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 8990</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 8990/RELS 8990</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 8995</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 8995/RELS 8995</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>PHIL 8999</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2008 ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW SURVEY SUMMARY

C. UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT SURVEY FINDINGS REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Dept Mean</th>
<th>Univ Mean</th>
<th>% Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty members in the department are interested in the academic</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development of undergraduate majors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The undergraduate program of study is academically challenging.</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty in the department are appropriately prepared for their courses.</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel the undergraduate program is preparing me for my professional</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>career and/or further study.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is open communication between faculty and undergraduate students</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>about student concerns.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class size is suitable for effective learning.</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic advisement available in the department</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career advisement available in the department</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of teaching methods used by faculty</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures used to evaluate student performance</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of undergraduate major course offerings</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of undergraduate major course offerings</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of degree requirements</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supplemental Questions Provided by the Department of Philosophy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Dept Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The outside-class departmental activities I participated in help contribute</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positively to my education.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The philosophy major community contributes positively to my education</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and to my college experience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy taking classes that include graduate students and think that</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>these classes help contribute positively to my education.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. UNDERGRADUATE ALUMNI SURVEY FINDINGS REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Dept Mean</th>
<th>Univ Mean</th>
<th>% Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty members in the department were interested in the academic</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development of undergraduate majors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The undergraduate program of study was academically challenging.</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty in the department were appropriately prepared for their courses.</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel the undergraduate program prepared me for my professional</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>career and/or further study.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was open communication between faculty and undergraduate students</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>about student concerns.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class size was suitable for effective learning.</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic advisement available in the department</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career advisement available in the department</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom  3.78  3.88  33
Effectiveness of teaching methods used by faculty  4.28  3.97  78
Procedures used to evaluate student performance  3.59  3.78  26
Frequency of undergraduate major course offerings  3.89  3.52  85
Variety of undergraduate major course offerings  3.94  3.60  78
Clarity of degree requirements  4.17  4.06  57

Supplemental Questions Provided by the Department of Philosophy

Question
The outside-class departmental activities I participated in helped contribute positively to my education.  3.79
The philosophy major community helped contribute positively to my education and to my college experience.  4.00
I enjoyed taking classes that included graduate students and think that these classes helped contribute positively to my education.  4.39

E. GRADUATE STUDENT SURVEY FINDINGS

Question
Faculty members in the department are interested in the academic development of graduate majors.  4.38  4.15  84
The graduate program of study is academically challenging.  4.41  4.05  94
Faculty in the department are appropriately prepared for their courses.  4.53  4.15  94
I feel the graduate program is preparing me for my professional career and/or further study.  4.16  4.07  84
There is open communication between faculty and graduate students about student concerns.  3.79  3.83  47
Class size is suitable for effective learning.  3.13  4.23  3
Academic advisement available in the department  4.21  3.63  97
Career advisement available in the department  3.70  3.25  91
Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom  4.18  3.98  75
Effectiveness of teaching methods used by faculty  4.26  3.94  97
Procedures used to evaluate student performance  4.05  3.91  81
Frequency of graduate course offerings  3.89  3.32  94
Variety of graduate course offerings  3.92  3.49  100
Clarity of degree requirements  4.34  3.93  88

Supplemental Questions Provided by the Department of Philosophy

Question
The colloquia and other outside-class departmental activities I participate in help contribute positively to my education.  4.26
I enjoy taking classes that include undergraduate students and think that these classes help contribute positively to my education.  2.46
My teacher training and support while teaching Critical Thinking are worthwhile and help me do an effective job teaching philosophy.  3.75
My assistantship support is adequate.  2.83
The amount of work I have to do for my assistantship is not too much and does not interfere with my ability to put in adequate time for my classes and thesis research.  3.38
F. GRADUATE ALUMNI SURVEY FINDINGS REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Dept Mean</th>
<th>Univ Mean</th>
<th>% Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty members in the department were interested in the academic</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development of graduate majors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The graduate program of study was academically challenging.</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty in the department were appropriately prepared for their courses.</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel the graduate program prepared me for my professional career</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and/or further study.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was open communication between faculty and graduate students</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>about student concerns.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class size was suitable for effective learning.</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic advisement available in the department</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career advisement available in the department</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of teaching methods used by faculty</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures used to evaluate student performance</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of graduate course offerings</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of graduate course offerings</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of degree requirements</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supplemental Questions Provided by the Department of Philosophy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Dept Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The colloquia and other outside-class departmental activities I</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participated in helped contribute positively to my education.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoyed taking classes that included undergraduate students and think that</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>these classes helped contribute positively to my education.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My teacher training and support while teaching Critical Thinking were</td>
<td>4.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worthwhile and helped me do an effective job teaching philosophy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My assistantship was adequate.</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of work I had to do for my assistantship was not too much and</td>
<td>4.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>did not interfere with my ability to put in adequate time for my classes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and thesis research.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. FACULTY SURVEY FINDINGS REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Dept Mean</th>
<th>Univ Mean</th>
<th>% Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship of the faculty in the department</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of required course offerings</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of advanced course offerings</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of clerical staff support</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of departmental goals for the next two years</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of computer/data base software relevant to your work</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The department's program of study is academically challenging.</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty in the department work together toward program goals.</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In our department, faculty feel comfortable expressing different views and opinions.</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have adequate opportunities to influence decisions made in the</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>department about our programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines regarding job performance are clear to faculty in the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
department.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Dept Mean</th>
<th>Univ Mean</th>
<th>% Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research tasks</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service to department</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing in certain journals</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing in certain journals</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>% Yes/No</th>
<th>% Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have you ever been the editor of any journals or served on any editorial boards in your field?</td>
<td>33.3/66.7</td>
<td>47.5/52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you been awarded any grants from Georgia State University to support research in your field?</td>
<td>50.0/50.0</td>
<td>63.2/36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you been awarded any grants from a source other than Georgia State University to support research in your field?</td>
<td>83.3/16.7</td>
<td>69.2/30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During the last two years, have you refereed or served as a reviewer of one or more articles submitted to journal(s) in your field?</td>
<td>83.3/16.7</td>
<td>76.1/23.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Dept Mean</th>
<th>Univ Mean</th>
<th>% Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many professional articles or chapters in books have you published in the last five years?</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many authored books or edited books have you published in the last five years?</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many monographs, manuals, or reviews have you published in the last five years?</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many formal presentations have you given at professional meetings over the last five years?</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many formal presentations have you given at other colleges or institutions over the last five years?</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supplemental Questions Provided by the Department of Philosophy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Dept Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The pre-tenure release time for research is adequate.</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for summer research is adequate.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The work-load policy regarding the number of M.A. and honors theses one has to direct in order to have one's teaching load remain at 2 courses a semester is appropriate.</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find having classes that include both graduate and undergraduate students is an effective set-up for effectively meeting our pedagogical goals.</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Synopsis of What to Take as a Philosophy Major

When you declare philosophy as a major, you must see the Director of Undergraduate Studies (DUS) in Philosophy, Eddy Nahmias (enahmias@gsu.edu; 404-413-6117), who will discuss this Guidebook with you and assign you a Faculty Advisor/Mentor (see below).

To graduate with a major in philosophy, you must take 10 philosophy courses (30 hours) in which you receive a grade of C or better (*note that a grade of C- will NOT be applied to major):

**In Area F (2 courses, 6 hours):**
- PHIL 2010 (Great Questions of Philosophy)—you likely took this course before declaring.
- PHIL 2050 (Philosophical Thinking)—**YOU SHOULD TAKE THIS COURSE AS SOON AS POSSIBLE after declaring your major**; it is intended to prepare you for higher-level courses in philosophy (especially 4000-level courses).

**In Area G (8 courses, 24 hours):**
- History Requirement: PHIL 3010 (History of Western Philosophy I: Ancient and Medieval) and PHIL 3020 (History of Western Philosophy II: Modern)—if possible, you should take these two history courses in order (3010 then 3020) and *early in your major*, since they provide a historical background for most other classes.
- Ethics requirement (at least 1 course): PHIL 4700 (Ethics), PHIL 3720 (Contemporary Moral Problems), or PHIL 3730 (Business Ethics).
- Metaphysics & Epistemology (M&E) requirement (at least 1 course): PHIL 4090 (Special Topics in Continental Philosophy), PHIL 4100 (Epistemology), PHIL 4130 (Philosophy of Science), PHIL 4300 (Metaphysics), PHIL 4330 (Philosophy of Mind), or PHIL 4530 (Philosophy of Language).
- At least 4 other courses at the 3000-level or 4000-level (see Appendix I for a list of all philosophy courses).
- At least half (4) of your courses in Area G must be taken at Georgia State University.

**Other requirements and suggestions:**
- 4 other courses (12 hours) are required in Area F, one of which must be beginning foreign language II (1002-level course); we recommend two further intermediate foreign language courses (2001 and 2002-level).
- We strongly recommend taking PHIL 1010 (Critical Thinking) as a course for Area B, preferably before taking PHIL 2050.
- See below for suggestions for majors considering graduate school in philosophy.

**The Pre-Law Concentration**
For those considering law school, philosophy is an ideal major both to prepare you for the type of reasoning needed in law school and for the LSAT and to make you an attractive candidate (see p. 7 below: Why Major in Philosophy). The Pre-Law Concentration is designed to further serve these goals. The faculty advisor for this program is Andrew I. Cohen (aicohen@gsu.edu). The requirements for the Pre-Law Concentration include:
- Area F requirements as above: PHIL 2010 and PHIL 2050 and a foreign language (1002-level course) plus 3 other courses (see below for suggestions)
- History Requirement as above: PHIL 3010 and 3020
- M&E Requirement as above: PHIL 4090, 4100, 4130, 4300, 4330, or 4530
- Ethics Requirement (at least 1 course): PHIL 3720 (Contemporary Moral Problems), PHIL 3730 (Business Ethics), PHIL 4800 (Social and Political Philosophy), or PHIL 4850 (African-American Ethical and Legal Issues)
- PHIL 4700 (Ethics). This course is in addition to the ethics requirement above.
- PHIL 4820 (Philosophy of Law)
- At least 2 other courses relevant to the study of law (see Appendix II on p. 20 for list)
- It is recommended that one of these two courses be PHIL 4520 (Symbolic Logic), which develops reasoning and argumentative skills and may improve performance on the LSAT.
- It is also recommended that you take these courses in Area F: ECON 2105 (Macroeconomics), ECON 2106 (Microeconomics), SOCI 1101 (Introductory Sociology), and/or two intermediate foreign language courses (2001 and 2002-level). Students with no other language preference should consider that a grounding in Latin may be useful in law school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHECKLIST OF REQUIREMENTS:</th>
<th>PHILOSOPHY MAJOR</th>
<th>PRE-LAW CONCENTRATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area B Strongly Suggested</td>
<td>PHIL 1010</td>
<td>PHIL 1010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area F Requirements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3 courses)</td>
<td>PHIL 2010 and</td>
<td>PHIL 2010 and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PHIL 2050</td>
<td>PHIL 2050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language 1002</td>
<td>Language 1002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area F Recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3 more courses required)</td>
<td>Language 2001</td>
<td>Language 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language 2002</td>
<td>Language 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ 1 more course</td>
<td>ECON 2105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ECON 2106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SOCI 1101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area G (8 courses)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. History Requirement</td>
<td>PHIL 3010 and</td>
<td>PHIL 3010 and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2 courses)</td>
<td>PHIL 3020</td>
<td>PHIL 3020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ethics Requirement</td>
<td>PHIL 4700 or</td>
<td>PHIL 3720 or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 course)</td>
<td>PHIL 3720 or</td>
<td>PHIL 3730 or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PHIL 3730</td>
<td>PHIL 4800 or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PHIL 4850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. M&amp;E Requirement</td>
<td>PHIL 4090 or</td>
<td>PHIL 4090 or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 course)</td>
<td>PHIL 4100 or</td>
<td>PHIL 4100 or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PHIL 4130 or</td>
<td>PHIL 4130 or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PHIL 4300 or</td>
<td>PHIL 4300 or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PHIL 4330 or</td>
<td>PHIL 4330 or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PHIL 4530</td>
<td>PHIL 4530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other Requirements</td>
<td>+ 4 more courses at</td>
<td>PHIL 4700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4 more courses required)</td>
<td>3000-level or</td>
<td>PHI 4820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4000-level</td>
<td>+ 2 more courses from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(for list of all philosophy</td>
<td>approved list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>courses see Appendix I)</td>
<td>(see Appendix II)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Course Scheduling
In an effort to assist majors in planning their schedules, the department of philosophy offers a number of high-demand courses on a regular schedule. While we cannot guarantee that the schedule below will always be followed, the department will do everything possible to follow it.

Phil 1010, Critical Thinking--Fall, Spring and Summer Semesters
Phil 2010, Great Questions of Philosophy--Fall, Spring and Summer Semesters
Phil 2050, Philosophical Thinking--Fall and Spring Semesters
Phil 3010, History of Western Philosophy I, Ancient & Medieval--Fall, Spring and Summer
Phil 3020, History of Western Philosophy II, Modern--Fall and Spring Semesters
Phil 4100, Epistemology--Fall Semesters
Phil 4300, Metaphysics--Spring Semesters
Phil 4520, Symbolic Logic--Fall Semesters
Phil 4700, Ethics--Spring Semesters
Phil 4820, Philosophy of Law--Spring Semesters

Majors Considering Graduate School in Philosophy
If you are considering continuing your education in Philosophy beyond your undergraduate degree (i.e., applying to an MA or PhD program in Philosophy):

• We strongly encourage you to take PHIL 4100 (Epistemology), PHIL 4300 (Metaphysics), PHIL 4520 (Symbolic Logic), PHIL 4700 (Ethics), and several other 4000-level courses.
• We strongly encourage you to establish a relationship with one or more professors who will know your work well and may be able to write you helpful and informative letters of recommendation.
• Develop one of your philosophy papers into a writing sample (12-15 pages) under the supervision of a faculty member (independent studies are one way to do this).
• Attend the annual meeting (in early fall) for applying to graduate school in Philosophy.
• If you are considering a career in philosophy, discuss with your Faculty Mentor/Advisor how best to proceed and the prospects for getting a teaching position in a college or university.

Minor in Philosophy
Students who wish to minor in philosophy must take at least 5 courses (15 hours) in philosophy, including at least 3 courses (9 hours) at the 3000-level or 4000-level. Students taking more than 15 hours in philosophy may count the additional hours toward their electives or may consider completing a double major. (A grade of C or better is required in all courses counting toward the minor.) If, for some reason, you choose to change majors from philosophy, you should discuss with the DUS whether you can still get a minor in philosophy.

* Note that courses applied to the minor cannot also be used to satisfy Areas A-F.

Minor in Ethics
The minor in Ethics is designed to complement any major. Students with a major in business, education, the natural sciences, the social sciences, or the health and human sciences are particularly encouraged to consider a minor in Ethics. Students completing this minor must take PHIL 3720 (Contemporary Moral Problems) and PHIL 4700 (Ethics), plus 3 more classes from an approved list (see Appendix III, p. 17). (A grade of C or better is required in all courses counting toward the minor.)
Philosophy as a Major, a Double Major, or a Minor

Philosophy is an excellent field of study for anyone wishing a broad education that teaches one how to think and that promotes self-awareness. It is particularly appropriate as a major or minor for those contemplating a career in law, government or business administration, public service, politics, education, or religion—in addition, of course, to students preparing for graduate work and careers in philosophy. (See “Top Ten Reasons to Major in Philosophy” on p. 7 below and the department’s website, click on “Majors”: www.gsu.edu/philosophy).

The department’s major is designed to make double majoring or minoring in philosophy viable options whatever your major may be. Philosophy is an excellent choice for a second major or minor since it provides skills, such as critical thinking, writing, and communication, that are useful for any field and any profession. To declare a major, minor, or concentration, fill out the appropriate forms at the Office of Undergraduate Assistance (OAA), GCB 418.

Advising for Philosophy Majors

Majors are given both academic and career advising from the Office of Academic Assistance (OAA) in the College of Arts and Sciences and from the Department of Philosophy. The Office of Academic Assistance is located in 418 General Classroom Building (GCB). Their phone number is (404) 413-5000. The Advisor for Philosophy Majors is Deborah Beach-Bradford (dbeach1@gsu.edu). The Office of Academic Assistance has primary responsibility for all curriculum areas not directly related to the major (A-E)—that is, all areas other than courses appropriate to the major (Area F) and major requirements (Area G), including questions about transfer credits, residency requirements, AP or IB credits, etc.

- OAA website: http://www.cas.gsu.edu/oaa.html
- Major Map for philosophy: http://www.cas.gsu.edu/docs/mm/maps/PHIL_Map.pdf
- Undergraduate Catalog: www.gsu.edu/images/Downloadables/Undergrad_06-07_catalog.pdf
- Enrollment Services: www.gsu.edu/es
- For financial aid questions, students should go to the One Stop Shop in Sparks Hall 227: www.gsu.edu/one_stop_shop.html
- For information about GSU Orientation, go to: www.gsu.edu/incept

Overview of University Requirements (see Undergraduate Catalog, especially pages 78-83)

- 120 hours to graduate (* Note that 1000- and 2000-level courses that do not fulfill Area A-F requirements DO NOT count towards the 120 hours to graduate *)
- 39+ hours at the 3000-4000 level at GSU for academic residency requirement (at least half your courses in Area G for the major must be taken at GSU).

Area A, Essential Skills: 9 hrs/3 courses (Engl 1101, Engl 1102, and one math course)
Area B, Institutional Options: 4 hrs/2 courses (Majors take PHIL 1010 plus 1 other course)
Area C, Humanities & Fine Arts: 6 hrs/2 courses (see list in Catalog pp. 80-81)
  * Note that majors cannot use PHIL 2010 in Area C since it is required in Area F.
Area D, Science, Math & Tech: 11 hrs/3 courses (see list in Catalog pp. 81-82)
Area E, Social Sciences: 12 hrs/4 courses (see list in Catalog pp. 82-83)
Areas F & G, Major: See above
Transfer Credit
In order to get credit for courses taken at a different school, see Deborah Beach-Bradford at the OAA. To get credit for a philosophy course you should take to OAA a syllabus for the course which will then be attached to a form for the DUS to review in order to determine what, if any, GSU philosophy course it matches for credit. (See p. 53 of the Undergraduate Catalog.)
• Transfer students should make sure they are aware of the GSU Residency Requirement (39+ hours at the 3000-4000 level at GSU) and that they must complete at least half of their courses for the major in the Philosophy Department at Georgia State University.

Graduation Audit
Students must apply for graduation at least TWO semesters prior to the planned completion of their degree requirements. An application can be obtained through the Office of Academic Assistance, 418 General Classroom Building or from the Graduation Office in 231 Sparks Hall (see http://www.gsu.edu/applying_for_graduation.html). The student will then need to set up an appointment with the Philosophy Director of Undergraduate Studies, Eddy Nahmias by emailing him at enahmias@gsu.edu. The DUS reviews and signs the audit form during the advisement session and informs the student of any remaining requirements needed to graduate. The student has the responsibility for returning the audit form to the Office of Academic Assistance or Graduation Office promptly. The student must meet with the DUS and CANNOT simply leave the audit form to be signed or have their advisor/mentor sign it.

PACE / CAPP / Academic Evaluation Form
The PACE/CAPP form (Academic Evaluation form) is used to determine both what classes the student has taken as well as the classes that are remaining to be taken. The easiest way for students to obtain these forms is through GoSOLAR (see Appendix IV on p. 17). The OAA, philosophy DUS, or your philosophy advisor/mentor (see below) can review these forms with students. These forms indicate how many hours are required to graduate, to satisfy the residency requirement, and to satisfy the university and major requirements (areas A-G). They are an essential tool to use in your meetings with advisors.

Philosophy Majors Listserv
The department’s primary means of communication with philosophy majors is the philosophy majors listserv. All philosophy majors must subscribe to this listserv. Other interested individuals are welcome to subscribe. Go to the departmental website, click on “Majors” and scroll down or go to mailbox.gsu.edu/mailman/listinfo/philmajor and follow the directions there.

Faculty Advisor/Mentor
When you declare your philosophy major you must meet with the DUS who will advise you about courses to take and assign you a Faculty Advisor/Mentor. If there is a permanent faculty member who you would like to be your Advisor/Mentor, that can usually be arranged (ask the DUS). The Advisor/Mentor will meet with you at least once a year to discuss your progress in the major, requirements and class scheduling, and future plans for graduate school or your career. When you meet with your Advisor/Mentor please bring your PACE/CAPP (Academic Evaluation) form available on GoSOLAR. It is best to schedule an appointment with your Advisor/Mentor by emailing him or her and setting up a time to meet during office hours.
Requests for Overloads
If a course you need to take to satisfy the major is full, attend the first class and speak to the instructor about overloading. You should try to register for the class during the first week by taking a spot opened by students who drop it. If that does not work and the instructor allows the overload, then have the instructor send an email to the department chair requesting that you be added to the course. If you have questions, see the DUS.

Honors Program and Philosophy
Students in the GSU Honors Program interested in writing an Honors thesis in philosophy should contact Dr. Melissa Merritt, the Honors advisor for philosophy majors, for more details.

Graduation with Distinction
To graduate with Distinction in the Philosophy major, the student must have excelled in his or her philosophy courses and undergraduate career. In general, a 3.5 GPA in the major and a 3.5 GPA overall is required and the student must be in good academic standing. Rare exceptions may be made by faculty vote.

Activities, Colloquia, Clubs
The Department of Philosophy offers various extracurricular activities that we encourage philosophy students to take advantage of. They have the potential to enhance your experience as a philosophy major and student at Georgia State University.

• Philosophy on Friday: The Department of Philosophy (along with the Department of Religious Studies) hosts a gathering with free lunch, usually on the first Friday of every month during the fall and spring semesters. Philosophy students are encouraged to come. These events are announced through the Philosophy Majors Listserv.

• Colloquium Series: Philosophy majors are encouraged to attend the department’s colloquium series, which brings philosophers from around the nation to present talks on contemporary debates. The schedule of speakers can be found at the department’s website.

• Phi Sigma Tau: Majors may become members of Phi Sigma Tau, the International Honor Society in Philosophy, if they meet the requirements. All majors may participate in activities sponsored by Phi Sigma Tau, such as the Georgia State Student Philosophy Symposium. Go to the department’s website for more information.

• Philosophy Forum: This philosophy club hosts and sponsors events, often in conjunction with Phi Sigma Tau.

• Ethics-in-Film Movie Series: Watch movies that raise ethical issues and then discuss them with a panel of relevant discussants. For more information, go to the Blumenfeld Center for Ethics website: www.gsu.edu/ethics

Contests and Awards
The Department of Philosophy offers:

• The *Troy Moore Undergraduate Essay Contest* in Ethics.

• The *George W. Beiswanger Award* for most outstanding graduating philosophy major.

• The *Robert Almeder Award* for best paper at the Georgia State Student Philosophy Symposium.
Top Ten Reasons to Major in Philosophy … or
“What to Tell Your Friends and Family When They Ask You The Question?”

Inevitably, people will want to know why you have chosen to be a philosophy major. Here are some answers you can give them:

10) Because philosophy feeds your head. You can get your free GSU Department of Philosophy T-shirt with this slogan on the back … and this one on the front:

9) Because philosophers are rational animals (philosophy courses improve one’s reasoning abilities and argumentative skills, helping you discover when other people are being irrational or trying to trick you with bad arguments).

8) Because I really enjoyed my first philosophy class.

7) What did you major in? What exactly was it good for?

6) Because I get to read and discuss some of the greatest works ever written, from Plato to Kant, from Aquinas to Nietzsche, from Frege to Freud, from Descartes to Dennett …

5) Because philosophy improves my ability to read, write, and think critically and carefully, skills that are essential in any profession, from law to business to medicine to teaching to … you name it.

4) And most jobs don’t really care what your major was anyway—they just want you to be a smart and interesting person who communicates clearly and learns fast.

3) Philosophy majors rock the Graduate Record Exam (GRE) and other standardized tests for graduate schools (see below).

2) Because I get to discuss the most fascinating questions in the world, from “How should I live my life?” to “Does God exist?” to “Can science explain everything?” to “Do we have free will?” to “What type of government is best?” to “What is Beauty?” to “What is human nature?”

1) Because it will make the rest of my life more interesting.

For more on the above, see:

• Why Study Philosophy: http://www.louisiana.edu/Academic/LiberalArts/PHIL/WhyStudyPhilosophy.html
• Philosophy Careers Handbook: http://www.philosophy.eku.edu/hndbook1.htm
• How philosophy majors do on various graduate exams: http://www.philosophy.eku.edu/scores.htm and http://www.lclark.edu/%7Ephil/gre.html
• Why Major in Philosophy: http://www.philosophy.eku.edu/virginia.htm
• What Can You Do with a Philosophy Degree: http://www.philosophy.eku.edu/Illinoisstate.htm
• Just a few famous philosophy students (majoring in philosophy does not guarantee fame!): http://www.philosophy.eku.edu/phimajors.htm
How Students Performed on Graduate Admissions Tests

Percentage by which the mean score of test-takers from specific undergraduate majors differs from the mean score of all test-takers

*As reported in The Chronicle for Higher Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>LSAT</th>
<th>GMAT</th>
<th>GRE verbal</th>
<th>GRE Quant.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Music</td>
<td>-.05%</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
<td>+1.7%</td>
<td>-8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>+5.6%</td>
<td>+4.1%</td>
<td>+14.5%</td>
<td>-5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Langs.</td>
<td>+5.7%</td>
<td>+3.3%</td>
<td>+7.9%</td>
<td>-4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>+2.9%</td>
<td>+4.6%</td>
<td>+10.8%</td>
<td>-5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen Humanities</td>
<td>+4.7%</td>
<td>+1.8%</td>
<td>+7.3%</td>
<td>-5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>+8.7%</td>
<td>+11.0%</td>
<td>+17.6%</td>
<td>+4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>-1.6%</td>
<td>+.06%</td>
<td>+3.5%</td>
<td>-5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>+0.9%</td>
<td>+0.8%</td>
<td>+3.1%</td>
<td>-4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>-7.0%</td>
<td>-5.0%</td>
<td>-5.0%</td>
<td>-15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-8.7%</td>
<td>-4.2%</td>
<td>-10.4%</td>
<td>-15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>-2.7%</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>-6.0%</td>
<td>-14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>+8.7%</td>
<td>+11.0%</td>
<td>+17.6%</td>
<td>+4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>+4.0%</td>
<td>+3.3%</td>
<td>+5.4%</td>
<td>+8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>+12.8%</td>
<td>+13.3%</td>
<td>+2.7%</td>
<td>+26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>+7.6%</td>
<td>+7.5%</td>
<td>+2.1%</td>
<td>+18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Admin</td>
<td>-4.5%</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
<td>-9.1%</td>
<td>-2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>-5.4%</td>
<td>-7.7%</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>nr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>+8.7%</td>
<td>+11.0%</td>
<td>+17.6%</td>
<td>+4.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

nr=not reported
Average GRE Scores by Intended Graduate Major, 7/1/01-6/30/04

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbal Reasoning</th>
<th>Quantitative Reasoning</th>
<th>Analytical Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. PHILOSOPHY</strong></td>
<td>589</td>
<td><strong>1. PHILOSOPHY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. English Lang. &amp; Lit</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>2. English Lang. &amp; Lit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Humanities &amp; Arts – other</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>3. Arts &amp; Humanities – other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. History</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>4. History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Arts – History, Theory</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>5. Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Religion</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>6. Religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Physics / Astronomy</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>7. Anthropology/Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Foreign Lang. &amp; Lit.</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>10. Foreign Lang. &amp; Lit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Political Science</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>11. Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Engineering – other</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>17. Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Arts – Performance/Studio</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>18. Biological Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Sociology</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>20. Earth Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Engineering – Chemical</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>22. Education – Eval. &amp; Res.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Natural Sciences – other</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>23. Engineering – other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Psychology</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>27. Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Engineering – Mechanical</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>29. Business – Bank &amp; Fin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Agriculture</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>33. Public Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Engineering – Electrical</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>34. Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Engineering – Civil</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>35. Business – Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Education – Eval &amp; Res</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>37. Education – Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Business – other</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>38. Education – Counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Education - Elementary</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>40. Education – special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Engineering – Industrial</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>41. Engineering – Civil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Business – Administration</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>42. Engineering – Mechanical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Education – other</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>43. Health &amp; Med. Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Home Economics</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>44. Home Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Education – Special</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>45. Business – other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Education – Counseling</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>46. Business – other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Social Work</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>47. Engineering – Early Childhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Education – Administration</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>48. Engineering – Electrical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Education – Early Childhood</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>49. Business – Industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Business – Accounting</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>50. Business – Accounting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Think Your Liberal Arts Degree Won't Get You a Real Job? THINK AGAIN!
By Laura Raines Atlanta Journal-Constitution 05/04/07

Your passion is philosophy, English literature or American history. That's fine for college, but what does it get you in the real world? Are you doomed to a sequence of random, boring and low-paying jobs once you leave the ivory towers behind?

Not if you know how to translate your education into the world of work.

Emory University reports that, historically, more than 90 percent of job postings at its Career Center and on-campus interview opportunities are open to all majors. Recently, a representative from Goldman Sachs made a presentation on why people who major in the liberal arts make great analysts on Wall Street.

"Liberal arts majors are in high demand by the employers who interview on our campus," said Phil Rockwell, a counselor with Georgia State University Career Services. "Companies want employees with good communication skills. They need people who can think critically; who can write and speak well; who can run projects, interact on teams and sell on paper or in person.

"Liberal arts majors can do all those things. Our challenge is to get them to expand their own thinking — to know their values, skills and interests so that they can put their degrees to work."

He encourages students to plug into the university's Panther Career Net, where they can use assessment instruments such as SIGI 3, which links personal values and skills with actual job titles, or the Vault, which also explores education and career pathways.

"There might be 100-plus job titles for the English major who doesn't want to teach, but the student has to do the research," Rockwell said.

His office also sponsors Career Conversations sessions with industry leaders during the year to spark students' imaginations and give insider points on how to get a foot in the door in various career fields.

"Students will tell me that, if they get a degree in math, they'll have to teach, and I tell them, no, you don't! There are so many things you can do, and there is a universe of tools out there to help you find those jobs," Rockwell said.

While it's a straight shot for an accounting major to seek employment with a corporate accounting firm, the career road for a philosophy or English major likely will have more twists.

Todd Wilson graduated from the University of Georgia with a bachelor of arts in anthropology and a bachelor of science in secondary education with a history emphasis.

"I wasn't sure what I wanted to do, so I thought my best avenue would be teaching. Student-teaching ninth-grade world history was the most rewarding and most depressing thing I've ever done," he said.

Because he didn't graduate during the teacher-hiring season, his 100 teaching applications went unnoticed, but a posting on an Internet jobs board led to a job at a small firm that designs Web sites.

That job was an awkward fit, so Wilson fell back on college editing experience and took a job at ProEdit, where he wrote technical and marketing copy for large corporations. That led to a job with IBM's global innovation services group.

Today, he's an account director with nurun | ant farm interactive, a global agency that specializes in Web site and mobile advertising.

"I have a lot of global clients, and it has been enormously helpful to have a varied background," Wilson said. "Anthropology taught me to understand and appreciate differences in cultures and people. History taught me about research and how to analyze materials for their underlying influences, and my teaching courses taught me how to speak in front of a crowd."

Wilson is "thrilled with his education and doesn't regret it for a minute." His advice to liberal arts majors: "Learn to bring everything you study into the real world."

Joe Bechely, senior account executive in integrated marketing communications with Manning, Selvage & Lee, doesn't believe that anything you learn ever will be a detriment to your career. He advises young people to chase their dreams and follow what they like to do.

Bechely chose to major in American Sign Language interpreting at the University of Tennessee because he loved it. He earned a master's degree in college administration at Florida State University because he liked working with students. While working as the assistant director of student activities at Emory University, he did a weekly radio segment on around-town activities for Star 94, which led to his hosting a talk show with a startup TV network in Los Angeles. The station went bankrupt about two years ago, but, by then, Bechely knew that he wanted a career in communications.

He was ready when the hiring managers at Manning, Selvage & Lee wanted to know how his experience prepared him for the job.
"What we do here is translating complex ideas into something that people can digest — that's where interpreting comes in," he said. "My job in higher education taught me how to manage people, time and projects, and hosting my own TV show taught me how to sell a project."

He got the job, which he believes is a perfect fit.

"The whole point of a college degree is to prove that you're trainable," Bechely said. "Any employer will teach you the specifics of a job, but you need to show that you know how to learn."

Having a degree in history and political science from Emory University made him more willing to listen and learn in all of his jobs, said Lee Bradley, managing director of SAMCO Capital Markets Inc.

"I didn't start out with any preconceived notions about business, so in new situations I was adaptable and open-minded. I'd rather hire someone with a liberal arts degree, because they don't know everything, but they know how to think analytically," Bradley said.

Joe Bechely earned a bachelor's degree in American Sign Language interpreting; he now "interprets" complicated ideas as a senior account executive in integrated marketing communications with Manning, Selvage & Lee. He planned to go to law school, but he took corporate and business jobs. When an aunt left him $10,000, he started investing in stocks.

Bradley was running his own boutique brokerage when a client asked him to help raise money for a community bank in Savannah. In the last 20 years, he's become the "Johnny Appleseed of banking," raising investment capital to start 122 banks in 20 states. In 2005, he merged his company with SAMCO.

"I'm still doing the same thing; I just have more resources. I love working in different communities, and this job allows me to meet some of the most fabulous people," he said.

He advises liberal arts majors to get a good education and stay open-minded about where they might end up in the real world.

Students think that their GPAs and majors are the most important factors to employers, Rockwell said, but skills and initiative are what the job market requires. A National Association of Colleges and Employers survey showed that what companies want most from new college graduates are communication skills, motivation/initiative, teamwork, leadership, flexibility, technical skills and interpersonal skills.

Liberal arts students often have more transferable skills than they realize, but it's up to them to recognize their strengths and be able to articulate them. Unless you help him or her, the hiring manager may never make the leap from your study of cultural anthropology to your ability to size up a business market.

The challenge, say career coaches, is that too many new graduates don't know how to make that leap.

George DuPuy, dean of the School of Business Management at Shorter College's satellite campus in Atlanta, became interested in career coaching for students in the 1980s, when he realized that even business majors didn't have a clue about the job search process.

Seeing too many bright kids graduate without jobs, return home to live with their parents and take the first jobs that offered them paychecks, DuPuy wrote "Career PREP-aration: Transition Guide for College Students" (Prentice Hall, 2003).

According to a Money magazine article in January, this phenomenon is so common that social scientists have dubbed it "adultolescence." More than 65 percent of college graduates return home to live for five years or more after graduation, compared with 53 percent in 2002.

DuPuy recently founded Career Launch (www.welaunchcareers.com), an Atlanta consulting firm that specializes in helping college students and graduates find fulfilling careers.

"Before they graduate, students need to figure out who they are by using personal assessment tools to discover their strengths, weaknesses, abilities and interests," DuPuy said. "That way, when they research the world of work, they'll have a better idea of what occupations are a good fit."

DuPuy shows students how to look at courses from the perspective of skills acquired. He coaches them in the use of networking and informational interviews to find jobs and narrow down career choices. Students are more successful when they focus on career paths, rather than interviewing with every possible employer, he said.

DuPuy believes internships are a valuable tool, because they provide students with looks at real jobs, help them narrow down career selections and can lead to job offers, if the students impress their bosses.

"When they see the real work environment, not the TV version, they can tailor their résumés to what they want to do and market themselves aggressively to specific industries or companies," DuPuy said.

Far from useless or unmarketable, your liberal arts degree can lead to a range of job titles — not just "waiter," as the old joke states. The key is to move beyond your specific knowledge of Shakespeare and Plato to sell the benefits of your broad-based education.

If you can argue that four years of papers, projects, activities and interpersonal relationships taught you how to think and solve problems, you're well on your way to being a good investment for employers.
APPENDIX I:  Current Philosophy Courses

* All courses are 3 Credit Hours except PHIL 1010 (Critical Thinking) which is 2 Credit Hours and PHIL 4870, PHIL 4880, and PHIL 4950 which are variable credit hour courses.

PHIL 1010 - CRITICAL THINKING:  Preparing Students for Success in the Core
Development of practical, logical, and problem-solving skills important to all disciplines, with emphasis on the composition of argumentative essays. Definitions, types of meanings, fallacious and deceptive arguments, deductive and inductive reasoning. Introduction to major forms of scientific and logical reasoning used across humanities, sciences and social sciences, including deductive, hypothetico-deductive, and inductive arguments such as statistical, causal, and analogical. This course may be used as one of the courses required in Area B, Institutional Options, and is designed to prepare students for courses in Areas C, D, and E.

PHIL 2010 - GREAT QUESTIONS OF PHILOSOPHY
This course is an introduction to philosophy. We will explore some fascinating questions about human existence and discuss various answers offered by philosophers—questions such as: Does God exist? How should I live my life? What is justice? What is human nature? Do we have free will? What is the meaning of life?

PHIL 2050 - PHILOSOPHICAL THINKING
Philosophical methods, concepts, skills, and principles. For example: sentential logic, regress and reductio arguments, paradigm-case arguments, types of supervenience, Leibniz's Law, necessity versus apriority. Applications to important philosophical texts. (Required for philosophy majors in Area F.)

PHIL 3000 - MORTAL QUESTIONS: SEARCH FOR MEANING
Examination of topics central to living a meaningful life, such as life-goals, death, work, spirituality, money and ownership, emotions, friendship, and love. Readings from selected philosophers.

PHIL 3010 - HISTORY OF WESTERN PHILOSOPHY I: ANCIENT & MEDIEVAL
(Same as ReIS 3010.) Development of European philosophy from the early Greeks to the Renaissance. Typically included are Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, St. Augustine, and St. Thomas Aquinas.

PHIL 3020 - HISTORY OF WESTERN PHILOSOPHY II: MODERN
(Same as ReIS 3020.) Development of European philosophy from the Renaissance to the Enlightenment. Typically included are Hobbes, Descartes, Spinoza, Leibniz, Locke, Berkeley, Hume, and Kant.
PHIL 3030 - HISTORY OF WESTERN PHILOSOPHY III: 19-20TH CENTURY
(Same as RelS 3030.) Development of European and American philosophy from the Enlightenment to the mid-twentieth century. Philosophers and schools may include Hegel, Marx, Mill, Nietzsche, Russell, James, Dewey, Sartre, Whitehead, and Wittgenstein, and idealism, pragmatism, process thought, existentialism, and analytic philosophy.

PHIL 3050 - ANALYTIC PHILOSOPHY
Introduction to analytic philosophy through some of the most important works by leading figures, such as Russell, Ayer, Quine, Austin, Ryle, and Putnam.

PHIL 3060 – EXISTENTIALISM
Introduction to existentialism through selected literary and philosophical writings of Kierkegaard, Nietzsche, Camus, de Beauvoir, Sartre, and others.

PHIL 3230 - PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION
(Same as RelS 3230.) Issues such as the nature of religion, arguments for the existence of God, the problem of evil, faith and reason, religious experience, immortality, myth and symbol, and alternative religious philosophies.

PHIL 3690 - HONORS READINGS
Prerequisite: consent of the instructor and Honors Program director. Discussion and readings on selected topics.

PHIL 3720 - CONTEMPORARY MORAL PROBLEMS
Selected moral issues, such as abortion, euthanasia, environmentalism, genetic engineering, feminism, animal rights, gay and lesbian rights, and political violence. Brief coverage of ethical theories as they relate to the issues at hand.

PHIL 3730 - BUSINESS ETHICS
Moral issues in business, such as social responsibility, employee obligations and rights, ethics and the professions, marketing and advertising practices, and the environment. Issues in both domestic and international areas may be discussed.

PHIL 3740 – BIOMEDICAL ETHICS
An introductory survey of major moral problems in bioethics. Topics such as abortion, death and euthanasia, treatment of the mentally ill, experimentation with human subjects, and genetic research will be covered.

PHIL 3855 – TOPICS IN POLITICAL THEORY
Introductory survey of the great writings in political thought. Examines the contributions these works made to Western conceptions such as democracy, equality, human nature, citizenship, and liberty, as well as their continuing relevance for understanding contemporary moral and political dilemmas. May be repeated if topic varies.

PHIL 3900 – STUDIES IN PHILOSOPHY
Examination of selected philosopher(s) or topic(s). May be repeated if topic varies. A maximum of six credit hours may be applied toward the major.

PHIL 4010 – PLATO
Prerequisite: One 2000 or 3000-level philosophy course, or consent of instructor. Advanced introduction to the major areas of Plato's philosophy, which may include the relationship between virtue and knowledge, the theory of recollection, the theory of forms, the nature of sensible objects, and the relationship between the individual and the state.

PHIL 4020 – ARISTOTLE
Prerequisite: One 2000 or 3000-level philosophy course, or consent of instructor. Advanced introduction to the major areas of Aristotle's philosophy, which may include early and later theories of substance, methodology, the study of nature, the soul, and ethics.

PHIL 4030 - TOPICS IN ANCIENT PHILOSOPHY
Prerequisite: One 2000 or 3000-level philosophy course, or consent of instructor. Investigation of a specific theme, philosopher, or text, such as Aristotle's ethics, the philosophy of Socrates, Plato's Republic, Stoicism, Hellenistic ethics, or Aristotle's philosophy of mind. May be repeated if topic varies, but only six credit hours may be applied to the major.

PHIL 4040 - AUGUSTINE & AQUINAS
(Same as RelS 4040. Formerly Phil 4120.) Selected works of the major religious philosophers of the Middle Ages with emphasis on their views on topics such as God, sin, human nature, free will, faith, and politics.

PHIL 4050 - TOPICS IN MODERN PHILOSOPHY
(Formerly Phil 4150.) Prerequisite: One 2000 or 3000-level philosophy course, or consent of instructor. Intensive study of major works of at least two of the following rationalist or empiricist philosophers: Descartes, Spinoza, Leibniz, Malbranche, Locke, Berkeley, Hume, or Reid. May be repeated if topic varies, but only six credit hours may be applied to the major.

PHIL 4055 - HUME
Prerequisite: one 2000 or 3000-level philosophy course, or consent of instructor. Advanced introduction to the major areas of Hume's philosophy. Topics may include the relation between his theoretical and moral philosophy, skepticism, causation, necessity, the foundations of human knowledge, self-consciousness, personal identity, reason, will, sentiment, naturalism, and
normativity.

PHIL 4060 - KANT
(Formerly Phil 4160.) Prerequisite: One 2000 or 3000-level philosophy course, or consent of instructor. Selected works of Kant, such as The Critique of Pure Reason or The Foundations of the Metaphysics of Morals.

PHIL 4070 - MARXISM
(Formerly Phil 4790.) Prerequisite: One 2000 or 3000-level philosophy course, or consent of instructor. Origin and development of central themes in the philosophy of Karl Marx, such as alienation, exploitation, and dialectal materialism, with limited reference to contemporary trends in Marxist thought.

PHIL 4075 - TOPICS IN 19th CENTURY PHILOSOPHY
Prerequisite: One 2000 or 3000-level philosophy course, or consent of instructor. Investigation of a specific theme, philosopher, or text, such as Hegel, Nietzsche, German Idealism, or the emergence of philosophy in America.

PHIL 4080 - WITTGENSTEIN
(Formerly Phil 4170.) Prerequisite: One 2000 or 3000-level philosophy course, or consent of instructor. Intensive study of selected works, including the Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus, Philosophical Investigations, On Certainty, and others.

PHIL 4085 - TOPICS IN HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY
Prerequisite: One 2000 or 3000-level philosophy course, or consent of instructor. Investigation of a specific theme, philosopher, or text, such as Skepticism in Ancient and Modern Philosophy, Anselm, or the Summa Contra Gentiles. May be repeated if topic varies, but only six credit hours may be applied to the major.

PHIL 4090 - TOPICS IN CONTINENTAL PHILOSOPHY
(Formerly Phil 4190.) Prerequisite: One 2000 or 3000-level philosophy course, or consent of instructor. Study of works of such authors as Husserl, Scheler, Heidegger, Sartre, Merleau-Ponty, and Ricoeur. May be repeated if topic varies, but only 6 credit hours may be applied to major.

PHIL 4095 - TOPICS IN ANALYTIC PHILOSOPHY
Prerequisite: One 2000 or 3000-level philosophy course, or consent of instructor. Study of works of such authors as Russell, Moore, Carnap, Putnam, Lewis, Feinberg, Hart, and Rawls.

PHIL 4100 - EPISTEMOLOGY
(Formerly Phil 4190.) Prerequisite: One 2000 or 3000-level philosophy course, or consent of instructor. Problems in the concept of knowledge, such as the definition of propositional
knowledge, the problem of induction, the a priori, and theories of truth. May also include theories such as coherentism, reliabilism, and foundationalism.

PHIL 4130 - PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE
(Formerly Phil 4430.) Prerequisite: One 2000 or 3000-level philosophy course, or consent of instructor. Varieties of scientific explanation; hypothesis formation and confirmation; paradigms, laws, and theories; the status of unobservable entities; holism and reductionism; science and values; nature and scope of scientific progress; limits of scientific explanation.

PHIL 4150 – TOPICS IN EPISTEMOLOGY
Prerequisite: One 2000 or 3000-level philosophy course, or consent of instructor. Study of specific topics in classical and contemporary discussions of knowledge and justified belief, such as the Gettier problem, skepticism, foundationalism, coherentism, reliabilism, contextualism, theories of truth, verificationism, feminist and naturalized epistemology. May be repeated if topic varies, but only six credit hours may be applied to the major.

PHIL 4300 - METAPHYSICS
(Same as RelS 4300, Formerly Phil 4600.) Prerequisite: One 2000 or 3000-level philosophy course, or consent of instructor. Topics may include personal identity and human nature; space, time, matter, and causality; freedom and determinism; teleology; conceptions of divinity; and world views and paradigm shifts.

PHIL 4330 - PHILOSOPHY OF MIND
(Formerly Phil 4440.) Prerequisite: One 2000 or 3000-level philosophy course, or consent of instructor. Topics such as theories of mind; the connection between mental and physical states; the relation between mind, language, and the world; and artificial intelligence.

PHIL 4350 –TOPICS IN METAPHYSICS
Prerequisite: One 2000 or 3000-level philosophy course, or consent of instructor. Study of specific issues in metaphysics, such as free will, causation, time, personal identity, possible worlds, existence of God, realism, etc. May be repeated if topic varies. A maximum of six credit hours may be applied toward the major.

PHIL 4520 - SYMBOLIC LOGIC
Prerequisite: One 2000 or 3000-level philosophy course, or consent on instructor. Fundamentals of propositional and predicate logic, with selected topics in such areas as the logic of identity and relations. Emphasis placed on construction of proofs in formal systems.

PHIL 4530 - PHILOSOPHY OF LANGUAGE
(Formerly Phil 4400.) Prerequisite: One 2000 or 3000-level philosophy course, or consent of instructor. Efforts in twentieth-century philosophy to account for the unique capacities of language to represent the world and to communicate our beliefs about it. Topics may include the
nature of language, theories of meaning and reference, semantic paradoxes, private language, speech acts, and non-human language.

PHIL 4610 - HINDUISM
(Same as RelS 4610.) Introduction to Hindu religion and philosophy, with some consideration of Indian Buddhism, Jainism, Sikhism, Islam, and contemporary thought.

PHIL 4615 - BUDDHISM
(Same as RelS 4615.) Historical introduction to the Buddhist tradition, tracing its developments in India, Southeast Asia, Tibet, China, Japan, and the West.

PHIL 4620 - CONFUCIANISM AND TAOISM
(Same as RelS 4620.) Historical introduction to Chinese religion and philosophy, tracing developments in Confucianism and Taoism. Some consideration given to Chinese Buddhism and popular religion.

PHIL 4625 - ZEN AND SHINTO
(Same as RelS 4625.) Historical introduction to Japanese religion and philosophy, tracing its developments in Shinto, folk religion, and various Buddhist schools. Special consideration given to Zen Buddhism.

PHIL 4650 - RELIGION AND ETHICS
(Same as RelS 4650.) Study of the relation between religion and morality, including both Eastern and Western religious perspectives. Topics may include such issues as warfare, social justice, sexual ethics, and issues in modern medicine.

PHIL 4670 - CHURCH AND STATE
(Same RelS 4670.) Philosophical and theological perspectives on the relationship between church and state. Issues such as conscientious objection, school prayer, the free exercise of religion, and Islamic attitudes toward the state.

PHIL 4680 - WAR, PEACE, AND RELIGION
(Same as RelS 4680.) Comparative study of attitudes toward war and violence in major religious traditions. Topics may include the Christian just-war tradition; Islamic notions of jihad; Buddhist renunciation and pacifism; the writings of Gandhi; nuclear arms and the status on noncombatants; civil disobedience and conscientious objection; and religious motivated terrorism.

PHIL 4690 – TOPICS IN PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION
Prerequisite: One 2000 or 3000-level philosophy course, or consent of instructor. An advanced introduction to the philosophy of religion. May be repeated if topic varies, but only
six credit hours may be applied to the major.

PHIL 4700 – ETHICS
Prerequisite: One 2000 or 3000-level philosophy course, or consent of instructor. Major Western theories, such as relativism, egoism, emotivism, utilitarianism, deontology, naturalism, intuitionism, virtue ethics, existential ethics, and feminist ethics.

PHIL 4720 – ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS
Prerequisite: One 2000 or 3000-level philosophy course, or consent of instructor. This course will consider the challenges environmental problems pose for ethical theory. Topics covered may include: the moral status of nonhuman animals, environmental preservation and restoration, environmental sustainability, development, human population growth, ethics as it bears on issues in non-biological environmental sciences (such as geology and geography), and how theories of distributive justice bear on these and other related issues.

PHIL 4740 – ADVANCED BIOMEDICAL ETHICS
Prerequisite: one 2000 or 3000-level philosophy course, or consent of instructor. Major moral problems in science and medicine, including abortion, death and euthanasia, treatment of the mentally ill, experimentation with human subjects, and genetic research.

PHIL 4750 – TOPICS IN ETHICS
Prerequisite: One 2000 or 3000-level philosophy course, or consent of instructor. Study of the works of major authors or views in normative ethics and/or metaethics. The focus will be on contemporary ethics but the course may include some study of historical figures. May be repeated if topic varies. A maximum of six credit hours may be applied toward the major.

PHIL 4800 - SOCIAL & POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY
(Formerly Phil 4760.) Prerequisite: One 2000 or 3000-level philosophy course, or consent of instructor. Issues such as the definition and justification of human rights, justice, social welfare, and forms of political participation, and the debate between ideologies. Readings from classical and contemporary sources, for example, Plato, Locke, Mill, Marx, and Rawls.

PHIL 4820 - PHILOSOPHY OF LAW
(Formerly Phil 4720.) Prerequisite: One 2000 or 3000-level philosophy course, or consent of instructor. Topics such as theories of law, feminist legal theory, the nature of legal reasoning, legal obligation, law and justice, law and morality.

PHIL 4822 – TOPICS IN PHILOSOPHY OF LAW
Prerequisite: One 2000 or 3000-level philosophy course, or consent of instructor. May be repeated if topic varies. This course is designed to teach selected topics in the philosophy of law. A maximum of six credit hours may be applied toward the major.

PHIL 4830 - PHILOSOPHY OF ART
Prerequisite: One 2000 or 3000-level philosophy course, or consent of instructor. Historical and contemporary accounts of the nature of art, aesthetic experience, creative activity, imagination, expression, interpretation, and aesthetic evaluation.

PHIL 4850 - AFRICAN-AMERICAN ETHICAL/LEGAL ISSUES
Prerequisite: One 2000 or 3000-level philosophy course, or consent of instructor. (Same as AAS 4750. Formerly Phil 4750.) Application of ethical and legal theories to selected issues, such as affirmative action, the legality of slavery, civil disobedience, punishment, and reparations.

PHIL 4855 – ADVANCED TOPICS IN POLITICAL THEORY
Prerequisite: One 2000 or 3000-level philosophy course, or consent of instructor. Advanced survey of the great writings in political thought. Examines the contributions these works made to Western conceptions such as democracy, equality, human nature, citizenship, and liberty, as well as their continuing relevance for understanding contemporary moral and political dilemmas. May be repeated if topic varies.

PHIL 4860 - PHILOSOPHICAL PERSPECTIVES ON WOMEN
(Same as WSt 4360, Formerly Phil 4770.) Prerequisite: One 2000 or 3000-level philosophy course, or consent of instructor. Classical and contemporary issues concerning women, such as discrimination on the basis of gender, class, race, or sexuality, whether gender is natural or constructed, and historical roots of feminist and anti- feminist perspectives.

PHIL 4870 – HONORS THESIS: RESEARCH
Prerequisites: consent of the instructor and Honors Program director. (Same as WSt 4360. Formerly Phil 4770.) Readings or research preparatory to honors thesis or project. 1.0 to 6.0 Credit Hours

PHIL 4880 – HONORS THESIS: WRITING
Prerequisites: Phil 4870, consent of the instructor and Honors Program director. Writing or production of honors thesis or project. 1.0 to 6.0 Credit Hours

PHIL 4890 – TOPICS IN SOCIAL AND POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY
Prerequisite: One 2000 or 3000-level philosophy course, or consent of the instructor. Study of issues in social/political philosophy. The focus will be on contemporary topics but the course may include some study of historical figures. May be repeated if topic varies. A maximum of six credit hours may be applied toward the major.

PHIL 4900 - ISSUES IN PHILOSOPHY
Prerequisite: One 2000 or 3000-level philosophy course, or consent of instructor. Examination of selected philosopher(s) or topic(s). May be repeated if topic varies, but only six credit hours may
be applied to the major.

PHIL 4950 - INDEPENDENT RESEARCH
Prerequisite: consent of instructor. Designed to provide students with the opportunity to do more advanced work in an area in which they have already had regular course work. Not to be used as a substitute for regular upper-level courses.
1.0 to 3.0 Credit Hours

PHIL 4980 – SUPPLEMENTAL INSTRUCTION IN PHILOSOPHY
This course focuses on helping students who have successfully completed PHIL 2010 become successful Supplemental Instruction ("SI") Leaders for that course. The course is open only by authorization. While taking this course, the student will be assigned to be a Supplemental Instruction Leader for a Phil 2010 class.

PHIL 4990 – SENIOR SEMINAR
Prerequisite: senior class standing, major in philosophy, Phil 2010, Phil 2050, Phil 3010, and Phil 3020 with grades of C or higher. An in-depth treatment of a philosophical issue. This course represents the capstone to the major in philosophy.

APPENDIX II: Courses for the Pre-Law Concentration

In addition to philosophy major requirements, students in the pre-law concentration must take:
1) Phil 4700 Ethics
2) Phil 4820 Philosophy of Law
3) Two of the following courses:
   AAS 3070 African-Americans in the Criminal Justice System. (3)
   Hist 3220 United States in the 20th century (4)
   Hist 4240 American Labor and Working Class (4)
   Hist 4532 Crime, Law, and Society in Early Modern Europe (4)
   Hist. 4540 England to 1689 (4)
   Hist 4620 Europe: Culture and Ideas (4)
   LglS 3020 Introduction to the Law. (3)
   LglS 4050 Principles of Business Law. (3)
   Phil 4520 Symbolic Logic. (3)
   Symbolic Logic is strongly recommended both for the mental abilities it develops and because many feel that it improves performance on the LSAT.

**Note that there is some overlap of material between Phil 4520 and Phil 2050.

PoIS 3140 Judicial Process and Courts (3)
PoIS 4130 Constitutional Law I (3)
PoIS 4131 Constitutional Law II (3)
PoIS 3110 State Government (3)
PoIS 3170 American Legislative Process (3)
PoIS 3700 Public Administration and Bureaucratic Politics (3)
PoIS 3750 Public Policy Analysis (3)
PolS 3770 Governmental Budgeting (3)
PolS 4115 Urban Politics (3)
PolS 4157 Politics of the Civil Rights Movement (3)
PolS 4180 American Chief Executives (3)
PolS 4420 International Law (3)
PolS 4425 International Criminal Justice (3)
PolS 4427 International Human Rights (3)
PolS 4570 American Political Thought (3)
PolS 4780 Administrative Law and Government (3)
PolS 4950B Practicum in Political Science (3)
RelS 4670. Church and State. (3)
Soci 3220. Activism, Protest, and Revolution (3)
Soci 3222. Deviant Behavior (3)
Soci 3224. Crime and Punishment (3)
Soci 4218. Power and Politics. (3)
Soci 4314. Complex Social Institutions (3)
Soci 4366. Law and Society (3)

Or other law-related 3000-level or 4000-level courses (in any College) ONLY IF THEY ARE APPROVED IN ADVANCE by the Philosophy Pre-Law Advisor, Dr. Andrew I. Cohen. No courses will be approved after a student has enrolled in the course.

G. APPENDIX III: Minor in Ethics

To complete a minor in ethics, students must take:
1) Phil 3720 Contemporary Moral Problems
2) Phil 4700 Ethics
3) Three of the following courses:
   Phil 3730 Business Ethics. (3)
   Phil 4650 Religion and Ethics. (3)
   Phil 4670 Church and State. (3)
   Phil 4680 War, Peace, and Religion. (3)
   Phil 4710 Biomedical Ethics. (3)
   Phil 4800 Social and Political Philosophy. (3)
   Phil 4820 Philosophy of Law. (3)
   Phil 4870 Philosophical Perspectives on Women. (3)

The following courses may count towards the Ethics minor if they are covering appropriate material only with the advance approval of the Director of Undergraduate Studies. No courses will be approved after the mid-point of the semester of the course.
Phil 3000 Mortal Questions: The Search for Meaning. (3)
Phil 3060 Existentialism. (3)
Phil 4030 Topics In Ancient Philosophy. (3)
Phil 4050 Topics In Modern Philosophy. (3)
Phil 4090 Topics in Continental Philosophy. (3)
Appendix IV: Accessing PACE / CAPP / Academic Evaluation Forms
1) Go to www.gsu.edu
2) Click on GoSOLAR (top line of webpage)
3) Click on GoSOLAR (top of page)
4) Enter User ID (SS# or Panther ID) and Pin
5) Click on “Student Records Menu”
6) Click on “View Academic Evaluation”
7) Click on “Submit” (with most recent semester showing)
8) Click on “Generate New Evaluation” (bottom middle of screen)
9) Click on “Generate Request”

This form should show all the courses the student has taken in the relevant areas, including courses not yet completed. It should also highlight which requirements and areas have not been satisfied and allow you to see the courses that satisfy those areas.
Appendix D6b  Graduate advisement procedures

How to Get Your M.A. in Two Years

Georgia State's philosophy M.A. program is designed to be finished in two years. Out of a philanthropic concern for your welfare, we urge you to try to finish up within that time. Why? If you have an assistantship, there is no guarantee that you'll be supported past two years. And if you do not have an assistantship, chances are that you are taking out some loans to live on. Taking out any more loans than is absolutely necessary in order to finish an M.A. in philosophy is, economically, a doubleplusungood idea. And if you go on to obtain a Ph.D. after your M.A. here, you'll probably be in school at least 5 more years. So while we hope that your time with us at Georgia State is wonderful and intrinsically valuable, it should also be short.

Our program requirements can more or less be divided into two main areas: (1) taking a certain number of classes, that also fulfill distribution requirements, and (2) writing and successfully defending a thesis. Few people have difficulty finishing the classes expeditiously. Where people get hung up is in finishing the thesis.

That's because the thesis is open-ended and largely self-directed. With classes, there is a set meeting time, and a deadline for the final paper, so that, even if you are a habitual procrastinator, you'll probably buckle down at the end and crank out the work that needs to be done. With the thesis, on the other hand, it's easy to put off the work and instead put your time into more immediately pressing matters. In the second year, most people on aid will be teaching Critical Thinking for the first time, and it's easy to allow the various tasks associated with that--preparing for classes twice a week, grading assignments, etc.--to take up almost all of your time. And if you're also taking or sitting in on a couple of classes, it will be difficult to get started on your thesis. What many people do is to let things slide. They might have a vague idea of what they'd like to write on, but they don't begin serious work on settling on a definite topic, putting together a thesis proposal and a committee, and so on, until near the end of the Fall semester of their second year, or even the beginning of the following Spring semester. These people are very unlikely to finish the program in two years, especially because we have a set of deadlines for when drafts of the thesis must be given to your advisor and your committee that fall fairly early in the semester you wish to graduate.

And so, the key to finishing in two years is to get started on the work on your thesis early. Our program, basically, involves taking 9 graduate-level classes (excluding Teaching Philosophy, Thesis Research, etc.) that fulfill various distribution requirements, plus writing and defending a thesis. A typical course load at the graduate level is 3 such classes each semester. So think of the program this way: your first year should be dedicated to getting the majority of your classes out of the way, and the second year to writing your thesis. In order to do this, it would be best to have a thesis topic and an advisor selected by the end of your first year in the program, to spend the summer between your first and second years reading and taking notes for the sake of the thesis, plus developing an outline of how your thesis will be structured, and then to hit the ground running at the start of your second year in writing the thesis.

But in order to do this, you obviously need to start thinking about your thesis in your first year in
the program. That doesn't mean that you need to come in with a thesis topic already in mind. But consider which people you might like to have as your advisor, and then try to take classes with them ASAP. And while you're taking your classes, ask yourself whether any of the material you're studying interests you as a possible topic for a thesis. If so, make sure to write your final paper on that topic. Having a paper already written on your thesis topic to use as a starting point for further work gives you a big head start. If you have a possible thesis topic in mind, but it isn't covered directly in any of the classes offered your first year, do not despair. You may be able to work that topic, in a plausible and natural manner, into a paper for a class on something else. For instance, let's imagine that you're really interested in Thomas Reid, but GSU happens not to be offering a seminar on Reid that particular year. However, if we are offering a class on Hume, you may be able to write your final paper on an analysis of Reid's criticisms of Hume's doctrine of impressions and ideas. (NB: before doing something like this, it would be prudent to run your paper idea past your professor to make sure that it's suitable for the class.) Another option is to try to arrange for a directed readings class on the subject.

Getting a majority of your thesis written in the Fall of your second year offers a number of advantages. First of all, if you're applying to Ph.D. programs (most of which have application deadlines around January 1), your thesis advisor will be able to discuss your thesis in some detail in his or her letter of recommendation, which should make it a stronger letter. Secondly, you'll then be able to make any needed revisions in the following Spring semester in a low-key, low-stress way, rather than sweating things out in order to meet deadlines. For those applying to PhD and JD programs, campus visits may eat up some of the Spring, and that can be time-consuming. Also, once you are accepted to a program, the preparations for a move to a new city can be time consuming. The less thesis work you have to do in April or May (or August!), the better off you are.

Getting a full draft of the thesis done in your third semester in the program is not a wild pipe dream. GSU's philosophy department does not have hard and fast page requirements for its M.A. theses, but we do not expect (and do not desire) sprawling opuses. An M.A. thesis ought to be a more substantial piece of work than a typical seminar paper, and it will quite likely be longer than a typical seminar paper. But what we really care about in the M.A. thesis is its being a much more polished, professional, and tightly-argued piece of work than a typical seminar paper, rather than its simply being longer. We have had excellent M.A. theses that are 35 pages long. If you put as much time each week into working on your thesis as you should be putting in for two graduate-level classes, then getting a solid draft (or even two) of the thesis done over the course of a semester should be easily achievable--especially if you already have a class paper written on the topic to use as your starting-point.

In order to put in that time, particularly if you are also teaching Critical Thinking, it's important to set a writing schedule and designated work times (as opposed to class time/teaching time). Also, you should take at most one class that semester. In fact, taking zero classes that semester might not be a bad idea. And don't audit a lot of classes either. Even if a bunch of classes look interesting, don't deceive yourself into thinking that you'll be able to squeeze in the time to work on your thesis while also taking them. Focus on the thesis.

We won't here give much advice on how to make sure that the time you put into your thesis is
productive. It will help with writing your thesis to set deadlines for yourself and to meet them, even if the advisor isn't pushing too hard. Lots of good things have been written on how to get done quickly with one's dissertation, and most of that advice also applies, mutatis mutandis, to writing one's thesis. Also, because of the self-directed nature of a thesis, it is excellent practice for writing a dissertation. One brief piece on writing a dissertation we can recommend is "Words on Paper."

[The above was written with regular-status, full-time graduate students entering in the Fall in mind. Much of this advice would also apply to e.g., special status, J.D./M.A. track, or part-time students who wish to get through the program expeditiously, but obviously the exact time-line would need to be adjusted.]

Revised 2/18/08

Thesis Prospectus

Prior to registering for Phil 8999, Thesis Research, students must write and have approved a thesis prospectus, which is a preliminary plan for how the thesis will run. It will contain the following parts:

A. A title for the thesis.
B. A brief description of the subject of the thesis and of the main conclusion or conclusions that you will argue for in the thesis.
C. An outline, chapter by chapter, of how the thesis will be structured.
D. A listing of the classes you have taken, and with whom, that you think will be fairly directly relevant to the issues you will be exploring in your thesis.
E. A bibliography of the works you plan on consulting during your research for the thesis.

The prospectus should be brief; we suggest no more than 3 pages double-spaced for A-D, and no more than 2 pages for E.

The student will show all of the members of her committee a draft of the prospectus and get their feedback on it. Then she will revise the prospectus in light of their suggestions and have them sign the revised prospectus along with the registration form for Phil 8999.

The prospectus is simply a tool to help ensure that your thesis topic is viable and your work on that topic fruitful; it is not a binding contract. We fully expect that by the time a thesis is completed, its structure or conclusions might be significantly different than the student envisioned at the start of the process.

Revised 2/6/2006

M.A. Thesis Standards

Writing and defending a Master's thesis is the culmination of our M.A. program. It is writing a thesis that distinguishes the M.A. from a typical undergraduate philosophy program, in which a
student just needs to pass a certain number of classes that cover the various areas of philosophy. A thesis should reflect a greater depth and breadth of research than the usual end-of-term seminar paper, and it will be written over a longer period of time, with several rounds of substantial revision in response to input from a range of philosophical viewpoints. (It is for this reason that we require the series of thesis writing deadlines that we do.) And so, the thesis should be much more substantial, incisive, and polished than the usual class paper.

That said, the successful thesis need not be a landmark achievement in philosophy. Instead, it simply needs to demonstrate that the student has acquired sufficient philosophical skills and knowledge. And so, many of the things we will be looking for in a successful thesis are the same sorts of things we want in a good seminar paper.

**Philosophical Skills.** Philosophy is (in part) an activity of offering arguments for a conclusion. An M.A. thesis needs to have a clear overall thesis, and the rest of the M.A. thesis needs to be clearly organized around the goal of supporting that thesis, by offering arguments in support of it, rebutting objections, etc. Some exposition will be necessary to lay out background for one's project, to set out objections before answering them, and the like, but your M.A. thesis should not be primarily expository. Likewise, your M.A. thesis should not be a set of disconnected reflections on some topic or philosopher. In the course of writing the thesis and refining it in response to feedback from your advisor and committee members, you will end up demonstrating that you can lay out a series of clear and sustained arguments for some conclusion, and anticipate and rebut objections.

NB: the thesis of your thesis need not be ambitious ("I will prove that substance dualism is true"); for an M.A. thesis, a modest and tightly focused thesis is more likely to be successful. And a 'negative' thesis is acceptable ("I will argue that so-and-so's arguments against substance dualism, which are based upon the causal interaction of mind and body, do not give us good reason to reject substance dualism"). Finally, a thesis can demonstrate a great deal of philosophical skill, far more than enough to pass, even though (in the opinion the advisor or committee) its arguments have serious problems, some major objections are still outstanding, etc. In fact, it would be shocking if a thesis didn't have flaws, loose ends, and the like.

**Mastery of content.** By the time you're done with your thesis, you should know what you're talking about. This includes being to explain clearly the relevant distinctions, arguments, and positions in the topic you're exploring in a way that demonstrates your understanding of them. (NB: being able to do this is consistent with having a controversial interpretation of what's going on with some argument or philosopher, even one that your advisor might regard as mistaken.) It also involves being able to bring to bear the relevant scholarly literature on one's topic. The scope of the literature you will be expected to consider will vary widely from topic to topic; determining its scope should be done in close consultation with your advisor.

**Other.** The M.A. thesis should be a professional piece of work. Typos, grammatical mistakes, and other pieces of sloppiness should have been ruthlessly sought out and destroyed by the time you are ready to turn it in. Philosophy does not have one standard reference system, but textual references should be clear, complete, and not in some strikingly atypical format. And if there are other scholarly conventions adhered to by people in the field in which one is writing (e.g., using...
Stephanus numbers to refer to passages in Plato, not page numbers in particular translations), one should follow them.

**Length.** We do not have a set length for M.A. theses. Because the thesis is supposed to be more in-depth than a seminar paper, it typically will be longer. It's possible to imagine a polished, tightly-argued, well-done thesis that clocks in at 15 pages, where it would be obtuse to ask for more, but this would be highly unusual. At the same time, we do not want theses to sprawl on forever. It's not a dissertation, and you're better off keeping it within manageable limits. So—keeping in mind that we do not mandate particular page lengths—somewhere between 30 and 60 pages would be a decent range. Please also remember that longer does not equal better. We recently had an M.A. thesis whose first draft was 75 pages, and the final one 32 pages, and partly as a result of this, was far better at the end.

Please note that it will be much easier to meet these standards if you use, as the starting point for your thesis, a paper you've already researched and written for a seminar, rather than beginning your thesis *ex nihilo*. So, insofar as it is practical to do so, try to select paper topics that you could see yourself possibly doing more work on in your thesis.

Revised 2/6/2006

**Finding a Place to Live**

Where should you live? All else being equal, it’s probably best to live close to a MARTA rail line. Atlanta traffic is horrendous, so the less you have to drive, the happier you’ll be. GSU is in the middle of downtown Atlanta, with two MARTA stations (Five Points and Georgia State) right next to campus, so you can get to campus pretty quickly from any MARTA rail line.

As a student, you can get a monthly MARTA pass at a discount. Other considerations that are important, of course, are whether the neighborhood is safe and affordable. With that in mind, here are some plausible areas in which to live (please note that this is not exhaustive):

There are a number of nice, safe, and affordable areas along the east MARTA line: Inman Park, Little 5 Points, Candler Park, and Decatur. Along the North MARTA line, Midtown is nice, especially near Piedmont Park, if you can find an affordable place, which you probably can’t. Other neighborhoods that aren’t right next to a MARTA line but are still fairly close in are Grant Park, East Atlanta, Cabbagetown and Virginia Highlands.

**Housing resources:**

1. **Creative Loafing**
   This website consistently has the best listings.
2. **Emory University's Off Campus Housing**
   You can find things there that aren't listed anywhere else and landlords welcome students.
3. **Craig’s List Atlanta**
This website is also a good place to find listings for housing or roommates before they appear anywhere else.

4. **Rent List**
   Lists things from property management companies and is worth checking out.

5. **AIC (Atlanta Journal and Constitution, the local newspaper)**

6. **Drive-Bys**
   Some of the most promising houses and apartments are not advertised at all. Many people rely on yard signs and drive-by traffic. Don't assume that all properties for rent are listed. If you have a car available, try to drive around the neighborhood where you would like to live and keep your eyes open for “For Rent” signs.

7. **On-campus housing**
   GSU does offer limited on-campus housing for graduate students at University Lofts, although it is more expensive than most apartments.

**Safety**

If safety is your concern, you may want to watch out for some signs of not-so-good neighborhoods.

1. The grocery stores in the area do not take checks.
2. Gas stations all require prepayment on all pumps even during the day.
3. The apartment complex requires CASH for first months rent upon move in.
4. The complex wants to do a criminal background check on you.
5. There are several liquor stores in the immediate area.
6. Most businesses in the area have bars on the windows.

If 2 or more of these criteria are met, be suspicious of the place’s safety. These criteria were provided by a graduate student who wishes he had thought of them before moving here.
GSU Philosophy M.A. program, degree requirement worksheet

Traditional track

Please go to our website, http://www.gsu.edu/philosophy, for a complete listing of requirements.

**Distribution and track-specific requirements (no doublecounting)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Seminar requirement—3 courses (w/ ‘seminar’ in title)</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. History (Phil 6010-6095; 8030-8090)</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Ethics &amp; Social/Political Philosophy (Phil 6650-6890, 8700-8870)</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Metaphysics and Epistemology</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Phil 6100-6330, 6530, 8100-8300, 8520, 8530)</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Logic: Phil 6520 OR passing the symbolic logic exam</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Thesis** (See the departmental website for thesis draft deadlines before oral defense)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Passed, Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Six hours of thesis research, Phil 8999</td>
<td>____________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Thesis Defense</td>
<td>____________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Twenty-seven credit hours**

Excluding Phil 8960-8999, only one Phil 8950, and max. 6 hours transfer credits.
GSU Philosophy M.A. program, degree requirement worksheet

Neurophilosophy track

Please go to our website, http://www.gsu.edu/philosophy, for a complete listing of requirements.

**Distribution requirements** (no doublecounting except for requirement G)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Seminar requirement—3 courses (w/ ‘seminar’ in title)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. History (Phil 6010-6095; 8030-8090)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Ethics &amp; Social/Political Philosophy (Phil 6650-6890, 8700-8870)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Metaphysics and Epistemology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Phil 6100-6330, 6530, 8100-8300, 8520, 8530)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Logic: Phil 6520 OR passing the symbolic logic exam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Brains &amp; Behavior requirement—2 courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Philosophy of Mind (Phil 6330 or 8330)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Thesis** (See the departmental website for thesis draft deadlines before oral defense)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Passed, Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Six hours of thesis research, Phil 8999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Thesis Defense (thesis must be on B&amp;B topic)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Twenty-seven credit hours**

Excluding Phil 8960-8999, only one Phil 8950, and max. 6 hours transfer credits. The six credits for distribution requirement F can count towards this requirement.
*Appendix D7
2007-2008
Assessment Reports
MISSION

Philosophy has traditionally had a central role in the liberal arts. The writings of Aristotle, Descartes, Hume, and Kant are among the greatest products of the human mind. They are worth studying for their inherent value as well as for their impact on subsequent intellectual history. Much philosophical work is concerned with abstract and fundamental questions: What is real? Can we know anything about the external world? Are there objective moral truths? Is there a God? Although some of these issues are unlikely to have practical consequences, they are no less important. In fact, it is difficult to conceive of an educated person who has not systematically grappled with these questions. At the same time, philosophy is deeply involved with practical issues, such as the nature of the good life and what constitutes a just society. In the last two decades there has been an explosion of activity in applied philosophy with the result that philosophers now work in numerous cross-disciplinary fields such as business ethics, medical ethics, philosophy of law, philosophy of science, philosophy of language and philosophy of mind. Despite its wide range of applications, philosophy as currently practiced in this country has one overarching theme: it is fundamentally concerned with good reasoning. Although philosophers by no means have a monopoly on logical argumentation, the systematic study of what distinguishes good arguments from bad is central to the philosophical enterprise. Consequently, those who teach philosophy are as much concerned with fostering reasoning skills as with imparting information. Both ethics and critical reasoning are stressed in GSU’s strategic plan, which states: “In the twenty-first century, Georgia State University’s curricular and co-curricular activities must prepare students who are critical thinkers, creative problem solvers, and responsible citizens who make ethical choices.” Likewise, the strategic plan of the College of Arts and Sciences states: “Central goals in Humanities include enhancing the communication and critical thinking abilities of all Georgia State students . . . .” The Philosophy Department serves the citizens of Georgia in several complementary ways. In addition to its highly ranked M.A. program, it plays a significant role in undergraduate education. In Critical Thinking (Phil 1010 in Area B) students hone reasoning skills that are applicable to any endeavor. Furthermore, because it is a writing intensive course, each section of Phil 1010 focuses developing the essential skill of writing lucid argumentative essays. Great Questions of Philosophy (Phil 2010 in Area C) offers students the opportunity to confront big questions and to learn what history’s most original thinkers have said about issues fundamental to existence as a human being.

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

Outcome/Objective 1:
PHIL 1010 Learning Goals
Full Description:
Students successfully completing Phil 1010 should be able to: distinguish arguments from non-arguments, identify the premises and conclusion, understand the relation between main and subordinate arguments, critically evaluate the arguments of others, and construct their own well-written argumentative essays.

A Student Learning Outcome? Yes

Associated General Education Outcomes:
• 1: Written Communication
• 2: Oral Communication
• 4: Critical Thinking

Strategic Plan Initiatives:
• A-1: Recruitment
• A-2: Undergraduate Experience

Institutional Priorities:
• PRO-2: Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
• PRO-5: Global, cultural perspectives
• STU-1: Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

Related Measures:
• M. 1: Writing ability
• M. 2: Philosophical skills
• M. 3: Application

Related Actions:
• A. 1: Redesign of Phil 1010
• A. 2: Improve Assessment Committee

OUTCOMES/OBJECTIVES

Outcome/Objective 2:
PHIL 2010 Learning Goals
**Full Description:**
(A) Students successfully completing Phil 2010 should have a basic understanding of central problems in metaphysics (What is real?), epistemology (What do we know?), and ethics (What should we do?), and should have a basic understanding of how to apply ethical theory to practical ethical problems. They should also have a basic familiarity with some classical and some contemporary authors. (B) Students successfully completing Phil 2010 should also have a basic ability to think and write philosophically. This requires being able to critically evaluate philosophical claims and arguments and being able to provide and defend their own claims and arguments.

**A Student Learning Outcome?** No

**Associated General Education Outcomes:**
- 2: Oral Communication
- 4: Critical Thinking

**Strategic Plan Initiatives:**
- A-1: Recruitment
- A-2: Undergraduate Experience

**Institutional Priorities:**
- PRO-2: Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
- PRO-5: Global, cultural perspectives
- STU-1: Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**Related Measures:**
- M. 2: Philosophical skills
- M. 3: Application
- M. 4: Content Knowledge

**MEASURES**

**Measure 1:**
Writing ability

**Measure Full Description:**
All philosophy students should be able to construct well-written argumentative essays. This measure concerns is a determination of whether our Critical Thinking (Phil 1010) students are writing argumentative essays appropriately. (Our target is an average of 2.50.)
**Related Outcome(s)/Objective(s):**
- **Obj. 1:** PHIL 1010 Learning Goals

**Target Level:**
Papers of 1010 students should, on average, be evaluated as 2.50 in writing ability.

**Findings:**
As this measure relates to Phil 1010 Learning, we selected five 1010 classes at random and then took the papers submitted by the first four students listed on the GoSolar roll of each of those classes. The 20 papers were then scored (on a 4 point scale) by the 3 Assessment Committee members. Regarding writing, the average score for the papers was 2.78.

**Target Level Achievement:** Met

**Further Action Planned?** Yes

**Measure 2:**
Philosophical skills

**Measure Full Description:**
All philosophy students should possess philosophical skills. More particularly, they should be able to analyze information and arguments by: distinguishing arguments from non-arguments, identifying premises and conclusions, understanding the relation between main and subordinate arguments, critically evaluating the arguments of others, and constructing their own argumentative essays. This measure is meant to determine how if students in Critical Thinking (Phil 1010) and Great Questions in Philosophy (Phil 2010) adequately possess these philosophical skills. (Our target is an average of 2.50 for both 1010 and 2010.)

**Related Outcome(s)/Objective(s):**
- **Obj. 1:** PHIL 1010 Learning Goals
- **Obj. 2:** PHIL 2010 Learning Goals

**Target Level:**
Papers of 1010 students should, on average, be evaluated as 2.50 in philosophical skills. Papers of 2010 students should, on average, be evaluated as 2.50 in philosophical skills.
Findings:
This measure concerns both of our Outcomes for the Core. As it pertains to the Phil 1010 Learning Goals, we selected five 1010 classes at random and then took the papers submitted by the first four students listed on the GoSolar roll of each of those classes. The 20 papers were then scored (on a 4 point scale) by the 3 Assessment Committee members. Regarding philosophical skills, the average score for the papers was 2.56. As this measure pertains to the Phil 2010 Learning Goals, we also selected five 2010 classes at random and then took the papers submitted by the first four students listed on the GoSolar roll of each of those classes and required those instructors to give each of the exams a score (on a 4 point scale) isolating philosophical skills. The average score the instructors gave the tests for philosophical skills was 2.65.

Target Level Achievement: Met

Further Action Planned? Yes

Measure 3:
Application

Measure Full Description:
Philosophy students should be able to apply philosophical abilities and skills to contemporary problems. This measure is meant to determine if students in Critical Thinking (Phil 1010) and Great Questions of Philosophy (Phil 2010) can do so at an adequate level. (Our target is an average of 2.50 for both 1010 and 2010.)

Related Outcome(s)/Objective(s):
• Obj. 1: PHIL 1010 Learning Goals
• Obj. 2: PHIL 2010 Learning Goals

Target Level:
Papers of 1010 students should, on average, be evaluated as 2.50 in application skills. Papers of 2010 students should, on average, be evaluated as 2.50 in application skills.

Findings:
As this measure pertains to the Phil 1010 Learning Goals, we selected five 1010 classes at random and then took the papers submitted by the first four students listed on the GoSolar roll of each of those classes. The 20 papers were then scored by the 3 Assessment Committee members who gave them an average score of 2.62 (on a 4 point scale) for the ability to apply what they learned. As this measure also pertains to the Phil 2010 Learning Goals, we also selected five 2010 classes at random and then took the papers submitted by the first four students listed on the GoSolar roll of each of those classes and required those instructors to give each of the exams a score (on a 4 point scale) isolating the ability to apply what they learned. The average score the instructors gave the tests for that ability was a 2.77.
Target Level Achievement: Met

Further Action Planned? Yes

**Measure 4:**
Content Knowledge

**Measure Full Description:**
All philosophy students should have mastery of content knowledge. More particularly, students in Great Questions of Philosophy (Phil 2010) should have a basic understanding of central problems in metaphysics, epistemology, and ethics, and should have a basic understanding of how to apply ethical theory to practical ethical problems and a basic familiarity with some classical and some contemporary authors. This measure is meant to determine if students in 2010 have the appropriate level of content knowledge. (Our target is an average of 2.50.)

**Related Outcome(s)/Objective(s):**
- Obj. 2: PHIL 2010 Learning Goals

**Target Level:**
Papers of 2010 students should, on average, be evaluated as 2.75 in content knowledge.

**Findings:**
As this measure pertains to the Phil 2010 Learning Goals, we selected five 2010 classes at random and then took the papers submitted by the first four students listed on the GoSolar roll of each of those classes and required those instructors to give each of the exams a score (on a 4 point scale) isolating content knowledge. The average score the instructors gave the tests for this was a 2.92.

Target Level Achievement: Met

Further Action Planned? No

**ACTIONS**

**Action 1:**
Redesign of Phil 1010
Full Description

Two years ago, the Department decided to do a complete redesign of the 1010 curriculum, focusing the course on the critical thinking skills needed to help students earn an undergraduate degree. (This will have the side benefit of contributing to the University’s retention to graduation efforts.) We have already begun to institute this change, but it will be complete in the Fall of 2009. The course now has three parts corresponding to Areas C, D and E of the core curriculum: critical thinking in the humanities, critical thinking in the social sciences, and critical thinking in the natural sciences. The goal of the course is to give the students the knowledge and skills they need to do well in Areas C, D, and E of the core. As these are also basic skills for majors, the new Phil 1010 should also help students in their majors. George Rainbolt and Sandy Dwyer have now largely completed a new critical thinking text that is being used in an almost final form in all sections of 1010. As our course redesign will be further implemented in Fall 08 and fully implemented in Fall 09, it is likely that we will begin an in-depth review of the redesign. This may well include revision to the learning outcomes and assessment measures.

Related Objectives:
- **Obj. 1:** PHIL 1010 Learning Goals

Related Measures:
- **M. 1:** Writing ability
- **M. 2:** Philosophical skills
- **M. 3:** Application

Person/group responsible for the action George Rainbolt and Sandra Dwyer

Target date to implement the action ongoing

Priority High

Action 2: Improve Assessment Committee

Full Description

Upon the recommendation of the Coordinator, at its March 14 meeting, the Department decided to expand the Assessment Committee by one (bringing the Committee to 4, including the Coordinator). This will allow for improved evaluation of the papers that are collected and used in the overall assessment process.

Related Objectives:
- **Obj. 1:** PHIL 1010 Learning Goals
Related Measures:
- M. 1: Writing ability
- M. 2: Philosophical skills
- M. 3: Application
- M. 4: Content Knowledge

Person/group responsible for the action  Andrew Jason Cohen
Target date to implement the action  2008-2009 cycle
Priority  Med

ANALYSIS

Strength
Overall, the Department was satisfied with the performance of students in Phil 1010 and Phil 2010. While there is and always will be room for improvement, the Department feels that, in general, the data demonstrates that the students are attaining the learning goals.

Attention Needed
As can be seen in the "Action Plan," the Department has been instituting a major change to the way we deliver Phil 1010. We hope that this will help improve not only the student learning in 1010, but also--because of that improved preparation--the ability of students to perform well in all of their classes and thus to progress to graduation more steadily. Since our goal is continuous improvement, we also hope that this will enable us to raise our targets and have students demonstrate those increased levels of learning.
MISSION

Philosophy has traditionally had a central role in the liberal arts. The writings of Aristotle, Descartes, Hume, and Kant are among the greatest products of the human mind. They are worth studying for their inherent value as well as for their impact on subsequent intellectual history. Much philosophical work is concerned with abstract and fundamental questions: What is real? Can we know anything about the external world? Are there objective moral truths? Is there a God? Although some of these issues are unlikely to have practical consequences, they are no less important. In fact, it is difficult to conceive of an educated person who has not systematically grappled with these questions. At the same time, philosophy is deeply involved with practical issues, such as the nature of the good life and what constitutes a just society. In the last two decades there has been an explosion of activity in applied philosophy with the result that philosophers now work in numerous cross-disciplinary fields such as business ethics, medical ethics, philosophy of law, philosophy of science, philosophy of language and philosophy of mind. Despite its wide range of applications, philosophy as currently practiced in this country has one overarching theme: it is fundamentally concerned with good reasoning. Although philosophers by no means have a monopoly on logical argumentation, the systematic study of what distinguishes good arguments from bad is central to the philosophical enterprise. Consequently, those who teach philosophy are as much concerned with fostering reasoning skills as with imparting information. Both ethics and critical reasoning are stressed in GSU’s strategic plan, which states: “In the twenty-first century, Georgia State University’s curricular and co-curricular activities must prepare students who are critical thinkers, creative problem solvers, and responsible citizens who make ethical choices.” Likewise, the strategic plan of the College of Arts and Sciences states: “Central goals in Humanities include enhancing the communication and critical thinking abilities of all Georgia State students . . . .” The Philosophy Department serves the citizens of Georgia in several complementary ways. In addition to its highly ranked M.A. program, it plays a significant role in undergraduate education. In Critical Thinking (Phil 1010 in Area B) students hone reasoning skills that are applicable to any endeavor. Furthermore, because it is a writing intensive course, each section of Phil 1010 focuses developing the essential skill of writing lucid argumentative essays. Great Questions of Philosophy (Phil 2010 in Area C) offers students the opportunity to confront big questions and to learn what history’s most original thinkers have said about issues fundamental to existence as a human being.

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

Outcome/Objective 1:
Learning Goals for Philosophy BA
**Full Description:**
(A) Students majoring in philosophy are expected to gain: general knowledge of a variety of philosophical systems and movements from the different periods in the history of Western philosophy (ancient/medieval and modern) and detailed knowledge of at least one system or movement in each of these two periods; general knowledge of the thought of various major philosophers from the different periods in the history of Western philosophy and detailed knowledge of at least one philosopher from each of the two periods; a familiarity with representative philosophers and movements in contemporary philosophy and in-depth understanding of at least one philosopher in at least two of the movements; knowledge of the fundamental concepts, principles, and issues found in at least three of the main areas of philosophy (ethics, aesthetics, metaphysics, epistemology, and logic, all defined broadly so as to exhaust all fields of philosophy); knowledge of the distinctive contributions made by philosophy to intellectual inquiry; and knowledge of the relevance of philosophy to contemporary American culture and life. (B) Students majoring in philosophy are also expected to gain certain philosophical skills: the ability to read critically and with comprehension; the ability to think critically and to write clearly and persuasively; the ability to apply principles and techniques of logic to philosophical discussions; and the ability to conduct philosophical research effectively.

**A Student Learning Outcome?**  Yes

**Associated General Education Outcomes:**
- 1: Written Communication
- 2: Oral Communication
- 3: Collaboration
- 4: Critical Thinking

**Strategic Plan Initiatives:**
- A-1: Recruitment
- A-2: Undergraduate Experience

**Institutional Priorities:**
- PRO-2: Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
- PRO-4: Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
- PRO-5: Global, cultural perspectives
- STU-1: Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**Related Measures:**
- M. 1: Communication
- M. 2: Collaboration
- M. 3: Content Knowledge
- M. 4: Philosophical skills
Related Actions:
- **A. 1:** Improving Philosophical Skills
- **A. 2:** Streamline Assessment of BA
- **A. 3:** Improve Assessment Committee

MEASURES

**Measure 1:**
Communication

**Measure Full Description:**
All philosophy students should be able to construct well-written argumentative essays. Our majors should also be able to orally communicate substantial philosophical views and arguments as well as well-formulated objections. This measure concerns both. It is a determination of whether our majors are able to communicate using appropriate oral and signed conventions and formats. (Our target is an average of 2.75.)

**Related Outcome(s)/Objective(s):**
- **Obj. 1:** Learning Goals for Philosophy BA

**Target Level:**
Philosophy Majors should, on average, be evaluated as 2.75 in communication skills.

**Findings:**
Senior Majors in any 4000 level philosophy class were required to submit their final papers electronically for evaluation. We also required the instructors to give each of the students a score isolating their communication skills. The average score (on a 4 point scale) the instructors gave the students for this was a 3.18.

**Target Level Achievement:** Met

**Further Action Planned?** No

**Measure 2:**
Collaboration

**Measure Full Description:**
We expect our majors to participate effectively in the collaborative activities of our discipline. These primarily include engaging in philosophical discourse, both orally and in written work. This measure is meant to determine if they do so. (Our target is an average of 2.75.)


**Related Outcome(s)/Objective(s):**
- **Obj. 1:** Learning Goals for Philosophy BA

**Target Level:**
Philosophy Majors should, on average, be evaluated as 2.75 in collaboration skills.

**Findings:**
Senior Majors in any 4000 level philosophy class were required to submit their final papers electronically for evaluation. We also required the instructors to give each of the students a score isolating their collaborative abilities. The average score (on a 4 point scale) the instructors gave the students for this was a 3.16.

**Target Level Achievement:** Met

**Further Action Planned?** No

**Measure 3:**
Content Knowledge

**Measure Full Description:**
All philosophy students should have mastery of content knowledge. More particularly, our majors should have well detailed content knowledge as outlined in the Philosophy BA Learning Goal. This measure is meant to determine if majors have the appropriate level of content knowledge. (Our target is an average 2.75 for Majors.)

**Related Outcome(s)/Objective(s):**
- **Obj. 1:** Learning Goals for Philosophy BA

**Target Level:**
4000 level papers should, on average, be evaluated as 2.75 in content knowledge.

**Findings:**
Senior Majors in any 4000 level philosophy class were required to submit their final papers electronically. These were evaluated by the 3 Assessment Committee Members who gave them an average score of 3.04 (on a 4 point scale) for this measure.

**Target Level Achievement:** Met

**Further Action Planned?** No
Measure 4:
Philosophical skills

Measure Full Description:
All philosophy students should possess philosophical skills. More particularly, they should be able to analyze information and arguments by: distinguishing arguments from non-arguments, identifying premises and conclusions, understanding the relation between main and subordinate arguments, critically evaluating the arguments of others, and constructing their own argumentative essays. This measure is meant to determine if Majors (Philosophy BA Learning Goal B) adequately possess these philosophical skills. (Our target is an average of 2.75 for Majors.)

Related Outcome(s)/Objective(s):
- Obj. 1: Learning Goals for Philosophy BA

Target Level:
4000 level papers should, on average, be evaluated as 2.75 in philosophical skills.

Findings:
Senior majors in all 4000 level philosophy classes submitted their final papers electronically. These were evaluated by the 3 Assessment Committee Members who gave them an average score of 2.91 (on a 4 point scale) for philosophical skills.

Target Level Achievement: Met

Further Action Planned? Yes

ACTIONS

Action 1:
Improving Philosophical Skills

Full Description
We will focus on getting the average rating for skills up to the level students are achieving for content knowledge.

Related Objectives:
- Obj. 1: Learning Goals for Philosophy BA

Related Measures:
- M. 4: Philosophical skills
**Priority**  Low

**Action 2:**  
Streamline Assessment of BA

**Full Description**  
Current Policy has the Committee evaluating all papers submitted by Philosophy Majors to 4000 level classes. When majors are few, this seems appropriate. This year, though, the Committee evaluated 40 such papers. This seems more extensive then is needed. (We only evaluate 20 papers from 1010 or 2010.) Hence, upon the Coordinator`s recommendation, at its March 14 meeting, the Department decided to change the procedure in the following way: we continue to collect all of the papers as we do now, but when there are more than 20, the Coordinator chooses 20 of them for assessment, using a random number generator to do so.

**Related Objectives:**  
- **Obj. 1:** Learning Goals for Philosophy BA

**Related Measures:**  
- **M. 1:** Communication
- **M. 3:** Content Knowledge
- **M. 4:** Philosophical skills

**Person/group responsible for the action**  Andrew Jason Cohen

**Target date to implement the action**  2008-2009 cycle

**Priority**  Med

**Action 3:**  
Improve Assessment Committee

**Full Description**  
Upon the recommendation of the Coordinator, at its March 14 meeting, the Department decided to expand the Assessment Committee by one (bringing the Committee to 4, including the Coordinator). This will allow for improved evaluation of the papers that are collected and used in the overall assessment process.

**Related Objectives:**  
- **Obj. 1:** Learning Goals for Philosophy BA
Related Measures:
• M. 1: Communication
• M. 3: Content Knowledge
• M. 4: Philosophical skills

Person/group responsible for the action Andrew Jason Cohen

Target date to implement the action 2008-2009 cycle

Priority Med

ANALYSIS

Strength
Overall, the Department was satisfied with the performance of senior majors (BA students). While there is and always will be room for improvement, the Department feels that, in general, the data demonstrates that the students are attaining the learning goals. We do, however, wish to improve the scores our majors receive for philosophical skills.

Attention Needed
Our majors’ average on content exceeded their average rating for skills. While it is natural that majors would perform best on content knowledge of their subject, it is also true that students who graduate with a major in philosophy go into all kinds of careers. Thus, it is very important that we emphasize students’ ability to acquire philosophical skills which are applicable to whatever occupation or field they enter after graduation. To this end for continuous improvement of student learning, we will focus on getting the average rating for skills up to the level students are achieving for content knowledge (as per our action plan).
Philosophy has traditionally had a central role in the liberal arts. The writings of Aristotle, Descartes, Hume, and Kant are among the greatest products of the human mind. They are worth studying for their inherent value as well as for their impact on subsequent intellectual history. Much philosophical work is concerned with abstract and fundamental questions: What is real? Can we know anything about the external world? Are there objective moral truths? Is there a God? Although some of these issues are unlikely to have practical consequences, they are no less important. In fact, it is difficult to conceive of an educated person who has not systematically grappled with these questions. At the same time, philosophy is deeply involved with practical issues, such as the nature of the good life and what constitutes a just society. In the last two decades there has been an explosion of activity in applied philosophy with the result that philosophers now work in numerous cross-disciplinary fields such as business ethics, medical ethics, philosophy of law, philosophy of science, philosophy of language and philosophy of mind. Despite its wide range of applications, philosophy as currently practiced in this country has one overarching theme: it is fundamentally concerned with good reasoning. Although philosophers by no means have a monopoly on logical argumentation, the systematic study of what distinguishes good arguments from bad is central to the philosophical enterprise. Consequently, those who teach philosophy are as much concerned with fostering reasoning skills as with imparting information. Both ethics and critical reasoning are stressed in GSU’s strategic plan, which states: “In the twenty-first century, Georgia State University’s curricular and co-curricular activities must prepare students who are critical thinkers, creative problem solvers, and responsible citizens who make ethical choices.” Likewise, the strategic plan of the College of Arts and Sciences states: “Central goals in Humanities include enhancing the communication and critical thinking abilities of all Georgia State students . . . .” The Philosophy Department serves the citizens of Georgia in several complementary ways. In addition to its highly ranked M.A. program, it plays a significant role in undergraduate education. In Critical Thinking (Phil 1010 in Area B) students hone reasoning skills that are applicable to any endeavor. Furthermore, because it is a writing intensive course, each section of Phil 1010 focuses developing the essential skill of writing lucid argumentative essays. Great Questions of Philosophy (Phil 2010 in Area C) offers students the opportunity to confront big questions and to learn what history’s most original thinkers have said about issues fundamental to existence as a human being.

**STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES**

**Outcome/Objective 1:**
PHIL 1010 Learning Goals
**Full Description:**
Students successfully completing Phil 1010 should be able to: distinguish arguments from non-arguments, identify the premises and conclusion, understand the relation between main and subordinate arguments, critically evaluate the arguments of others, and construct their own well-written argumentative essays.

**A Student Learning Outcome?** Yes

**Associated General Education Outcomes:**
- **1:** Written Communication
- **2:** Oral Communication
- **4:** Critical Thinking

**Strategic Plan Initiatives:**
- **A-1:** Recruitment
- **A-2:** Undergraduate Experience

**Institutional Priorities:**
- **PRO-2:** Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
- **PRO-5:** Global, cultural perspectives
- **STU-1:** Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**Related Measures:**
- **M. 1:** Writing ability
- **M. 2:** Philosophical skills
- **M. 3:** Application

**Related Actions:**
- **A. 1:** Redesign of Phil 1010
- **A. 2:** Improve Assessment Committee

**OUTCOMES/OBJECTIVES**

**Outcome/Objective 2:**
PHIL 2010 Learning Goals
**Full Description:**

(A) Students successfully completing Phil 2010 should have a basic understanding of central problems in metaphysics (What is real?), epistemology (What do we know?), and ethics (What should we do?), and should have a basic understanding of how to apply ethical theory to practical ethical problems. They should also have a basic familiarity with some classical and some contemporary authors. (B) Students successfully completing Phil 2010 should also have a basic ability to think and write philosophically. This requires being able to critically evaluate philosophical claims and arguments and being able to provide and defend their own claims and arguments.

**A Student Learning Outcome?**  No

**Associated General Education Outcomes:**
- 2: Oral Communication
- 4: Critical Thinking

**Strategic Plan Initiatives:**
- A-1: Recruitment
- A-2: Undergraduate Experience

**Institutional Priorities:**
- PRO-2: Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
- PRO-5: Global, cultural perspectives
- STU-1: Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**Related Measures:**
- M. 2: Philosophical skills
- M. 3: Application
- M. 4: Content Knowledge

**MEASURES**

**Measure 1:**
Writing ability

**Measure Full Description:**
All philosophy students should be able to construct well-written argumentative essays. This measure concerns is a determination of whether our Critical Thinking (Phil 1010) students are writing argumentative essays appropriately. (Our target is an average of 2.50.)
**Related Outcome(s)/Objective(s):**
- **Obj. 1:** PHIL 1010 Learning Goals

**Target Level:**
Papers of 1010 students should, on average, be evaluated as 2.50 in writing ability.

**Findings:**
As this measure relates to Phil 1010 Learning, we selected five 1010 classes at random and then took the papers submitted by the first four students listed on the GoSolar roll of each of those classes. The 20 papers were then scored (on a 4 point scale) by the 3 Assessment Committee members. Regarding writing, the average score for the papers was 2.78.

**Target Level Achievement:** Met

**Further Action Planned?** Yes

**Measure 2:**
Philosophical skills

**Measure Full Description:**
All philosophy students should possess philosophical skills. More particularly, they should be able to analyze information and arguments by: distinguishing arguments from non-arguments, identifying premises and conclusions, understanding the relation between main and subordinate arguments, critically evaluating the arguments of others, and constructing their own argumentative essays. This measure is meant to determine how if students in Critical Thinking (Phil 1010) and Great Questions in Philosophy (Phil 2010) adequately possess these philosophical skills. (Our target is an average of 2.50 for both 1010 and 2010.)

**Related Outcome(s)/Objective(s):**
- **Obj. 1:** PHIL 1010 Learning Goals
- **Obj. 2:** PHIL 2010 Learning Goals

**Target Level:**
Papers of 1010 students should, on average, be evaluated as 2.50 in philosophical skills. Papers of 2010 students should, on average, be evaluated as 2.50 in philosophical skills.
Findings:
This measure concerns both of our Outcomes for the Core. As it pertains to the Phil 1010 Learning Goals, we selected five 1010 classes at random and then took the papers submitted by the first four students listed on the GoSolar roll of each of those classes. The 20 papers were then scored (on a 4 point scale) by the 3 Assessment Committee members. Regarding philosophical skills, the average score for the papers was 2.56. As this measure pertains to the Phil 2010 Learning Goals, we also selected five 2010 classes at random and then took the papers submitted by the first four students listed on the GoSolar roll of each of those classes and required those instructors to give each of the exams a score (on a 4 point scale) isolating philosophical skills. The average score the instructors gave the tests for philosophical skills was 2.65.

Target Level Achievement: Met

Further Action Planned? Yes

Measure 3:
Application

Measure Full Description:
Philosophy students should be able to apply philosophical abilities and skills to contemporary problems. This measure is meant to determine if students in Critical Thinking (Phil 1010) and Great Questions of Philosophy (Phil 2010) can do so at an adequate level. (Our target is an average of 2.50 for both 1010 and 2010.)

Related Outcome(s)/Objective(s):
- Obj. 1: PHIL 1010 Learning Goals
- Obj. 2: PHIL 2010 Learning Goals

Target Level:
Papers of 1010 students should, on average, be evaluated as 2.50 in application skills. Papers of 2010 students should, on average, be evaluated as 2.50 in application skills.

Findings:
As this measure pertains to the Phil 1010 Learning Goals, we selected five 1010 classes at random and then took the papers submitted by the first four students listed on the GoSolar roll of each of those classes. The 20 papers were then scored by the 3 Assessment Committee members who gave them an average score of 2.62 (on a 4 point scale) for the ability to apply what they learned. As this measure also pertains to the Phil 2010 Learning Goals, we also selected five 2010 classes at random and then took the papers submitted by the first four students listed on the GoSolar roll of each of those classes and required those instructors to give each of the exams a score (on a 4 point scale) isolating the ability to apply what they learned. The average score the instructors gave the tests for that ability was 2.77.
Target Level Achievement: Met

Further Action Planned? Yes

Measure 4:
Content Knowledge

Measure Full Description:
All philosophy students should have mastery of content knowledge. More particularly, students in Great Questions of Philosophy (Phil 2010) should have a basic understanding of central problems in metaphysics, epistemology, and ethics, and should have a basic understanding of how to apply ethical theory to practical ethical problems and a basic familiarity with some classical and some contemporary authors. This measure is meant to determine if students in 2010 have the appropriate level of content knowledge. (Our target is an average of 2.50.)

Related Outcome(s)/Objective(s):
• Obj. 2: PHIL 2010 Learning Goals

Target Level:
Papers of 2010 students should, on average, be evaluated as 2.75 in content knowledge.

Findings:
As this measure pertains to the Phil 2010 Learning Goals, we selected five 2010 classes at random and then took the papers submitted by the first four students listed on the GoSolar roll of each of those classes and required those instructors to give each of the exams a score (on a 4 point scale) isolating content knowledge. The average score the instructors gave the tests for this was a 2.92.

Target Level Achievement: Met

Further Action Planned? No

ACTIONS

Action 1:
Redesign of Phil 1010
Full Description
Two years ago, the Department decided to do a complete redesign of the 1010 curriculum, focusing the course on the critical thinking skills needed to help students earn an undergraduate degree. (This will have the side benefit of contributing to the University’s retention to graduation efforts.) We have already begun to institute this change, but it will be complete in the Fall of 2009. The course now has three parts corresponding to Areas C, D and E of the core curriculum: critical thinking in the humanities, critical thinking in the social sciences, and critical thinking in the natural sciences. The goal of the course is to give the students the knowledge and skills they need to do well in Areas C, D, and E of the core. As these are also basic skills for majors, the new Phil 1010 should also help students in their majors. George Rainbolt and Sandy Dwyer have now largely completed a new critical thinking text that is being used in an almost final form in all sections of 1010. As our course redesign will be further implemented in Fall 08 and fully implemented in Fall 09, it is likely that we will be begin an in-depth review of the redesign. This may well include revision to the learning outcomes and assessment measures.

Related Objectives:
• Obj. 1: PHIL 1010 Learning Goals

Related Measures:
• M. 1: Writing ability
• M. 2: Philosophical skills
• M. 3: Application

Person/group responsible for the action George Rainbolt and Sandra Dwyer

Target date to implement the action ongoing

Priority High

Action 2:
Improve Assessment Committee

Full Description
Upon the recommendation of the Coordinator, at its March 14 meeting, the Department decided to expand the Assessment Committee by one (bringing the Committee to 4, including the Coordinator). This will allow for improved evaluation of the papers that are collected and used in the overall assessment process.

Related Objectives:
• Obj. 1: PHIL 1010 Learning Goals
**Related Measures:**
- M. 1: Writing ability
- M. 2: Philosophical skills
- M. 3: Application
- M. 4: Content Knowledge

**Person/group responsible for the action**    Andrew Jason Cohen
**Target date to implement the action**    2008-2009 cycle
**Priority**    Med

**ANALYSIS**

**Strength**
Overall, the Department was satisfied with the performance of students in Phil 1010 and Phil 2010. While there is and always will be room for improvement, the Department feels that, in general, the data demonstrates that the students are attaining the learning goals.

**Attention Needed**
As can be seen in the "Action Plan," the Department has been instituting a major change to the way we deliver Phil 1010. We hope that this will help improve not only the student learning in 1010, but also--because of that improved preparation--the ability of students to perform well in all of their classes and thus to progress to graduation more steadily. Since our goal is continuous improvement, we also hope that this will enable us to raise our targets and have students demonstrate those increased levels of learning.
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This handbook collects the University, College and Department policies most relevant to faculty and graduate teaching assistants in the Department of Philosophy. This handbook does not contain a complete statement of University policies. See the Faculty Handbook (www.gsu.edu/~wwffh/hfb.html) for this complete statement. Please direct questions to the Chair of the department.
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Section 1. Course Syllabi Requirements
(Faculty Handbook, Section 401.01)

Course syllabi shall contain the following items of information:
1. complete course title and number; name of instructor; semester, year;
2. statement of office hours, telephone number and e-mail address. You must have at least 3 hours of office hours per week.
3. prerequisites (if any) for the course;
4. objectives of the course;
5. course assignments (e.g., required readings and activities) and due dates;
6. specific course requirements (e.g., written and oral tests and reports, research papers; performances). In cross-listed undergraduate and graduate classes, the course requirements will specify any projects and/or other activities required specifically of graduate students taking the course and the criteria by which student work will be judged that differentiate graduate-level from undergraduate-level work; (Graduate-level work must be significantly more rigorous than undergraduate-level work.)
7. grading policy: how the final grade is to be determined with respect to the weights assigned to various course requirements;
8. attendance policy (see current University general Catalog for University guidelines). If there are specific requirements for attendance these should be stated;
9. list of text(s) or other required course materials;
10. make-up examination policy;
11. all syllabi should include the following statement: "The course syllabus provides a general plan for the course; deviations may be necessary."
12. all syllabi should refer to the Policy on Academic Honesty.

Section 2. Reporting Grades
(Faculty Handbook, Section 403.02)

The University considers student grades to be private information and prohibits the posting of grades by name or social security number on bulletin boards or classroom or office doors.

The Department recommends that faculty and GTAs not send advance notification of student’s final grades through email. It discourages students who make good grades from filling out the student evaluations and it encourages students who make bad grades to fill them out.

Section 3. Drops, Withdrawals, Incompletes, and Hardship Withdrawals
(University Catalog, Section 1332)

Drops and Withdrawals
Schedule revisions follow different rules at different periods within the semester.

1. During registration (i.e., until the end of the first week of classes)
   During this period, students may drop or add classes using GoSOLAR. When a class is dropped, no grade is recorded and no record of the student’s being enrolled in the course appears on the transcript. No withdrawals are permitted.

2. Instructor Adjustment Period, the second week of classes
   Faculty may add or drop students from courses. Withdrawals are not permitted.

   GTAs may request to add students to their classes during this period by submitting the appropriate email to the Chair (and CCing CGT), but GTAs may not drop any students without advance permission from the CGT and Chair.

3. After the instructor adjustment period and before the midpoint of the term
   Students may withdraw from a class or classes using GoSOLAR. No drops are permitted. Students who are withdrawn will receive a grade of W or WF for any class dropped during this period depending on whether or not they have exceeded their limit of withdrawals with a grade of W. Specifically, students will automatically be awarded a W if they have not exceeded their limit and a WF if they have. Grades of W and WF appear on the student’s transcript. (Note: A grade of WF is treated as an F for GPA calculation purposes.) Students are allowed to withdraw with a grade of W a maximum of six (6) times in their undergraduate careers at Georgia State. The following sorts of withdrawals do not count against the limit on withdrawals with a grade of W: hardship withdrawals, grades of WF (withdrawal failing), grades of WM (withdrawal military), withdrawals taken in semesters before Fall 2006, withdrawals taken at other institutions.

4. After the midpoint of the term
   No drops or withdrawals are permitted except for hardship withdrawals. See below.
Incompletes (Section 1350 of the Catalog)
The grade of "I" (Incomplete) may be given to a student who for nonacademic reasons beyond his or her control is unable to meet the full requirements of a course. In order to qualify for an "I", a student must (a) have completed most of the major assignments of the course (generally all but one); and (b) be passing the course. The "I" is for students who for nonacademic reasons do not complete some course requirement(s) during the semester but who will be able to complete the requirement(s) in a timely manner without needing to repeat the class.

GTAs are not allowed to assign an “I” to any student without advance permission of the CGT. We want to make every effort to minimize if not eliminate the use of “I’s” because GTAs are often not on campus the following term.

Hardship Withdrawals
Students may be granted hardship withdrawals after the midpoint of the semester when nonacademic emergency situations which prevent them from completing their course work occur. Hardship withdrawals are subject to the following restrictions:

1. Students are not eligible for hardship withdrawals in any course in which they have completed the course requirements (e.g., taking the final exam or submitting the final project).

2. Students must initiate an application for a hardship withdrawal no later than one academic year after the semester in which the courses were taken.

Hardship status normally applies to all the courses a student took in a semester but in some cases may be granted for some of a student’s courses. Students requesting a hardship withdrawal in some but not all of their courses must provide documentation to justify such a partial withdrawal. If a student is granted a hardship withdrawal (full or partial), the instructors of the courses from which the student is withdrawing must award a grade of “W” or “WF,” depending on whether the student was doing passing work as of the effective date of the hardship.

Hardship withdrawals are awarded by the Dean of Students, www.gsu.edu/deanofstudents

Section 4. Canceling Classes
(Faculty Handbook Section 312.01)
Faculty members are expected to provide instruction and student advising as assigned by the departmental chairman. Classroom instruction responsibilities include holding class for the entire period for which the class is scheduled (including the final examination period) and evaluating students' work and assigning grades.

Implementation of this rule in the philosophy department:
*You always need chair's approval to not teach your classes.
*If you get sick or there is a family emergency, just send an e-mail to the chair with a CC to the staff. Or call the chair at home or at the office.
*For professional events (conferences, talks, etc.) you need to give the chair the Travel Request form at least two weeks in advance and arrange to have someone else cover your classes.
*If you would like to not teach your classes for a non-professional reason, you need to give the chair the Vacation Pre-Approval Form at least two weeks in advance. However, please be aware that faculty are not generally allowed to not teach their classes for non-professional, non-emergency reasons. Be sure to discuss such matters with the chair before buying tickets or making other such plans.

GTAs and Canceling Classes
Unplanned:
If you are too ill or have an emergency that makes it unwise or impossible for you to teach class, you must call or send an email to the Chair as soon as you possibly can. Give as much notice as you can. When emailing the Chair, explaining that you are ill or have an emergency, CC the CGT and the staff, so that when the Chair approves your absence, it is an easy “reply all” matter for the staff to know to put a sign up on your classroom door(s). You are not allowed to cancel your class without permission from the Chair. Staff members are not allowed to notify your class without permission from the Chair, so do not put them in an awkward position by asking them to do so.

Planned:
For nonemergency, professional reasons, use the GTA Absence from Teaching Pre-approval Form in section II.E. below and see note at end of this document for details.

Section 5. Policy on Sick Leave
(Faculty Handbook, Section 501.01, Senate Policy Passed on April 24, 2003)

1. Faculty are responsible for informing their chair of any illness that prohibits their meeting their assigned responsibilities.

2. It is the responsibility of the chair (a) to ensure that the instructional responsibilities for courses are met; and in consultation with an ill faculty member, (b) to determine whether illness has resulted in the faculty member not being able to perform his or her assigned work load.

3. If the chair determines that the illness has resulted in a reduction of work load, the chair, in concert with the faculty member, will determine the amount of sick-leave time that must be reported for the faculty member. Those hours will be reported on the Report of Absence form.

GTAs use the GTA Absence form at end of this handbook for all absence requests other than illness or emergency. For illness and emergencies, GTAs email or call the chair, with a CC to the Coordinator of Graduate Teaching and the staff.

Section 6. Outside Activities
(Faculty Handbook Section 312.04.01)

A. Occupational

1. An employee of the University System shall not engage in any occupation, pursuit, or endeavor which will interfere with the regular and punctual discharge of official duties.

2. All full-time faculty, administrators, and other professional staff members employed by a unit of the University System are expected to give full professional effort to their assignments of teaching, research, and service.

3. Professional employees are encouraged to participate in professional activity that does not interfere with the regular and punctual discharge of official duties provided the activity meets one of the following criteria: (1) is a means of personal professional development; (2) serves the community, state, or nation; or (3) is consistent with the objectives of the institution.

4. For all activities, except single-occasion activities, the employee shall report in writing through official channels the proposed arrangements and secure the approval of the President or his designee prior to engaging in the activities. Such activities include consulting, teaching,
speaking, and participating in business or service enterprises. (Emphasis added.)

By Department policy, the rules above apply to GTAs except that the chair approves outside activities.

Section 7. Amorous Relationships Policy
(Faculty Handbook Section 301.08)

The integrity of academic and work relationships is the foundation of the university's educational mission. These relationships vest considerable trust in persons with authority whether as mentor, educator, evaluator and/or administrator. The unequal institutional power inherent in university academic and work relationships heightens the vulnerability of those in subordinate positions. The university must protect itself from influences or activities that interfere with intellectual, professional and personal growth, or with the university's financial interests. Consequently, people in positions of authority within the university community must be sensitive to the potential for conflict of interest as well as sexual harassment in amorous relationships with people over whom they have a professional power/status advantage. (See Section 206.03 of the Faculty Handbook, Section 6-1 in the Classified Employee Handbook, and the GSU General Catalog for the Sexual Harassment Policy of the university.)

The individual in authority bears the primary responsibility for any negative consequences resulting from an amorous relationship. It is in the interest of the university to provide clear direction and educational opportunities to the university community about potential professional risks associated with consensual amorous relationships between members of the university community where a power/status advantage exists.

1. Power Advantages

Academic Relationship Advantage. A faculty member or other instructor always will be treated as having a power advantage when that faculty member or instructor has authority to assign grades; serves on thesis, dissertation, or scholarship awards committees; provides research and/or training opportunities, etc.

Staff Advantage. A staff member will always be treated as having a power advantage when the staff member has the authority to evaluate, determine salary, and/or make employment decisions.

Other Power Advantage. Power advantages also can occur between junior and senior faculty, faculty and administrators, and faculty/administrators and staff.

2. Conflict of Interest

Relationships that are mutual and consensual may be viewed by others as exploitative and may adversely affect the work environment in that serious conflicts of interests may be perceived to exist. In particular, the parties to an amorous relationship should be aware that such relationships often create general conflicts of interest and the fear from co-workers or students of unfair treatment in terms of promotions, grades, etc.

Therefore, Georgia State University prohibits the parties who are or have been involved in any amorous relationship from evaluating each other.

There are situations sufficiently complex that judgments may differ as to whether there is or may be a conflict of interest, and individuals may inadvertently place themselves in situations where
conflict exists. Accordingly, for the common good, should a situation arise in which parties who are or have been involved in any amorous relationship come into a position in which they would normally be called upon to evaluate one another, the individual in authority must promptly report this fact to his or her supervisor. The supervisor will then make arrangements to see that those who are or have been involved in any amorous relationship do not evaluate each other. In particular, if a faculty member has had or comes to have an amorous relationship with a student over whom the faculty member has authority as described above, the faculty member must promptly report this to the department/school chair who will make arrangements for an alternate evaluation mechanism. Should the individual in authority fail to promptly report an amorous relationship with a person the individual in authority evaluates, the individual in authority has violated University policy and is subject to disciplinary action in the Faculty Handbook, Classified Employee Handbook, or appropriate student catalogue, handbook, or college regulations (depending on whether the individual in authority is faculty, staff, or a student).

3. Malicious Use of This Policy

It is important to avoid conflict of interests resulting from amorous relationships; it is equally important to recognize that malicious accusations of inappropriate amorous relationships have the potential to severely damage a person's career and reputation.

Therefore, Georgia State University prohibits making knowingly false accusations that an unreported amorous relationship exists or existed between two parties now in a position to evaluate each other.

4. Due Process

Due process rights are matters of fundamental fairness; therefore, disciplinary action will be taken in accordance with the procedures set out in the Faculty Handbook, Classified Employee Handbook, or appropriate student catalogue, handbook, or college regulations.

Section 8. Ethical Behavior with Regard to Complimentary Textbooks
(Faculty Handbook Section 313.05)

The distribution of complimentary textbooks is an important part of the process whereby professors review the full range of instructional materials available for their courses. However, the integrity of this process must be respected. Selling complimentary copies of textbooks adversely affects the entire academic community. Professor-authors are deprived of economic return in royalties, and incentives to write textbooks are diminished. Students generally do not benefit from the sale of complimentary copies, as these books are sold at or only slightly below the new book price. Selling complimentary textbooks inflates the cost of all textbooks, as publishers must compensate for revenue lost from the sale of new books. Selling complimentary copies violates the tradition of respect by professors for the intellectual work of their colleagues and for the textbook publishers. The future of availability of complimentary textbooks may be seriously jeopardized by the reluctance of publishers to risk further financial loss. Faculty members receive complimentary textbooks as a result of their position at the University. These textbooks should not be viewed as a source of faculty income. We recommend the following:

1. Complimentary textbooks are not to be resold for faculty profit. The books may be maintained for faculty reference or contributed to a library for student reference.

2. Solicitors for complimentary copies are forbidden from campus.
3. The campus bookstore may not sell copies which are identifiable as complimentary copies whatever their source may be."

Section 9. Guidelines for Classroom Copying in Not-for-profit Educational Institutions with Respect to Books and Periodicals, Excerpted  (Faculty Handbook 313.01)

A. Single copy for teachers
A single copy may be made of any of the following by or for a teacher for his or her scholarly research or use in teaching or preparation to teach a class:
1. chapter from a book;
2. article from a periodical or newspaper;
3. a short story, short essay or short poem, whether or not from a collective work;
4. a chart, graph, diagram, drawing, cartoon or picture from a book, periodical, or newspaper;

B. Multiple copies for Classroom Use
Multiple copies (not to exceed in any event more than one copy per pupil in a course) may be made by or for the teacher giving the course for classroom use or discussion; provided that:
1. the copying meets the tests of brevity and spontaneity as defined below; and,
2. meets the cumulative effect test as defined below; and
3. each copy includes a notice of copyright.

313.01.02 Definitions

A. Brevity
2. prose: (a) either a complete article, story or essay of less than 2,500 words, or (b) an excerpt from any prose work of not more than 1,000 words or 10% of the work, whichever is less, but in any event a minimum of 500 words.
3. illustration: one chart, graph, diagram, drawing, cartoon or picture per book or per periodical issue.

B. Spontaneity
1. The copying is at the instance and inspiration of the individual teacher, and
2. the inspiration and decision to use the work and the moment of its use for maximum teaching effectiveness are so close in time that it would be unreasonable to expect a timely reply to a request for permission.

C. Cumulative Effect
1. The copying of the material is for only one course in the school in which the copies are made;
2. not more than one short poem, article, story, essay or two excerpts may be copied from the same author, nor more than three from the same collective work or periodical volume during one class term;
3. there shall not be more than nine instances of such multiple copying for one course during one class term.

The limitations stated above shall not apply to current [newspapers].

Section 10. Policy on Academic Honesty

Introduction
As members of the academic community, students are expected to recognize and uphold standards of intellectual and academic integrity. The university assumes as a basic and minimum
standard of conduct in academic matters that students be honest and that they submit for credit only the products of their own efforts. Both the ideals of scholarship and the need for fairness require that all dishonest work be rejected as a basis for academic credit. They also require that students refrain from any and all forms of dishonorable or unethical conduct related to their academic work.

The university's policy on academic honesty is published in the Faculty Affairs Handbook and the On Campus: The Undergraduate Co-Curricular Affairs Handbook and is available to all members of the university community. The policy represents a core value of the university and all members of the university community are responsible for abiding by its tenets. Lack of knowledge of this policy is not an acceptable defense to any charge of academic dishonesty. All members of the academic community -- students, faculty, and staff -- are expected to report violations of these standards of academic conduct to the appropriate authorities. The procedures for such reporting are on file in the offices of the deans of each college, the office of the dean of students, and the office of the provost.

In an effort to foster an environment of academic integrity and to prevent academic dishonesty, students are expected to discuss with faculty the expectations regarding course assignments and standards of conduct. Students are encouraged to discuss freely with faculty, academic advisors, and other members of the university community any questions pertaining to the provisions of this policy. In addition, students are encouraged to avail themselves of programs in establishing personal standards and ethics offered through the university's Counseling Center.

409.02 Definitions and Examples

The examples and definitions given below are intended to clarify the standards by which academic honesty and academically honorable conduct are to be judged. The list is merely illustrative of the kinds of infractions that may occur, and it is not intended to be exhaustive. Moreover, the definitions and examples suggest conditions under which unacceptable behavior of the indicated types normally occurs; however, there may be unusual cases that fall outside these conditions which also will be judged unacceptable by the academic community.

A. Plagiarism: Plagiarism is presenting another person's work as one's own. Plagiarism includes any paraphrasing or summarizing of the works of another person without acknowledgment, including the submitting of another student's work as one's own. Plagiarism frequently involves a failure to acknowledge in the text, notes, or footnotes the quotation of the paragraphs, sentences, or even a few phrases written or spoken by someone else. The submission of research or completed papers or projects by someone else is plagiarism, as is the unacknowledged use of research sources gathered by someone else when that use is specifically forbidden by the faculty member. Failure to indicate the extent and nature of one's reliance on other sources is also a form of plagiarism. Any work, in whole or in part, taken from the Internet or other computer-based resource without properly referencing the source (for example, the URL) is considered plagiarism. A complete reference is required in order that all parties may locate and view the original source. Finally, there may be forms of plagiarism that are unique to an individual discipline or course, examples of which should be provided in advance by the faculty member. The student is responsible for understanding the legitimate use of sources, the appropriate ways of acknowledging academic, scholarly or creative indebtedness, and the consequences of violating this responsibility.

B. Cheating on Examinations: Cheating on examinations involves giving or receiving unauthorized help before, during, or after an examination. Examples of unauthorized help include the use of notes, computer based resources, texts, or "crib sheets" during an examination (unless specifically approved by the faculty member), or sharing information with another student during an examination (unless specifically approved by the faculty member). Other examples include intentionally allowing another student to view one's own examination and collaboration before or after an examination if such collaboration is specifically forbidden by the faculty member.

C. Unauthorized Collaboration: Submission for academic credit of a work product, or a part thereof, represented as its being one's own effort, which has been developed in substantial
collaboration with another person or source, or computer-based resource, is a violation of 
an academic honesty. It is also a violation of academic honesty knowingly to provide such 
assistance. Collaborative work specifically authorized by a faculty member is allowed.

D. Falsification: It is a violation of academic honesty to misrepresent material or fabricate 
information in an academic exercise, assignment or proceeding (e.g., false or misleading citation 
of sources, the falsification of the results of experiments or of computer data, false or misleading 
information in an academic context in order to gain an unfair advantage).

E. Multiple Submissions: It is a violation of academic honesty to submit substantial portions of 
the same work for credit more than once without the explicit consent of the faculty member(s) to 
whom the material is submitted for additional credit. In cases in which there is a natural 
development of research or knowledge in a sequence of courses, use of prior work may be 
desirable, even required; however the student is responsible for indicating in writing, as a part of 
such use, that the current work submitted for credit is cumulative in nature.

409.03 Evidence and Burden of Proof
In determining whether or not academic dishonesty has occurred, the standard which should be 
used is that guilt must be proven by a preponderance of the evidence. This means that if the 
evidence which indicates that academic dishonesty occurred produces a stronger impression and 
is more convincing as to its truth when weighed against opposing evidence, then academic 
dishonesty has been proved. In other words, the evidence does not have to be enough to free the 
mind from a reasonable doubt but must be sufficient to incline a reasonable and impartial mind 
to one side of the issue rather than to the other. Evidence as used in this statement can be any 
observation, admission, statement, or document which would either directly or circumstantially 
indicate that academic dishonesty has occurred.

409.04 Procedures for Resolving Matters of Academic Dishonesty
The following procedure is the only approved means for resolving matters of academic 
dishonesty, except for matters arising in the College of Law which has its own Honor Code for 
handling such matters. It is available to all members of the academic community who wish to 
pursue an action against a student for academic dishonesty.

A. Initiation
If a member of the academic community believes that a student has engaged in academic 
dishonesty in a course, on a test, or as a part of an academic program, that individual is 
responsible for initiating action against the student or bringing the matter to the attention of an 
individual who may initiate action against the student. In allegations of academic dishonesty 
involving course requirements, the course faculty member is generally responsible for initiating 
the action. If the alleged violation involves a departmental program requirement (e.g., 
comprehensive examination or language competency examination) or an institutionally-required 
test (e.g., test of Georgia/United States history or Georgia/United States constitutions), or if the 
individual who discovers the incident is not a faculty member, the individual should bring the 
matter to the attention of the faculty member and administrator who has responsibility of 
overseeing the activity (e.g., departmental chair, director of the Testing Office). If that 
administrator decides to bring charges of academic dishonesty against the student, then that 
administrator becomes the initiator. (Test proctors, laboratory assistants, and other individuals 
who are not course faculty members should bring any instances of alleged academic dishonesty 
to the attention of the course faculty member or their administrative superior. That individual, 
after weighing the evidence, may become the initiator by formally charging the student with 
academic dishonesty.)
The channel of review, recommendation, and decision-making follows the administrative lines 
associated with the course or program requirement involved. In any instance, however, when the 
alleged incident does not occur within the context of a course and when it is unclear which 
college of more than one college involved should have jurisdiction in review and decision-
making, either unit may initiate the case.
For the sake of brevity the following processing procedures are written from an "academic
unit/college" perspective. Nonacademic units (i.e., Testing Center) would substitute appropriate supervisory personnel at the respective levels. Herein the "initiator" will be referred to as "faculty member" and the "administrative unit head" will be referred to as "chair," designating the departmental chair. "Dean" will refer to appropriate administrative supervisory personnel at the overall college or division level.

While the matter of academic dishonesty is pending, the student will be allowed to continue in the course and register for upcoming terms. Should a grade be due to the registrar before the matter is resolved, a grade of GP (grade pending) will be reported for the student in the course involved. Withdrawal from a course does not preclude the imposition of penalties for academic dishonesty.

B. Penalties to be Imposed
Penalties to be imposed in incidents of academic dishonesty are classified as "academic" or "disciplinary." Academic penalties include such sanctions as assignment of a failing grade for a particular course requirement, or for the course itself, or for other tests or program assignments. They are set by the faculty member. Disciplinary sanctions can be sought in addition to those considered academic and could include, but are not limited to, the following penalties: suspension, expulsion, transcript annotations. Disciplinary penalties can be requested by the faculty member, in consultation with the chair; they must be reviewed by the University Senate Committee on Student Discipline and they are set by the provost.

C. Action at Administrative Unit (Department Level)
As soon as possible after the alleged incident, the faculty member should discuss the matter with the student. This discussion should be conducted in a manner which protects the rights and confidentiality of students. If the faculty member believes that academic dishonesty has occurred, the faculty member (with the advice of the chair if necessary) will determine the appropriate academic penalty. The faculty member will complete a "notice of academic dishonesty" form describing the incident and indicating the academic penalty imposed. Any recommendation for a disciplinary penalty must be reviewed in consultation with the chair. The faculty member will deliver to the student the notice of academic dishonesty which includes a statement of appeal rights. If there is difficulty in delivering the notice to the student, the faculty member/chair should request assistance from the college dean in determining the most expeditious way to inform the student that a notice of academic dishonesty has been filed. Once the student has been informed, the chair forwards the documentation, including the notice of academic dishonesty and an indication of when the student was informed, to the dean to be held pending possible appeal. Until the student has been given the opportunity to appeal, a grade of GP (grade pending) should be submitted for the student for the course involved.

D. Student Action
The student will have 20 business days after receipt of the notice of charges of academic dishonesty to submit a written appeal denying the charges and providing any rationale for the appeal. The appeal should be addressed to the college dean of the initiator. In the event the student is found guilty of academic dishonesty, the student does not have the right to appeal the academic penalty assessed by the faculty member, unless the student can prove that such penalty was arbitrarily imposed or discriminatorily applied.

If the student wishes to challenge a disciplinary penalty, the student must submit a written rationale for challenging the disciplinary penalty within 20 business days of receipt of the notice of charges of academic dishonesty. The statement of challenge should be addressed to the college dean. The college dean will forward the challenge to the dean of students for inclusion in the review of the disciplinary penalty by the University Senate Committee on Student Discipline. All disciplinary penalties are automatically reviewed by the University Senate Committee on Student Discipline, regardless of student appeal.

If the student has also filed an appeal denying the charges of academic dishonesty, any review of disciplinary penalty recommended will be delayed pending review of the charges of academic dishonesty by the college hearing committee.

E. College Action
1. No Appeal by the Student. If the student does not submit a written appeal to the college dean
within 20 business days, the dean will notify the chair/faculty member to post any pending grade(s) immediately. The dean will then forward the notice of academic dishonesty to the dean of students for inclusion in the student's disciplinary file. Any recommendation of a disciplinary penalty will also be forwarded to the dean of students for appropriate review by the Senate Committee on Student Discipline.

2. Appeal by the Student. If the student submits a written appeal within 20 business days, the dean will notify the registrar to issue a grade of GP (grade pending) for the course(s) in question on all transcript requests for the student pending outcome of the appeal. The dean will forward the charges of academic dishonesty to the chair of a college hearing committee and will notify the faculty member to set forth in writing a comprehensive statement describing the incident of academic dishonesty. This statement will be presented to the committee and to the student at least five (5) business days prior to the hearing.

3. Student Hearing Committee Process. The following guidelines will be used to govern the hearing of the appeal by the college student hearing committee:
   a. Within ten (10) business days after the committee receives the charges of academic dishonesty, a hearing date will be determined. The committee will notify the faculty member and the student of the time, date, and the place of the hearing. Copies of all charges of academic dishonesty and related materials for the hearing will be provided to the student at least five (5) business days in advance of the hearing.
   b. The faculty member and the student will be allowed to make oral presentations, call witnesses, and present any documentary evidence regarding the incident in question. The hearing will be recorded on audio tape. The hearing will not be open to observers.
   c. At the conclusion of the hearing, the committee will meet in closed session and will make its recommendation as to the guilt or innocence of the student based on a preponderance of evidence with respect to the charge of academic dishonesty. The committee chair will forward to the college dean its findings and recommendations in a written report within five (5) business days of the hearing.

4. College Decision on Appeals. Within five (5) business days of receiving the committee's written report, the college dean will make the final decision regarding guilt or innocence. The dean will notify all appropriate parties of the decision.
   If the dean finds the student "not guilty," the matter will be terminated and no notice of charges will be filed with the dean of students. The dean will notify the chair to post the pending course grade promptly and will notify the registrar to remove the GP (grade pending) on the student's transcript.
   If the dean finds the student "guilty," the notice of charges of academic dishonesty will be forwarded to the dean of students for inclusion in the student's disciplinary file. The academic penalty stipulated by the faculty member will be imposed. The dean will notify the chair to insure that any pending grade is posted promptly. The dean will notify the registrar to remove the GP (grade pending) on the student's transcript if only an academic penalty was involved. If a disciplinary penalty has been recommended, the dean will notify the registrar to continue the GP (grade pending) annotation until the disciplinary penalty can be reviewed by the University Senate Committee on Student Discipline.

5. Appeal of the Decision of the Dean. If the student or initiator wishes to appeal the decision of the college dean regarding guilt or innocence of the charges of academic dishonesty, the student or initiator may appeal to the provost. The subsequent appeal route would be to the president and then the Board of Regents. The student or initiator must submit a written statement of appeal to the provost within 20 business days of notification of the dean's decision. The basis of the appeal must be on the grounds that the decision was arbitrary, capricious, or discriminatory.

6. University Senate Committee on Student Discipline Action. In cases where a disciplinary penalty has been recommended, the Senate Committee on Student Discipline will conduct a hearing to review the disciplinary penalty. The committee will review the faculty member's notice of academic dishonesty and the student's statement of challenge of the disciplinary penalty, if any. The faculty member and the student will be allowed to appear at the hearing to discuss the imposition of disciplinary penalties. Only the recommendation concerning the
disciplinary penalty to be imposed will be considered by this committee. Issues of guilt or innocence are determined at the college level (see IV.3 and IV.4 above).

The Senate Committee will conduct the hearing in accordance with its regular hearing procedures. Copies of these procedures may be obtained from the Provost's Office and/or the Dean of Students.

The Senate Committee on Student Discipline will provide its recommendation within five (5) business days of its hearing to the provost regarding appropriateness of the disciplinary penalty recommended by the college and/or whether other disciplinary penalties are to be imposed in addition to or in lieu of those already recommended by the college.

F. Provost Action

1. Decision of the Provost. The role of the provost in handling student appeals regarding the charge of academic honesty has been explained (see IV.5.5 above). Based on the recommendation, the Provost will render a decision within ten (10) business days of receipt of the recommendation of the Senate Committee. The provost will notify the student, the referring dean, the department chair and the faculty member of the Senate Committee's recommendations and of the provost's decision. At that time the provost will also notify the registrar to annotate the student's transcript, if necessary.

2. Appeal of the Decision of the Provost. If the student wishes to appeal the decision of the provost regarding the imposition of a disciplinary penalty, the student may appeal to the president, and then to the Board of Regents. The student must submit a written statement of appeal to the president within 20 business days of notification of the provost's decision. The basis for such an appeal must be on the grounds that the decision was arbitrary, capricious, or discriminatory.

G. Students Involved in Two or More Incidents of Academic Dishonesty

A student is subject to disciplinary action in addition to any already undertaken once it is determined that the student has been found guilty in a previous incident of academic dishonesty. In such cases, the dean of students will forward a report to the University Senate Committee on Student Discipline regarding the incidents of academic dishonesty which have been reported. The dean of students is responsible for initiating this report within twenty (20) business days of completion of proceeding of any subsequent finding of academic dishonesty.

The University Senate Committee on Student Discipline will review the report of the dean of students. The student may submit supplemental written documents for the committee's review and may request to appear before the committee in its deliberations. After reviewing the matter, the committee will send a report to the provost with the recommendation for disciplinary penalty to be imposed. The provost will proceed as in IV.7 above.

(Source: Senate Office, 9/7/95)
Georgia State University
Notice of Academic Dishonesty

TO THE STUDENT: This serves as notification to you that the below signed individual has found you in violation of the University policy on academic honesty and has established the penalty(ies) described below.

You have a right to deny this finding of academic dishonesty and request a college hearing to determine your guilt or innocence. The academic penalty recommended below cannot be challenged. If a disciplinary penalty has been recommended below, you have a right to challenge the disciplinary penalty (whether or not you accept the finding of academic dishonesty) and to appear before the University Senate Committee on Student Discipline; this committee automatically reviews all recommendations for student disciplinary sanctions.

To deny the finding of academic dishonesty or to challenge a recommendation for a disciplinary penalty, you must submit within 20 business days of receipt of this notice a written statement to the college dean requesting either or both of these actions. If you do not respond within 20 business days, it will be assumed that you have accepted this finding of academic dishonesty and that you have waived the right to challenge the disciplinary penalty, if any, recommended below. This notice of academic dishonesty will then be included in your disciplinary file in the Dean of Students’ Office. This information (unless the disciplinary penalty recommended below, if any, specifically indicates otherwise) is not included in your permanent academic record and is used for disciplinary purposes only. Multiple findings of academic dishonesty may result in additional recommendations for disciplinary sanctions.

Definition of penalties and a summary of review and processing procedures are contained attached to this notice. The complete academic honesty policy if available from your instructor or the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, www.cas.gsu.edu.

Student Name ____________________________ SSN _______________________
Course _______________________ Comp # ___________ Term/Yr ________________
Instructor ____________________________ College ____________________________

Statement of finding of academic dishonesty by initiator: ____________________________

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

Academic penalty recommended: ____________________________

Disciplinary penalty recommended, if any: ____________________________

Initiator's Signature Date ____________________________
Date student notified ____________________________
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DEFINITION OF ACADEMIC PENALTY: Sanction sought for academic dishonesty will be considered an academic penalty if the initiator wishes to assess penalty for academic assignments only, such as a failing grade to the student for a particular course assignment, or for the course itself, or for other tests or program requirements involved in the incident. The academic penalty cannot be challenged.

DEFINITION OF DISCIPLINARY PENALTY: Sanction sought for academic dishonesty will be considered a disciplinary penalty if the initiator wishes to seek sanction in addition to those considered as academic. Disciplinary penalties could include, but are not limited to, the following sanctions: suspension, expulsion, transcript annotation(s). Students may challenge a disciplinary penalty regardless of whether the student accepts findings of academic dishonesty. All disciplinary penalties are automatically reviewed by the University Senate Committee on Student Discipline.

STUDENT DISCIPLINARY RECORD: The Dean of Students' Office maintains a disciplinary record on any student who has been reported for any disciplinary sanction, including cases of academic dishonesty. This record is not a part of the student's permanent academic record (unless disciplinary sanction imposed is specifically designated to be public record). If two or more incidents of academic dishonesty are filed against a student, or if record of other disciplinary problems exists, additional disciplinary sanctions may be sought.

SUMMARY OF REVIEW AND PROCESSING PROCEDURES: For the sake of brevity, the following review and processing summary is written from an "academic unit/college" perspective. Non-academic units (i.e. Testing Center) would substitute appropriate supervisory personnel at the respective levels.

1. The faculty member gives the student notice of academic dishonesty and forwards the notice to the college dean to hold pending a possible appeal by the student.
2. The student must appeal in writing within 20 business days to the college dean if the student wishes to deny the finding of academic dishonesty or challenge a disciplinary penalty.
3. If the student does not appeal within 20 business days, the college dean forwards the notice of academic dishonesty to the dean of students.
4. If the student appeals the charges, a college hearing committee conducts a hearing and reports its findings to the college dean regarding guilt or innocence. If the student is found not guilty, the notice of academic dishonesty is destroyed and the faculty member is notified to assign an appropriate grade. If the student is found guilty, the dean forwards the notice of academic dishonesty to the dean of students.
5. Any recommendation for a disciplinary penalty and a challenge of that disciplinary penalty submitted by the student, if any, is reviewed by the University Senate Committee on Student Discipline. Based on the committee's recommendation, the provost makes a decision and takes action regarding any disciplinary sanction.
6. The dean of students maintains the disciplinary records on all findings of academic dishonesty and is responsible for forwarding notice of multiple findings.
Section 11. Policy on Plus/Minus Grading

All philosophy courses must use plus/minus grades. Instructors are not allowed to give only whole-letter grades.

Source: Department Meeting of April 28, 2006

Section 12. 1010 Policy

Purpose. The Critical Thinking course is about understanding and evaluating arguments. Students learn how to (i) distinguish arguments from non-arguments, (ii) identify the premises and conclusion, (iii) comprehend the relation between main and subordinate arguments, (iv) critically evaluate the arguments of others, and (v) construct their own argumentative essays.

Content. Critical thinking is a skills course: its aim is to foster the understanding of good reasoning in general. Students ought to be able to apply the skills they learn in this course to a variety of topics. The first sentence of the course description for Phil 1010 in the university catalogue reads: "Development of practical, logical, and problem-solving skills important to all disciplines, with emphasis on the composition of argumentative essays." While there is nothing wrong with assigning some philosophical essays, the argumentative essays that the students are assigned to read and write should not focus primarily on philosophical topics.

Common Topics. All sections of Phil 1010 must cover

1. differentiating various inductive arguments including hypothetico-deductive, statistical, causal and analogical

and at least six of the following topics

a. distinguishing arguments from non-arguments
b. identifying premises and conclusions; distinguishing deductive and inductive methods
c. comprehending relations between main and subordinate arguments
d. distinguishing chain and parallel arguments
e. understanding concepts of validity and soundness; inductive strength and cogency
f. recognizing simple valid and invalid argument forms
g. identifying common fallacies, including inductive fallacies
h. understanding different types of meaning and definition

Individual instructors may add additional topics if they wish.

No Formal Logic. 1010 is complemented by Phil 2050, Philosophical Thinking, which includes an introduction to propositional logic. Since philosophy majors are required to take both courses, the two should not overlap. Thus no symbolic logic should be part of the content of 1010.

Tests. Examinations measuring these skills must count for at least 20% of the final grade.

Papers. Phil 1010 is intended to be a writing-intensive course. Each student must write at least two papers whose total cumulative word count is at least 1500. At least 40% of the final grade must be based on these papers.

Grades. The University Catalogue defines a grade of "C" as average, a "B" as good, and an "A"
as excellent. In addition, the Department has established some guidelines for grades in 1010. Between 20% and 30% of the students in a section should receive an "A" or an "A-" and no more than 70% should receive an "A", an "A-", a "B+", a "B", or a "B-". When computing the percentage of As and the percentage of As and Bs, all grades (including Ws, and WF$s$) count in the denominator. Since these are guidelines, not absolute requirements, they should not be presented as policy in a course syllabus or used as justification for particular student grades. It is to be expected that there will be exceptional sections for which these guidelines are not appropriate. For example, a section of 12 students taught 8 am MWF might by random chance have very good or very poor students.

Common Text and Final for GTAs. The Coordinator of Graduate Teaching, in consultation with the Dept Chair, will develop a default text, syllabus and final exam for Phil 1010. These materials will be reviewed and approved by the Philosophy Curriculum Committee. GTAs will be required to use these materials unless they provide alternative text, syllabus and final which is approved by the Coordinator of Graduate Teaching. Visiting instructors, lecturers and tenure-track faculty are encouraged to use the default materials but may use their own materials if they wish.

Effective Fall 2007, all sections of Phil 1010 will use a common text, syllabus, midterm, and final exam.
Phil 1010: Critical Thinking  (2 semester hours)  Core Area B
College:  Arts and Sciences
Division:  Humanities and Fine Arts
Department:  Philosophy
Average class size:  35

Prerequisite:  None

Class Expectations:
Attendance Policy:  Attendance is required. Specific policies vary by instructor.
Homework:  All sections require reading and some writing. Some require other work.
Graded and Returned:  Written assignments typically returned within 7-10 days.
Out of Class Prep Time:  3-4 hours per week
Pages to Read:  Typically 15-25 pages per week

In Class Assignments:
Tests:  Yes
Study Guide available:  No
Test Type:  Variable combinations of essay, quiz, short answer, and objective.

Papers and Other Writing Assignments:
Papers:  Yes, a few short essays
Other:  Some instructors may use other writing assignments.

Study Skills Taught:  Critical reasoning and problem-solving skills.

Resources:  Instructors are available outside of class. Some instructors offer computer-based assistance.

Skills Taught:
Math -  None.
Writing –  Clear, well reasoned essays
Reading –  Understanding and critical evaluation of complex issues.

The class emphasizes the development of practical, logical, and problem-solving skills important to all disciplines and to life outside the classroom.
Section 13. 2010 Policy

1. Purpose:
The Great Questions course addresses problems and proposed solutions through lecture, analysis of arguments, and selected readings of philosophers of historical import, but is neither a history of philosophy course nor one that focuses exclusively on just a few philosophers or just a few topics. It establishes a basic vocabulary of issues, positions, and terms foundational for the course and for further work in philosophy. Finally, it stimulates as powerfully as possible an interest in the value of philosophy as an integral part of the liberal arts curriculum and as relevant for personal meaning and decision-making.

2. Content:
   A. *Metaphysics* (“What is Real?”). The course must include at least one of the following topics:
      A. The freedom, determinism, responsibility matrix
      B. The mind-body question, including applied areas such as AI or ESP
      C. The existence of God or problem of evil
   
   If two or more topics are selected, it is recommended but not required that it (they) come from this list; however, it (they) could be about time or universals or some other metaphysical topic. Many sections of 2010 include aspects of all three.
   B. *Epistemology* (How do we know?”) At least one topic must be selected from this area, samples of which are given below, but not restricted to:
      1. Rationalist vs. empiricist approaches to knowing
      2. Theories of truth
      3. Perception and the external world
      4. The limits of science
   
   It is understood that, no matter what labels are used, the distinction between empirical and necessary truth claims will be introduced in appropriate contexts.
   C. *Normative Philosophy* (What should we do?”). The course must include at least two major topics in normative thought as follows: (Most courses include more.)
      A. At least one major ethical theory (relativism, utilitarianism, etc.)
      B. At least one issue in applied ethics and/or social, political, or legal philosophy (abortion, social contract, the meaning of life, etc.)
   
   D. The course must include both classical selections and contemporary sources in the proportions deemed most appropriate by the instructor. Some may be covered by lecture alone.
   E. With these requirements one could teach only 4 major topics in considerable depth in the Great Questions course. These minimums, however, are an outer limit. Most sections of 2010 carry a greater number of topics, the task being one of finding a proper balance between considerations of breath and of depth. Potential exceptions to, or questions about, the requirements should be brought to the attention of the Director of Undergraduate Studies, who will also review the syllabi of Visiting Instructors and Lecturers who teach this course.

3. Writing.
The course must include a writing component such as a short paper, essay tests, journals, short essays, or summaries of readings.
Pedagogical Recommendations

1. Stimulate significant student discussion of ideas.

2. Draw students into the course by relating to their interests, backgrounds, and majors, showing them how important philosophy is to their own lives and why, whether they know it or not, they are already involved in philosophy.

3. Show why this is a very important course in undergraduate education -- in general relating philosophy to (but also distinguishing it from) science, religion, lifestyles, common sense, psychology, moral decision-making, etc.

4. Include some selections come from non-philosophers who have written engaging philosophical pieces that students easily relate to, e.g., Darrow, Skinner, Sagan, etc. (This helps students to see the relevance of philosophy to other arenas.)

5. Insure that students develop a rudimentary understanding of how to recognize an argument and distinguish between premises and conclusion(s). (Many will not have had 1010!)

Note: We make every effort to staff 2010 sections with instructors who:
A. Are clear, well organized, and reasonably dynamic (high energy) in class.
B. Relate to students well and encourage office visits (are available)
C. Show that they like to teach and generally enjoy being there.
D. Turn on average as well as bright students to philosophy.
E. Revise content to engage students, not merely to conform to the Academy’s imprimatur.

A primary goal of this course is to make philosophy both intellectually and personally interesting to a degree sufficient to cause students to want to take more philosophy courses. It stresses the Great Questions of Philosophy in preparation for and, hopefully, in anticipation of, more focus on the Great Philosophers themselves in upper-division courses.
2010 Advisement Sheet

This material is departmental policy and given to students by the Office of Academic Assistance.

Phil 2010: Great Questions of Philosophy (3 semester hours)  Core Area C
College: Arts and Sciences
Division: Humanities and Fine Arts
Department: Philosophy
Average class size: 50

Prerequisite: None

Class Expectations:
Attendance Policy: Attendance is required. Specific policies vary by instructor.
Homework: All sections require reading. Some require other work.
Graded and Returned: Written assignments typically returned within 7-10 days.
Out of Class Prep Time: 3-6 hours per week
Pages to Read: Typically 20-35 pages per week

In Class Assignments:
Tests: Yes
Study Guide available: No
Test Type: Variable combinations of essay, quiz, short answer, and objective

Papers and Other Writing Assignments:
Papers: Typically none or no more than one; requirements vary
Other: Some writing is required, such as a short paper, essay tests, journals, short essays, or summaries of readings.

Study Skills Taught: Reading comprehension and critical analysis

Resources: Instructors are available outside of class

Skills Taught:
Math - None.
Writing – Clear, well reasoned paragraphs and/or essays
Reading – Understanding and critical evaluation of complex issues

Other: The class emphasizes the fair and reasoned discussion of ideas and the ability to develop, express, and defend one's own ideas.
Section 14. Adds, Drops, Withdrawals and Removal of Incompletes and Grade Changes

_ Send an e-mail to: grainbolt@gsu.edu
   In many cases you must put the underscore in the spaces.
   The message must be from your GSU e-mail account. You can send the message from
   your home computer as long as you are using your GSU e-mail, (not, e.g., hotmail).

_ The SUBJECT line must be in the following format:
   student’s name, [“Add”, “Drop”, “Withdraw” or “Change Grade”].
   Here are some examples:
   Harrison Ford, Add
   Madeline Albright, Drop
   John Stuart Mill, Withdraw
   Madeline Zavodny, Change Grade

_ The BODY of ALL messages must include
   _ The student’s ID number
   _ The course subject and number, e.g., Phil 2010
   _ The course CRN, e.g., 86745
   _ The term of the course, e.g. Fall 2003

_ For ADDS and DROPS
   _ If the student wants to drop one class and add another, put both in one e-
     mail.
   _ A brief (no more than two sentence) reason for the action.

_ For WITHDRAWALS, the body of the message must also include
   _ The estimated last date of attendance
   _ A brief (no more than two sentence) reason for the action.
   _ Note that withdrawals done after the semester midpoint will
     automatically generate a grade of WF and that WFs count as an F in the student’s
     GPA.

_ For GRADE CHANGES and REMOVALS OF INCOMPLETES, the body of the message
   must include the following text
   _ “Current grade: X”
   _ “Correct grade: Y”
   _ The reason for the change. Either the phrase "Error in Grade" or
     "Removal of Incomplete"

_ For GRADES CHANGES from NR to any other grade, the body of the message must include,
   in addition to the text note above
   _ the reason why the grade was not entered during the normal grade reporting period.
   (The NR (not reported) grade appears when an instructor fails to submit grades on time.)
To: grainbolt@gsu.edu
From: Eddy Nahmias
Re: Harrison Ford, Add

123-45-6789
Phil 1010
CRN 57821
Summer 2003
Student attending but not correctly registered.

To: grainbolt@gsu.edu
From: Andrew Altman
Re: Madeline Albright, Drop

111-22-3333
Phil 4720
CRN 87654
Fall 2003
Student not attending, has left the country

To: grainbolt@gsu.edu
From: Tim O'Keefe
Re: John Stuart Mill, Withdraw

444-55-6666
Phil 3010
CRN 12345
Spring 2004
Grade: [*]
Last Date of Attendance: Feb 17, 2004
Student disruptive. Speaking too much.

* If the withdraw occurs before the midpoint of the semester, the grade may be either W or WF.
If the withdraw occurs after the midpoint of the semester, the grade must be WF.
A WF counts as an F in the student's GPA

To: grainbolt@gsu.edu
From: Christie Hartley
Re: Madeline Zavodny, Grade Change

777-88-9999
Phil 2010
CRN 86745
Fall 2002
Current grade: A
Correct grade: C
Error in Grade.
Incompletes

_ Enter an "I" for the student using the GoSOLAR system.

_ Send an e-mail to the student using the official GSU e-mail address, the one which ends in "student.gsu.edu"

_ CC Ellen on this message, elogan@gsu.edu

_ The SUBJECT line must be in the following format:
  student’s name, Incomplete

    Here's an example:___

    Harrison Ford, Incomplete

_ The BODY of ALL messages must include
  _ The students ID number
  _ The course subject and number, e.g., Phil 2010
  _ The course CRN, e.g., 86745______________________________
  _ The term of the course, e.g. Fall 2003
  _ The work the student must complete in order to remove the incomplete.
  _ The deadline by which the student must complete this work.

Sample Message

To: hlamarr1@student.gsu.edu
From: Tim Renick
CC: Ellen Logan
Re: Hedy Lamarr, Change Grade

222-44-6666
Phil 2010
CRN 86745
Spring 2004
Complete final paper.
Section 15. GTA Absence from Teaching Pre-Approval Form

The absence from work by any GTA must be approved in advance and in accordance with the following procedure. This form must be used for all absences other than immediate illness or emergency.

1. When you know in advance, for example, that you will be reading a paper at a conference, or attending an invitation from a doctoral program to which you are applying, your first job is to figure out what to have your students do in your absence. Then ask a fellow GTA to cover your class.
2. This form must be submitted at least two weeks in advance to the Coordinator of Graduate Teaching. Included in the submission should be an explanation and reason for the cause of absence (for example, that the GTA is reading a paper at a professional conference), as well as the details of how the GTA intends to cover the classes missed (for example, providing the name of another GTA who has agreed to teach the missed classes).
3. The Coordinator of Graduate Teaching will make a recommendation to the Chair of the department that the request be granted or denied, based on the explanation and reason for the absence.
4. The Chair of the department will approve or disapprove the request.

Name of GTA: ___________________________________________________________

Date/Times of Missed Classes:_______________________________________________

Reason/Explanation for Absence:

________________________________________________________________________

SIGNED by GTA_________________________ Date________________________

SIGNED by CGT_________________________ Date________________________

Initial Recommendation by CGT: __________ Grant __________ Deny

APPROVED ___________________________ Date________________________

Department Chair
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Section 16. Recommendation on Politeness and Keeping It Professional

Note: This section is not department policy. It is nothing more than some words of wisdom from the Department Chair.

When dealing with students, especially when delivering bad news or interacting with students who are upset, it is important to be polite, professional, and calm. If a student gets upset or insulting, one natural human reaction is to get upset and respond in kind. This natural reaction should be resisted. It generally leads to escalation. On the other hand, it is also important to resist another natural human reaction—the desire to give the student what s/he wants even though s/he does not deserve it just because the student is upset and bothering you.

If you are talking to an upset student in person, it is best not to cut the student off. Let them saying their piece while nodding and listening. Only when the student is finished should you respond.

In e-mails, it is important to be polite and professional. It is also important to respond promptly. Here is an example.

-----Original Message-----
>>> John Doe <jdoe1@student.gsu.edu> 9/5/2006 7:52 AM>>>
To: jinstructor@gsu.edu Subject: You are so stupid
My name is John Doe. I can’t believe that you will not let me into your class! I know we are in the fourth week of classes but I need it to graduate and I was dropped due to problems in financial aid. I can’t afford another semester here! There are so many stupid people like you at GSU.

-----Bad Response-----
>>> Jane Instructor <jinstructor@langate.gsu.edu> 9/15/2006 9:55 AM >>>
To: jdoe1@student.gsu.edu Subject: Your request
Get off my case. There is no way you can get the material if you start in the fourth week!

-----Good Response-----
>>> Jane Instructor <jinstructor@langate.gsu.edu> 9/5/2006 9:55 AM >>>
To: jdoe1@student.gsu.edu Subject: Your request
Dear Mr. Doe,

Thank you for your e-mail. I fully understand your difficulties with regards to finances and the University, and you have my sympathies for these troubles.

However, at this point in the semester, you have missed the majority of the foundational material for the class. I think it would be extremely difficult for you to do well. For this reason, I must regretfully decline your request.

Sincerely, Jane Instructor
H. I. Introduction and History
Over the past two years, our RPG grants allowed us to create and improve three RPG programs. The programs are: (A) Supplemental Instruction Leaders (hereafter, “SILs”) for Phil 1010; (B) Supplemental Instruction Leaders for Phil 2010; and (C) a Sophomore Connections section of 2010.

A. Phil 1010, Critical Thinking
In the Fall of 2006, we had a program whereby graduate students helped undergrads in Phil 1010, but we did not have those grad students participate in the training offered by the Office of Undergrad Studies. Additionally, attendance at the supplemental sessions was made mandatory for those scoring below 65 on midterm exams. That semester, there was no substantial difference in the DFW rates between 1010 classes with the supplemental assistance and those without. The grades in classes with assistance were actually lower than those without.

In the Spring of 2007, we limited the number of instructors teaching 1010 that had the graduate students helping their classes. (We had complaints from students in classes taught by instructors who had supplemental assistance in other classes but not theirs.) That change seemed to help: we got lower DFW rates and better grades in classes with supplemental assistance than those without (17.8% vs 20.3% and 2.9 vs 2.81).

The results improved more in 2007-2008, as outlined below. We believe that this improvement (16.86% v. 21.43% and 2.85 v. 2.64 in the Fall and 17.31% v. 22.91% and 3.0 v. 2.63 in the Spring) is due to the training the Supplemental Instruction Leaders now receive from the Office of Undergraduate Studies—which we began providing the 1010 SILs in Fall 2007.

B. Phil 2010, Great Questions of Philosophy
While our supplemental assistance to 2010 also began (in the Fall of 2006) without the benefit of the training from the Office of Undergraduate Studies, we transitioned that part of our program more quickly and the undergrads who assisted in those classes received the training in the Spring of 2007. For both of those semesters, though, the DFW rates and grades were worse in classes with the supplemental assistance than in classes without. We continue to have problems in this area, as indicated below, but have made and are making changes we hope will help.
Most importantly, we have been consistently willing to alter all three programs to improve student learning. As suggested below, we seem to be on a good path. All of our SILs now take part in the training program run by the Office of Undergraduate Studies and we have begun to rely more heavily on grad students.

II. Timeline
Fall 2006: We institute our RPG Programs. This includes graduate students serving as “Supplemental Instructors” for Phil 1010; undergraduates serving as “Peer Mentors” for Phil 2010; a Sophomore Connections section of 2010; and an RPG Coordinator. The 5 Supplemental Instructors for 1010 each worked with 2 sections of 1010, taught by different instructors. We also ran centralized “meet-and-greets” to encourage students to participate in the Supplemental Instruction or Peer Mentor sessions.

Spring 2007: 1010 “Supplemental Instructors” now called “Critical Thinking Tutors” and now work with 2 sections of 1010 each, but both with same instructor. “Peer Mentors” merged into University SIL program. First run of Sophomore Connections Phil 2010; all students chosen by RPG Coordinator. Continued with centralized “meet-and-greets.”

Fall 2007: Phil 1010 “Critical Thinking Tutors” merged into University SIL program; now work with 1 Phil 1010 class each. SIL program for 2010 continues. Rather than using centralized “meet-and-greets,” had each Critical Thinking Tutor or SIL run their own sessions.

Spring 2008: For the first time, use graduate students as SILs for Phil 2010 as well as Phil 1010. Continue with several undergrad SILs also for Phil 2010. Second run of Sophomore Connections Phil 2010; all students chosen by RPG Coordinator. Continued with individually run “meet-and-greets.”

Fall 2008: Trying all and only graduate students as SILs and primarily for Phil 2010 (if not more successful, may concentrate efforts on Phil 1010). Third run of Sophomore Connections Phil 2010; this time trying to control for selection bias. Discontinued “meet-and-greets.”

III. Analysis
A. Phil 1010
The DFW rates in Phil 1010 since beginning the program have improved nicely (21.2% for the four semesters of the program vs 26% for the four prior semesters). Grades in these classes have also improved (2.725 for the four semesters of the program vs 2.5 for the four prior semesters).

We had better results with our interventions in Phil 1010 in 2007-2008 than we did before. Classes with SILs have better DFW rates and grades (15.51% vs 20.45% and 2.85 vs 2.64 in the Fall and 17.31% vs 22.91% and 3.00 vs 2.63 in the Spring). Moreover, in classes with SILs, those who participate in the SI sessions do better than those who do not. We now also have data that indicates the latter is not a mere selection bias (see “A&B. Data: Freshman Index and Current Performance of SI vs non-SI participants, Spring 08” below).
Some of the improvement here may be due to factors extraneous to the program; we suspect that the overall drop in DWF rates, even in those classes without SILs, is due to a new textbook, the redesign of Phil 1010, and efforts to provide better teacher-training to our graduate students. Some of those very clearly successful changes were funded by Wadsworth Press, as two members of the Department of Philosophy completed a new text-book geared to help students prepare for the rest of their college curriculum.

B. Phil 2010
The improvement in DFW rates in Phil 2010 since beginning the program has not been as positive as for 1010 (23.5% for the four semesters of the program vs 24% for the four prior semesters). The change in grades is similar (2.68 for the four semesters of the program vs 2.675 for the four prior semesters).

Although those who participate in SI sessions in Phil 2010 classes that have SILs do better than those who do not (and we now have data indicating this is not a mere selection bias), the comparison to classes without SILs remained poor in the Fall (negligible to negative difference in grades and worse DFW rates). We did see some improvement on this front in the Spring, but had already begun seeking an explanation as to why we weren’t seeing better results. One likely possibility is that the SILs in Phil 2010 had thus far all been undergraduates (while those in the 1010 classes were all, thus far, graduate students). Admittance to our graduate program is very selective and our grad students have obviously had more experience in philosophy courses than our undergraduate students. We thus suspected that our grad students are better SILs than our undergraduate students. We tested this in the Spring but only partially. The results are promising. DFW rates are now better in 2010 classes with SILs than in those without (29.01% vs 32.75%) as are grades (2.43 vs 2.27). However, while the DFW rates are lower in classes with Grad SILs than in those with Undergrad SILs (27.69% vs 29.81%), the grades are better in classes with Undergrad SILs than in those with Grad SILs (2.3 vs 2.52). We had difficulties in the initiation and structure of two of the Grad SILs and this may have lowered the overall affect seen here. Given the changes, we also had smaller data sets throughout. In the Fall of 2008, we will try using only grad students as SILs in 2010 and hope that encourages better results in student learning and retention.

C. Sophomore Connections Class
In the Spring of 2008, we held our second Sophomore Connections (SC) version of Phil 2010. The evidence regarding this program is univocally positive. The average final grade in the class was higher than the average in all other 2010 classes. The responses by students to survey questions were significantly more favorable than in 5 randomly selected Phil 2010 classes. Students in the SC class rated their experience with the course and how much they learned substantially higher than their counterparts. They were also far more likely to feel they got to know their classmates and that they had a high level of interaction with other students in their class. The SC students also indicated that they were more likely to visit a professor in his or her office after this class. Surprisingly, the only questions where the responses may not favor the SC course were questions directly about a GA State Community. SC students thought of themselves as slightly less like other GA State students than the non-SC students and were less likely to believe there is such a community or to feel themselves part of such a community. However, they also were paradoxically more likely to take themselves to be involved at GA State than their
counterparts. (We saw this same paradoxical result in last year’s data—indeed, most of the data about the SC class affirms last year’s findings.) One problem with the design of this program is that we are not controlling for selection bias. In fact, we are creating it because the students are chosen by the RPG Coordinator. The next time we offer this class (Fall 2008) there will be some students chosen by the Coordinator and some not.

IV. Changes

A. In the Fall of 2007, all of the SILs for Phil 2010 were undergraduates and all of the SILs for Phil 1010 were graduate students. In the Spring of 2008, we tested using graduate students for Phil 2010. For the Fall of 2008, we will only use Grad student SILs and most will be assigned to 2010 classes. We hope this will clarify if we should continue to use SILs in 2010 or dedicate all to 1010. Using Grad students has other advantages:

1. Using SILs with Phil 2010 rather than Phil 1010 allows us to lessen the problems created when we make a graduate student an SIL in a class that has another graduate student as the instructor (as we do with 1010).
2. There is more “bang for the buck” since the 2010 classes cap at 60 and the 1010 classes cap at 30. That is, we help twice the number of undergraduates if we have an SIL in Phil 2010 rather than in Phil 1010.
3. This alleviates some of our scheduling difficulties. We often don't know for sure until a few days before classes who will be teaching which 1010 classes and we can't schedule the SILs for those classes until we know that. This means we can't get rooms for their SI sessions for 2 or 3 weeks—which is at odds with the National SI program.
4. It allows our graduate students to have a greater variety of GRA/GLA assignments; this can be both more interesting and more educational for them.

B. In testing graduate students in Phil 2010, we are also moving to a greater reliance on graduate students than undergraduates. There are also several reasons for this:

1. The data, as analyzed above, indicates less success in 2010 with Undergrad SILs then in 1010 with Grad SILs. One possible reason for this is the use of undergraduates as SILs.
2. Graduate students may be more reliable in instructional roles.
3. We have found that often undergraduates do not want to repeat the experience. They are paid $1500 and receive 3 credits the first time but only 1 credit the second time. Several have indicated that they don't think it’s worth it for 1 credit. By contrast, acting as an SIL is simply one of the possibilities for graduate students in the Department (that is, there is no concern about incentives).
4. We believe this can be a useful way for graduate students to get more direct contact with a regular faculty member.

C. Depending on the data collected in the 2008-2009 year and if funding continues, we may decide to switch entirely to using graduate students as SILs. After a fuller test of Grad SILs in 2010, we will also have to consider whether we should concentrate our efforts on Phil 1010, where we seem to be having greater success (though there are negatives associated with doing
so, as indicated in A immediately above). If the use of only Grad SILs in 2010 is successful, we will continue to split the resources between 1010 and 2010.

4. We will also try the Sophomore Connections class with a mixed group of students, some selected by the Coordinator and some not. This will allow us a control group (though of limited size) to determine if the positive results we have achieved are due to selection bias.

V. DATA FOR 2007-2008

A1. Data: Supplemental Instruction Leaders for Phil 1010, Fall 2007\(^1\)

1. DFW rates
   a. sections without SILs: 21.43 %
   b. sections with SILs: 16.86 %

2. Average class grades; i.e., (Mean grade in class 1 + mean grade in class … + mean grade in class N) / N:
   a. sections without SILs: 2.64
   b. sections with SILs: 2.85

3. Average student grades; i.e, (Mean grade of student 1 + mean grade of student 2 … + mean grade of student N) / N
   a. sections without SILs: 2.67
   b. sections with SILs: 2.81

4. In sections with SILs:
   a. percent of students that were SI participants:\(^2\) 35.6%
   b. SIL evaluation by SI participants (on a 5 point scale):\(^3\) 4.59

5. Mean final grade of those in sections with SILs:\(^4\)
   a. for SI participants: 3.09
   b. for non-SI participants: 2.68

A2. Data: Supplemental Instruction Leaders for Phil 1010, Spring 2008\(^5\)

1. DFW rates
   a. sections without SILs: 22.91%
   b. sections with SILs: 17.31%

---

\(^1\) Data for #1, #2, and #3 from Statware. Data for #4 and #5 from the Office of Undergraduate Studies (Peggy Ogden).

\(^2\) “SI participants” are defined as those who used the service at least twice.

\(^3\) SI participants were given an evaluation form to fill out about SI. Overall they perceived the sessions to be helpful, as indicated by this score.

\(^4\) This data compares only students in classes with SILs; the data in #1, #2, and #3 compares classes with SILs to those without.

\(^5\) The sample here is smaller than in previous semesters; as we began to use grad students as SILs in 2010, we only had 3 sections of 1010 with SILs.
2. Average class grades; i.e., \((\text{Mean grade in class 1} + \text{mean grade in class} \ldots + \text{mean grade in class N}) / N\):
   a. sections without SILs: 2.63
   b. sections with SILs: 3.00

3. Average student grades; i.e., \((\text{Mean grade of student 1} + \text{mean grade of student 2} \ldots + \text{mean grade of student N}) / N\)
   a. sections without SILs: 2.65
   b. sections with SILs: 3.00

4. In sections with SILs:
   a. percent of students that were SI participants: 47%
   b. SIL evaluation by SI participants (on a 5 point scale): 4.58

5. Mean final grade of those in sections with SILs:
   a. for SI participants: 3.21
   b. for non-SI participants: 2.82

A3. Four year Data for Phil 1010

   a. Pre-RPG program
      
      |                | average DFW rate | average GPA |
      |----------------|------------------|------------|
      | Fall 2004      | 21.4%            | 2.6        |
      | Spring 2005    | 27.41%           | 2.5        |
      | Fall 2005      | 27.6%            | 2.3        |
      | Spring 2006    | 27.55%           | 2.6        |
      | Average        | 25.99%           | 2.5        |

   b. Post RPG Program
      
      |                | average DFW rate | average GPA |
      |----------------|------------------|------------|
      | Fall 2006      | 21.56%           | 2.7        |
      | Spring 2007    | 19.93%           | 2.8        |
      | Fall 2007      | 20.87%           | 2.7        |
      | Spring 2008    | 22.43%           | 2.7        |
      | Average        | 21.2%            | 2.725      |

B1. Data: Supplemental Instruction Leaders for Phil 2010, Fall 2007

1. DFW rates
   a. sections without SILs: 21.46%
   b. sections with SILs: 24.19%

---

6 This data compares only students in classes with SILs; the data in #1, #2, and #3 compares classes with SILs to those without.
7 All information from Statware.
8 Data for #1, #2, and #3 from Statware. Data for #4 and #5 from the Office of Undergraduate Studies (Peggy Ogden).
2. Average class grades; i.e., (Mean grade in class 1 + mean grade in class … mean grade in class N) / N:
   a. sections without SILs: 2.77
   b. sections with SILs: 2.75

3. Average student grades; i.e, (Mean grade of student 1 + mean grade of student 2 … + mean grade of student N) / N
   a. sections without SILs: 2.75
   b. sections with SILs: 2.75

4. In sections with SILs:
   a. percent of students that were SI participants: 9
   b. SIL evaluation by SI participants (on a 5 point scale): 4.7

5. Mean final grade of those in sections with SILs:
   a. for SI participants: 3.06
   b. for non-SI participants: 2.52


1. DFW rates
   a. sections without SILs: 32.75%
   b. sections with Undergrad SILs: 29.81%
   c. sections with Grad SILs: 27.69%
   d. sections with Undergrad or Grad SILs: 29.01%

2. Average class grades; i.e., (Mean grade in class 1 + mean grade in class … + mean grade in class N) / N:
   a. sections without SILs: 2.27
   b. sections with Undergrad SILs: 2.52
   c. sections with Grad SILs: 2.3
   d. sections with Undergrad or Grad SILs: 2.43

3. Average student grades; i.e, (Mean grade of student 1 + mean grade of student 2 … + mean grade of student N) / N
   a. sections without SILs: 2.30

---

9 “SI participants” are defined as those who used the service at least twice.
10 SI participants were given an evaluation form to fill out about SI. Overall they perceived the sessions to be helpful, as indicated by this score.
11 This data compares only students in classes with SILs; the data in #1, #2, and #3 compares classes with SILs to those without.
12 Data for #1, #2, and #3 from Statware. Data for #4 and #5 from the Office of Undergraduate Studies (Peggy Ogden).
13 The sample here is smaller than in previous semesters; as we began to use grad students as SILs in 2010, we only had 3 sections of 2010 without SILs. There were 6 sections with Undergrad SILs and 4 sections with Grad SILs. Importantly, we also had difficulties in the initiation and structure of two of the latter; this may have lowered the overall affect seen here and in 2 and 3 below.
b. sections with Undergrad SILs: 2.53
c. sections with Grad SILs: 2.46
d. sections with Undergrad or Grad SILs: 2.50

4a. In sections with Undergrad SILs:
   a. percent of students that were SI participants: 35%
   b. SIL evaluation by SI participants (on a 5 point scale): 4.82

4b. In sections with Grad SILs:
   a. percent of students that were SI participants: 24%
   b. SIL evaluation by SI participants (on a 5 point scale): 4.71

4c. In sections with Undergrad OR Grad SILs:
   a. percent of students that were SI participants: 36.63%
   b. SIL evaluation by SI participants (on a 5 point scale): 4.79

5a. Mean final grade of those in sections with Undergrad SILs:
   a. for SI participants: 3.1
   b. for non-SI participants: 2.1

5b. Mean final grade of those in sections with Grad SILs:
   a. for SI participants: 2.92
   b. for non-SI participants: 2.13

5a. Mean final grade of those in sections with any SILs:
   a. for SI participants: 3.06
   b. for non-SI participants: 2.11

B3. Four year Data for Phil 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>average DFW rate</th>
<th>average GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-RPG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2004</td>
<td>20.87%</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2005</td>
<td>28.71%</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>19.24%</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2006</td>
<td>26.94%</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>23.94%</td>
<td>2.675</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>average DFW rate</th>
<th>average GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post RPG Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>18.19%</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2007</td>
<td>22.72%</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>23.46%</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14 This result is skewed. Of the four sections with Grad SILs, the numbers were: 7%, essentially 0%, 41%, essentially 0%.
15 This data compares only students in classes with SILs; the data in #1, #2, and #3 compares classes with SILs to those without.
16 All information from Statware.
A&B. Data: Freshman Index and Current Performance of SI vs non-SI participants in Philosophy (combining Phil 1010 and Phil 2010), Spring 08

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Freshman Index</th>
<th>Transfer GPA</th>
<th>Term GPA</th>
<th>Cumulative GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>2708</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-SI</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>2715</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>-.270</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>8.868</td>
<td>7.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>significance (p)</td>
<td>.788</td>
<td>.842</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Signif at p&lt;.05</td>
<td>Not Signif at p&lt;.05</td>
<td>Significant at p&lt;.001</td>
<td>Significant at p&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Data: Sophomore Connections Course

As planned, the Coordinator taught this course in Spring 2008. The course was capped at 30 and enrolled 20 students who did very well in 1010 and 4 students from the Honors program. To evaluate the use of the course, we conducted a survey of the students in it and five other sections of 2010, chosen at random, to determine whether the initiative was successful in encouraging students to become philosophy majors, in developing community, and in increasing student involvement in the University.

C1. Data: Regarding the Major

Asked “Were you a philosophy major when you signed up for this course?,” 15% of those in the Sophomore Connections class and 2% of those in the other 5 classes responded “yes.”

Asked “Are you now a philosophy major?,” those numbers were 8% and 6% respectively. The difference should not be taken as significant as there were only 13 students polled in the once case and 144 in the other (in both cases, fewer then the number enrolled). With a 5 point scale, asked “Has this course made you more or less likely to be a philosophy major?,” those in the Sophomore Connections class averaged 3.38, slightly better then the result of 3.32 of the other 5 classes.

The students also answered the following 12 questions in C2, C3, C4, and C5. Each question is followed with the average response, from a scale of 1-5, comparing the response of those in the Sophomore Connection (“SC”) class those in the 5 non-Sophomore Connection classes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C2. Data: Regarding the Course</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>Non-SC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. How would you rate your experience with this course?</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17 From Institutional Research via Peggy Ogden.
5. How much do you think you learned in this course? & 4.62 & 4.04 \\
6. How much do you feel your professor tried to explain the current condition of academic philosophy? & 4.54 & 4.26 \\

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C3. Data: Regarding Students</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>Non-SC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. How well do you feel you got to know the other students in this class? &amp; 3.92 &amp; 2.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Compared to other classes you’ve taken, how much interaction with other students in the class do you think there was? &amp; 4.62 &amp; 3.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How much do you feel you are like other GA State students? &amp; 2.69 &amp; 2.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C4. Data: Regarding Professors</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>Non-SC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Before this semester, how many times, on average, did you visit professors’ offices in a given semester? &amp; 2.15 &amp; 1.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. How many times have you visited the office of the professor of this class? &amp; 2.23 &amp; 1.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference in answer from before this semester to this semester: &amp; .08 &amp; -0.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: 1=never, 2=once or twice, 3=3 or 4 times, 4=5 or 6 times, 5=a lot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Do you think you are more likely to visit a professor in his or her office now than you were before this semester? &amp; 3.00 &amp; 2.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C5. Data: Regarding GA State Community</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>Non-SC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. To what extent do you believe there is a GA State community? &amp; 2.92 &amp; 3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. To what extent do you feel yourself to be a part of the GA State community? &amp; 2.58 &amp; 2.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. To what extent do you take yourself to be involved at GA State? &amp; 2.73 &amp; 2.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendices F1 and F2
Graduate Faculty
Appendix F1  Definition of graduate faculty & criteria for selection of graduate faculty

Graduate Faculty Policy

1. The Department of Philosophy will follow the procedures for graduate faculty status as outlined in the College of Arts and Sciences Graduate Faculty Policy and the University Graduate Faculty Policy.

2. The Department of Philosophy defines current scholarly competence as being an active and productive scholar and an effective teacher at the graduate level. Evidence of recent active and productive scholarship includes the materials listed in Category A and Category B of the Department of Philosophy Promotion and Tenure Manual. Evidence of graduate teaching effectiveness is provided by the Teaching Portfolios of the faculty. These portfolios are compiled according to the requirements of the Department of Philosophy’s Annual Review Policy.

3. At the times for review noted in the College of Arts and Sciences Graduate Faculty Policy, candidates for new or renewed graduate faculty status will be reviewed by the Graduate Faculty Committee. The Graduate Faculty Committee is composed of all tenured members of the department who hold graduate faculty status except the candidate, the Chair of the Department, and any members of the Department serving in a position that will review the candidate’s graduate faculty status at the College or University level.

4. To be appointed to or retain graduate faculty status the candidate must be at least Very Good in both professional development and instruction. The standards for the ranking of Very Good in these two areas are described in the Department’s Promotion and Tenure Manual.

5. When a candidate is reviewed, the Graduate Faculty Committee will make a written recommendation to the Department Chair. The Department Chair will then forward this letter along with her own written recommendation to the appropriate College committee.

Source: Department Meeting of December 2, 2005

Appendix F2  List of graduate faculty

Andrew Altman  Stephen Jacobson
Jessica Berry   Peter Lindsay
Andrew I. Cohen Melissa Merritt
Andrew J. Cohen Eddy Nahmias
Sandra Dwyer    Tim O'Keefe
William Edmundson George Rainbolt
George Graham   Sebastian Rand
Christie Hartley Andrea Scarantino
Appendix F-3a
Current curriculum vitae for full-time tenure/tenure-track faculty
NAME: Andrew Altman

ADDRESS: Department of Philosophy
Georgia State University
P.O. Box 4089
Atlanta, GA 30302-4089

TELEPHONE: H: 404-370-9722  O: 404-370-9722
E-MAIL: aaltman@gsu.edu

DEGREES: A.B., 1972, Columbia University
M.Phil., 1975, Columbia University
Ph.D., 1977, Columbia University

ACADEMIC POSITIONS

Professor of Philosophy, Georgia State University, 2001-present, and
Director, Jean Beer Blumenfeld Center for Ethics, 2005-present

Professor of Philosophy, The George Washington University, 1997-01

Associate Professor of Philosophy, The George Washington University, 1987-1997

Assistant Professor of Philosophy, The George Washington University, 1985-87

Fellow in Law and Philosophy, Harvard Law School, 1984-85

Assistant Professor of Philosophy, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, 1981-85

Visiting Assistant Professor of Philosophy, Bowling Green State University, 1977-81

AREAS OF SPECIALIZATION

Philosophy of Law; Political Philosophy; Philosophy and Social Policy;
Philosophy and Race

AREAS OF COMPETENCE

Nineteenth-Century Philosophy; Philosophy of Social Science; History of
Philosophy; Ethical Theory; Logic

PUBLICATIONS

Books

A Liberal Theory of International Justice  (co-author: C.H. Wellman)

Critical Legal Studies: A Liberal Critique

Arguing About Law: An Introduction to Legal Philosophy
Wadsworth, second edition, 2001
Articles


"Liberalism and Campus Hate Speech: A Philosophical Examination," Ethics 103 (January 1993), 302-317. [reprinted in Morality Matters, McGraw-Hill; Social Ethics: Morality and Social Policy, McGraw-Hill; Crime and Punishment, Jones and Bartlett; Campus Wars, Westview; Ethical Theory and Society, Harcourt and Brace; Our Times: Reading from Recent Periodicals for Writers, Bradford; Controversies in Constitutional Law, Garland]


HONORS/AWARDS/GRANTS

NEH grant to co-direct (with C.H. Wellman) a summer seminar for college and university teachers; topic: Philosophical Perspectives on Law, Democracy and Human Rights (2007)

NEH grant to co-direct (with C.H. Wellman) a summer seminar for college and university teachers; topic: Political Obligation Democratic Legitimacy, and Human Rights (2005)

Eleventh Annual Bell Distinguished Lecture in Law, College of Wooster, OH (2008).

The University Prize for Teaching Excellence, George Washington University, 1996

Liberal Arts Fellowship in Law, Harvard Law School, 1984-85

Research Grant from The Center for Dewey Studies to study Pragmatism and Contemporary Legal Philosophy, 1984-85

Stipend from NEH to participate in summer seminar on the Role of Courts, J. Grossman, Director, 1983

Stipend from NEH to participate in summer seminar on Marxism. M. Fisk, Director, 1980

COURSES TAUGHT

Undergraduate: Introduction to Philosophy; Ethics; Social and Political Philosophy; Nineteenth-Century Philosophy; Theories of History; Philosophy of Law; Communism, Fascism, and Democracy; Logic; Metaphysics; Humanities; Honors Introduction to Western Civilization; African-American Ethical and Legal Issues

Graduate: Seminar in Ethics; Seminar in Legal Philosophy; Philosophy of Social Science; Philosophy, Law, and Social Policy; Marxism; Pragmatism
SELECTED PAPERS/COMMENTS READ TO PROFESSIONAL GROUPS/CONFERENCES


"Harm to Humanity: A Critique," IVR World Congress, Granada, Spain, 2005

"Colonialism and Group Self-Determination," University of Kansas, 2005

“Collective Self-Determination and the Issue of Felon Disenfranchisement,” APA- Eastern Division (group session), 2003

“Religious Exemptions to Antidiscrimination Law,” Georgia Philosophical Society, and Colloquiums at Washington U.-St. Louis and Emory University, 2002

“Comments on N. Sturgeon,” Conference on G. E. Moore’s Principia Ethica, Georgia State U., April 2002


“Keeping the Sex in Sexual Harassment: A Reply to Vicki Schultz,” APA-Pacific Division, symposium session, 2000


“On the Idea of Sexual Harassment,” Bowling Green State University, 1995

“Toleration as a Form of Bias,” Mary Washington College, 1993

“Power and Agency,” American Philosophical Association-Eastern, 1993

“Positivism and Its Critics,” Association for Psychiatry and Philosophy, 1993

“Speech Acts and Hate Speech,” APA-Eastern, 1992

“Speech Acts, Hate Speech, and Ethical Values,” Hoffberger Center for Professional Ethics, University of Baltimore School of Law, 1992

“Critical Legal Studies,” American University Philosophy Club, 1992


“Law and Social Reality,” GWU Human Sciences Seminar, 1990

“Critical Legal Studies v. Liberalism: Law, Deception, and Social Reality,
"APA-Eastern, 1989

SERVICE TO PROFESSION/MEMBERSHIP IN PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Advisory Board, Social Theory and Practice 2006-

APA Committee on Philosophy and Law (2002-05)

Reviewer of manuscripts submissions, Social Theory and Practice, 2000-2005

External evaluator of Philosophy Dept., Brooklyn College, CUNY, 2000

Outside reviewer on tenure decisions for Loyola Law School and Georgia State University Law School


Session Chair, “Legal Philosophy,” APA-Eastern 1991

Member of: American Philosophical Association, American Society for Legal and Political Philosophy, International Association for Philosophy of Law
EDUCATION
Ph.D., University of Texas at Austin (Philosophy), August 2003
B.A. cum laude, University of Puget Sound (Philosophy), May 1994

AREAS OF SPECIALIZATION
Continental Philosophy (late 18th - early 20th century)
History of Ancient Philosophy

AREAS OF COMPETENCE
Aesthetics; Epistemology

I. PUBLICATIONS


“Perspectivism and Ephexis in Interpretation,” Philosophical Topics 33: 2 (19-44), Fall 2005.


J. PUBLICATIONS (IN PROGRESS)
Nietzsche and the Ancient Skeptical Tradition, Oxford University Press (under contract).


K. BOOK REVIEWS (INVITED)


L. RESEARCH HONORS and AWARDS
National Endowment for the Humanities Fellowship for University Teachers ($25,200),
Summer / Fall 2008

UNCW Charles L. Cahill Award for Faculty Research ($3,000), Summer 2006
UNCW Faculty International Travel Grant ($500), Fall 2005
UNCW Summer Research Initiative Grant ($3,000), Summer 2005

University of Texas at Austin Professional Development Travel Award ($400), 2002 and 1998
University of Texas at Austin Continuing Fellowship ($12,000), 2001 – 2002 and 1999 – 2000
University of Texas at Austin Tuition Fellowship ($5,000), 2000 – 2001
University of Texas at Austin Department of Philosophy Graduate Studies Committee High Commendation, ‘96, ‘97, ‘98, and ‘99

Phi Beta Kappa Honor Society (1994)
Phi Kappa Phi Honor Society (1993)

M. COLLOQUIA (INVITED)

“The Great Health,” Ronald E. Moore Humanities Symposium: ‘Nietzsche and the Philosophical Life’, Texas Christian University (Fort Worth, TX); April 17-19, 2008.

“Nietzsche’s Naturalism, Nietzsche’s Skepticism,” University of Nevada Las Vegas; November 16, 2007.

“On the Use and Abuse of Nietzsche for Italian Futurism,” American University Rome (Rome, Italy); September 21, 2007.

“Nietzsche’s Naturalism and Nietzsche’s Skepticism: The Compatibility Issue” at ‘Nietzsche and Naturalism’: a seminar sponsored by the Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study; (Harvard University); Cambridge, MA. November 4-6, 2004.


“Skepticism About Nietzsche’s ‘Perspectivism’,” The Undergraduate Philosophy Association of the University of Texas at Austin. November 8, 2002.


CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS and COMMENTS


Comments on David Conter (University of Western Ontario), "A Poem Is an Abstract Object Located in Time" and John Dilworth (Western Michigan University), "Why No Content Theories of Art?" at the Eastern Division Meeting of the American Society for Aesthetics; Philadelphia, PA. April 8-9, 2005.


“Democritus and His Successors on the Human Good,” International Conference on Ancient and Medieval Philosophy (Society for Ancient Greek Philosophy); Fordham University Lincoln Center, New York, NY. October 31-November 2, 2003.


PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS
North American Nietzsche Society
Friedrich Nietzsche Society of Great Britain & Ireland
American Philosophical Association

TEACHING HONORS and AWARDS

 › Recognized by a graduating senior with a major in Philosophy as a faculty member who had “most contributed to their progress at UNCW” and “made a difference in the course of their academic and personal development”; Letter from the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences (Spring 2006, 2 students; Fall 2006, 1 student).

COURSES TAUGHT

Georgia State University, Assistant Professor
Upper Division / Graduate: Philosophy of Art (Spring 2008)
Marxism (Fall 2007)
Marx, Nietzsche, Freud (Fall 2004)
Nietzsche on Eternal Recurrence (Directed Study [2 students], Spring 2007)
Introductory: Great Questions of Philosophy (2006-07, 2007-08)

The University of North Carolina at Wilmington, Assistant Professor
Upper Division: Marx, Nietzsche, Freud (Fall 2004)
Aristotle (Spring 2005)
The Philosophy of Immanuel Kant (Fall 2005)
Nietzsche’s Genealogy of Morality (Directed Individual Study, Fall 2005)
Heidegger’s Being and Time (Spring 2006)

Introductory: Introduction to Ethics (Fall 2004, Summer 2005)
Invitation to Philosophical Thinking (Spring 2005, Fall 2005, Spring 2006)

The College of William and Mary, Visiting Assistant Professor
Upper Division: Greek Philosophy (Fall 2003)
Kant and His Successors (Spring 2004)
Introductory: Introduction to Philosophy (Fall 2003)
Freshman Writing Seminar: The Problem of Evil (Spring 2004)
The University of Texas at Austin, Instructor
Introductory: Introduction to Ethics (Fall 2002)
Human Nature (Spring 2003)

St. Edward’s University (New College), Instructor
Introductory: Ethical Analysis (Summer 2002, 2003)

SERVICE TO THE PROFESSION
Referee for Routledge Publishers (September 2008)
Referee for Oxford University Press (December 2006; November 2007)
Referee for The Journal of Nietzsche Studies (June 2006; March 2008)
Referee for The Journal of Philosophical Research (June 2007)
Supervisor: Executive Editor R.J. Hankinson
Research Assistant for the Professor Gregory Vlastos Memorial Archive Project at the Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center (Summer 1997). Supervisor: Professor A.P.D. Mourelatos

UNIVERSITY SERVICE
UNCW Faculty Senate Representative (Philosophy), Fall 2005

DEPARTMENT SERVICE
Georgia State University Department of Philosophy, Assessment Committee (2007-2008)
Georgia State University Department of Philosophy, Undergraduate Committee (Spring 2007)
UNCW Department of Philosophy and Religion, Evaluation Committee (Fall 2005-Spring 2006)
UNCW Department of Philosophy and Religion, Curriculum Committee (Fall 2004-Spring 2005)
UNCW Department of Philosophy and Religion, Philosophy and Religion Club Faculty Advisor (Fall 2004 – present)
UNCW Center for Teaching Excellence, Philosophy and Religion Department Liaison (Spring 2005)
The College of William and Mary Freshman Advisor (Fall 2003-Spring 2004)
The College of William and Mary Philosophy Club Faculty Advisor (Fall 2003-Spring 2004)

UT Austin, Planning Committee for the 2000 Annual Philosophy Graduate Conference Committee
Topic: “Philosophy and the Social Sciences” (March 31-April 1, 2000)
Keynote Speaker: Professor Brian Skyrms, University of California at Irvine Program in Logic and Philosophy of Science

UT Austin, Chair of the 1999 Annual Philosophy Graduate Conference Executive Committee
Topic: “Evolution, Genetics and Culture” (April 23-24, 1999)
Keynote Speaker: Professor M. Susan Lindee, University of Pennsylvania Program in the History and Sociology of Science

Co-Chair, Philosophy Graduates’ Association (Fall 1996-Spring 1999)

PROFESSIONAL POSITIONS OUTSIDE PHILOSOPHY
Exhibitions Assistant, Austin Museum of Art (September 1998 – May 2001)
ANDREW I. COHEN
Jean Beer Blumenfeld Center For Ethics
Department of Philosophy
Georgia State University
Box 4089, Atlanta, GA 30302-4089
404-413-6111
aicohen@gsu.edu

EDUCATION:

1994  Ph.D., University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.
1990  M.A., University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

POSITIONS HELD:

2005-present  Assistant Professor, Georgia State University
2003-present  Associate Director, Jean Beer Blumenfeld Center for Ethics, Georgia State University. (Acting Director, 2004-2005.)
2001-2004  Adjunct faculty, Independent/Distance Learning, University of Georgia.
1999-2003  Assistant Professor, University of Oklahoma (on unpaid leave, 2001-2002).
Fall, 2001  Visiting Instructor, University of Georgia.
1997-1999  Assistant Professor, University of Wisconsin - Stevens Point.
1996-1997  Visiting Assistant Professor, University of South Carolina.
1995-1996  Visiting Assistant Professor, Washington and Lee University.
1994-1995  Lecturer, University of North Carolina at Wilmington.
Summer, 1994  Visiting Assistant Professor, Fayetteville State University.

PUBLICATIONS:

Edited volumes:

Essays in anthologies:
Journal articles:

Encyclopedia entries:

Invited book reviews:

WORKS IN PROGRESS:
“Reparations and the Paradox of Apologies”
“On the Conditions of Successful Corporate Apologies”
“Factory Farming of Animals and the Nazi Death Camp Analogy”

OTHER PUBLICATIONS:
2008  (with Jennifer A. Samp, who was first author) “Judgments of Corporate Wrongdoing: The Influence of Age, Race, and Personal Effect on Third Party Appraisals and


Book reviews:


**SELECTED AWARDS, GRANTS, AND HONORS RECEIVED:**

2008-2009 Arthur W. Page Legacy Scholar Grant for “Public Responses to Corporate Apologies: A Study of the Ethics of Corporate Crisis Communication.” $6,500 (with Jennifer A. Samp, University of Georgia, Department of Speech Communication).

2007-2008 Arthur W. Page Legacy Scholar Grant for “The Ethics of Corporate Apologies”: $10,000 (with Jennifer A. Samp, University of Georgia, Department of Speech Communication).

2003-2007 Arts and Sciences Freshman Learning Community Development grant, Georgia State University: 5 awards of $2000 each year

2004 Arts and Sciences Writing Across the Curriculum Development grant, Georgia State University, $2000

2002 Vice President for Research, Graduate College travel grant, Univ. of Oklahoma: $300.

2001 Arts and Sciences Faculty Enrichment Grant, University of Oklahoma: $1000.

**PRESENTATIONS:**


“Warmongers, Martyrs, and Madmen, versus the Hobbesian Laws of Nature,” West Chester University of Pennsylvania Department of Philosophy, June 17, 2002; University of Georgia Department of Philosophy, February 22, 2002.


“Natural Hobbesian Right Reason,” Ohio University Department of Philosophy, February 6, 2001; University of Oklahoma Department of Philosophy, February 9, 2001.


“Public Reason and the ‘Reasonable’ Person”: Isaac Ferris Lecture at the University of Wisconsin, Stevens Point, April 9, 1998.

“May Subjects Have a Right to Resist an Absolutely Authorized Hobbesian Sovereign?”: American Philosophical Association Central Division, Pittsburgh, PA, April 1997.

“Rawls, Hobbes, and ‘Political Schizophrenia’”: University of South Carolina Department of Philosophy, December 5, 1996.

“Hobbesian Political Obligation and the Right of Private Judgment”: Ohio University Department of Philosophy, February 3, 1995; The University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill Department of Philosophy, January 20, 1995; The University of North Carolina at Wilmington Department of Philosophy, November 4, 1994.

“Power and Freedom: Can We Hinder a Hobbesian Liberty?”: Fayetteville State University Department of Philosophy, September 30, 1994.


SELECTED OTHER PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES/PRESENTATIONS:

Organizer and chair, session on “Disaster Relief,” Association of Practical and Professional Ethics meetings, March 3, 2006


“Leadership Ethics,” presented to University Housing Staff, February 6, 2005.

“Tsunami Relief,” Tsunami Relief Symposium, George State University, January 19, 2005.


“Rejuvenating Ethics in the Liberal Arts: Ethics Centers in the University Community,” presentation to the annual meetings of the American Association of Colleges and Universities, January 2004, Washington, D.C.


“Democracy and the Public/Private Distinction”: Stevens Point Unitarian-Universalist Congregation, April 5, 1998.

UNIVERSITY AND PROFESSIONAL SERVICE:

Georgia State University:

2005 – present JD/MA joint program advisor, Philosophy Department.
2005 – present Pre-law advisor, Philosophy Department.
2004 – present Faculty advisor – Phi Sigma Tau philosophy honor society.
2004 – present Faculty advisor – SACFE (Center for Ethics Student Forum).
2003 – present Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (Vice-Chair 2006-)
2008 Search committee, lecturer, Department of Philosophy.
2008 Search committee, visiting instructor, Department of Philosophy.
2006 – 2008 Undergraduate Committee (Philosophy Department).
2007 Search committee: Academic Professional for Student Retention, Office of Undergraduate Studies.
2006-2007 Assessment Committee (Philosophy Department).
2004-2005 Ethics search committee chair (Philosophy Department).
2004-2005 Blumenfeld Center for Ethics, Director search committee chair.
2003-2004 Program Committee (Philosophy Department).
2003-2004 Responsible Conduct in Research Committee.
University of Oklahoma:
2002 Philosophy Department Assessment Liaison
1999-2002 Philosophy Department Undergraduate Advisory Committee.
1999-2000 Secretary at philosophy department meetings.
2000 Philosophy Department Assessment Liaison.

University of Wisconsin, Stevens Point:
1997-1998 Faculty advisor of UWSP Gamer’s Anonymous Club.

Washington and Lee University:
1996 Faculty Advisor: Undergraduate Conference on Contemporary Political Issues.
1996 Faculty Advisor undergraduate journal of political commentary.

Editorial/Reviewer Projects
2007 Referee, Social Theory and Practice.
2007 Reviewer, textbook proposal, Oxford University Press.
2005 Referee, Reason Papers.
2005 Referee, Law and Philosophy.
2005 Reviewer, textbook proposal, Prentice Hall.
2002 Referee, Ethics.
2000 Textbook proposal reviewer for Oxford University Press.
2000 Referee, Pacific Philosophical Quarterly.
1999 Textbook proposal reviewer for Oxford University Press.
1998 Textbook proposal reviewer for Oxford University Press.

SELECTED ORGANIZING/COORDINATING CONFERENCES/SYMPOSIA/SPEAKERS:
Organizer, workshop for Elizabeth Anderson’s manuscript on democratic inclusion, Jean Beer Blumenfeld Center for Ethics, May, 2009.


Organizer, manuscript workshop for Arthur Ripstein’s manuscript on Kant’s political theory, Jean Beer Blumenfeld Center for Ethics, Georgia State University, May 14-15, 2008.


Organizer, Fall 2007 Blumenfeld Ethics Center symposia - Ethics in Traffic:


Organizer: “Globalizing the American Way,” an interdisciplinary symposium, October 19, 2006, featuring: Maureen Kelley, assistant professor of philosophy at University of Alabama - Birmingham; Scott Beaulier, assistant professor of economics at Mercer University; and Michael Eriksen, director of Georgia State's Institute of Public Health.

Organizer, “Religion, Globalization, and Public Health,” September 27, 2006, an interfaith symposium featuring Plemont T. El-Amin, the Masjid Imam of the Atlanta Masjid of Al-Islam; Rabbi Joshua Lesser of Congregation Bet Haverim and the Rainbow Center in Atlanta; Rev. H. Ray Newman, Sr., Specialist of the Ethics Public Affairs Ministry of the Georgia Baptist Convention; and Kencho Tenzin, formerly a Buddhist monk with the Drepung Loseling Monastery in India.


Organizer: Panel discussion: "Religion, disasters, and the problem of suffering" (cosponsored with College of Arts and Sciences, Center for Neighborhood and Metropolitan Studies). Nov. 8, 2005.
Organizer: Philosophy, Religious Studies, Blumenfeld Ethics Center & Middle East Center Ossabaw


Co-organizer: Joel Feinberg Memorial Conference, April 1-2, 2005.


Organizer, ethics colloquia/events for Brown v. Board of Education 50th Anniversary: arranged promotional and educational materials, secured cosponsors (Office of Student Life/Leadership & Intercultural Relations, College of Arts and Sciences, Department of African American Studies, Program in Religious Studies, GSU Housing, Office of Undergraduate Studies):

Keynote Address, Raymond T. Diamond, Prof. of Law, Tulane University, November 5, 2004.


Organizer, symposium on same-sex marriage. Arranged a three-part symposium, secured cosponsors (College of Law, Department of Philosophy, Program in Religious Studies):

March 23, 2004: "Same-Sex Marriage and the Law" - Panelists: Clark Cunningham, W. Lee Burge Professor of Law & Ethics; L. Lynn Hogue, Professor in the College of Law at Georgia State University and Executive Director of the Southeastern Legal Foundation in Atlanta; Ellen Taylor, Associate Professor at Georgia State University's College of Law.

March 24, 2004: "Same-Sex Marriage and Religion" - Panelists: Richard A. Goode, Assoc. Prof. and Chair of Urban Studies, Beulah Heights Bible College; Rabbi Joshua Lesser, M.H. L. of Congregation Bet Haverim; B. Wiley Stephens, Senior Pastor, Dunwoody United Methodist Church; The Reverend Canon Gray Temple, Rector of St. Patrick's Episcopal Church.

March 25, 2004: "Same Sex Marriage: Ethics and Public Policy" - Panelists: Prof. John Corvino, Philosophy, Wayne State University; Randy Hicks, president of the Georgia Family Council; Prof. Juliana Kubala: Women’s Studies, GSU, and English, Clark Atlanta University.


SELECTED INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES:
Courses taught include ethics (graduate and undergraduate), philosophy of law, contemporary moral theory, social/political philosophy (history or contemporary, graduate or undergraduate), business ethics, history of modern, general introductory philosophy, introduction to logic.

Direction of Individual Student Work:
Georgia State University:
2009- Director, Lauren Wells, Honors Research Project, “A Critique of Restitution.”

University of South Carolina:

Washington and Lee University:

Membership on Committees for Individual Student Work
Georgia State University:

University of Oklahoma:

University of South Carolina:

Other instructional activities:
2008 “Leadership Ethics and Residential Life,” presentation to University Commons staff, October 15 and October 22, 2008.
2008 “Socrates, the gods, and the good”: a presentation to an audience at Georgia State University’s “family weekend,” October 6, 2007.
2003-2007 “Research Ethics,” presented to the Research, Education, and Development Program forum on Responsible Conduct of Research, Georgia State Univ., Sept. 18, 2003, and


2004 “Rejuvenating Ethics in the Liberal Arts: Ethics Centers in the University Community,” presentation to the annual meetings of the American Association of Colleges and Universities, January 2004, Washington, D.C.


1997 Participated in eight weekly workshops on teaching writing intensive courses: UWSP, Fall 1997.

PROFESSIONAL AND HONOR ORGANIZATION ACTIVITIES

Memberships: American Philosophical Association, Association for Practical and Professional Ethics, Society for Political, Social, and Legal Philosophy.
Curriculum Vitae

ANDREW JASON COHEN
November 2008

Department of Philosophy
College of Arts and Sciences
Georgia State University, PO Box 4089
Atlanta, GA 30302-4089

cohenaj@gsu.edu
Home: 404-534-6455
Office: 404-413-6128
Office Fax: 404-413-6124

ACADEMIC POSITIONS HELD

Associate Professor of Philosophy, Department of Philosophy
Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia (2008-present)

Assistant Professor of Philosophy, Department of Philosophy
Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia (2005-2008)

Assistant Professor of Philosophy, Department of Philosophy and Religion
James Madison University, Harrisonburg, Virginia (2000-2005)

Visiting Assistant Professor, Department of Philosophy

EDUCATION

Georgetown University
Ph.D., Philosophy (1997)
M.A., Philosophy (1994)

Emory University

AREAS OF SPECIALIZATION

Social and Political Philosophy, Normative Ethical Theory

AREAS OF COMPETENCE

History of Moral, Social, and Political Philosophy; Philosophy of Law; Medical and Environmental Ethics; Existentialism; Free Will; Philosophy of Religion

PUBLICATIONS


BOOK REVIEWS


WORKS IN PROGRESS OR UNDER REVIEW

“A Conceptual and (Preliminary) Normative Exploration of Waste” (to be submitted, Fall 2008)

“On Hard-headed Economics Capturing the Soft Side of Life and Improving Two Models of Obligation” (to be submitted, Fall 2008)

“Religion, Truth, and Toleration” (in progress)

“Toleration and the Good Life” (in progress)

“Toleration in the Economic Order” (in progress)

“Toleration in the International Arena” (in progress)


Letting Toleration Reign: What it Means, Why it Matters, What it Requires (in progress)

PRESENTATIONS


Models of Obligation often Extensionally Coincide” (Georgia Philosophical Society Fall 2006 Meeting, Agnes Scott College, Decatur, Georgia, November, 2006).

“About Objectivity and Morality.” Humanists of Georgia, Atlanta, Georgia May, 2008


“What Toleration Does and Does Not Require From Liberalism.” Invited Speaker, Department of Political Science, University of Virginia, March 2005.


“From Radical Choice to Real Impartiality: Existentialist Voluntarism as a Source of Normativity.” Invited Speaker, College of William and Mary Department of Philosophy, November 2002.

“The Shepherd, the Wolf, & the Sheep: An Exploration into Toleration and Liberalism.” Invited Speaker, MA College of Liberal Arts Philosophy Club, May 2002 and Hampden Sydney College Philosophy Club, February 2002.


“Religion and Life.” Guest Speaker, Center for Creative Photography, University of Arizona, May 2000.

“A Libertarian View of the Current Global Economy.” Guest Speaker, Students Against Sweatshops Colloquia Series, University of Arizona, October 1999.

“What Toleration is and What it Requires.” Invited Speaker, Social Philosophy and Policy Center and Department of Philosophy, Bowling Green State University and Departments of English, Political Science and Philosophy, University of Waterloo, July 1999.


Chair, Society for Philosophy and Public Affairs: “Compatriots, Friends and Political Obligation.”

GRANTS, ETC.

GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY GRANT TO IMPROVE RETENTION, PROGRESS, AND GRADUATION

GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATION GRANT

Summer 2006

NEH FACULTY DEVELOPMENT SEMINAR: POLITICAL OBLIGATION, DEMOCRATIC LEGITIMACY, AND HUMAN RIGHTS: THEORETICAL & APPLIED ISSUES (directed by Andrew Altman and Christopher Heath Wellman), Georgia State University. Participant, Summer 2005

LIBERTY FUND, INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA
Visiting Scholar, 2003-2004

PHILOSOPHY DEPARTMENT, UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
Visiting Scholar, Summer 2002

JMU COLLEGE OF ARTS AND LETTERS FACULTY DEVELOPMENT SUMMER RESEARCH GRANT
Summer 2002

NEH FACULTY DEVELOPMENT SEMINAR: SUPRANATIONALISM: THE ETHICS OF GLOBAL GOVERNANCE
(directed by The Carnegie Council on Ethics and International Affairs), School of International and Public Affairs, Columbia University. Participant, Summer 2001

SOCIAL PHILOSOPHY AND POLICY CENTER, BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY
Visiting Scholar, Summer 1999

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY (Fall 2005-present)
2000 level: Great Questions of Philosophy (Introductory)
4000/6000 level: Social and Political Philosophy, Philosophy of Law, Ethics
8000 level: Justice, Rights, and International Affairs
Independent Studies: On the Nature of Obligation; On Henry Richardson’s Practical & Public Reasoning

MA Thesis Committees:
Tim Crews-Anderson (Summer 2006, “The Impossibility of Evil Qua Evil: Kantian Limitations on Human Immorality”)
John Ranta (Summer 2006, “Nietzsche on the Future and Value”)
Sean Aas (Summer 2006, “Rawls’s Cosmopolitan Law of Peoples? The Place of Persons in a Peoples’ World”)
William Allen (Spring 2007, “In Defense of Rawlsian Constructivism”)
Jenn Hudgens (Spring 2007, “Perspectives on Perspectivism: Nietzsche and His Commentators”)
Brandon Byrd (Summer 2007, “Virtue Ethics and Moore’s Criticisms of Naturalism”)
Derrick Nantz (Fall 2007, “Nietzsche on Naturalism, Egoism and Altruism”)
Joe Adams (Chair; Spring 2008, “Retribution Conflicts with the Demands of Fairness”)
Joy Salvatore (Chair; Spring 2008, “Facing the Problems of Feminism: Working Toward Resolution”)
Maria Guorova (Summer 2008, “The Aesthetic Idea and the Unity of Cognitive Faculties in Kant’s Aesthetics”)
Ness Creighton (Summer 2008, “Kant, Jefferson, and Freedom and its Implications”)
Chase Turner (Chair; current, “Children, Harm and the State”)
Charles Carmichael (Chair; current, “Redistribution and the Disabled”)
Brent Hiatt (Chair; current, title undecided, on punishment)
Jason Craig (current, “Raz on Authority: Problems of Practical Reason and Expertise”)
Jodi Geever-Ostrowsky (current, title undecided, on the family in the state)
Grant Christopher (current, “Contemplation, Politics, and Virtue: An Aristotelian Inclusivist Position”)
Robert Underwood (current, “Warfare, Conceptual Unity, and the Just War Tradition”)
Harold Bennett (current, “A Critique of the Idea of Liberation in the Social Ethics of J. Deotis Roberts”)
BA Honors Thesis Committee:
Elijah Owour (Chair, Spring 2008, “Theory of Human Rights in The International Legal System)
McNair Fellow Advisor:
Jason Murray (Summer 2008, On the morality of the “Fair Tax”)

James Madison University (Fall 2000-Spring 2005)
100 level: regularly 2 sections of Introduction to Philosophy (sometimes Honors)
200 level: Introduction to Ethics; Environmental Ethics
300 level: The Individual, The State, and Justice; Moral Theory; Existentialism
400 level: The Limits of Liberty; Advanced Political Philosophy; Advanced Moral Theory
BA Thesis Committees:
Sarah Hippolitus (2002 Philosophy, on Mackie and Nagel)
Jonathon Norris (2003 History, on Dostoevsky and Nietzsche)

University of Arizona (Fall 1997-Spring 2000)
100 level: Philosophical Perspectives on Society; Justice and Virtue; Introduction to Philosophy; Logic and Critical Thinking
200 level: Existentialism; 19th Century Philosophy: Hegel to Nietzsche; Philosophy of Religion
300 level: Medical Ethics
4/500 level: History of Political Philosophy; History of Moral Philosophy; Normative Ethics
Independent Study: Plato’s Moral & Political Thought

Georgetown University (Fall 1994-Spring 1997)
100 level: Ethics and Public Policy; Introduction to Philosophy

Service
Georgia State University Philosophy Department
Academic Program Review Committee Chair (2008-2009)
College Curriculum Committee (2008-2009)
Executive Committee (2008-2009)
Promotion and Tenure Committee (2008-2009)
Program Committee (2007-2009)
Coordinator, Program for Retention, Progress, and Graduation (2006-2009; authored proposals)
Alternate, University Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (2006-2009)
Assessment Committee Chair and Coordinator (2005-2009)
Lecturer Search Committee Chair (2007-2008; hired Ed Cox)
Metaphysics or Epistemology, Senior Position, Search Committee (2006-2008)
Chair, Visitor Instructor Search Committee (Spring 2006 and Spring 2007)
Graduate Student Committee (2005-2007)
19th Century/Continental, Tenure Track, Search Committee (2005-2006)
Metaphysics or Epistemology, Tenure Track, Search Committee (2005-2006)
Departmental Secretary (2005-2006)

James Madison University Department of Philosophy and Religion
Personnel Advisory Committee (2004-2005)
Student Educational Policies Committee (2000-2005)
Philosophy Curriculum Committee (2000-2003; Chair 2002-2003)
Advisor, Philosophy Minors (2001-2003)

College of Arts and Letters, James Madison University
Writing in the Disciplines Committee (2000-2001)

Regional
Coordinator, 2003 Virginia Philosophical Association Conference (Mary Baldwin College, Staunton, VA, October 17-18, 2003)
President, Virginia Philosophical Association (2002-2003)
Coordinator, 2002 Virginia Philosophical Association Conference (University of Richmond, Richmond, VA, October 18-19, 2002)
Vice-President and Acting President, Virginia Philosophical Association (2001-2002)

Publishing
Reviewer of proposal for an edited volume on contemporary work in analytic existentialism for Cambridge University Press (2002)

Other:
President, Avondale Estates Condominium Association President (2007-2009)
Secretary, Avondale Estates Condominium Association Secretary (2006-2007)
Member, Family Selection Committee, Central Valley Habitat for Humanity (VA, 2003)
WILLIAM A. EDMUNDSON

Georgia State University
College of Law
Atlanta, Georgia 30302-4037
404-413-9167
wedmundson@gsu.edu

Urban Life Building
Room 458
140 Decatur Street, NE
Fax: 404-413-9225
http://law.gsu.edu/wedmundson/

ACADEMIC EMPLOYMENT

Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia

University of Mississippi, Oxford, Mississippi
Assistant Professor of Law, 1989-90. Courses taught: Jurisprudence; Torts; Legal Profession; Legal Writing

PUBLICATIONS: Books

An Introduction to Rights

The Blackwell Guide to the Philosophy of Law, co-edited with Martin P. Golding

The Duty to Obey the Law: Selected Philosophical Readings
(Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield, 1999)

Three Anarchical Fallacies: An Essay on Political Authority

PUBLICATIONS: Articles, Chapters, Comments, and Essays

Pluralism, Intransitivity, Incoherence
In Mark White, ed., Theoretical Foundations of Law and Economics (Cambridge 2009)
Comments on Fred Schauer’s “Stare Decisis in the Supreme Court”
Georgia State University Law Review (forthcoming)

Adding Reasons Up
In Barbara Montero and Mark White, eds., Economics and Mind (Routledge 2007)

The Virtue of Law-Abidance
Philosophers’ Imprint, vol. 6, no. 4 (December 2006)
www.philosophersimprint.org/006004

“First Force”
Journal of Ethics and Social Philosophy www.jesp.org, (2005), vol. 1, no. 3

Comments on Richard Arneson’s “Joel Feinberg and the Justification of Hard Paternalism”


State of the Art: The Duty to Obey the Law

Locke and Load
Law and Philosophy 22:195-216 (2003)(review essay on A. John Simmons,
Justification and Legitimacy)

Afterword: Proportionality and the Difference Death Makes

The Contextualist Answer to Skepticism and What a Lawyer Cannot Know
Florida State University Law Review 30:1-23 (2002), response by Rob Atkinson

Social Meaning, Compliance Conditions, and Law's Claim to Authority

Civility as Political Constraint

Introduction: Some Recent Work on Political Obligation

Legitimate Authority without Political Obligation
Law and Philosophy 17:43-60 (1998)

The Antinomy of Coherence and Determinacy
(Fall, 1998)

Transparency and Indeterminacy in the Liberal Critique of Critical Legal Studies


Liberalism, Legal Decisionmaking and Morality “As Such”


Are Law and Morality Distinct?

Lawyers’ Justice

*Moral Relativism and the Basis of Obligation*
Doctoral Dissertation (University Microfilms, 1982)

PUBLICATIONS: Book Reviews and Other Publications

Review of Christopher Wellman and A. John Simmons, *The Duty to Obey the Law: For and Against Law and Philosophy* (forthcoming)

*Notre Dame Philosophical Reviews*, [http://ndpr.nd.edu/review.cfm?id=8225](http://ndpr.nd.edu/review.cfm?id=8225)

William Godwin
Letter to the Editor, *The Times Literary Supplement*, January 13, 2006, at 15

She

Speeding: A Sprawling Offense?
*Fulton County Daily Report* (Oct. 25, 2002)

Abstract of Liam Murphy, “Beneficence, Law, and Liberty: The Case of Required Rescue,”
*APA Newsletter on Law and Philosophy* 101:140-31 (Spring 2002)

Ethics 111:644-48 (2001)


Clinton & the Jones Case

*APA Newsletter on Law and Philosophy* 97:108 (Spring 1998)


Letter to *Word Court*

*Philosophical Psychology* 7:135-37 (1994)

Ethics 104:394-96 (1994)

British Privacy Debate Swayed U.S. Decisions


Discovery of Federal Income Tax Returns and the New “Qualified” Privileges

Book Notes
WORK in PROGRESS or UNPUBLISHED

Morality without Responsibility
(article, on submission)

*Carving Morality at Its Joints*
(book ms., three chapters completed)

*Hart and His Critics*
(book ms., five chapters completed)

*Posterity and Embodiment*
(book proposal, on submission)

The Social Enforcement of Morality
(abstract and downloadable draft in the SSRN Working Paper Series)
Body and Soul in the Year 2020: Moral and Ethical Considerations in our Biological Future
(entered in the Greenwall Foundation Oscar M. Ruebhausen Award competition)

Liberating the Future from the Past? Liberating the Past from the Future?

Comments on Coherence Theory in the Philosophy of Law
(unpublished remarks delivered at APA Central Division meeting, 1994)

EDUCATION

Duke University, Durham, North Carolina
J.D. 1985

University of California, Berkeley, California
Ph.D. 1982

Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio
B.A. 1972

PRIZES, FELLOWSHIPS and AWARDS

University College, Oxford
H.L.A. Hart Visiting Fellow
Oxford University Centre for Ethics and Philosophy of Law; Trinity term, 2006

Patricia Morgan Award for Outstanding Faculty Scholarship
Georgia State University College of Law, 2006
Visiting Research Fellow  
Institute for Advanced Studies in the Humanities, University of Edinburgh, 1997  
(unable to take up)

Henry M. Phillips Research Grant in Jurisprudence  
American Philosophical Society, 1991

J.D. awarded with honors, Duke University; Order of the Coif; Member and Article Editor, *Duke Law Journal*

Ralph W. Church Scholar  
University of California, Berkeley, 1975-76

OTHER EMPLOYMENT

Gibbs & Holmes, Charleston, South Carolina  
Attorney, 1986-89

The Hon. John C. Godbold, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit  
Law Clerk, 1985-86

Bondurant, Miller, Hishon & Stephenson, Atlanta, Georgia  
Summer Law Clerk, 1984

Hunton & Williams, Richmond, Virginia  
Summer Law Clerk, 1983

PRESENTATIONS, CONFERENCES, SEMINARS, AND WORKSHOPS

Will speak on “Authority,” on panel with David Estlund and Stephen Perry  
Association of American Law Schools, San Diego, CA, January 2009

Analytical Legal Philosophy Conference  
Yale Law School, April 2008

Workshop on Arthur Ripstein’s ms. on Kant’s Political Philosophy  
Georgia State University, April 2008

Analytical Legal Philosophy Conference  
University of California, Berkeley, April 13-14, 2007

Spoke on “Copyright Disobedience from a Rawlsian Perspective,” as part of a panel on “The Morality of Copyright Disobedience.” Annual Meeting of the AALS, Washington DC, January 4, 2007

Workshop on Joe Carens’s ms. on justice in immigration
Georgia State University Center for Ethics, November 2006

Presented “Primary Rules and the Virtue of Sociability,” at the University of San Diego College of Law faculty colloquium. September 22, 2006

Interdisciplinary Colloquium on Current Issues in Law and Philosophy
University College London; July 3-4, 2006

Graduate Seminar on Rationality
Presented “Reasons, Requirements, and Maximization”
University of Oxford; June 14, 2006

Conference on The Philosophical Justifications of Political Violence
Presented “Group Desert”; Commentator: John Gardner
Oxford Centre for Ethics and the Philosophy of Law
University of Oxford; June 10, 2006

Jurisprudence Discussion Group
Presented “The Virtue of Law-Abidance”
University of Oxford; June 1, 2006

Cambridge Forum for Legal and Political Philosophy
Presented “The Virtue of Law-Abidance”
University of Cambridge; May 17, 2006

Analytical Legal Philosophy Conference
UCLA; April 7-8, 2006

NEH Seminar on Political Obligation, Democratic Legitimacy, and Human Rights: Theoretical and Applied Issues
Presented “The Virtue of Law-Abidance”
Georgia State University Center for Ethics; June 21, 2005

Legal Analytical Philosophy Conference
University of Texas, April 8-9, 2005

A Conference on the Work of Joel Feinberg
Commentator
Georgia State University Center for Ethics; April 1-2, 2005

Workshop on Thomas Christiano’s The Constitution of Equality
Georgia State University Center for Ethics; February 18-19, 2005

Legal Analytical Philosophy Conference
New York University, April 16-17, 2004
Privacy: An Interdisciplinary Colloquium
Presented “Privacy as a Right to do Wrong”
University of Utah; April 2, 2004

Workshop on David Schmidtz’s *The Elements of Justice*
Georgia State University Center for Ethics; March 12-13, 2004

Transvision 2003: The Adaptable Human Body, Yale University
Presented “Posterity and Embodiment”; June 29, 2003

Workshop on Larry May’s *International Criminal Law*
Georgia State University Center for Ethics; May 2003

Philosophy Forum, Georgia State University
Presented “What Philosophy Can Tell Policy”; October 23, 2002

Legal Analytical Philosophy Conference
Yale University, April 8-9, 2002

Workshop on Allan Buchanan’s *Moral Foundations of International Law*
Georgia State University Center for Ethics; May 2002

Philosophy Forum, Georgia State University
Presented “Logical Gaps in Morality”; April 5, 2002

American Philosophical Association, Eastern Division Annual Meeting
Moderator of Death Penalty Panel, Atlanta, Georgia, December 27, 2001

Florida State University Faculty Forum
Presented “What A Lawyer Cannot Know”; November 6, 2001

Philosophy Forum, Georgia State University
Commented on George Rainbolt’s “The Concept of Rights”; November 1, 2001

Legal Analytical Philosophy Conference
University of Chicago, April 3-4, 2001

Federalist Society, GSU Chapter
Presented “First Force” Georgia State University; March 29, 2001

Georgia Philosophical Society
Presented “Toward a Role-Differentiated Epistemology”
Emory University; November 18, 2000

“Morality and Its Other(s)”
Conference presentation, Albion College, November 11, 2000 (unable to attend)
Legal Analytical Philosophy Conference
Columbia University; April 7-8, 2000

Georgia Philosophical Society
Presented “The Necessary Enforceability of Morality”, Athens, Georgia; April 17, 1999

Legal Analytical Philosophy Conference
University of Pennsylvania; April 9-10, 1999

Working Group on Law, Culture, and the Humanities
Presented “The Social Enforcement of Morality”
Wake Forest University; March 22, 1999

AMINTAPHIL Conference
Presented “Civility as Political Constraint”
Montreal, Quebec; September 24-27, 1998

Legal Analytical Philosophy Conference
University of San Diego; April 2-4, 1998

Tort Theory Workshop
National Humanities Center; September 26-28, 1997

Legal Analytical Philosophy Conference
Columbia University; April 4-5, 1997

Center for Ethics/Philosophy Forum
Presented “The Duty to Obey the Law”
Georgia State University; January 16, 1997

Atlanta Area Seminar In Analytic Philosophy
Participant, since 1996

AMINTAPHIL Conference
Charleston, South Carolina, November 10-12, 1994

Reading Group on John Rawls’s Political Liberalism
Georgia State University; summer 1994

American Philosophical Association, Central Division Annual Meeting
Commentator on “Coherence Theory in the Philosophy of Law”
Kansas City, Missouri; May 6, 1994

Federalist Society, GSU Chapter
Spoke on “Rights of Unwed Fathers”, Georgia State University; October 18, 1993
Georgia Political Science Association
Panelist, “Teaching Ethics in Georgia: Substance and Method”
Savannah, Georgia; February 26-27, 1993

Federalist Society, GSU Chapter
Spoke on “Voucher Plans, Funding the Arts, and Immigration Policy”
Georgia State University; March 11, 1992

“Distressed Real Estate: Advanced Issues” CLE
Lectured on “Ethical Issues”
Atlanta, Georgia; November 15-16, 1991

Ole Miss Philosophy Club
Spoke on “Law and Morality”
University of Mississippi; January 1990

South Carolina Society for Philosophy, Annual Meeting
Presented “Is Moral Conventionalism a Relativism?”
Clemson University; February 17, 1989

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS and SERVICE

Cambridge Introductions to Philosophy and Law
General Editor (2003-08)

Law and Philosophy: An International Journal for Jurisprudence and Legal Philosophy
Member, Editorial Board

American Philosophical Association
Member of the Committee on Philosophy and Law, 1999-2002

Jean Beer Blumenfeld Center for Ethics
Georgia State University; Advisory Board member, since 1995

Research Faculty member of the Brain and Social Behaviors Group, Brains and Behaviors Program, Georgia State University, 2003-

Law and Interpretation Section, Association of American Law Schools
Secretary, 1998-99

AMINTAPHIL
Member; March 2000 San Diego Conference Program Committee

American Society for Political and Legal Philosophy
Member
Southern Society for Philosophy and Psychology

The Aristotelian Society
Member

State Bar of Georgia
Member 1985-present (inactive since 2002)

South Carolina Bar
Member 1986 (inactive since 1995; resigned 2002)

MISCELLANEOUS

Consultant to Free Speech on Campus, on the “Intellectual Diversity” bill, H.B. 154


*The Garden of Forking Paths*, Blogger, January 2006

Faculty Advisor, Joint JD-MA in Philosophy Program, Georgia State University, 2000


Special Topic Editor, American Philosophical Association *Newsletter on Philosophy and Law*, issue on the duty to obey the law, Fall 1999


Volunteer Attorney, *Christenson v. State*, Case No. S90P1386, in the Supreme Court of Georgia, a defendant’s death penalty appeal

Volunteer Attorney, *State v. Murphy*, Case No. Z47974, Fulton County Superior Court, a “crack” cocaine distribution defense

Volunteer Attorney, *Coleman v. Miller* (11th Cir.), a constitutional challenge to the inclusion of the Confederate battle flag in the Georgia state flag

Occasional consultant to the *Atlanta Constitution*, the *Fulton County Daily Reporter*, WQXI-TV, CNN (Cable News Network)

Co-instructor, “Legal Reelism,” an undergraduate honors seminar on law in the movies, with Georgia State University College of Arts and Sciences faculty, Spring 1993

Co-founder, Prisoner Rights Project, Duke Law School, 1984

Adjunct Instructor Introduction to Philosophy: Belief and Value; College of Charleston, Charleston, South Carolina; 3 hours; Fall 1988, Spring 1989

Teaching Assistant in Logic and Introduction to Philosophy; UC-Berkeley

Graduate Chair, Philosophy Colloquium Committee, UC-Berkeley, 1976-77

PERSONAL

Married to Ann Weisler Edmundson (Cantab.; Ph.D., M. Chir.); daughter: Isabella; extracurricular interests include squash, crosswords, and hiking

REFERENCES

Upon request

Last updated: October 30, 2008
GEORGE GRAHAM
PROFESSOR OF PHILOSOPHY AND NEUROSCIENCE
GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY

Contact Information
Department of Philosophy, P. O. Box 4089, Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia 30302-4089, USA. Office Phone: 404-413-6106. Office Fax: 404-413-6124. Office Physical Location: 34 Peachtree Street, Suite 1100. Email: ggraham@gsu.edu or ggrhm@yahoo.com

Employment History

Georgia State University
Professor of Philosophy and Neuroscience
Fall 2008-Present

Wake Forest University
A.C. Reid Professor of Philosophy, Spring 2003-2008
Adjunct Neuroscience Program Graduate Faculty, Spring 03-08

University of Alabama at Birmingham (UAB)
Professor of Philosophy, 1988-2002
Chair, Department of Philosophy, 1983-2001
Associate Professor of Philosophy, 1982-1988
Assistant Professor of Philosophy, 1975-1982

Research and Scholarship

Philosophy of mind; philosophical psychopathology (philosophy and psychiatry); consciousness and Intentionality.

Books-in-Compositional Progress

The Disordered Mind: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Mind and Mental Illness. Due to appear with Routlege in 2009.


Papers or Chapters in Compositional Progress


In Press Completed Papers/Chapters


Published Books


Scholarly Book Series Edited


Scholarly Journal Edited

Behavior and Philosophy. (Co-editor with Peter Killeen; then editor). Cambridge Center for Behavioral Studies, 1984-91. Formerly known as Behaviorism.

Published Articles and Chapters (from most recent)
(*indicates reprinted; reprint is second entry)


Paper also published in Europe in the Proceedings of the 27th International Wittgenstein
Symposium as follows: M. Reicher and J. Marek (eds.), *Experience and Analysis*: Vienna, 2005, pp. 191-207.


Self-Consciousness, Mental Agency, and the Clinical Psychopathology of Thought-Insertion. (Co-


Reprinted in *Folk Psychology and the Philosophy of Mind*, edited by Scott Christensen and Dale Turner.


Reprinted in *Connectionism and the Philosophy of Mind*, edited by Terence Horgan and John Tienson.


Reprinted in *Folk Psychology and the Philosophy of Mind*, edited by Scott Christensen and Dale Turner.


    Reprinted in Gender Basics, edited by Anne Minas.


**Book Reviews**


Plus 12+ book reviews (authored or co-authored) in such journals as Canadian Philosophical Reviews, Ethics, Jamaica Journal, Mind, Philosophical Psychology, Philosophical Quarterly, Contemporary Psychology, and Trends in Cognitive Science as well as on-line for Metapsychology and Notre Dame Philosophical Reviews.

**Research Miscellaneous** (Dictionary entries etc.)

Co-authored editorial introductions for Person to Person, Philosophical Psychopathology, Philosophy Then and Now, A Companion to Cognitive Science, and Reconceiving Schizophrenia. Bibliographic information, see above.

Special Teaching Experience, Honors and Awards

Experience –

At Georgia State:
Graduate Seminar in Philosophy, Mental Health, and Mental Disorder

At Wake Forest:
Special Freshman Year Seminar (Fall 2003, Spring 2006)
Mad Minds, Broken Minds
Plus electives in
Philosophy of Mind
Contemporary Philosophy
Philosophy, Mental Illness, and Mental Health

At UAB:
About 3 dozen courses, including seminars, team taught courses, and graduate courses.
Representatives include
Mind/Brain (with M. Friedlander, then Chair UAB/Now Chair Baylor, Neurobiology)
Conceiving Childhood
Conscious Mind
Epistemology
Five Immoral Acts
Metaphysical Foundations of Cognitive Science
Illusion and Reality
Language, Mind, and Communication
Philosophy, Mental Health, and Mental Disorder
Problems of Consciousness

Honors & Awards --
UAB:
President's Excellence in Teaching Award for School of Arts and Humanities
Outstanding Teacher in UAB Honors Program
Twice Finalist for University Ingalls' Award for Classroom Teaching Excellence

Editorial, Advisory or Research Boards
Behavior and Philosophy (Cambridge Center for Behavioral Studies)
Brain and Mind (Kluwer Academic Publishers; journal discontinued)
Companion to Consciousness (Blackwell)
Field Guide to the Philosophy of Mind (Societa Italiano Filosofia Analitica)
Consciousness and Emotion (John Benjamins)
Reader/Reviewer
About 2 dozen journals, book publishers, and professional organizations, institutions, and foundations

Invited Lectures
For philosophy departments or related programs of various institutions including (among others): Arkansas, Bentley, Claremont, Clemson, Cincinnati-Dayton, Davidson, Duke, East Carolina, Emory, Finch University (Medical School), Georgia State, Houston, Memphis, North Carolina State University, Oklahoma State, Texas (Austin), University of California at San Diego, University of West Indies, Virginia Tech, and Washington University in St. Louis.

For various professional societies or associations including (among others): Society for Philosophy & Psychology; Association for the Scientific Study of Consciousness; American Philosophical Association; European Society for Philosophy and Psychology; North American Sartre Society; Southern Society for Philosophy and Psychology.

External Promotion and Tenure Reviewer
External reviews for promotion and tenure candidates at the following universities: Alabama-Huntsville, Cincinnati, City College of the City University of New York, Duke, Emory University, Hertfordshire (UK), Indiana University (South Bend), Memphis, New Orleans, North Carolina State, South Florida, Rice, Texas (Austin and San Antonio), UCSD, Virginia Tech, Washington University at St. Louis, and York (Canada).

Education
Ph.D. Philosophy, Brandeis University, 1975
   Dissertation topic: The identities of persons
   Advisor: J. Van Heijenoort.  2nd Reader: M. Weitz
M.A. Philosophy, Western Ontario, 1969
B.A. with Honors, Philosophy, Fordham University, 1967

Past President (2004-05), Society for Philosophy & Psychology

Updated: September 23, 2008
CHRISTIE J. HARTLEY

Curriculum Vitae

Department of Philosophy
Georgia State University
34 Peachtree Street, 1103
P.O. Box 4089
Atlanta, GA 30302-4089
404.413.6123
chartley@gsu.edu

EMPLOYMENT
Georgia State University, Assistant Professor of Philosophy, 2005-present
- Affiliate Faculty Member of the Women’s Studies Institute, 2006-present

EDUCATION
University of Michigan, School of Law, completed first year curriculum, 1998-1999
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1994-1998. B.A. Philosophy and Political Science
with Highest Distinction and Honors, 1998

AREAS OF SPECIALIZATION
Social and Political Philosophy, Ethics, Feminist Philosophy

DISSERTATION
Justice for All: Constructing an Inclusive Contractualism
Committee: Elizabeth Anderson (Chair), Stephen Darwall, Peter Railton, Arlene Saxonhouse

FELLOWSHIPS, HONORS, AND AWARDS
American Association of University Women, Short-Term Research Publication Grant, 2006-2007
Outstanding Graduate Student Instructor Award (Graduate School, University of Michigan), 2004
Rackham Predoctoral Fellowship (Graduate School, University of Michigan), 2003-2004
Institute for the Humanities Graduate Student Fellowship (Institute for the Humanities, University of Michigan), declined, 2003-2004
Community of Scholars Summer Fellow (Institute for Research on Women and Gender, University of Michigan), 2003
John Dewey Prize for Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching (Philosophy Department, University of Michigan), 2002-2003
Phi Beta Kappa (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill), 1997
WORK IN PROGRESS


“Is a Feminist Political Liberalism Possible?” co-authored with Lori Watson, in preparation.

PRESENTATIONS
Refereed Talks

Invited Talks


Commentaries
Comments on Joseph Carens’s manuscript on immigration
Jean Beer Blumenfeld Center for Ethics, Georgia State University, November 10th and 11th, 2006.

Comments on A. John Simmons’s “Political Philosophy”
Jean Beer Blumenfeld Center for Ethics, Georgia State University, November 4th and 5th, 2005.

TEACHING EXPERIENCE
M.A. Thesis, chair or co-chair:
Adams, Joseph, “Morris’s Retributivism Fails to Justify Punishment” (defended April 7, 2008, Georgia State University)
Carmichael, Charles, “The Indirect Contribution of Persons Unable to Work” (in progress)
Fulfer, Katherine, “The Category ‘Woman’: Feminism after the Essentialism Critique”
Salvatore, Joy, “Facing the Problems of Feminism: Working Toward Resolution” (defended April 14, 2008, Georgia State University)

M.A. Thesis, committee member:
Aas, Sean, “Rawls’s Cosmopolitan Law of Peoples? Persons in a People’s World” (defended June 15, 2006, Georgia State University)
Allen, William, “In Defense of Rawlsian Constructivism” (defended March 30, 2007, Georgia State University)
Delmas, Candice “Liberalism and the Worst-Result Principle: Preventing Tyranny, Protecting Civil Liberty” (defended June 20, 2006, Georgia State University)
Lei, Kun, “Defending Lucretius’ Symmetry Argument against the Fear of Death” (defended April 27, 2007, Georgia State University)
Phillips, Daleana, “Constructing Definitions of Sexual Orientation in Research” (defended July 30, 2007, Georgia State University)
Ridley, Knox, “Property Without Government” (defended July 13, 2007, Georgia State University)
Slade IV, Joseph W, “Aristotelian Liberal Virtues” (defended April 11, 2008, Georgia State University)

Honors Thesis Director:
Horwitz, Vicki, “Open Borders” (completed May 2008)

M.A. Seminar:
Seminar in Social and Political Philosophy (“The Political Philosophy of John Rawls,” Georgia State University)

Upper Level Undergraduate/M.A. Level:
Ethics (Georgia State University)
Philosophical Perspectives on Women (Georgia State University)

Introductory Undergraduate:
Great Questions of Philosophy (Georgia State University)
Introduction to Philosophy (University of Michigan)

Assisted:
Problems of Philosophy (University of Michigan, James Joyce)
History of Ancient Philosophy (University of Michigan, Rachana Kamtekar)
Contemporary Moral Problems (University of Michigan, Peter Railton)
Law and Philosophy (University of Michigan, Elizabeth Anderson)

PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIPS
American Philosophical Association
Society for Analytical Feminism
ACADEMIC SERVICE
Philosophy Department, Georgia State University
Colloquium Director, 2005-2008
Member of Executive Committee, 2005-2007
Member of Senior Faculty Search Committee, 2006-2008
Triennial Evaluation Committee for Department Chair, Spring 2006
Member of Faculty Search Committee (metaphysics and epistemology), 2005-2006
Member of Faculty Search Committee (19th-century continental philosophy), 2005-2006
Member of Assessment Committee, 2005-2006
Advisor to Philosophy Majors, 2007-2008
Member of Lecturer Search Committee, Spring 2008

Profession
Referee for Political Studies (2007)

Last updated October, 2008.
PETER LINDSAY
Director, Center for Teaching and Learning
Associate Professor of Political Science and Philosophy
Georgia State University
38 Peachtree Center Avenue
GCB – 1005
Atlanta, GA 30303

EDUCATION
Ph.D., Political Science (Theory), University of Toronto
M.A., Political Science (Theory), University of Toronto
B.A., Political Science & Italian, University of Colorado

INTELLECTUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Book

Refereed Journal Articles
“Representing Redskins: Professional Sports and the Ethics of Native American Team Names” Journal of Philosophy and Sport (Forthcoming)


“Lincoln on Secession.” Social Theory and Practice Volume 29, Number 1, 2003 (with Christopher Wellman).


Under Review:
“Property by Agreement” Philosophy and Public Affairs
Review Essays/Book Reviews/Book Notes


Dancing in Chains: Narrative and Memory in Political Theory, by Joshua Dienstag (Political Theory, August 1999).

Philosophy, Science and Ideology in Political Thought, by David Morrice (Ethics, October 1998).

Solidarity in the Conversation of Humankind: The Ungroundable Liberalism of Richard Rorty, by Norman Geras (Ethics, January, 1997).

Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity, by Francis Fukuyama (The Review of Politics, Fall, 1996).


Other Publications

Atlanta Journal Constitution editorial “Love affair with car carries hidden costs” (11/27/07)

Atlanta Journal Constitution editorial: “Facts show Cheney has it all wrong” (9/13/04)

Atlanta Journal Constitution editorial: “Political insight has lost a champion” (11/29/02)

Atlanta Journal Constitution editorial: “Atrocity is hardly our nation’s alone” (9/11/02)
Atlanta Journal Constitution editorial: “Busting the Braves’ chops” (10/19/99)

Invited Lectures


“Just War Theory,” Clayton College and State University, April 19, 2005.


Conference Participation

“Inspiring Teachers to Learn about Teaching” (2008 Southern Regional Faculty and Instructional Development Consortium Annual Meeting)

“Deliberative Democrats Talk Property” (2007 Southern Political Science Association Annual Meeting)

“Are the Judgments of Conscience Unreasonable?” (2006 Southern Political Science Association Annual Meeting)

Participant on John Simmons Manuscript Workshop, Blumenfeld Ethics Center, Georgia State University (October, 2005)

“Are the Judgments of Conscience Unreasonable?” (2005 Northeastern Political Science Association Annual Meeting)

“Polanyi and Hayek, 60 Years Later” (10th International Karl Polanyi Conference, Istanbul, Turkey, October, 2005)

“Representing Redskins: Professional Sports and the Ethics of Native American Team Names” (Annual Conference of the International Political Science Associations Research Committee on Political Philosophy, April, 2005)

“Representing Redskins: Professional Sports and the Ethics of Native American Team Names” (2005 Midwest Political Science Association Meeting)

Participant on Tom Christiano Manuscript Workshop, Blumenfeld Ethics Center, Georgia State University (February, 2005)
“What Rights of Property Would We *Really* Agree to?” (2004 Western Political Science Association Meeting)

“Liberal Neutrality and the Myth of Free Markets” (2003 Canadian Political Science Association Meeting)

“Comments on The Legacy of C.B. Macpherson” (2003 Canadian Political Science Association Meeting)

Participant on Larry May Manuscript Workshop, Blumenfeld Ethics Center, Georgia State University (March 2003)

“Comments on Religion and the Liberal State” (2002 Southern Political Science Association Meeting)

“Comments on Cosmopolitan Politics and Political Theory” (2002 Canadian Political Science Association Meeting)

“Comments on the Problems of Liberalism in Theory and Practice” (2001 Southern Political Science Association Meeting)

Participant on Allen Buchanan Manuscript Workshop, Blumenfeld Ethics Center, Georgia State University (March 2001)

“Liberal Property Rights” (2000 Southern Political Science Association Meeting)

“Comments on Geeks and Monsters: Hate Crime Subjectivity in Perspective” (Conference on Hate Crimes; Jean Beer Blumenfeld Center for Ethics, Georgia State University, April, 2000)

“Episodes in the Disembodiment Narrative: The Communitarians, Macpherson and Marx” (1997 Canadian Political Science Association Annual Meeting)

“Ontology, Labour and Markets” (1993 Canadian Political Science Association Annual Meeting)

**TEACHING EXPERIENCE**

| 2006-present | Georgia State University – Associate Professor |
| 1999-2006     | Georgia State University – Assistant Professor |
| 1996-1999     | Harvard University – Lecturer on Social Studies |
| Fall 1998     | University of New Hampshire – Visiting Lecturer |
| 1995-96       | University of Toronto – Adjunct Professor |
| 1988-95       | University of Toronto – Teaching Assistant |
| 1990-92       | Harvard University – Teaching Fellow |
| 1984-88       | Thayer Academy, Braintree, MA – High School history teacher |
COURSES TAUGHT

Georgia State University (1999-Present)

Graduate level:

- Feminist Political Theory
- Classical and Early Modern Political Thought
- Modern Political Thought
- Liberalism and Its Critics
- Contemporary Political Philosophy
- The Political Theory of Economic Justice

Undergraduate level:

- Feminist Political Theory
- Introduction to Political Theory
- Introduction to Political Science
- Classical and Early Modern Political Thought
- Contemporary Political Philosophy
- Modern Political Thought
- Liberalism and Its Critics
- The Political Theory of Economic Justice

Independent studies directed:

- Machiavelli and Kautilya
- Contemporary Political Philosophy
- Feminist Political Theory
- The Political Thought of Alexis de Tocqueville
- The Political Thought of Niccolò Machiavelli
- Just War Theory

Harvard University (1996-1999)

- Introduction to Social Studies A (Fall)
- Introduction to Social Studies B (Spring)
- The State and Economic Life
- The Political Theory of Economic Justice
- Senior thesis supervision and evaluation

University of New Hampshire (1998)

- Feminist Political Theory

University of Toronto (1995-1996)

- American Political Thought
  (co-taught with Melissa Williams)
- Modern Political Theory (Erindale Campus)
- Thinking About Politics
  (co-taught with former Ontario Premier Bob Rae)
RECENT ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERIENCE

- Review, Georgia Board of Regents Teaching Awards (2008)
- Director of Georgia State University Italian exchange program (2001-2007)
- Member, Classrooms Committee (2007-present)
- Member, Georgia State University Faculty Senate (2007-present)
- Content Knowledge Committee (2002-2005)
- Member, Professional Education Faculty (2002-2005)
- Member, Jean Blumenfeld Center for Ethics (1999-present)
- Affiliate faculty member, Women’s Studies Institute (1999-present)
- Affiliate faculty member, Honors Program (2006-2008)
- Board of Governors, Women’s Studies Institute (2000-1)
- Library Liaison, Women’s Studies Institute (2001-2002)
- Executive Committee, College of Arts and Sciences Humanities Initiative (2006-present)
- Undergraduate Committee, Department of Political Science (2006-2008)
- Executive Committee, Department of Political Science (2001-2, 2003-4, 2005-6, 2006-7)
- Self-Study Committee, Department of Political Science (2006-7)
- Faculty Advisor, Pi Sigma Alpha (Political Science Honors Society) (2000-2002)

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

Memberships

- American Philosophical Association
- American Political Science Association
- Canadian Political Science Association
- Northeastern Political Science Association
- Southern Political Science Association
- Western Political Science Association

Manuscript Reviewer

- Journal of Politics
- History of Political Thought
- Blackwell Publishing
- Politics & Policy

AWARDS

- 2007 Georgia Board of Regents Hall of Fame Teaching Award
- American Political Science Association and Pi Sigma Alpha citation for Outstanding Teaching in Political Science
- 2005 Georgia State University College of Arts and Sciences Outstanding Teaching Award
  (See PS: Political Science & Politics Volume XXXVIII, Number 4, October 2005, pg. 751)
· 2005 Georgia State University Distinguished Honors Professor Award
  (See PS: Political Science & Politics Volume XXXVIII, Number 4, October 2005, pg. 751)
· Phi Beta Delta Honors Society for International Scholars (inducted 2005)
· Golden Key Honors Society (inducted 2005)
· Georgia State University Writing Across the Curriculum Grant (2003)
· Derek Bok Award for Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching (Harvard University)
· University of Toronto Open Fellowship

REFERENCES

Available upon request
MELISSA McBAY MERRITT

Department of Philosophy
Georgia State University
P.O. Box 4089
Atlanta, GA 30302
Webpage: <http://www2.gsu.edu/~phlmmm/>

Education
Ph.D., Philosophy, University of Pittsburgh; 2004
B.A., Philosophy, Yale University (with honors, and with distinction in the major); 1994

Employment
Assistant Professor, Georgia State University, 2004-present

Areas of Specialization
Kant, History of Modern Philosophy

Areas of Competence
Aesthetics, Ethics, History of Ancient Philosophy

Dissertation
“Drawing from the Sources of Reason: Reflective Self-Knowledge in Kant’s First Critique”
Committee: Stephen Engstrom (director), John McDowell, Nicholas Rescher, and James Conant

Publications


Work in progress
“The Moral Source of the Kantian Sublime.” (Invited, for a collection on the sublime edited by Timothy Costelloe, for Cambridge University Press.)

“Kant’s Argument for the Apperception Principle.” (Under review.)

“Humility, Reflection, and Moral Illusion in Kant.”

“Taste and the Assessment of Moral Norms in Hume and Smith.”

Presentations
Commentator on Arthur Ripstein, “Acquired Rights” (Chapter 3 of Kant’s Legal and Political Philosophy). Center for Ethics manuscript workshop, Georgia State University, May, 2008.

“Kant’s Establishment of the Apperception Principle.” University of Oxford, Department of Philosophy, January 2008; New School for Social Research, Department of Philosophy, February 2008; University of Montana, Department of Philosophy, April, 2008.
“Spontaneity and Originality in Kant.” Northwestern University, Department of Philosophy, February 2006; Claremont McKenna College, Department of Philosophy, January, 2007.


“The Role of Beauty in Michael Fried’s Art Criticism.” Princeton University Department of Art and Archaeology, Graduate Student Symposium, March, 2002.

“Brandom’s Account of Perception and the Problem of Spontaneity.” The University of Chicago, Department of Philosophy, Contemporary Philosophy Workshop, April, 2000.

**Fellowships and Awards**

NEH Summer Seminar participant, “Scottish Enlightenment Aesthetics and Its Reception in Germany,” directed by Paul Guyer and Rachel Zuckert at the University of St. Andrews, 2007

Research Initiation Grant, Georgia State University, 2005-2006

Winner of the Review of Metaphysics Dissertation Essay Competition, 2005

Anna Margaret and Mary Sloan Dissertation Fellowship, University of Pittsburgh, 2003-2004

American Dissertation Fellowship, American Association of University Women, 2001-2002

Andrew Mellon Pre-doctoral Fellowship, University of Pittsburgh, (declined), 2001-2002

Faculty of Arts and Sciences Graduate Fellowship, University of Pittsburgh, 2001

Summer Language Fellowship, Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst (DAAD), 1999

Tuition Fellowship, The School of Criticism and Theory at Cornell University (seminar with Michael Fried on Diderot, Baudelaire, Fry, and Greenberg), 1998

University of Pittsburgh Teaching Fellowships (when not on other fellowship), 1996-2003

Andrew Mellon Pre-doctoral Fellowship, University of Pittsburgh, 1995-1996

Ellen Battel Stoeckel Fellowship, Norfolk Session, Yale School of Art, 1993

**Teaching Experience**

Georgia State University, Assistant Professor, 2004-present

University of Chicago, Visiting Lecturer, 2000 (Winter and Spring Quarters)

University of Pittsburgh, Teaching Fellow 1997-2003 (when not on other fellowship)

**Courses Taught**

M.A. Seminars:

Smith’s Theory of Moral Sentiments (Georgia State University [in Spring 2009])

Kant’s Critique of Judgment (Georgia State University)

Kant on Spontaneity and Freedom (Georgia State University)

Upper-level Undergraduate and M.A.-level:

Hume (Georgia State University)

Early Modern Aesthetics (Georgia State University)

Kant’s Practical Philosophy (Georgia State University)

Kant’s Critique of Pure Reason (Georgia State University)

Kant’s Critique of Judgment (University of Chicago)

Plato and Aristotle on the Soul (University of Chicago)

Introductory and Mid-level Undergraduate:

The Relevance of Beauty: an interdisciplinary introduction to aesthetics (Georgia State University)

History of Modern Philosophy (University of Pittsburgh, Georgia State University)

History of Ancient Philosophy (University of Pittsburgh)
Introduction to Philosophical Problems, Writing Intensive (University of Pittsburgh)
Introduction to Symbolic Logic (University of Pittsburgh)

Languages: German, French, Ancient Greek, Modern Greek

Referee for Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism

Academic Service
Program Coordinator, Georgia State University - Universität Bielefeld exchange, 2005-present
Honors adviser for philosophy majors, Georgia State University, 2006-present
Chair of Visiting Instructor Search Committee, GSU Philosophy Department, Spring 2008
Graduate Committee, GSU Philosophy Department, 2007-2008; 2005-2006
Assessment Committee, GSU Philosophy Department, 2006-2007
Senior Faculty Search Committee, GSU Philosophy Department, 2006-2007
Chair of Junior Faculty Search Committee (19th-century continental), GSU Philosophy Department, 2005-2006
Faculty Search Committees, GSU Philosophy Department, 2004-2005
Junior Faculty Search Committee, University of Pittsburgh Philosophy Department, 2000-2001
President, Philosophers in Graduate School, University of Pittsburgh, 2000-2001
Librarian, Grünbaum Reading Room, University of Pittsburgh, 1999

References
James F. Conant (jconant@uchicago.edu)
Professor of Philosophy, University of Chicago

Stephen Engstrom (engstrom@pitt.edu)
Professor of Philosophy, University of Pittsburgh

Paul Guyer (pguyer@phil.upenn.edu)
Murray Professor in the Humanities, Department of Philosophy, University of Pennsylvania

John McDowell (jmcdowel@pitt.edu)
University Professor of Philosophy, University of Pittsburgh

Nicholas Rescher (rescher@pitt.edu)
University Professor of Philosophy, University of Pittsburgh

George Rainbolt (grainbolt@gsu.edu)
Professor and Department Chair, Department of Philosophy, Georgia State University

Dissertation Abstract:
“Drawing from the Sources of Reason: Reflective Self-Knowledge in Kant’s First Critique”

My dissertation addresses two intertwining themes of Kant’s first Critique: its method, and its status as a project of rational self-knowledge. Kant advertises the Critique as fulfilling reason’s “most difficult” task: self-knowledge. This investigation, moreover, is meant to be “scientific and fully illuminating”. Commentators writing in English have tended to dismiss Kant’s conception of the Critique as a scientific investigation in which reason achieves self-knowledge — either taking the claim to be sheer rhetoric, or worrying that it pollutes the Critique with an unfortunate residue of rationalism. As a result, there is little sustained treatment of the method of the Critique in the secondary literature. Since Kant holds that the substantive insights of critical philosophy are not separable from the methodological context in which they come to light, this is a serious mistake. My dissertation corrects for this, by approaching the Critique through an examination of its method. In doing so, it yields a reading of the Transcendental Deduction that not only promises to resolve current debates about its “proof structure”, but also fully accounts for the Deduction’s pivotal role in the work as a whole.

Current Research
I am currently working on a book manuscript, tentatively titled Enlightenment, Reflection, and the Unity of Kant’s Critical Philosophy. The aim of the project is to provide an interpretation of “reflection” (Überlegung, Reflexion)
that demonstrates the consistency of its meaning throughout Kant’s critical philosophy, and reveals its roots in Kant’s conception of enlightenment. As I argue, Kant understands enlightenment in terms of the judging subject’s capacity to acknowledge fundamental normative requirements of our cognitive practices. This acknowledgement is most fruitfully understood in light of the notion of reflection — an issue central to all three Critiques, and which is also discussed at length in Kant’s lectures on logic. Existing secondary literature on reflection considers reflection in isolated contexts, and largely ignores its roots in Kant’s conception of enlightenment. As a result, current secondary literature fails to appreciate the unity and coherence of Kant’s conception of reflection; my project aims to correct for this, and in this way to come to terms with the normative force of Kant’s critical project.

Other work in progress addresses the appeal to “moral taste” in Hume and Smith. Specifically, I am concerned to explore the explanatory resources that the notion of taste may offer, particularly as concerns the assessment of moral norms. My work in this area focuses on the importance of “moral taste” in the developing conception of a “critical” philosophy — a philosophy of enlightenment — in Hume and Smith. While this is not directly part of my larger project on Kant, it nevertheless belongs to my general interest in the varieties of “reflection” and “enlightenment” afoot in the 18th century, and the pre-history of the Kantian project.
EDDY NAHMIA

Curriculum Vitae

September 2008

Georgia State University
P.O. Box 4089
Atlanta, GA 30302-4089

phone: (404) 413-6117
email: enahmias@gsu.edu
homepage: http://www2.gsu.edu/~phlean/

EMPLOYMENT

Georgia State University:
Department of Philosophy
Neuroscience Institute
Associate Professor
Director of Undergraduate Studies
Fall 2008-present (Assistant Professor, Fall 2005-Spring 2008).

Florida State University:
Department of Philosophy, Assistant Professor
Fall 2001-Spring 2005

Areas of Specialization:
Philosophy of Mind, Philosophy of Psychology, Moral Psychology
(especially Free Will and Moral Responsibility), Experimental Philosophy

Areas of Competence:
Philosophy of Science (especially Neuroscience, Cognitive Science, Biology);
Ethics; Metaphysics; History of Modern Philosophy

EDUCATION

Duke University:
Ph.D. in Philosophy, 2001
Dissertation: Free Will and the Knowledge Condition

University of St. Andrews, Scotland:
Bobby Jones Scholarship (philosophy), 1992-1993

Emory University:
B.A. (with Highest Honors) in English Literature, 1992

FORTHCOMING PUBLICATIONS

Fredlowing Free Will (contracted with Oxford University Press)


“Introduction to Section 1: Virtue and Character.” Forthcoming in Moral Psychology (Blackwell).

“Introduction to Section 4: Agency and Responsibility.” Forthcoming in Moral Psychology (Blackwell).


PUBLICATIONS


PRESENTATIONS

= refereed  • = invited  _ = invited commentary
· “Free Will and Wisdom in the Age of the Mind Sciences.”
Defining Wisdom Grant Competition: University of Chicago, August 2008
  · “What is Experimental Philosophy?” Workshop on Experimental Philosophy.
Society for Philosophy and Psychology (SPP): Philadelphia, June 2008
Society for Philosophy and Psychology (SPP): Toronto, June 2007
  · “If the Mind is the Brain, Can we Have Free Will?”
Neurophilosophy Meeting: GSU, March 2007
  o “Collins’ Sure Bet is Either Costly or Self-Defeating”
Southern Society for Philosophy and Psychology (SSPP): Atlanta, March 2007
  · “Free Will as Knowledge” (with commentary by John Fischer)
New Work in Free Will and Moral Responsibility: San Francisco, November 2006
  · “Emotional and Cognitive Components of Social Anxiety” (poster with Erin McClure, Trevor Kvaran, and Bryan Miller)
International Society for Research on Emotions (ISRE): Atlanta, August 2006
  o “Experimental Philosophy: Come for the Answers, Stay for the Questions! Commentary on Joshua Knobe and Ericca Roedder’s ‘The Concept of Valuing’” (with Thomas Nadelhoffer)
Society for Philosophy and Psychology (SPP): St. Louis, June 2006
  o “Is it Fair to Beat a Beast to Build it Better? Commentary on Manuel Vargas’ ‘Building a Better Beast’”
On-line Philosophy Conference: May 2006
  · “Relocating the Problem of Free Will”
Inland Northwest Philosophy Conference (INPC): Moscow, ID, March 2006
  · “Re-thinking the Problem of Free Will: Folk Intuitions about Determinism and Reductionism”
Southern Society for Philosophy and Psychology (SSPP): Charleston, March 2006
  · “Free Will, Determinism, and Neuroscience”
Georgia State University Neuroscience Retreat: Atlanta, October 2005
  · “Mind and Brain in the Media”
Neurophilosophy Meeting: GSU, Sept. 2006
  · “The (Un)reliability of Moral Intuitions: Evidence from Neuroeconomics” (with Zachary Ernst)
Southern Society for Philosophy and Psychology (SSPP): Durham, March 2005
  · “Free Will, Knowledge, and the Threat of Social Psychology”
Georgia State University: January 2005
Washington University, St. Louis: February 2001
Florida State University: February 2001
  · “The State of the Free Will Debate: From Frankfurt Cases to the Consequence Argument”
University of South Florida: March 2004
  o “I Know I Authored This: Commentary on Daniel Wegner’s ‘How Do You Know You’re the One Reading This?’”
The Brain and Its Self: Washington University, St. Louis, April 2004
  · “Surveying Freedom: Folk Intuitions about Free Will and Moral Responsibility” (poster)
The Brain and Its Self: Washington University, St. Louis, April 2004
  · “The Phenomenology of Free Will”
University of Arizona’s Center for Consciousness Studies: Tuscon, October 2003
  · “When Consciousness Matters: A Response to the Theory of Apparent Mental Causation”
Southern Society for Philosophy and Psychology (SSPP): Atlanta, April 2003
  o “Commentary on Jing Zhu’s ‘Is Conscious Will and Illusion?’”
American Philosophical Association (APA), Central Division: Cleveland, April 2003
  · “Close Calls and the Confident Agent: Free Will, Deliberation, and Alternative Possibilities”
Florida Philosophical Association (FPA): Gainesville, November 2002
  · “Pain Reports as Vital Signs”
Society for Philosophy and Psychology (SPP): Edmonton, June 2002
“First-Person Reports and the Contents of Consciousness”
*Association for the Scientific Study of Consciousness (ASSC): Duke University, May 2001*

“Free Will and the Threat of Social Psychology”
*Southern Society for Philosophy and Psychology (SSPP): New Orleans, April 2001*

“Undesired Free Actions and The Problem of Strength of Will”
*American Philosophical Association (APA), Eastern Division: New York, December 2000*

“A Problematic Proposal for the Evolution of Consciousness”
*International Society for History, Philosophy, Social Studies of Biology (ISHPSSB): Seattle, July 1997*

“Why Our Brains Got So Big: Reciprocal Altruism, Deception, Theory of Mind”
*Southern Society for Philosophy and Psychology (SSPP): Atlanta, March 1997*

“What is False-Belief Theory of Mind?” (poster)
*Toward a Science of Consciousness III: Tuscon, May 1998*

**TEACHING**

**Georgia State University:**
- Moral Psychology (Graduate Seminar in Philosophy of Mind): Fall 2008
- Philosophy of Mind: Spring 2007, Spring 2008
- Great Questions of Philosophy: Spring 2007, Fall 2007 (2 sections)
- Free Will and Moral Responsibility (Graduate Seminar in Metaphysics): Fall 2006
- Ethics, Agency & the Sciences of the Mind (Graduate Seminar in Philosophy of Mind): Fall 2005
- Philosophical Thinking: Spring 2006, Fall 2005
- Committee Member, MA Theses: Brandie Bedard-Martinez (2008), Jim Oias (2007)
- Directed Readings: Philosophy of Mind (Summer 2008), Free Will (Summer 2007)
- McNair Mentor: Johnson Ashu (Summer 2007)

**Florida State University:**
- Philosophy of Mind: Consciousness & Mental Causation (Graduate Seminar): Spring 2005
- Theories of Human Nature (Honors Seminar): Spring 2005, Fall 2001
- Philosophy of Mind (Upper-level Undergraduate): Fall 2004, Summer 2003, Fall 2002, Fall 2001
- Free Will and the Sciences of the Mind (Upper-level Undergraduate): Spring 2004
- Readings in Free Will (Graduate): Summer 2003
- Free Will (Graduate Seminar): Spring 2003
- Introduction to Philosophy: Fall 2003, Spring 2002 (Bryan Hall)
- Ethical Issues and Life Choices: Spring 2003 (Bryan Hall), Fall 2002 (Honors Seminar)
- Philosophy of Mind: Recent History and Issues (Graduate Seminar): Spring 2002
- Teaching Philosophy (Graduate student teaching course): Fall 2003, Fall 2001
- Director, MA Thesis: Matt James
- Director, Honors Thesis: Matt James
- PhD Committee: Thomas Nadelhoffer; Christina Huggins; Brandon Schmeichel (psychology);
  - Stephen Morris; Kermit Harrison; Jonathan Caro; Melissa Lammey
- MA Committee: Jason Turner; David Sumney
- Honors Thesis Committee: Michael Killian (psychology); Amanda Gilchrist (psychology)

**Duke University:**
- Philosophy of Mind: Summer 2001
- Free Will and the Sciences of the Mind: Spring 2001
- Logic: Fall 1999
Introduction to Philosophy: Fall 1999, Spring 1999, Fall 1998
Sleep, Dreams, and the Evolution of the Conscious Mind, with Owen Flanagan (FOCUS): Fall 1999

Talent Identification Program (TIP), Duke University:

AWARDS, GRANTS & FELLOWSHIPS
- Defining Wisdom Initiative, University of Chicago (2008-2010), $100,000 grant.
- Research Initiation Grant (RIG): “Defending Free Will from the Sciences of the Mind” (2007)
- Brains & Behavior Seed Grant, Co-PI on a $30,000 grant to initiate research project: “Neurobiological, Emotional, and Cognitive Components of Social Anxiety: Behavioral and fMRI Studies” (2005-2006)
- Superior Honors Teaching Award, for best teacher in the FSU Honors Program (2002-2003)
- First-Year Assistant Professor (FYAP) Research Grant, FSU (2002)
- W. Bernard Peach Instructor, Duke University Teaching Fellowship (2000-2001)
- Kenan Ethics Program, Graduate Student Colloquium Award, Duke University (2000-2001)
- APA Travel Grant, Eastern Division (2000)
- SSPP Travel Grant (2001)
- AAPT Teaching Seminar for Graduate Students, APA Travel Grant (2000)
- Bobby Jones Scholarship, St. Andrews University (1992-1993)
- Means Scholarship (full tuition), Emory University (1988-92)
- National Merit Scholarship (1988-92)
- Georgia Governor’s Scholar (1988-92)
- Phi Beta Kappa, Emory University (initiated 1990)
- NEH Younger Scholars Grant (1991)

SERVICE
To College and University:
- Undergraduate Studies Council, GSU (2005-2009)
- Undergraduate Major Committee, Neuroscience Institute, GSU (2008-2009)
- Institute for Neuroscience Task Force, GSU (2007)
- Department of Philosophy Chair Search Committee, FSU (2004)
- Faculty Advisory Committee, FSU (2002-2003)
- Arts and Sciences Academic Honor Panel, FSU (2001-2005)
- Professional Relations and Welfare Committee, FSU (2003)

To Department:
- Director of Undergraduate Studies, GSU (2005-2009)
- Chair, Undergraduate Committee, GSU (2005-2009)
- Honors Program Advisor, GSU (2008-2009)
- Self-Study Committee, GSU (2008-2009)
- Tenure and Promotion Committee, GSU (2008-2009)
- Executive Committee, GSU (2007-2008)
- Chair, Search Committee for Senior Position, GSU (2006-2008)
- Member, Search Committee for Lecturer, GSU (2008)
Chair, Search Committee for Junior Position in Metaphysics/Epistemology, GSU (2005-2006)
Chair, Improving Great Questions in Philosophy (PHIL 2010) Committee, GSU (2006-2007)
Teaching Assistant (TA) Coordinator & Trainer, FSU (2004-2005)
Colloquium Organizer, FSU (2002-2004)
Placement Officer, FSU (2002-2004)
Faculty Advisor, Student Philosophical Association (SPA), FSU (2001-2005)
Liaison to the Program for Instructional Excellence (PIE), FSU (2003-2005)
Graduate Student Admissions Committee, FSU (2002-2004)
Philosophy of Science Hiring Committee, Duke University (1999)
Graduate Student Representative to the Philosophy Faculty, Duke University (1997-98)

To Philosophical Community:
Organizer and Chair, Workshop on Experimental Philosophy (SPP 2008)
Executive Committee, Society for Philosophy and Psychology (SPP 2005-2008)
Executive Council, Southern Society for Philosophy and Psychology (SSPP 2006-2009)
Program Co-Chair, On-line Philosophy Conference (OPC 2006, OPC 2007)
Program Chair, 31st Annual Meeting of the Society for Philosophy and Psychology (SPP 2005)
Organizer and Chair, Panel Discussion on “Mind and Brain in the Media” (SPP 2005)
Grant Assessment: European Science Foundation's Eurocorpes Program for proposal titled “Consciousness in a Natural and Cultural Context” (2006)
Session Chair: Southern Society for Philosophy and Psychology (SSPP 2006); Society for Philosophy and Psychology (SPP 2001, 2004, 2005); Action and Agency (University of Florida 2005)
Regular contributor to: AskPhilosophers.org; Garden of Forking Paths (free will blog); and Experimental Philosophy (blog).

REFERENCES
John Martin Fischer, University of California, Riverside
Owen Flanagan, Duke University
George Graham, Georgia State University
Alfred Mele, Florida State University
Shaun Nichols, University of Arizona
George Rainbolt, Georgia State University
Timothy S. O’Keefe
Department of Philosophy
Georgia State University
P.O. Box 4089
Atlanta, GA 30302-4089

tokeefe@gsu.edu
(404) 413-6108

Area of Specialization: Ancient philosophy (esp. Hellenistic philosophy and Epicurus)

Areas of Competence: Ethics, philosophy of mind, modern philosophy

EDUCATION

Ph.D. 1997 University of Texas at Austin, Philosophy
Nominated by the Philosophy Department for the Outstanding Dissertation written in the College of Liberal Arts at the University of Texas at Austin in the academic year 1996-97.

M.A. 1993 University of Texas at Austin, Philosophy
Master’s Report: Epicurean Compatibilism

B.A. 1990 University of Notre Dame, Philosophy
Honors Thesis: Dostoyevsky’s Critique of Nihilism

EMPLOYMENT

Associate Professor of Philosophy, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA, Fall 2006-present

Assistant Professor of Philosophy (tenure-track), Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA, Fall 2003-Summer 2006

Assistant Professor of Philosophy (tenure-track), University of Minnesota, Morris, Morris, MN, Fall 1998-Spring 2003


Assistant Instructor, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX, Fall 1996-Spring 1997

Teaching Assistant, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX, Fall 1992-Summer 1995

SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY

Book

Journal Articles


N. Review Essays


Entries in Reference Works

“Epicurus,” *The Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, [http://www.utm.edu/research/iep/e/epicur.htm], posted April 2000, 6200 words
Conference Papers and Presentations

“From the lazy argument to the problem of free will and determinism in Cicero’s *De Fato*”
- Eastern Division Meeting of the American Philosophical Association (APA), Washington D.C., December 2006

“Clitophon’s Unanswered Charges Against Socrates”
- New Mexico State University, October 2005

“The Philosophy of Anaxarchus”
- 28th Annual Workshop in Ancient Philosophy, University of Texas, Austin, April 2005

“Socrates’ Therapeutic Use of Inconsistency in the *Axiochus*”
- Twelfth Annual Minnesota Conference on Ancient Philosophy, College of St. Catherine, May 2004
- 27th Annual Workshop in Ancient Philosophy, Texas Christian University, April 2004

“Aristotle’s ‘Cosmic Nose’ Argument for the Uniqueness of the World” (co-authored with Harald Thorsrud)
- Eleventh Annual Minnesota Conference on Ancient Philosophy, University of Minnesota Twin Cities, April 2003
- 26th Annual Workshop in Ancient Philosophy, Texas A&M University, March 2003

“Lucretius on the Cycle of Life and the Fear of Death”
- APA Central Division Meeting, Chicago, April 2002
- Minnesota Philosophical Society meeting, College of St. Benedict, September 2001

“The Cyrenaics on Pleasure, Happiness, and Future-Concern”
- APA Central Division Meeting, Minneapolis, May 2001
- 24th Annual Workshop in Ancient Philosophy, Florida State University, Tallahassee, April 2001

“Why There Are No ‘Fresh Starts’ in *Metaphysics* Epsilon or *Nicomachean Ethics* III 5”
- APA Central Division Meeting, Chicago, April 2000
- 23rd Annual Workshop in Ancient Philosophy, Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, March 2000

“Is Epicurean Friendship Altruistic?”
- St. Cloud State University, February 2000
- 22nd Annual Workshop in Ancient Philosophy, Trinity University, San Antonio, April 1999

“Death and Harm in Aristotle and Epicurus”
- University of Minnesota at Duluth, December 1999

“Will There Be Justice in the Ideal Epicurean Community?”
- APA Central Division meeting, New Orleans, May 1999
- Minnesota Philosophical Society meeting, St. Thomas University, October 1998

“Does Epicurus Need the Swerve as an *Archê* of Collisions?”
- APA Eastern Division meeting, December 1996

“The Ontological Status of Sensible Qualities for Democritus and Epicurus”
- APA Central Division meeting, April 1996

“Epicurean Reductionism”
- 19th Annual Workshop in Ancient Philosophy, Texas A&M University, March 1996
Commentaries Presented

Author meets critics session, *Epicurus on Freedom*, APA Pacific Division meeting, April 2007
(critics: Todd Ganson and Monte Johnson)
Matthew Evans, “Mental Causes in Plato’s *Phaedo*,” 29th Annual Workshop in Ancient Philosophy, Emory University, April 2006
Julia Annas, “*Précis of Platonic Ethics, Old and New*,” Eleventh Annual Minnesota Conference on Ancient Philosophy, April 2003
Sylvia Berryman, “Ancient Automata and Mechanical Explanation,” 25th Annual Workshop in Ancient Philosophy, University of Texas at Austin, March 2002
John Armstrong, “Epicurean Justice,” 20th Annual Workshop in Ancient Philosophy, University of Texas at Austin, April 1997
Phillip Mitsis, “The Stoics’ Conception of Rights,” 18th Annual Workshop in Ancient Philosophy, University of Colorado at Boulder, April 1995
David Bradshaw, “Aristotle’s Theory of Perception,” 17th Annual Workshop in Ancient Philosophy, University of Texas at Austin, March 1994

TEACHING

Georgia State University Courses Taught

Plato (cross-listed undergraduate and graduate): Spring 2007, Fall 2003
Epicurus (cross-listed undergraduate and graduate): Fall 2008, Spring 2006
Aristotle (cross-listed undergraduate and graduate): Spring 2008, Spring 2005
Great Questions of Philosophy: Spring 2009 (2 sections), Spring 2006, Spring 2005 (2 sections), Spring 2004, Fall 2003 (2 sections)
Ancient Ethical Theories: Spring 2008 (graduate seminar), Spring 2004 (cross-listed undergraduate and graduate)

University of Minnesota, Morris, Courses Taught

Introduction to Philosophy of Religion: Spring 1999, Fall 2001
Introduction to Philosophy of Mind: Fall 1999, Spring 2001
Logic I: Winter 1999
History of Ancient Philosophy: Fall 1998, Spring 2000, Fall 2001
History of Medieval Philosophy: Winter 1999, Spring 2002
History of Modern Philosophy: Spring 1999, Fall 2000, Spring 2003
Determinism, Foreknowledge, and Freedom in Ancient and Medieval Philosophy: Spring 2000
Existentialism, Fall 2000

University of Texas, Austin, Courses Taught

Introduction to Logic, Spring 1997
Argument, Fall 1996
Additional Teaching Activities

Directed readings class on Ethics of the Ancient Skeptics, Fall 2007, 4 students

Directed readings class on Stoic Ethics, Summer 2006, 4 students

Directed Master’s theses, Georgia State University:
- Kun Lei, “Defending Lucretius’ Symmetry Argument against the Fear of Death,” Spring 2007

Daniel Hampikian, Summer-Fall 2005


Directed senior theses, University of Minnesota, Morris:
- Wyatt Mondry, “Cyrenaic Epistemology,” Spring 2002

SERVICE

Professional Service

Member of editorial board, *Apeiron*, Fall 2007-present


**University-Wide Committee Work**

*Georgia State University:*

Faculty Senate (and committee member, Student Life and Development, Student Activity Fee, and Athletics), Fall 2006-present

Arts & Sciences Graduate Studies Committee, Fall 2004-present.

Sexual Misconduct Board, Spring 2009-present

Activity Program Review Committee, Fall 2007-Spring 2008

Ad hoc committee on the crisis in publishing in the humanities, Fall 2004-Spring 2005.

*University of Minnesota, Morris:*

Assessment of Student Learning Committee, subcommittee on Assessment of General Education, Fall 1999-Spring 2003 (chair of that subcommittee, Fall 2000-Spring 2003)

French Search Committee, Fall 2001-Spring 2002

Edith Farrell Award for excellence in undergraduate research Selection Committee, Spring 2000

Presidential Scholarship Selection Committee, Spring 1999

**Departmental Service**

*Georgia State:*

Director of Graduate Studies, Summer 2004-present (acting director until Spring 2005)

Executive Committee, Spring 2005-present

Graduate Studies Committee, Fall 2003-present

Self-study committee, Fall 2008-Spring 2009

Administrative assistant search committee, Spring 2007, Fall 2006

Visiting Instructor Search Committee, Spring 2007
Head of ad hoc committee on Ph.D. program costs, Fall 2006

Interviewing committee, tenure-track position in Metaphysics and Epistemology, Fall 2005

Head of search committee, ‘Brains and Behaviors’ initiative tenure-track positions, Fall 2004-Spring 2005

Assessment committee, coordinator of Critical Thinking assessment, Fall 2004-Spring 2005

Head of search committee, Coordinator of Graduate Teaching position, Spring 2004

Departmental scribe, Fall 2003-Spring 2004

University of Minnesota, Morris:

Co-director, 27th, 26th, 25th, and 24th Annual Midwest Philosophy Colloquia

Panel Member at sessions of the Annual Midwest Philosophy Colloquium
  • Michael Zimmerman, “Taking Luck Seriously,” Fall 2002
  • Stephen White, “Stoic Emotions,” Fall 2001
  • Mike Martin, “Responsibility in a Therapeutic Culture: Integrating Moral and Therapeutic Perspectives on Irrationality,” Fall 2000
  • Jennifer Greene, “Rights to Privacy and the Public Good,” Spring 2000
  • John Deigh, “Moral Agency and Mental Illness,” Spring 1999

Maintained and updated web pages for Philosophy Discipline


Other

Invited public lecture, “The ethical case for vegetarianism,” East Atlanta public library, November 2005

Member, Instructional Technology Leadership team for the faculty development project, “Enhancing Student Learning Through Innovative Teaching and Technology Strategies.” Fall 2001-present. Responsible for leading faculty group on “Creating web pages using HTML and posting them to the WWW,” Fall 2002-Spring 2003. Description of the group and material developed for it are available at http://cda.mrs.umn.edu/~okeefets/ITgroup.html.

Panel member, “Now What? Tales from First-Year Survivors,” New Faculty Orientation, Fall 1999

Panel member at Honors Colloquium, “The Nature of Consciousness,” Spring 1999
GEORGE W. RAINBOLT

Department of Philosophy
Georgia State University
P.O. Box 4089
Atlanta, GA 30302-4089
(404) 413-6109

436 Oakview Rd
Decatur, GA 30030
(404) 378-2120
Fax: (404) 413-6124
grainbolt@gsu.edu

EDUCATION

- Ph.D., Philosophy, University of Arizona, 1990.
- M.A., Philosophy, University of Arizona, 1986.
- B.A., Philosophy & Economics (with High Honors), Oberlin College, 1984.

EXPERIENCE

- Georgia State University, Professor of Philosophy, Summer 2006 to Present.
- Georgia State University, Chair, Department of Philosophy, Summer 2000 to Present.
- Georgia State University, Interim Chair, Department of Religious Studies, Spring 2006.
- Georgia State University, Associate Professor of Philosophy, Summer 1999 to Summer 2006.
- Georgia State University, Assistant Professor of Philosophy, Fall 1993 to Summer 1999.
- Oberlin College, Visiting Assistant Professor of Philosophy, Fall 1990 to Spring 1993.

AREAS OF SPECIALIZATION

Ethics
Philosophy of Law
Social/Political Philosophy
Medical Ethics

AREAS OF COMPETENCE

History of Ethics
Metaethics
Business Ethics
Feminist Ethics

AREAS OF INTEREST

French Philosophy
Decision Theory
Aesthetics
Philosophy of Economics
BOOKS

The Concept of Rights, Springer 2006.
Praise for The Concept of Rights
“Advances the positions of Joseph Raz and H.L.A. Hart, perhaps the two most important legal philosophers of the last century”
Douglas Husak, Rutgers
“The most sophisticated [Hohfeldian rights analysis] I have seen.”
David Schmidt, University of Arizona
“First-rate book, the best thing on the subject since Sumner and Thomson’s books fifteen to twenty years ago.”
Christopher W. Morris, University of Maryland

ARTICLES

--Web posting of this paper listed as a noteworthy web site by Britannica.com.


**REVIEWS**


**PRESENTATIONS**

“Why Duties are Not Rights,” Bielefeld University, Germany, May 2008.


Commentator on A. John Simmons’ *Political Philosophy*, Jean Beer Blumenfeld Center for Ethics Conference, November 2006.


“Martin on Civil Rights and Economic Justice,” International Association for Philosophy of Law and Social Philosophy (AMINTAPHIL), November 1996.

“Perfect and Imperfect Obligations,” Georgia Philosophical Society, October 1996.

“The Ethics of Civil Forfeiture,” College of Law, Georgia State University, March 1994.

“Mercy: In Defense of Caprice”
--Department of Philosophy, Emory University, November 1995.


“Mercy, Justice and the Death Penalty”
--Department of Philosophy, University of Maryland at Baltimore County, February 1993.


GRANTS

St. Joseph’s Health Care System Grant, “Medicare Managed Care: Increasing Access or Barriers for the Poor?” Grant supported the study the ethical ramifications of Medicare Health Maintenance Organizations (HMOs), 1997-1999. Grant amount: $6,500.

Georgia State University Policy Research Center Grant, supported research leave for Winter Quarter 1996. Grant amount: $3,000 for a two course release.

University System of Georgia Board of Regents Grant to attend the workshop, “Connecting Teachers and Technology,” Summer 1995 and to support research leave for Winter 1997. Grant amount: $3,000, $1,500 for a course release, and a laptop computer.

Georgia State University Research Initiation Grant, supported research leave for Winter Quarter 1995. Grant amount: $1,500 for a course release.

National Endowment for the Humanities Grant to attend the Summer Institute “Ethics: Principles or Practices?” University of California-Santa Cruz, 1992. Grant amount: $3,000 plus room and board.

National Endowment for the Humanities Grant to attend the Summer Seminar “The Changing Roles of the American Judge,” University of Maryland, 1991. Grant amount: $3,000 plus room and board.

Ford-Mellon Research Scholar Program for Minority Students Grant. Supported mentoring to encourage minority students to pursue graduate work. Worked with Lesley Thomas on Averroes, 1991. Grant amount: $1,000.


DISCUSSION OF WORK

Only discussion of a paragraph or more is mentioned here. Mere citations are not mentioned.


**HONORS AND SERVICE TO THE PROFESSION**

Member of External Review Team for the Program in Philosophy at Georgia Perimeter College, 2006.

Member of External Review Team for the Department of Philosophy and Religion at the University of Northern Iowa, Spring 2005.


Named the Outstanding Junior Faculty Member in the College of Arts and Sciences at Georgia State University, 1997.

Member of the Board of Editors, *Biomedical Ethics Reviews*, 1996 to 2005.

Member, Georgia State University Women’s Studies Institute, Fall 1993 to 2004.

Application evaluator for the Conferences program of the National Endowment for the Humanities, 1994.


Phi Beta Kappa, Oberlin College, 1984.

**PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS**

International Association for Philosophy of Law and Social Philosophy, 1996 to Present.

(This is an invitation-only professional association.)

Georgia Philosophical Society, 1993 to Present.

Society for Analytic Feminism, 1992 to Present.

American Philosophical Association, 1984 to Present.

**DEPARTMENT, COLLEGE, AND UNIVERSITY SERVICE**

Only service since promotion to associate professor is noted here.

**2007-2008**

- Department Chair. Departmental activities included:
  -- search for senior-level tenure-track faculty,
  -- a search for several visiting instructors.
- University Senator.
- University Senate Committee on Admissions and Standards, chair.
- Chair of the following subcommittees of Admissions and Standards:
  Admissions Discipline Review, A+ Grading, S-U Grading, WF Grades, Commencement and Academic Calendar, Policy for Complaints, Petitions, and Grievances, Honors Grading, Academic Recognitions, Critical Thinking Through Writing, Regents’ Test, Academic Calendar, WF Grades, Comp Sci GPA Requirements, IB Grades, Transfer Credit, Regents’ Test
- SACS Accreditation Leadership Team.
  Chair of Academic Programs Subcommittee.
- Critical Thinking Through Writing Leadership Team.
Critical Thinking Through Writing Coordinator.
Search Committee for a new Director of Admissions, chair.
Chief Transfer Officer for Georgia State University. (The Board of Regents decided to change the name of Transfer Ombudspersons to Chief Transfer Officers.)
Enrollment Management Committee, this committee sets the university enrollment targets upon which budgets are based.
Enrollment Management Group, this committee is charged with implementing enrollment services policies.
University Senate Committee on Planning and Development.
Brains & Behavior Administrative Committee.
Neuroscience Institute, Proposal Committee, co-chair. This committee developed a proposal to transform the Brains & Behavior Program into a degree-granting, department-level institute.
Neuroscience Institute, Search Committee for the Director of the Neuroscience Institute.
Neuroscience Institute, Bylaws Drafting Committee.
Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia Philosophy Academic Advisory Committee, chair.
University System of Georgia (USG) Core Curriculum Evaluation Committee, chair. This is an official committee of the USG appointed in Fall 2008. It is charged with reviewing and making recommendations for changes to the core curriculum of USG.
Co-Founder and webmaster of Georgia Core Curriculum .Org (This is not a organization of Georgia State University or of the USG. It is an independent group of USG faculty that in Spring of 2008 sought an end to the USG Strong Foundations process to review the USG core curriculum.)

2006-2007

Department Chair. Departmental activities included:
--search for senior-level tenure-track faculty,
--a search for several visiting instructors.
University Senator.
University Senate Committee on Admissions and Standards, chair.
Chair of the following subcommittees of Admissions and Standards:
Admissions Appeals, Petitions, Graduation GPA, Regents’s Test, Academic Calendar, Chemistry Placement Testing.
Transfer Ombudsperson for Georgia State University.
Enrollment Management Committee, this committee sets the university enrollment targets upon which budgets are based.
Enrollment Management Group, this committee is charged with implementing enrollment services policies. Chaired the following subcommittees of this group:
Plus-Minus Grading, Limits on Withdrawals, Fee Waivers Appeals.
University Senate Committee on Planning and Development.
Brains & Behavior Administrative Committee. (This committee is responsible for overall administration of the Brains & Behavior Program.)
Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia Philosophy Academic Advisory Committee, chair.

2005-2006

Department Chair. Departmental activities included:
--two searches for tenure-track faculty,
--a search for several visiting instructors.

University Senator.

University Senate Committee on Admissions and Standards, chair.

Chair of the following subcommittees of Admissions and Standards:
Admissions Appeals, Petitions, Academic Calendar, Dual Degrees, High-Ability Applicants, Distribution of Syllabi, Limits on Withdrawals, Double Majors, COMPASS Testing, Declaration of Major.

Transfer Ombudsperson for Georgia State University.

Enrollment Management Committee, this committee sets the university enrollment targets upon which budgets are based.

Enrollment Management Group, this committee is charged with implementing enrollment services policies.

University Senate Committee on Planning and Development.

Brains & Behavior Administrative Committee. (This committee is responsible for overall administration of the Brains & Behavior Program.)

Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia Philosophy Academic Advisory Committee, chair.

2004-2005

Departmental Director of Undergraduate Studies.

Department Chair. Departmental activities included:
--four searches for tenure-track faculty,
--a search for several visiting instructors,
--moving to a new building and thereby almost doubling the square feet devoted to the Department,
--achievement of the Department of Philosophy’s long-standing goal of splitting the Program in Religious Studies off into a distinct Department of Religious Studies (effective July 1, 2005).

University Senator.

University Senate Committee on Admissions and Standards, chair.

Chair of the following subcommittees of Admissions and Standards:
Admissions Appeals, Add/Drop, General Admission Requirements, Good Standing, Incomplete Grades, Major Declaration, Nonnative Speakers of English, Petitions, Regents’s Test, Upper-Division Admissions.

Transfer Ombudsperson for Georgia State University.
Enrollment Management Committee, this committee sets the university enrollment targets upon which budgets are based.

Enrollment Management Group, this committee is charged with implementing enrollment services policies.

University Senate Committee on Planning and Development.

Committee to Evaluate the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.

Brains & Behavior Administrative Committee. (This committee is responsible for overall administration of the Brains & Behavior Program.)

Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia Philosophy Academic Advisory Committee, chair.

2003-2004

Department Chair. Departmental activities included:
--two searches for tenure-track faculty,
--a search for several visiting instructors,
--rewrote the student learning outcomes,
--developed a learning outcomes assessment plan,
--hired a Coordinator of Graduate Teaching to supervise the program to prepare graduate students to teach.

University Senator.

University Senate Committee on Admissions and Standards, chair.

Chair of the following subcommittees of Admissions and Standards:
Academic Calendar, Academic Orientation, Academic Renewal, ACT, Add/Drop Policy, Application to Graduate, Non-Academic Withdrawal Policy, Petitions, Science Transfer Credit.

Transfer Ombudsperson for Georgia State University.

Enrollment Management Committee, this committee sets the university enrollment targets upon which budgets are based.

Enrollment Management Group, this committee is charged with implementing enrollment services policies.

University Senate Committee on Planning and Development.

Chair of Committee to evaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Education for possible elimination. (The Committee recommended elimination and the program has been eliminated.)

Committee to Evaluate the Associate Provost for Academic Programs.

Search Committee for the Dean of the College of Law.

Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia Philosophy Academic Advisory Committee, chair.

2002-2003

Department Chair. Departmental activities included:
--two searches for tenure-track faculty,
--a search for several visiting instructors,
--added a philosophy major with a pre-law concentration,
--started a Philosophy Freshman Learning Community entitled “Law and Society,”
--started a three-course program to prepare graduate students to teach:
    Phil 8970, Teaching Philosophy, graduate students must take this course before they can teach
    Phil 8980, Teaching Philosophy Practicum I, graduate students must take this course the first time they teach,
    Phil 8985, Teaching Philosophy Practicum II, graduate students must take this course each subsequent time they teach,
--the Department’s five-year program review,
    --completing and gaining Provost approval of the Department’s program review action plan.

  - University Senator.
  - University Senate Committee on Admissions and Standards, chair.
  - Chair of the following subcommittees of Admissions and Standards:
  - Transfer Ombudsperson for Georgia State University.
  - Enrollment Management Committee, this committee sets the university enrollment targets upon which budgets are based.
  - Enrollment Management Group, this committee is charged with implementing enrollment services policies.
  - University Senate Committee on Budget.
  - University Senate Committee on Planning and Development.
  - Undergraduate Catalog Committee, chair. This committee rewrote all of the university sections of the Catalog and placed the entire Catalog on the web. The University no longer prints a hard-copy catalog.
  - Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia Philosophy Academic Advisory Committee, chair.

**2001-2002**

- Department Chair. Departmental activities included:
  --a search for several visiting instructors,
  --instituted an orientation for new graduate students (continues to the present),
  --instituted an annual departmental newsletter, The Philosophy-Phile (continues to the present),
  --surveyed the alumni as to their opinion of the program and their suggestions for its improvement,
  --the approval of a plan to increase graduate student stipends (implemented and continues to the present),
  --a revision of the department’s general M.A. examination requirement,
  --starting a workshop for graduate students on applying to Ph.D. programs (continues to the present),
--approval of a Philosophy major with a pre-law concentration.

University Senator.

University Senate Committee on Admissions and Standards, chair.

Chair of the following subcommittees of Admissions and Standards:


Transfer Ombudsperson for Georgia State University.

Enrollment Management Committee, this committee sets the university enrollment targets upon which budgets are based.

Enrollment Management Group, this committee is charged with implementing enrollment services policies.

University Senate Committee on Budget.

University Senate Committee on Planning and Development.

Banner Implementation Team, this team implemented the University’s new Banner student information system.

Faculty/Staff Perspective Subcommittee of the Banner Implementation Team, chair.

Key Developments Subcommittee of the Banner Implementation Team.

Budget Priorities Committee.

Faculty/Staff Space Allocation Committee.

Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia Philosophy Academic Advisory Committee, chair.

2000-2001

Department Chair. At GSU, department chairs are 12-month administrative employees with budget authority. The chair is chosen by the Dean and the position does not rotate. The Department’s budget is over 1.5 million dollars. It has 26 FTE of full-time faculty, 22 FTE of supported graduate students and 3 FTE of staff. The Department has three sub-units (the Program in Philosophy, the Program in Religious Studies and the Jean Beer Blumenfeld Center for Ethics) and serves approximately 10,000 students per year. Departmental activities in 2000-2001 included:

--three searches for tenure-track faculty (including a full professor),

--a search for several visiting instructors,

--an agreement with the journal Ethics to publish the papers given at the Jean Beer Blumenfeld Center for Ethics’s annual conference (continues to the present),

--the joint appointment of William Edmundson (Law) and Peter Lindsay (Political Science) to the Department of Philosophy,

--renumbering and reorganization of the department’s graduate courses,
-- tenuring of three members of the department,
-- starting listservs for philosophy majors, religious studies majors, and philosophy graduate students (continues to the present),
-- a redesign of the department’s web pages to decrease downloads times,
-- writing a Teaching Handbook collecting the most relevant teaching policies,
-- instituting Philosophy on Friday, a monthly gathering of majors, graduate students and faculty for pizza provided by the Department (continues to the present).

- University Senator.
- Senate Committee on Admissions and Standards, chair.
- Chair of the following subcommittees of Admissions and Standards:
  Academic Calendar, Academic Improvement Program, Academic Unit Requirements, Admission Requirements, Banner Conversion Task Force, Certifying Competence in English, Early Attendance Programs, Hardship Withdrawal, Non-Degree Status, Non-Traditional Transfers, Petitions, Post-Graduation Exceptions, Scholarships, Scholastic Discipline, Transfer GPAs, Transient/ARCHE Requirements, WF Grades.
- Transfer Ombudsperson for Georgia State University.
- Enrollment Management Committee, this committee sets the university enrollment targets upon which budgets are based.
- Senate Committee on Budget.
- Senate Committee on Planning and Development.
- Chaired an Academic Dishonesty Committee. This committee reviewed a case involving charges of plagiarism, charges of sexual harassment, multiple lawyers, over 200 e-mails, extensive video evidence, and a paper dossier which was more than four inches thick.
- Banner Implementation Team, implemented GSU’s new Banner student information system.
- Faculty/Staff Perspective Subcommittee of the Banner Implementation Team, chair.
- Key Developments Subcommittee of the Banner Implementation Team.

1999-2000

- Department’s Executive Committee, chair. In addition to its usual work, in 1999, this Committee rewrote the Department’s Promotion and Tenure Manual.
- Director of Graduate Studies.
- Graduate Studies Committee, chair. In addition to its usual work, in 1999, this Committee rewrote the degree requirements for the M.A.
- Led the Department’s successful effort to start a joint J.D./M.A. program with the College of Law.
- Departmental Computer Coordinator. Maintained the Web pages for the Department of Philosophy, the Program in Religious Studies, and the Jean Beer Blumenfeld Center for Ethics. These are among the most extensive departmental pages at GSU. In 1999, these pages were redesigned to make them better organized and more visually appealing. Gave instruction/support to faculty and staff. Performed maintenance and trouble-shooting.
- University Senator.
- Senate Committee on Admissions and Standards, chair.
- Chair of the following subcommittees of Admissions and Standards:

- Transfer Ombudsperson for Georgia State University.
- Enrollment Management Committee, this committee sets the university enrollment targets upon which budgets are based.
- University Strategic Plan, Academic Committee.
- University Strategic Plan, University Steering Committee.
- Search Committee for new Director of Admissions, chair.
- Admissions and Recruitment Task Force.
- Senate Committee on Budget.
- Senate Committee on Planning and Development.
- Hardship Withdrawals
Education:
Ph.D. Philosophy, Northwestern University, Evanston IL (12/2006)
M.A. Philosophy, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Milwaukee WI (1997)
B.A. College of Letters, Wesleyan University, Middletown CT (1995)

Employment:
Assistant Professor, Georgia State University (2006 – Present)
Affiliate Faculty of the Neuroscience Institute (2007 – Present)

Area of Specialization:
German Idealism

Areas of Competence:
Continental Philosophy; Philosophy of Science; Formal Logic

Publications:
Articles:
“Apriority from the Grundlage to the System of Ethics,” Philosophy Today (forthcoming)

Translations:

Book Reviews:
G.W.F. Hegel, Philosophy of Mind, tr. W. Wallace & A. V. Miller, revised with introduction and commentary by Michael Inwood, appeared online 10/08/07 in Notre Dame Philosophical Reviews (http://ndpr.nd.edu/review.cfm?id=11283)


Presentations [upcoming presentations in italics]


“Hegel, Biology, and Contemporary Philosophy,” Department of Philosophy, American University of Beirut, Beirut, Lebanon (5/2007)

“Hegel’s Transformation of Kant’s Physics,” Department of Philosophy, Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia (2/2006)

“Nachdenken and the Transition from Empirical to Speculative Physics in Hegel’s Naturphilosophie,” Department of Philosophy, University of Memphis, Memphis, Tennessee (2/2005)

Awards, Fellowships, and Grants:

Research Initiation Grant, Georgia State University; Project Title: “Hegel and the Biological Sciences;” awarded to support research at the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin; $10,000 award for stipend, travel, and graduate assistant (Summer 2007)

Pensionnaire étranger, École Normale Supérieure, rue d’Ulm, Paris; awarded by the ENS/Paris and the French Interdisciplinary Group, Northwestern University; combined with Graduate Fellowship, Dean’s Office, Northwestern University (2005 – 2006)

Dissertation Year Fellowship, Graduate School, Northwestern University (2004)


Dissertation:
“From A Priori Grounding to Conceptual Transformation: The Philosophy of Nature in German Idealism,” Committee: Terry Pinkard (Chair), Peter Fenves, Axel Mueller

In this dissertation I argue that the traditional understanding of Hegel’s philosophy of nature as involving an aprioristic deduction of the laws and facts of nature is wrong. By tracing the theory of matter from Kant through Hegel, I show that the post-Kantians developed the concept of apriority in response to a perceived flaw in Kant’s system. The flaw lies in his two central distinctions: the distinction between concepts and intuitions; Fichte’s and Schelling’s solutions fail in their attempts to present different ways to modify these distinction. Hegel argues that we should keep the concept/intuition distinction while recognizing it as an achieved normative one, rather than a metaphysical one. In consequence, he effectively abandons the closely allied distinction between the a priori and the a posteriori, and thereby abandons any attempt to provide a priori foundations or content for the natural sciences. On his alternative account, we only understand ourselves properly as autonomous agents when we see ourselves as part of a social-normative whole which can give a historical and yet rational account of how it itself came to be. I show how to understand the specific theses about physics contained in the Philosophy of Nature as part of this general social-normative, historical view, so that the philosophy of nature allows us to see the disenchanted picture of nature given in modern science as part and parcel of our achievement of our own autonomy.

Work in Progress:

*Hegel’s Physics* (monograph)

In this book I develop and defend a reading of Hegel’s philosophical account of physics as a post-Kantian, nonaprioristic attempt to demonstrate how our modern scientific conception of nature is compatible with a conception of ourselves as autonomous agents. I begin by laying out the historical (philosophical and scientific) context of Kant’s philosophy of nature and its reception and development. I show that problems in the philosophy of nature motivated many major features of post-Kantian thought. I then reconstruct Hegel’s mature position, focusing on his criticism of Kantian and post-Kantian matter theory and his conception of the logical relations between the basic concepts of physics and the laws of motion.

“Dimensional Analysis in Hegel’s Treatment of the Laws of Motion”

In this paper I argue that Hegel’s ordering of the laws of motion can be understood neither as an attempt to re-establish an Aristotelian distinction between terrestrial and celestial motion nor as based in a misunderstanding of Newton’s concept of force. I show instead that Hegel deploys an early version of the modern procedure of dimensional analysis to structure his treatment of the laws of motion and their component concepts.

“Nervous System Habituation in Hegel’s *Philosophy of Nature*”

In this paper I present Hegel’s account of the nervous system and the brain. I show that this conception is directly informed by the major biological texts available to Hegel (either in his personal collection or in libraries), and that it reflects up-to-date information about physiology and anatomy. Specifically, I show how certain nervous system structures are presented by Hegel as underlying the possibility of animal stimulus-response habituation. Such habituation is the biological condition of Hegelian Bildung.

“Nature as a Condition of Geist”

In this paper I argue that Hegel conceives of our animal bodies as placing certain conditions on our mindedness. However, these conditions cannot be thought of as logical, transcendental, or metaphysical in any traditional sense. They must instead be understood as dialectical conditions in Hegel’s sense: starting-points, both for the individual and for the species, for further development. While the individual must, and can only, develop her mindedness beginning from her physical body, a given culture, through the practices, institutions, technologies, and concepts it has developed beginning from its own origins (biological, historical, geographical, etc.), can itself develop specific modes of development made
available to, and formative of, the individual in her relationship with her body as a plastic entity.

**Teaching Experience:**
Hegel (graduate and undergraduate)
Hegel’s *Phenomenology of Spirit* (graduate and undergraduate)
Hegel’s *Philosophy of Right* (graduate directed reading)
Seminar in Continental Philosophy of Science (graduate)
Philosophy of Science (graduate and undergraduate)
History of the Concept of Time (graduate directed reading)
Symbolic Logic (graduate and undergraduate)
Existentialism (undergraduate course, graduate directed reading, writing intensive)
Great Questions of Philosophy (Honors)

**MA Thesis Direction:**

*A Comparative Study of Korsgaard and Sartre* (Summer 2008)
*Hegel and the Calculus* (in progress)
*Hegel’s Critique of Kantian Ethics* (in progress)
*Foucault and the Endless Struggle of Genealogy* (in progress)
*Kant’s Influence on Heidegger* (in progress)

**Service:**
Philosophy Department Colloquium Series Director (2008-present)
GSU/Universität Bielefeld MA Exchange Program Director (2008-present)
Philosophy Department Library Liaison (2007-present)
Philosophy Department Scribe (2006-present)
Philosophy Department Graduate Committee (2006-2007)
Panelist, Ethics in Film Series (2006, 2007)
Jury Member, Philosophy Department Graduate Student Conference (2007)

Host, Georgia Philosophical Society Fall Meeting (2007)
Reader for Hackett Publishing and Fordham University Press

**References:**

| Terry Pinkard | Andy Altman | Peter Fenves |
| Philosophy Department | Philosophy Department | Department of German |
| Georgetown University | Georgia State University | Northwestern University |
| 215 New North | Box 4089 | 2-107 Crowe Hall |
| 37th and O Streets, NW | Atlanta GA 30302-4089 | 1880 Campus Drive |
| Washington DC 20057 | aaltman@gsu.edu | Evanston IL 60208-2203 |
| pinkard1@georgetown.edu | | p-fenves@northwestern.edu |

Catherine Malabou
Université de Paris X- Nanterre
Département de Philosophie
200, Avenue de la République
92001 Nanterre Cedex
cmalabou@club-internet.fr

Languages:
German, French, Spanish
ANDREA SCARANTINO
CV

Contact Information
Email: ascarantino@gsu.edu
Department of Philosophy
Neuroscience Institute
Georgia State University

2005-present Assistant Professor, Department of Philosophy, Georgia State University

EDUCATION

2005 Ph.D. University of Pittsburgh, Department of History and Philosophy of Science
2005 M.S. University of Pittsburgh, Department of Philosophy
2000 Ph.D. Università Cattolica of Milan (Italy), Department of Economics
1997 M.S. The London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE), Department of Philosophy, Logic and Scientific Method
1994 B.S. Bocconi University (Italy), Department of Economics

AREAS OF SPECIALIZATION AND INTEREST

AOS: Philosophy of mind (esp. emotion theory), philosophy of science
AOC: Metaphysics and epistemology, logic

PUBLICATIONS

PAPERS

1. "Inductive Risk and Justice in Organ Allocation" (Forthcoming), Bioethics
2. “Insights and Blindspots of the Cognitivist Theory of Emotions” (Forthcoming), British Journal for the Philosophy of Science
3. “Is Core Affect a Natural Kind?” (Forthcoming), Philosophy of Science
4. (with Gualtiero Piccinini) “Computation vs Information Processing” (Forthcoming), Studies in the History and Philosophy of Science
6. “Shell Games, Information, and Counterfactuals” (Forthcoming), Australasian Journal of Philosophy

SHORTER PIECES

**REVIEWS**


**WORK IN PROGRESS**

Under Review
2. “The Experimental Philosophy of Emotions” (*European Review of Philosophy*)

In Preparation
1. “Unconscious Emotions Explained”
2. “Did Dretske Learn the Right Lesson from Shannon’s Theory of Information?”
3. “The Bundle Theory of Art” (with Francis Longworth)
4. “How to Define Folk Terms” (with Francis Longworth)
5. “How to Define Theoretical Terms” (with Francis Longworth)
6. “How To Do Things With Emotions”
7. “Emotions and Non-conceptual Content”

**HONORS**

2006 Richard M. Griffith Memorial Junior Award in philosophy for the paper “Emotions as Umotions”, awarded yearly by the Southern Society for Philosophy and Psychology
2004 Michael R. Bennett Prize in Philosophy, Philosophy Department, University of Pittsburgh, for the paper “Did Dretske Learn the Right Lesson from Shannon’s Theory of Information?”
2004 Graduate Student Travel Stipend, American Philosophical Association, Central Division, for the paper “Blindfright and the Cognitivist’s Dilemma”
2002 Graduate Student Travel Award, Society for Philosophy and Psychology, for the paper “A Deeper Problem for Dretske’s Theory of Informational Content”
2001 Andrew Mellon Dissertation Fellowship, University of Pittsburgh
2000 Student Paper Award from the American Society for Bioethics and Humanities, for the paper “The Interplay Between Science and Values in the Allocation of Cadaveric Kidneys”
1997 Andrea Mannu Prize, London School of Economics, for the Master Thesis “What is an Action? When is an Action Altruistic?”
1994 Fondazione Lanza Prize, for the dissertation “Rational Fools: a Study on the Requirements of Rationality Beyond Internal Consistency” (in Italian)
1994  Golden Medal “Amici della Bocconi” from Bocconi University given to all graduates “summa cum laude” for the academic year 1993-1994

GRANTS

2007  Summer Institute in Cognitive Neuroscience, University of California, Santa Barbara, June 25 - July 6, 2007 (funding for $2,500), Director: Michael S. Gazzaniga

TALKS

2008 “Shell Games, Information and Counterfactuals”, poster presented at the Society for Psychology and Philosophy Meeting, Philadelphia 2008
2008 “Is Core Affect a Natural Kind?”, Emotion Research Group, Savannah, invited talk
2007 “The Trouble with Counterfactual Theories of Information”, Philosophy Department, GSU, Brown Bag Lunch Series
2007 “Emotion as Umotion”, Emotion Research Group, Point Reyes, invited talk
2006 “What is an Umotion?”, Philosophy of Science Association, Biennial Meeting in Vancouver, Canada, November 3, 2006
2006 “Emotions as Umotions”, Southern Society for Philosophy and Psychology, Charleston, April 15, 2006
2006 “Carving Emotion at Its Joints”, Emotion Research Group, Miami, April 14, 2006, invited talk
2005 “Do Invertebrates Have Emotions?”, Neurophilosophy Brown-Bag Talk, Georgia State University, October 27, 2005
2005 “Understanding Emotions”, Neuroscience Fall 2005 Retreat, Georgia State University, October 14, 2005
2005 Chair of a session on “Ethics, Aesthetics, and Cognitive Science”, The Society for Philosophy and Psychology, Wake Forest, June 9-12, 2005
2005 “Blindfright and the Cognitivist’s Dilemma”, American Philosophical Association, Central Division Meeting, Chicago, April 27-30
2004 “Blindfright and the Cognitivist’s Dilemma”, Society for Philosophy and Psychology and European Society for Philosophy and Psychology, First Joint Meeting in Barcelona
2003 “Toward a New Theory of Semantic Information”, Graduate Student Conference at the University of California at S. Diego, La Jolla
2002 “Affordances Explained”, Philosophy of Science Association, Biennial Meeting in Milwaukee
2002 “A Deeper Problem for Dretske’s Theory of Informational Content”, Society for Philosophy and Psychology, Annual Meeting in Edmonton
“Local justice in organ allocation”, invited paper, Conference on Equity in Health Care in Reggio Emilia (Italy)

LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION

Paul Griffiths, ARC Federation Fellow and Professor of Philosophy, University of Queensland
Peter Machamer, Professor, History and Philosophy of Science Department, University of Pittsburgh
Bob Brandom, Professor, Department of Philosophy, University of Pittsburgh
Ruth Millikan, Professor, Department of Philosophy, University of Connecticut
Rob Wilson, Professor, Department of Philosophy, University of Alberta

TEACHING

2005-present Assistant Professor, Department of Philosophy, Georgia State University
Fall 2008
1. Great Questions of Philosophy (Phil 2010)
2. Philosophy of Science (Phil 4130/6130)
   Spring 2008
1. Great Questions of Philosophy (Phil 2010)
2. Metaphysics (Phil 4300/6300)
   Fall 2007
1. Great Questions of Philosophy (Phil 2010)
2. Seminar in Philosophy of Mind (on Emotions and Intentionality) (Phil 8330)
   Spring 2007
1. Great Questions of Philosophy (Phil 2010)
   Fall 2006
1. Great Questions of Philosophy (Phil 2010)
2. Symbolic Logic (Phil 4520/6520)
   Spring 2006
1. Great Questions of Philosophy (Phil 2010)
2. Seminar in Philosophy of Language (on Concepts and Conceptual Analysis) (Phil 8530)
   Fall 2005
1. Great Questions of Philosophy (Phil 2010)
2. Symbolic Logic (Phil 4520/6520)

1997-2005 Graduate Teaching Fellow, Department of History and Philosophy of Science, University of Pittsburgh

1995-1996 Teaching Assistant, Department of Economics, Bocconi University

LANGUAGES
Italian: native language; English: fluent; French: very good; Spanish: good

**SERVICE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2006</strong></td>
<td>Organization of the International Society for Research on Emotions (ISRE) annual meeting, August 6-10, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2005-present</strong></td>
<td>Referee for Philosophy of Science, Philosophical Quarterly, Philosophical Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2005-present</strong></td>
<td>Organization of the Neurophilosophy Brown Bag Series at Georgia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2005-present</strong></td>
<td>Master thesis committee membership: Soo Young Byun, Jill Brooks and Jessica Owensby-Sandifer, Scott Schneider, Bradley Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2005-present</strong></td>
<td>Master thesis direction: Bryan Miller (co-director Eddy Nahmias), Trevor Kvaran (co-director Eddy Nahmias), Barclay Brown (co-director Eddy Nahmias), Jimmy Vaught (co-director Eddy Nahmias), Jason Outlaw (co-director Eddy Nahmias), Brandie Martinez-Bedard (director)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2005-2006</strong></td>
<td>Brains &amp; Behavior Scientific Committee, Georgia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2005</strong></td>
<td>Organization of the 2005/2006 Philosophy Colloquium on “Reason and Emotion”, Georgia State University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F-3b
Current curriculum vitae
for full-time
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EDWARD T. COX
CURRICULUM VITAE

Address: Department of Philosophy
Georgia State University
34 Peachtree Street, Suite 1100
P.O. Box 4089
Atlanta, GA 30302-4089
Phone: 404-413-6133
Email: ecox@gsu.edu

EDUCATION

Ph.D. University of Oklahoma (Philosophy) 2000
M.A. University of Oklahoma (Philosophy) 1995
B.A. University of Chicago (Philosophy) 1990

Areas of Specialization: Philosophy of Mind, Metaphysics
Areas of Competence: Epistemology, Philosophy of Science, Philosophy of Language

RESEARCH

PUBLICATIONS

PRESENTATIONS AND COMMENTARIES

NATIONAL CONFERENCES
  “Against Phenomenal Direct Reference,” by Gordon Barnes, American Philosophical Association, Central meeting, Commentator (April, 2003)
  “Physicalism without Token Identity: the Ubiquity of Real Coincidence,” by James Taggart, American Philosophical Association, Central meeting, Commentator (May, 1998)

REGIONAL CONFERENCES
  “Autonomy and Mental Causation,” Mid-South Philosophy Conference, Presenter (February 2008)
  “Unstable Intuitions and Need for Cognition,” by Jonathan Weinberg, Mid-South Philosophy Conference, Commentator (February 2008)
  “Metaphysical Assumptions of Methodological Naturalism,” Central States Philosophy Association, Presenter (October 2007)
  “Defending Downward Causation,” Kentucky Philosophical Association, Presenter (Fall 2005)
  “Springing Forward and Falling Back: Traveling through Time,” by Anne Edwards, Mid-South Philosophy Conference, Commentator (March 1997)
  “Pure Informational Semantics and the Problem of Non-Disjunctive Content,” by Murat Aydede, Mid-South Philosophy Conference, Commentator (February 1996)
Univertsity Presentations

“Against Causal Parallelism” Murray State University faculty research forum, Presenter (October 2003)

“In Defense of Downward Causation” James Madison University colloquium series, Presenter (November, 2001)

“A Problem of Mental Causation and its Solution,” West Virginia University In-House Conference, Presenter (February, 2000)

Academic Positions

Department of Philosophy, Georgia State University
Lecturer (2008-Present)

Department of English and Philosophy, Murray State University
Assistant Professor (2003-2008)

Department of Philosophy and Religion, James Madison University
Assistant Professor (2000-2003)

Department of Philosophy, West Virginia University
Visiting Assistant Professor (1999-2000)

Upper Division Courses Taught

• Mortal Questions
• Philosophy of Language
• Metaphysics
• Symbolic Logic
• Philosophy of Religion
• Epistemology
• Philosophy and Cognitive Science
• Introduction to Philosophy of Science
• Philosophy of Mind
• Philosophy in Science Fiction
• History of Ethics

Lower Division Courses Taught

• Great Questions of Philosophy
• Introduction to Logic/Critical Thinking/Critical Reasoning
• Introduction to Philosophy
• Western Humanities (Ancient world to 1650)
• Introduction to Symbolic Logic
• Introduction to Ethics

Professional Service

Journal referee, *dialectica*
SANDRA L. DWYER
Department of Philosophy
Georgia State University
Atlanta, GA 30303
404.413.6103 sdwyer@gsu.edu


EDUCATION: Emory University Ph.D., May, 1995; M.A., May, 1993 in Philosophy, James Madison University B.A. with distinction, June, 1982

Dissertation: “Hannah Arendt’s Distinction Between the Social and the Political: The Locus of Freedom” Director: Professor Thomas R. Flynn

RESEARCH AREAS
Of Specialization: Critical Thinking; Ethics; History of Western Philosophy; Philosophy of Hannah Arendt
Of Competence: Applied Ethics; Twentieth Century Philosophy
Of Interest: Feminist Criticism; Pedagogy

WORKS IN PROGRESS

Ethical Thinking in Business. (Humanities—Ebooks.co.uk; Philosophy Insights Division) [forthcoming]

TEACHING
Courses Taught
*Business Ethics (upper level)
Contemporary Analytic and Continental Philosophy (upper level)
Contemporary Social & Political (upper level)
*Critical Thinking; Deductive Logic; (lower level)
Ethics (lower and upper level); Great Questions (lower level)
*History of Western Philosophy: Modern; Ancient (upper level)
*Teaching Philosophy (pedagogy and practicum: graduate level)

Independent Studies
Autonomy v. Authority (Nozick v. Wolff)
Phenomenology: Realism or Idealism?
Foucault and Healthcare
Descartes’ cogito: argument or intuition?
Moral Realism
Aristotle & Sankara on Causality (resulted in Honors thesis)
The Concept of Race (Outlaw, Sartre, West, Zack)
“Intrinsic Good” in Selected Classics

SERVICE
Fall 2007—current
Coordinator of Graduate Teaching
Undergraduate Studies Committee, WSI

2004—Fall 2006
Coordinator of Graduate Teaching
Phil Dept Library Liaison, MA thesis committee reader

2005—2006
Phil Dept Triennial Chair Review committee, VI Search committee,
Undergraduate Studies Committee, WSI
Chair, Committee on Lecturer Policy, WSI
Phil Dept Library Liaison

2002-2003
Member, Department Critical Thinking Committee, GSU

1995—1998
Member, College Committee for Faculty Excellence Awards;
Advisor for Philosophy and Liberal Studies Majors;
Department Assessment Specialist; authored Philosophy Assessment
Plan;
Member, Core Curriculum Committee and Critical Thinking
Subcommittee; Member, Applied Ethics Committee;
Member, Philosophy Chair Search Committee, UALR

Publications, Conference Papers and Invited Talks


“Logic, Theory & Critical Thinking: Notes Toward Discussion on their Roles in Nursing Research,” invited lecture to MSN candidates, GSU School of Nursing, January 17, 2006.


“Recycling: Waste or Production? New or Ancient Practice,” Co-Options 9:10 (December 1998), 7. Co-Options is the monthly newsletter published by Sevananda Natural Foods Co-Operative in Atlanta, GA.


“Metapedagogy and the Mystique of the Egalitarian Classroom,” co-authored with Zenia Chavez, American Association for Philosophy Teachers, Old Dominion University, July 31-August 4, 1996.

“Is Hannah Arendt an Elitist?” Mid-South Philosophy conference, University of Memphis, February 23-24, 1996; also commented on “Existentialist Virtue Ethics.”


“The Impossibility of Social Freedom,” delivered at Philosophy Forum, a weekly presentation open to the University and the Public, sponsored by the Department of Philosophy and Religion, Georgia State University, Spring, 1994.

“Causes of Poverty: Distribution or Production?” invited lecture to graduate class in “Culture and Agriculture,” Morehouse College, Spring, 1990.

“Canadian Food Banking: Planning Its Own Demise?” Seeds 13 (May/June, 1990), 13-17. Seeds is a nonprofit quarterly magazine dedicated to issues of world food security.


“The Priority of Resemblance in Kant’s Notion of Apriority,” delivered to spring meeting of the Graduate Philosophy Club, Emory University, 1986.

Awards
UALR Philosophy Department Assessment Plan received highest score of the 108 programs
Recipient of Curriculum Reform Grant for workshop on Metapedagogy, UALR
Graduate Fellowship and Tuition Scholarship, Emory University

Affiliations
Member of American Philosophical Association
Member of American Association of Philosophy Teachers
STEPHEN JACOBSON

Senior Lecturer
Department of Philosophy
Georgia State University
Atlanta, Georgia 30302-4089

Phone: (404) 651-0726 (work)
(404) 848-8458 (home)
E-mail sjacobson@gsu.edu

EDUCATION

University of Michigan, Ph.D., Philosophy, 1989
University of Delaware, B.A. 1972, M.A.-1974

AREAS OF SPECIALIZATION AND COMPETENCE

(AOS) Epistemology

(AOC) Metaphysics, Philosophy of Language, Philosophy of Mind, Philosophy of Science,
History of Philosophy (Ancient, Modern, 20th Century), Philosophy of Religion

DISSENTATION  (Title: What's Wrong With Reliability Theories of Justification?)

Committee: Professors Louis E. Loeb (Chair), Lawrence Sklar, Stephen Yablo,
Gailann Rickert (Classics)

PUBLICATIONS


"Contextualism and Global Doubts about the World"

"Externalism and Action-Guiding Epistemic Norms,"


"In Defense of Truth and Rationality"
Pacific Philosophical Quarterly, December, 1992 (vol. 73, no. 4), pp. 335-346.
(actual acceptance/publication dates, June/October 1993)

"Internalism in Epistemology and the Internalist Regress"

"Alston on Iterative Foundationalism and Cartesian Epistemology"
WORK IN PROGRESS

"Defending Contextualism" (submitted for publication)

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Georgia State University, Lecturer in Philosophy (1997/present)
Graduate Epistemology Seminar, Theory of Knowledge Survey, Graduate Metaphysics Seminar, Metaphysics Survey, Philosophy of Language, 19th and 20th Century Philosophy, History of Modern Philosophy, Ancient Philosophy, Philosophical Thinking, Logic and Critical Thinking (including honors sections), Great Questions of Philosophy (including honors sections)

Bloomsburg University, Instructor in Philosophy (1996-1997)
Contemporary Moral Problems, Introduction to Philosophy, Introduction to Symbolic Logic, Critical Thinking

Dartmouth College, Visiting Assistant Professor (Fall, 1994; 1995-96)
Theory of Knowledge, Philosophy of Science, Philosophy of Mind, Introduction to Philosophy, Critical Thinking

University of Vermont, Visiting Assistant Professor (1993-94; Spring, 1)
Philosophy of Mind, Philosophy of Science, Epistemology, Introduction to Philosophy

Saint Michael's College, Visiting Instructor (Fall, 1994)
Philosophy of Human Nature

Kalamazoo College, Visiting Assistant Professor (1992-93)
20th Century Analytic Philosophy, Philosophy of Science, Theory of Knowledge, Logic, Introduction to Philosophy

University of Florida, Visiting Assistant Professor (1989-92)
Philosophy of Science, Graduate Seminar in Epistemology, Introduction to Philosophy, Honors Introduction to Philosophy

University of Michigan, Lecturer and Teaching Assistant
Introduction to Logic, Introduction to Philosophy, Epistemology and Metaphysics

RESEARCH INTERESTS

My research focuses on traditional and contemporary issues in epistemology and draws from my strong interests in the history of philosophy as well as metaphysics, and the philosophies of mind, language, and science. I have given considerable attention to reliability theories of justification. Reliability theories have undeniable virtues. They provide theory- and practice-neutral standards for epistemic evaluations, and they answer the skeptic without compromising the high, truth-linked standards that the skeptic insists are necessary for justification. I am in agreement with many writers that reliability theories acquire these virtues only by sacrificing important epistemic values; however, I am not in agreement with a number of prominent accounts of the failings of reliability theories, including-Stephen Stich's claim that truth is not a value we should care about, John Pollock's contention that externalist accounts of justification do not capture the action-
guiding character of epistemic norms, and Richard Foley's defense of subjective foundationalism. I have criticized these accounts on the grounds that even if they identify principles that reliability theories violate, it is not clear why an adequate epistemology ought to preserve these principles. (My criticisms are contained in several papers listed above: see e.g., “In Defense of Truth and Rationality” and “Externalism and the Regulative Role of Epistemic Norms.”) In my view, the problem with reliability theories is that they violate the requirement that justification is determined exclusively by the quality of reasons a person possesses in support of what he/she believes. In defending this view, an issue that requires attention is the significance of philosophical skepticism. The worry is that a reason-based conception of justification of the sort I favor may be thought to involve a demand for a global justification of our beliefs which cannot be satisfied. I am currently exploring recent contextualist responses to skepticism, which concede that the radical doubts of the skeptic are real and unanswerable, but deny that our inability to answer those doubts levels the epistemic distinctions we make in everyday and scientific contexts of inquiry.

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES


Commentator on Robert Almeder’s “The Vacuity of Truth: An Argument Against Correspondence Theories,” Georgia State University Colloquium in Philosophy, October, 2000.


"Internalism and Regulative Epistemic Norms," Eastern Pennsylvania Philosophical Association Meeting, Fall Meeting, November 9, 1996.

Commentator on David Christensen's "Diachronic Coherence and Epistemic Impartiality," Dartmouth College/University of Vermont Colloquium in Philosophy, June 28, 1996.


Commentator on Andrew Payne’s "BonJour and the Coherence Hypothesis," The American Philosophical Association Central Division Meeting, May 4-7, 1994.

Participant, NEH Summer Institute, "Knowledge, Teaching, and Wisdom: An Historical and


REFERENCES

Professors Louis E. Loeb, Lawrence Sklar, Frederick Schmitt, Stephen Yablo, Hilary Kornblith, David Christensen

DOSSIER AVAILABLE FROM

Ellen Logan, Department of Philosophy, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA 30302-4089
Appendix F-3c
Current curriculum vitae for full-time non-tenure-track visiting faculty
Brandie Martinez Bedard  
4652 Westhampton Circle  
Tucker, GA 30084  
(770) 356-6955  
Bbedard1@gsu.edu

Curriculum Vitae

EDUCATION

Master of Arts- Philosophy  
Georgia State University  
Thesis: Is Core Affect a Natural Kind? Directed by Dr. Andrea Scarantino  
Aug. 2008

Bachelor of Arts  
Double Major: Philosophy and Religious Studies  
Georgia State University  
Honor’s Thesis: Types of Causes in Aristotle and Sankara Directed by Dr. Kathryn McClymond  
May 2006

APPOINTMENTS

Visiting Instructor, Georgia State University  
Teaching four sections per semester of Introduction to Philosophy (Phil 2010)  
Fall 08- Current

Instructor of Record (GTA), Georgia State University  
Taught a total of seven sections of Critical Thinking (Phil 1010)  
Summer 2007- Spring 08

Supplemental Instructor, Georgia State University  
Tutored for Critical Thinking (Phil 1010)  
Fall 2007

PRESENTATIONS

“Determinism al Dente is Hard to Swallow” University of North Florida Student Philosophy Conference, Spring 2007

“Real Talk to Pre-GTAs” Co-presented with Joseph Q. Adams, Fall 2008

“Crossdisciplinary Implication of Reflections on Pedagogy in a Non-Authoritarian Environment” Co-presented with Joseph Q. Adams, Graduate Teaching Conference sponsored by The Center for Teaching and Learning and the Department of English, January 2008

Panel Discussion- “Presenting at Professional Conferences” Georgia State University Religious Student Forum, Spring 2008

HONORS

2006- George W. Beiswanger Best Philosophy Undergraduate Award  
2006- Research Honors  
2008- Outstanding Graduate Teaching in Philosophy and Religious Studies  
2008- Excellence in Teaching in Higher Education by the Center for Teaching and Learning

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS

American Philosophical Association  
2006-Current

Phi Sigma Tau  
President, 2007  
Vice President, 2006 and 2008  
Secretary, 2005

League of United Latin American Citizens  
Scholarship Chair, 2007 and 2008  
2002- Current
Theresa “Ness” Ashley Creighton
Last Updated: October 2008

Department of Philosophy
Georgia State University
P.O. Box 4089
Atlanta, GA 30302

Ness A. Creighton
1422 N. Morningside Dr NE
Atlanta GA USA 30306
404-231-9612
phltac@gsu.edu

Education
M.A. Philosophy (Philosophy of Religion), Georgia State University College of Arts and Sciences, 2008
B.A., Philosophy, Georgia State University College of Arts and Sciences (with Research Honors); 2004
(Minor: Biological Anthropology, Sociology)
B.B.A., Computer Information Systems, Georgia State University College of Business; 2004
(Certificate: C++ Programming, Database Design)

Employment
Visiting Instructor, Georgia State University (Phil) 2008-present (contracted through 2009)
Graduate Teaching Assistant, Georgia State University (Phil), 2007-2008
Undergraduate Assistant to the System Administrator, Georgia State University (CS), 1999 – 2004

Areas of Specialization
Buddhist Philosophy, Kant, Comparative Historical Political Philosophy

Areas of Competence

Philosophy
Enlightenment Period Studies, Political Philosophy, Kant (Practical Philosophy), Hume,
Philosophy of Science (Biological Anthropology), general History of Philosophy.

Religious Studies / Philosophy of Religion
Japanese Buddhist Philosophy, Japanese Popular Religion (Shinto and Buddhism), New
Religious Movements (Buddhist, American), American Popular Religion (19th Century).

Anthropology
Human Skeletal Morphology, Statistical Methods and Modeling

Areas of Interest
Alchemy (European, Near Eastern, Chinese), Linguistic History and Development,
Folklore, Popular Culture and Religion in the Media, History of Anthropology and
Forensics, Archeology (Modern, Medieval, Forensic), Military Technology and Social
Change

Master’s Dissertation
“Freedom and the Ideal Republic: Kant, Thomas Jefferson, and the Place of Freedom in the Ideal State”
Committee: Melissa Merritt, Sandra Dwyer, and Andrew J. Cohen
Defended May 2008

Undergraduate Thesis
“Comparative Skeletal Anatomy of Bipeds with an Evolutionary Perspective”
Director: Frank L. Williams
Defended April 2004
CONTACT INFORMATION

Department of Philosophy
Georga State University
P.O. Box 4089
Atlanta, Georgia 30302-4089
sjuan@gsu.edu

1376 Northview Ave. NE
Atlanta, Georgia 30306-3231
404/313-4111
sjjulian68@gmail.com

AREAS OF SPECIALIZATION

Recent Continental Philosophy
History of Ethics

AREAS OF COMPETENCE

History of Philosophy
Existentialism

EDUCATION

Ph.D., 2007, Philosophy, University of Memphis, Memphis, Tennessee
M.A., 1994, Philosophy, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio
B.A., 1991, Philosophy (Magna Cum Laude), University of West Florida, Pensacola, Florida

DOCTORAL DISSERTATION

DISCOVERING EXISTENCE WITH EMMANUEL LEVINAS, 1929-1951
Director: Robert Bernasconi
Readers: Leonard Lawlor, Mary Beth Mader, John Tienson

Abstract: Discovering Existence with Emmanuel Levinas, 1929-1951 is a study of the origin and meaning of the concept of existence in Levinas's early works. In short, I show that in these works “to exist” means to be for the Other. More precisely, I argue, first, that the origin of Levinas's conception of existence is to be found in his Heideggerian interpretation of Husserl's theory of the absolute and intentional existence of consciousness. Second, I contend that Levinas's early critique of Husserl’s ‘suprahistorical attitude’ indicates the need to interpret his own original phenomenological analyses in light of the larger historical horizon within which they initially appear. In connection with this claim, I argue that the admission of an unconstituted ‘hyletic’ level—especially the sensation of pain—at the basis of intentional life provides the phenomenological basis for Levinas's early analyses of the constitution of a personal ego beginning with the need to escape. I contend, moreover, that within the immediate historical situation the horror of anonymous existence, or the experience of de-personalization, is the concrete manner in which the abstract, philosophical question concerning the meaning of ‘being in general’ has genuine existential significance. Finally, I argue that the ethical significance of the intersubjective relation in Levinas's philosophy is already explicit in a number of earlier writings (and implicit in others); and that the primacy of this relation has its basis in Levinas's earliest conception of Husserlian phenomenology—that is, in his claim that the intersubjective reduction opens up a more fundamental dimension of the meaning of existence than does the merely preliminary, but indispensable egological reduction.

MASTER'S THESIS

NIETZSCHE'S TRAGIC AESTHETICISM: PRELUDE TO AN ETHICS OF THE FUTURE
Director: William McKenna
Readers: Lee Horvitz, Mary Windham
Awards


Publications


forthcoming


Works in Progress


“Beauvoir's Note on Levinas: From the Situation of the Married Woman to the Place of ‘the Feminine’ in the General Economy of Being” (in development).


Presentations


Teaching Experience

Course Instructor

**Visiting Instructor, Department of Philosophy, Georgia State University**, Atlanta, Georgia

Contemporary Moral Problems, PHIL 3720, Fall 2008, Spring 2009
Visiting Assistant Professor, Philosophy Program, Florida Southern College, Lakeland, Florida

Principles of Philosophy, PHI 205, Spring 2008
Ethics, PHI 206, Spring 2008
General Logic, PHI 207, Spring 2008

Department of History & Philosophy, Kennesaw State University, Kennesaw, Georgia

Ways of Knowing, PHIL 2200, Fall 2005, Spring 2006, Fall 2006, Fall 2007

Department of Philosophy, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio

Theories of Human Nature, PHL 105, Fall 2003, Spring 2004

Department of Philosophy, University of Memphis, Memphis, Tennessee

Classical Issues in Philosophy, PHIL 1101, Fall 2001, Spring 2002
Elementary Logic, PHIL 1611, Fall 1998
Values and the Modern World, PHIL 1102, Spring 1999

Department of Philosophy, Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton, Florida

Reason and Value, PHI 1030, Spring 2000

Department of Philosophy & Religious Studies, University of West Florida, Pensacola, Florida

Ethics in Contemporary Society, PHI 2630, Fall 1994, Spring 1995
Introduction to Philosophy, PHI 2010, Spring 1995

Teaching Assistant

Department of Philosophy, University of Memphis, Memphis, Tennessee

Values & the Modern World, PHIL 1102, Fall 1997, Spring 1998

Department of Philosophy, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio

Aesthetics, PHL 241, Fall 1993
Theories of Human Nature, PHL 105, Fall 1992

Department of Philosophy & Religious Studies, University of West Florida, Pensacola, Florida


Other Professional Experience

Editorial Assistant, Chiasmi International: Trilingual Studies Concerning Merleau-Ponty’s Thought, University of Memphis, 2002-2003

Research Assistant (Robert Bernasconi), University of Memphis, 1995-1997
PROFESSIONAL SERVICE

Ph.D. Student Representative, Department of Philosophy, University of Memphis, 1996-1997
Faculty Advisor, Socratic Society (undergraduate philosophy club), University of West Florida, 1994-1995

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS

North American Levinas Society
Society for Phenomenology and Existential Philosophy

LANGUAGES

Reading knowledge of French and German

REFERENCES

Robert Bernasconi, Lillian and Morrie Moss Professor of Philosophy
Department of Philosophy
The University of Memphis phone: 901/678-3357
Memphis, Tennessee 38152 email: rbermsen@memphis.edu

Leonard Lawlor, Edwin Erle Sparks Professor of Philosophy
Department of Philosophy
Pennsylvania State University phone: 814/865-7822
240 Sparks Building email: lul19@psu.edu
University Park, PA 16802

Tina Chanter, Professor of Philosophy
Department of Philosophy
DePaul University phone: 773/326-1151
2352 N. Clifton Ave., Ste. 150 email: tchanter@depaul.edu
Chicago, Illinois 60614

Sarah Robbins, Professor of English and English Education (teaching letter)
Office of the President
Kennesaw Hall phone: 770-423-6127
Kennesaw State University email: srobbins@kennesaw.edu
1000 Chastain Rd.
Kennesaw, Georgia 30144

GRADUATE SEMINARS

Department of Philosophy, University of Memphis

Courses for Credit
Plato’s Ethics (Roche)
Aristotle’s Moral Philosophy (Roche)
Rationalism and Empiricism in Ethics. Hume, Kant & Contemporary Analytic Metaethics (Timmons)
Kant’s Ethics (Timmons)
Kant’s Critique of Pure Reason (Robinson)
Kant’s Critique of Judgment (Robinson)
Hegel’s *Elements of the Philosophy of Right, Introduction to the Lectures on World History* and *Philosophy of History* (Bernasconi)

Nietzsche’s *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* (Lawlor)

Husserl. *Cartesian Meditations* and Fink’s *Sixth Cartesian Meditation* (Lawlor)

Derrida’s Interpretation of Husserl (Lawlor)

Recent Continental Philosophy. Heidegger, Levinas & Derrida (Bernasconi)

Levinas’s Critique of Heidegger on Time (Chanter)

Levinas’s *Existence and Existents, Humanism of the Other* and *Otherwise than Being* (Bernasconi)

Levinas’s *Otherwise than Being or Beyond Essence* and “Time and the Other” (Chanter)

Levinas’s *Totality and Infinity* (Bernasconi)

Contemporary Analytic Metaphysics. Naturalism (Tienson)

Contemporary Analytic Metaphysics. Truth and Ontology (Horgan)

**Courses Audited**

Recent Continental Philosophy. Humanism and Anti-Humanism (Bernasconi)

The Debate between Sartre and Merleau-Ponty (Bernasconi)

**Department of Philosophy, Miami University**

Spinoza’s *Ethics* (Seidel)

Nineteenth Century Philosophy. Hegel, Feuerbach, and Marx (De Laurentiis)

Nietzsche’s Critique of Morality (Windham)

Heidegger’s *Being and Time* (Horvitz)

Religious Existentialism. Kierkegaard, Marcel, and Tillich (Horvitz)

Critical Theory. Horkheimer, Adorno, Marcuse, Benjamin, and Habermas (De Laurentiis)

Advanced Ethical Theory. Contemporary Theory and Anti-Theory (Windham)

**Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies, University of West Florida** (post graduation)

Phenomenology. Phenomenological Psychology: Merleau-Ponty and Gurwitsch (Herman)

Humanistic Understanding. Feyerabend (Armstrong)
Appendices F4
Faculty Participation
Appendix F4  Faculty participation in developing & approving this self study

Andrew J. Cohen served as the Chair of the Academic Program Review Committee for the Department. A subcommittee consisting of Dr. Cohen, Eddy Nahmias, and Tim O’Keefe worked with the Chair of the Department to create a Draft of this Self-Study Report. On Friday, November 7, 2008, at a regularly scheduled Department meeting, the Department discussed the Report extensively and made many recommendations for improving the document. A new draft was created and circulated to the Department; with the additional input thus generated, the report was further revised. It was then circulated to the Department again, which then voted its approval of the final document.
*Appendices F5
Publications and Quality Points
Appendix F5  Quantity of Publications and Quality Point Values

Below is a chart with data on current faculty size and on number of publications produced by faculty in the top eleven philosophy programs offering a terminal MA degree. Information on current faculty was garnered from their departmental websites. Only full-time tenure and tenure-track faculty (full, associate, and assistant professors) housed in the philosophy department are included (i.e., no emeritus, visiting professors, adjunct professors, or faculty in other departments with affiliations in philosophy were included). Information on faculty publications was garnered from the faculty members’ up-to-date (2008) CVs online where available, and then GoogleScholar to check the CV or to supplement it where it is not complete or up-to-date. The Philosophers’ Index was also used to double check the information. Included are all journal articles and book chapters, excluding book reviews and encyclopedia entries, and all books, excluding textbooks and edited volumes.

Quality points are based on the journal and press rankings used for the Georgia State philosophy department’s tenure process, determined in the following manner, as indicated in the most recent Promotion and Tenure Manual of the Department of Philosophy.

1. The tenure-track members of the department will develop a list of journals and presses. The journals will be divided into six exhaustive areas: history journals, continental journals, value theory journals, metaphysics/epistemology journals, Brains & Behavior journals, and general journals.

2. All tenured and tenure-track members of the department (except the Department Chair) may nominate up to 10 faculty outside of Georgia State to rank the journals and presses to rank journals and presses in each of the five following areas: history nominees, continental nominees, value theory nominees, metaphysics/epistemology nominees, and Brains & Behavior nominees. (This is a total of up to 50 nominees.) The Department Chair will compile the list of nominated individuals and distribute this list to all tenured and tenure-track members of the department. Anyone may strike any name from the list. The Chair will then select and invite individuals to do the ranking until six individuals from each of the five nomination areas have agreed to rank the journals in that area. [In the last ranking, the Chair selected by going down each list in alphabetical order until the required number of individuals was attained.] Each of these 30 individuals will also be asked to rank the general journals. The Chair will inform the faculty who the 30 individuals are but will not reveal their rankings.

3. The outside reviewers will be asked to rank the journals/presses as follows with the following comments:

   “Excellent” should be used to indicate the few journals/presses that publish the very best work in the area.
   “Very Good” should be used to indicate the journals/presses that publish more than solid work in the area.
   “Good” should be used to indicate the journals/presses that publish solid work in the area.
   “Fair” should be used to indicate journals/presses that, while perfectly respectable, do not usually publish work that is of the quality found in the higher ranked
journals/presses.
“Poor” should be used to indicate journals/presses in which professors should not publish.

The department will tell the reviewers that, in the past, a great many journals were placed into the “Very Good” category with very few in Excellent, few in Good, and almost none in “Fair” or “Poor” categories. The department will also tell the reviewers that they would appreciate a more balanced ranking of the journals/presses with a few more in the “Excellent” group and some more in the “Good” group. Finally, the department will tell the reviewers that they should feel free not to give a ranking to any journal/press that they feel that they don’t know enough about to rank.

4. The ranking of each journal/press will be based on the average of the rankings returned using 5 points for Excellent, 4 points for Very Good, 3 points for Good, 2 points for Fair, and 1 point for Poor. However, rather than using normal rules of rounding, rankings of X.50 will be rounded down. Rankings of X.51 will be rounded up. For example, a journal ranked as excellent by three rankers and as very good by three rankers would be ranked as very good.

5. Any faculty member may request that an unranked journal be ranked and this requested will be honored. Every five years the Department will consider whether it is necessary to re-rank all the journals and presses. This issue will be decided by majority vote.

The rankings that resulted from this process are included after the chart comparing the Philosophy Department at Georgia State to our Peer Programs. Generally following the tenure manual, quality points were then awarded according to the following scale, with the exception of the unrated presses and journals:

Books
Excellent (E) = 12
Very Good (VG) = 8
Good (G) = 4
Fair (F) = 0
Not Rated (NR) = 2 (the assumption is that presses that were not rated are not of high quality)

Journals
Excellent (E) = 3
Very Good (VG) = 2
Good (G) = 1
Fair (F) = 0
Not Rated (NR) = 1 (unrated journals may be quite good or quite poor; we have used 1 point as the most reasonable compromise)

The total number of quality points for books and articles is listed in the far right column below (marked “TOTAL”).
The forthcoming publications listed for Georgia State faculty represent the books and articles that are in press or have been accepted for publication.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (Gourmet rank)</th>
<th>Fac Rank</th>
<th>Book rank</th>
<th>Book total</th>
<th>Article #</th>
<th>Exc (3)</th>
<th>VG (2)</th>
<th>Good (1)</th>
<th>Fair (0)</th>
<th>NR (1)</th>
<th>Art Totals</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Georgia State (2-5)</td>
<td>3+3+6=12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altman, A</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berry, J</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohen, Al</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohen, AJ</td>
<td>Assoc</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham, G</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartley, C</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merritt, M</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahmias, E</td>
<td>Assoc</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Keefe, T</td>
<td>Assoc</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainbolt, G</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rand, S</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaranitno, A</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Forthcoming publications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (Gourmet rank)</th>
<th>Fac Rank</th>
<th>Book rank</th>
<th>Book total</th>
<th>Article #</th>
<th>Exc (3)</th>
<th>VG (2)</th>
<th>Good (1)</th>
<th>Fair (0)</th>
<th>NR (1)</th>
<th>Art Totals</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tufts University (1)</td>
<td>5+4+2=11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bauer, N</td>
<td>Assoc</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azzouni, J</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>2 E</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennett</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>2 VG</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackendoff, R</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>2 E</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard, M</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, G</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly, E</td>
<td>Assoc</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McPherson, L</td>
<td>Assoc</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, S</td>
<td>Assoc</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baz, A</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (Gourmet rank)</th>
<th>Fac Rank</th>
<th>Book rank</th>
<th>Book total</th>
<th>Article #</th>
<th>Exc (3)</th>
<th>VG (2)</th>
<th>Good (1)</th>
<th>Fair (0)</th>
<th>NR (1)</th>
<th>Art Totals</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern Illinois (2-5)</td>
<td>3+5+3=11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allori, V</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buller, D</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>VG</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engel, M</td>
<td>Assoc</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finch, A</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gelven, M</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>2 NR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillet, C</td>
<td>Assoc</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson, J</td>
<td>Assoc</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapitan, T</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pynn, G</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sytsma, S</td>
<td>Assoc</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tothurst, W</td>
<td>Assoc</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name (Gourmet rank)</td>
<td>Fac Rank</td>
<td>Book rank</td>
<td>Book total</td>
<td>Article #</td>
<td>Exc (3)</td>
<td>VG (2)</td>
<td>Good (1)</td>
<td>Fair (0)</td>
<td>NR (1)</td>
<td>Art Totals</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips, David</td>
<td>Assoc</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson, W</td>
<td>Assoc</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnsen, B</td>
<td>Assoc</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garson, J</td>
<td>Assoc</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, J</td>
<td>Assoc</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, G</td>
<td>Assoc</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unv of Houston (6-8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tierney, R</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabrizio, M</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neufeld, B</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwartz, R</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensat, J</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tierney, R</td>
<td>Assoc</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westland, A</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Virginia Tech (2-5)**

**Wisconsin-Milw. (2-5)**

**Univ of Houston (6-8)**

**Total**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (Gourmet rank)</th>
<th>Fac Rank</th>
<th>Book rank</th>
<th>Book total</th>
<th>Article #</th>
<th>Exc (3)</th>
<th>VG (2)</th>
<th>Good (1)</th>
<th>Fair (0)</th>
<th>NR (1)</th>
<th>Art Totals</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Missouri-St. Louis (6-8)</td>
<td>(2+3+4)=9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alejandrova, A</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brogaard, Berit</td>
<td>Assoc</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunero, J</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGinnis, J</td>
<td>Assoc</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munson, R</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>E, G</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northcott, R</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piccinini, G</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross, S</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiland, E</td>
<td>Assoc</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri-St. Louis (6-8)</td>
<td>(4+2+2)=8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allhoff, F</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biener, Zvi</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alspector-Kelly, M</td>
<td>Assoc</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldner, K</td>
<td>Assoc</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilworth, J</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGrew, T</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>VG</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pritchard, M</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Q</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State (9-11)</td>
<td>(7+3+6)=16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archie, A</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cafaro, P</td>
<td>Assoc</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamid, I</td>
<td>Assoc</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchener, R.F.</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kneller, J.E.</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, G.S.</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Losonky, M.</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie, M.</td>
<td>Assoc</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maffie, J</td>
<td>Assoc</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCulloch, M.L.</td>
<td>Assoc</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKee, P.L.</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McShane, K</td>
<td>Assoc</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rollin, B.E.</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarenac, D.K.</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropman, E</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, R.G.</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name (Gourmet rank)</td>
<td>Fac Rank</td>
<td>Book rank</td>
<td>Book total</td>
<td>Article #</td>
<td>Exc (3)</td>
<td>VG (2)</td>
<td>Good (1)</td>
<td>Fair (0)</td>
<td>NR (1)</td>
<td>Art Totals</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Tech (9-11)</td>
<td>(2+3+5)=10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beck, J</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christiansen, P</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curzer, H</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>di Poppa, F</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hom, C</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim, Sungsu</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan, D</td>
<td>Assoc</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ribeiro, A</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schaller, W</td>
<td>Assoc</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webb, M</td>
<td>Assoc</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (Gourmet rank)</th>
<th>Fac Rank</th>
<th>Book rank</th>
<th>Book total</th>
<th>Article #</th>
<th>Exc (3)</th>
<th>VG (2)</th>
<th>Good (1)</th>
<th>Fair (0)</th>
<th>NR (1)</th>
<th>Art Totals</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cal State LA (9-11)</td>
<td>5+2+3 = 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abed, M</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balaguer, M</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bettcher, T</td>
<td>Assoc</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faust, J</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gomez, R</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendell, H</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitt, D</td>
<td>Assoc</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prabhu, J</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shim, M</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernallis, K</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fac Rank</th>
<th>Book rank</th>
<th>Article #</th>
<th>Exc (3)</th>
<th>VG (2)</th>
<th>Good (1)</th>
<th>Fair (0)</th>
<th>NR (1)</th>
<th>Art Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>2E</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>VG, 4E</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTALS: 140 142 31 43 22 2 44 245
Total Points, Articles and Books: 385
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The Philosophy Press Ranking as determined by the process explained above and used to determine the quality points in the above chart are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E = Excellent</th>
<th>VG = Very Good</th>
<th>G = Good</th>
<th>F = Fair</th>
<th>P = Poor</th>
<th>NR = Not Ranked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acumen Publishing Ltd.</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashgate Publishing Co.</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated University Presses</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Books</td>
<td>VG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackwell Publishers</td>
<td>VG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford Books</td>
<td>VG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge University Press</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic University of America Press</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia University Press</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuum/Thoemmes Continuum</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comell University Press</td>
<td>VG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke University Press</td>
<td>VG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duquesne University Press</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh University Press</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editions Rodopi</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham University Press</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Free Press</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garland Publishing</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown University Press</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilford Publications</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hackett</td>
<td>VG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard University Press</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities Press International</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imprint Academic</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University Press</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Universities Press</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns Hopkins University Press</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Erlbaum</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Fund</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana State University Press</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquette University Press</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT Press</td>
<td>VG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York University Press</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Illinois University Press</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern University Press</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University Press</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher</td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio University Press</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Court Publishing</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford University Press</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passagen Verlag</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penguin</td>
<td>VG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn State University Press</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy Documentation Center</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prentice Hall</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton University Press</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prometheus Books</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue University Press</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routledge</td>
<td>VG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowman &amp; Littlefield</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Martin's Press</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Illinois University Press</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springer</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Augustine Press</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State University of New York Press</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple University Press</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Tech University Press</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Alabama Press</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California Press</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Chicago Press</td>
<td>VG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Exeter Press</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia Press</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Hawaii Press</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois Press</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Massachusetts Press</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan Press</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota Press</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri Press</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nebraska Press</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina Press</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Notre Dame Press</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oklahoma Press</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pittsburgh Press</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Rochester Press</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Scranton Press</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Toronto Press</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Utah Press</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington Press</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Press of Florida</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher</td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Press of Kansas</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Press of New England</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Press of Virginia</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderbilt University Press</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verso (New Left Books)</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wadsworth</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter de Gruyter</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesleyan University Press</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westview</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. W. Norton</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale University Press</td>
<td>VG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Philosophy Journal Ranking as determined by the process explained above and used to determine the quality points in the above chart are as follows:

- E = Excellent
- VG = Very Good
- G = Good
- F = Fair
- P = Poor
- NR = Not Ranked

**General Journals/Journals Not Classified**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Philosophical Quarterly</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Journal of Philosophy</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australasian Journal of Philosophy</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Journal of Philosophy</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialectica</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue: The Canadian Philosophical Review</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elenchos</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Journal of Philosophy</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminist Studies</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grazer Philosophische Studien</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heythrop Journal</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypatia</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Philosophical Studies</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Philosophical Quarterly</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Studies in Philosophy</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iyyun</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Applied Philosophy</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Chinese Philosophy</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Philosophical Research</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Philosophy</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journals</td>
<td>Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphilosophy</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest Studies in Philosophy</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mind</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monist</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nous</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Philosophical Quarterly</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosopher’s Imprint</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophia</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophical Books</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophical Explorations</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophical Forum</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophical Inquiry</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophical Investigations</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophical Papers</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophical Quarterly</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophical Review</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophical Studies</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophical Topics</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy Compass</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy: The J of the Royal Institute of Phil</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy and Literature</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy and Phenomenological Research</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy and Rhetoric</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy East and West</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy in Review</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Metaphysics</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revue Internationale de Philosophie</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Journal of Philosophy</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Philosophy Review</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Philosophy</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topoi</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zygon</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ethics/Value Theory Journals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journals</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Journal of Bioethics</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annuals of the Society of Christian Ethics</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bioethics</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bioethics Forum</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Journal of Aesthetics</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magazine/Conference Title</td>
<td>Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Ethics Quarterly</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice Ethics</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Review</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics and Philosophy</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Ethics</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Values</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Theory and Moral Practice</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics and International Affairs</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics and the Environment</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics, Place, and the Environment</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastings Center Report</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Applied Philosophy</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Business Ethics</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Business and Professional Ethics</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Ethics</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Ethics and Social Philosophy</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Medical Ethics</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Medicine and Philosophy</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Moral Philosophy</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Political Philosophy</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Religious Ethics</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Social Philosophy</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Value Inquiry</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy Institute of Ethics Journal</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and Philosophy</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Theory</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nomos</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy and Public Affairs</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polis</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Theory</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics, Philosophy, and Economics</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polity</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Affairs Quarterly</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radical Philosophy</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio Juris</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason Papers</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Philosophy and Policy</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Theory and Practice</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical Medicine and Bioethics</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoria</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory and Decision</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>Volume Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utilitas</strong></td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metaphysics/Epistemology Journals</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Journal of Theology and Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annals of Pure and Applied Logic</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology and Philosophy</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Journal of Theology</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Journal for the Philosophy of Science</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erkenntnis</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History and the Philosophy of Logic</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Logic</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal for Philosophy of Religion</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Studies in the Phil of Science</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Semantics</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Philosophical Logic</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Symbolic Logic</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of the Social Sciences</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics and Philosophy</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophia Naturalis</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy of Science</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy of the Social Sciences</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies in History and Philosophy of Science</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthese</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>History Journals</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient Philosophy</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apeiron</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustinian Studies</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Journal for the History of Philosophy</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulletin of the Hegel Society of Great Britain</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical Quarterly</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fichte-Studien</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hegel-Studien</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermathena</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History and Theory</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of European Ideas</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Philosophy Quarterly</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Political Thought</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobbes Studies</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hume Studies</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husserl Studies</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealistic Studies</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internationales Jahrbuch des deutschen Idealismus (International Yearbook of German Idealism)</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isis</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Hellenic Studies</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of the History of Ideas</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of the History of Philosophy</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of the International Plato Society</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Neoplatonic Studies</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Nietzsche Studies</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Scottish Philosophy/Reid Studies</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kantian Review</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kant-Studien</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leibniz Review</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locke Studies</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Schoolman</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Nietzsche Studies</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Vico Studies</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nietzsche-Studien</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Owl of Minerva</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phronesis</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceedings of the Boston Area Colloquium in Ancient Philosophy</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studia Leibnitiana</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Thomist</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wittgenstein Studies</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continental Journals</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clio</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constellations</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continental Philosophy Review</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Inquiry</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critique (French)</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidegger Studies</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J of the British Society for Phenomenology</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophie (French)</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy and Social Criticism</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Po&amp;sie (French)</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sartre Studies International</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Brains & Behavior Journals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior and Philosophy</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral and Brain Sciences</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brain and Cognition</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brain and Language</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brain and Mind</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognition</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognition and Emotion</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Psychology</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Science</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication and Cognition</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consciousness and Cognition</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consciousness and Emotion</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Studies in the Physical and Biological Sciences</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History and Philosophy of Logic</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History and Philosophy of the Life Sciences</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Science</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Studies in the Phil of Science</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Cognition and Culture</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Consciousness Studies</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Mind and Behavior</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Phenomenological Psychology</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J of Theoretical &amp; Philosophical Psychology</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language &amp; Communication</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metascience</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mind and Language</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minds and Machines</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophical Explorations</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophical Psychology</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy, Psychiatry, &amp; Psychology</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy of the Social Sciences</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psyche</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Name</td>
<td>Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychologuy</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking &amp; Reasoning</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trends in the Cognitive Sciences</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B&B Science Journals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal Name</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annals of Science</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour Research and Therapy</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Anxiety Disorders</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerebral Cortex</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Neurobiology</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Psychology</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Social Psychology</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Reviews Neuroscience</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuron</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroimage</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Neuroscience</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trends in Neurosciences</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Review</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biophysical Journal</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brain, Behavior and Evolution</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Journal of Neuroscience</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Physiology</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Experimental Biology</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Neurophysiology</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Neuroscience</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning and Memory</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Neuroscience</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brain</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Brain Research</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY
ARTS & SCIENCES
AVERAGE STUDENT CREDIT HOURS TAUGHT PER TENURE TRACK, PERMANENT LECTURERS AND GTAS
FY06 - FY08

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>NUM T-T FAC</th>
<th>HOURS TAUGHT T-T FAC</th>
<th>NUM T-T TEN TRK</th>
<th>HOURS TAUGHT T-T TEN TRK</th>
<th>NUM PER LECT</th>
<th>HOURS TAUGHT PER LECT</th>
<th>NUM PER TRK</th>
<th>HOURS TAUGHT PER TRK</th>
<th>TOTAL HOURS TAUGHT</th>
<th>DIVIDED BY TEN TRACK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>AAS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>523.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>AAS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>417.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>AAS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>369.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>ALSL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>274.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>115.5</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>115.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>ALSL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>355.4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>127.3</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>127.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>ALSL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>292.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>119.5</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>119.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>ANTH</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>393.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>ANTH</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>330.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1466.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>ANTH</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>468.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1484.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>ART</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>323.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>677.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>ART</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>298.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>679.3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>ART</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>316.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>737.4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>BIO</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>487.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1381.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>BIO</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>469.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1449.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>BIO</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>390.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1433.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>CHEM</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>388.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1769.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>109.4</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>109.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>CHEM</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>408.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1219.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>CHEM</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>423.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1410.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>COMM</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>356.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>919.5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>236.3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>236.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>COMM</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>324.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1114.8</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>306.0</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>306.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>COMM</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>299.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>995.8</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>238.4</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>238.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>CSC</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>424.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>CSC</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>443.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>CSC</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>423.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>312.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>406.5</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>224.9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>224.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>329.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>270.0</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>245.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>245.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>338.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>495.8</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>241.9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>241.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>GEOS</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>423.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1178.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>274.8</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>274.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>GEOS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>503.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1490.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>104.5</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>104.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>GEOS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>519.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1452.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>DEPARTMENT</td>
<td>NUM</td>
<td>HOURS TAUGHT</td>
<td>HOURS TAUGHT</td>
<td>HOURS TAUGHT</td>
<td>TOTAL HOURS TAUGHT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T-T</td>
<td>PER FAC PER</td>
<td>PERM LECT</td>
<td>PERM LECT</td>
<td>GTA</td>
<td>GTA DIVIDED BY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>HIST</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>399.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>794.7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>270.0</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>HIST</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>422.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>549.0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>282.0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>HIST</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>388.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>897.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>283.2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>MATH</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>329.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1051.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>213.0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>MATH</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>399.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1055.7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>179.5</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>MATH</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>408.1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>866.2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>289.0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>MCL</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>315.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>423.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>326.8</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>MCL</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>375.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>430.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>315.8</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>MCL</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>420.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>507.3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>241.5</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>MUS</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>307.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>513.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>MUS</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>264.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>319.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>MUS</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>264.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>234.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>314.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>786.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>253.2</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>384.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>663.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>236.3</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>439.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>567.5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>219.0</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>PHYS</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>567.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1976.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>175.5</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>PHYS</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>593.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>191.8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>PHYS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>538.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>343.7</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>POLS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>627.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1174.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>287.2</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>POLS</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>555.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1183.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>412.1</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>POLS</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>620.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1771.7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>288.8</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>PSY</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>403.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>869.5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>237.4</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>PSY</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>374.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1034.7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>274.0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>PSY</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>396.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1030.0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>283.9</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>REL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>358.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>REL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>454.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>210.7</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>REL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>505.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1041.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>263.0</td>
<td>362</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>526.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1680.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>350.3</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>582.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1796.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>352.6</td>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>598.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1603.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>237.2</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>WSI</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>294.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>635.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>310</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>WSI</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>275.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>930.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>WSI</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>250.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>923.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>114.0</td>
<td>322</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendices G2
Library Report
PHILOSOPHY DEPARTMENT REVIEW
LIBRARY RESOURCES

Summary: Strengths and Weaknesses of the University Library Collection and Services

In general, the University Library’s collection of monographs, serials, and databases supports the Department of Philosophy’s programs through the master’s level. Notable strengths in the monographs collection include the areas of ancient and modern philosophy, speculative philosophy, ethics, and legal and political philosophy. In support of the University’s Neuroscience Institute, the Library has a good collection of monographs in empirically-based philosophy of mind, as well as in the areas of free will, moral responsibility, action theory, and the cognitive sciences, including neurophilosophy. In regards to student research, all of the most important monograph contributions, handbooks, and essay collections in these areas are included in the Library’s holdings. The main weakness in regards to faculty research lies in the lack of primary texts of Kant’s German predecessors and contemporaries, such as Christian Wolff, Alexander Baumgarten, Johann Nikolaus Tetens, Friedrich Heinrich Jacobi, Christian August Crusius, and Johann Heinrich Lambert. The librarian for the Department of Philosophy has noted this weakness and will make an effort to add the most appropriate monographs in this area to the collection.

The number of monograph titles supporting the program is appropriate to a philosophy program granting master’s degrees, especially given the fact that material relevant to the program is scattered throughout the collection in areas such as religious studies, psychology, political science, jurisprudence and philosophy of law, neuroscience, and medical and environmental ethics. In addition to materials in the general collection, materials in the College of Law Library are available to Philosophy students, staff, and faculty members.

The table in the “Relevant Library Statistics” portion of this document reflects the percentage of the approval plan universe in the primary philosophy call number ranges that the Library received in FY08. The percentage is appropriate for academic libraries with a terminal master’s degree program in philosophy. Titles not selected, were for the most part, textbooks, popular titles and revised dissertations.

In order to provide evidence regarding the strength of the monographs collection, specifically in the area of recent acquisitions, Yankee Book Peddler approval order acquisitions were compared to those of two peer institutions, Tufts University and Virginia Polytechnic Institute. These two universities, along with Georgia State University, are ranked by the 2006-2008 Philosophical Gourmet Report (http://www.philosophicalgourmet.com/maprog.asp) as being among the top ten ranked terminal master’s programs in the country for the study of philosophy. Titles acquired by these institutions were examined for the period from July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008. The results of the comparison indicate that in almost every Library of Congress Call Number Classification relevant to philosophy, the Georgia State University Library selected more titles than both Tufts and Virginia Polytechnic, including the areas of General Philosophy (B1-B5802), Logic (BC1-BC199), Speculative Philosophy (BD10-BD701), Aesthetics (BH1-BH301), Ethics (BJ1-BJ172),
Philosophy of Religion (BL51-BL65), Human Ecology (GF1-GF900), General Political Science (JA1-JA92), Political Theory (JC11-JC605), Medical Philosophy/Ethics (R723-R726), and the related areas of Consciousness and Cognition (BF309-BF635), Neurophysiology/Neuropsychology (QP351-QP495), and Neurosciences (RC321-RC571), relevant to the interdisciplinary Neurophilosophy track. Areas in which the University Library selected fewer titles included Environmental Sciences/Ethics (GE1-GE350), Philosophy and Theory of Law (K201-K487), Environmental Law (K3581-K3598), and Medical Legislation (K3601-K3611).

In addition to monographs, the University Library maintains a strong collection of online databases and journals to support the needs of the Philosophy faculty and students. The electronic databases used by the Department are made available via Georgia State University Library subscription and GALILEO, a Georgia initiative of database collections. The journals are available in both print and online formats, with increasing emphasis on online access as many databases increase their full-text availability. During the past three fiscal years, five journals relevant to philosophy were added to the collection, while only two journals were canceled. Two databases of relatively minor importance were added during the same time period to the list of other resources already made available. Overall, the Library continues to maintain a solid collection of philosophy journals and databases for both student and faculty use. Journals recently requested by Philosophy faculty include Hegel-Jahrbuch (ISSN: 0073-1579), Philosophy Compass (ISSN: 1747-9991), Environmental Ethics (0163-4275), and TPM: The Philosopher’s Magazine (http://www.philosophersnet.com/magazine). While the Library was unable to purchase these titles at the time they were requested due to budget constraints, the Library will make an effort to add these journals to the collection if and when funding becomes available.

For resources not available at the University Library, patrons can request materials through the library’s interlibrary loan service. The Interlibrary Loan Services Office can obtain most types of materials, including books, microfilmed newspapers, dissertations, theses, and periodical articles. Audio-visual materials may be requested, but are sometimes difficult to obtain on loan. This service is free of charge to Georgia State University faculty, staff and students. Books available at other University System libraries may be obtained through the GIL Express service.

In terms of library service to the Department in the form of instruction and individual consultations, there is moderate usage of services provided by the librarian for the Department of Philosophy. During fiscal year 2007-2008, 6 instruction sessions and 15 individual consultations were provided by the Department liaison. With continued outreach, including the holding of office hours in the Department, usage of these services should continue to increase.

### Relevant Library Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O. MEASUREMENT</th>
<th>P. STATISTIC</th>
<th>Q. COMMENTS/NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of journal titles supporting program</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Number of related journal titles added in last three fiscal years | 5 | Added titles (included in the number supporting the program):  
• Acta Analytica |
| Number of related journal titles cancelled in last three fiscal years | 3 Cancelled  
| 2 Ceased | Cancelled Titles:  
|  • *Journal of Pragmatics*  
|  • *Kantian Review*  
|  • *Politics, Philosophy & Economics*  
|  • *Think: Philosophy for Everyone*  
|  • *Medievalia et Humanistica*  
|  • *New Titles in Bioethics*  
|  • *Transactions of the Charles S. Pierce Society*  
| Ceased Titles:  
|  • *Revue d'Esthetique*  
|  • *Women & literature*  
| Number of related databases added in last three years | 2  
|  • *Early English Books Online*  
|  • *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*  
| Number of related databases cancelled in last three years | 0  
| Number of monograph titles supporting program | Philosophy: 22,551  
| Other related areas: 36,288  
| Total: 58,839  
| Number of titles in related areas:  
|  • Philosophy of Religion: 1,159  
|  • Political Science. Political Theory: 8,197  
|  • Jurisprudence. Philosophy & Theory of Law: 1,382  
|  • Medical Philosophy. Medical Ethics. Medical Legislation: 1,522  
| Number of monograph titles in key call number ranges added in last two years (01/2006-01/2008) | 3239  
| Percentage of available universe of related monograph titles |  • B1 - B5802 [Philosophy-General]: 50% of 719 titles available.  
| 363 |
titles purchased through approval plan during previous fiscal year.

- BC1 - BC199 [Logic]: 22% of 36 titles available.
- BD10 - BD701 [Speculative Philosophy. Includes Metaphysics and Epistemology]: 52% of 171 titles available.
- BH1 - BH301 [Aesthetics]: 61% of 41 titles available.
- BJ1 - BJ1725 [Ethics]: 50% of 187 titles available.
- BL51 - BL65 [Philosophy of Religion]: 50% of 108 titles available.
- GE1 - GE350 [Environmental Sciences. Environmental Ethics]: 37% of 107 titles available.
- JA1 - JA92 [Political Science-General]: 53% of 125 titles available.
- JC11 - JC605 [Political Theory]: 57% of 323 titles available.
- K201 - K487 [Jurisprudence. Philosophy and Theory of Law]: 1% of 80 titles available.
- K3581 - K3598 [Environmental Law]: 0% of 10 titles available.
- K3601 - K3611 [Medical Legislation]: 0% of 6 titles available.
- QP351 - QP495 [Neurophysiology and Neuropsychology. Includes Neuropsychology]: 34% of 135 titles available.
- R723 - R726 [Medical Philosophy. Medical Ethics]: 22% of 90 titles available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of library instruction courses taught for department during previous fiscal year.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of library consultations held with students from department during previous fiscal year.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Electronic Resources

Students and faculty in the Department of Philosophy rely heavily on journals, major reference works and databases to conduct research and complete assignments. The following section provides an overview of some of the major electronic resources available for Philosophy research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATLA</td>
<td>Consists of more than one million bibliographic records covering the research literature of religion. Includes article, essay and book review citations. Relevant topics covered include philosophy of religion, issues of church and state, and religious perspectives on social issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Abstracts</td>
<td>Covers research in biochemistry, biomedicine, biotechnology, and genetics. International coverage of over 4,000 journals. Relevant to the Department of Philosophy’s Neurophilosophy track.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge Online Journals</td>
<td>Access to full-text to subscribed journals in the sciences, social sciences, and humanities, including classical studies, language and linguistics, law, medical policy, medicine, philosophy, political and international relations, psychology, and religious studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighteenth Century Collections Online</td>
<td>Includes over 138,000 English-language titles and editions published between 1701 and 1800 printed in the United Kingdom, as well as thousands of works from the Americas. Relevant subjects covered, include history, social science, language, religion, philosophy and law.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities International Index (formerly American Humanities Index)</td>
<td>Covers journals, books and other important reference sources in the humanities. Provides cover-to-cover indexing and abstracting for over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ITER: Gateway to the Middle Ages and Renaissance</strong></td>
<td>Interdisciplinary index to the journal literature pertaining to the Middle Ages and Renaissance. Types of works include articles, reviews, bibliographies, catalogues, editions, abstracts, discographies and notes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JSTOR</strong></td>
<td>Provides full text access to back issues of journals. Pertinent subject areas include biological sciences, classical studies, feminist &amp; women's studies, law, linguistics, mathematics, philosophy, political science, religion, and sociology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Linguistics Abstracts Online</strong></td>
<td>Provides access to more than 31,000 abstracts from nearly 400 linguistics journals published since 1985.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Linguistics and Language Behavior Abstracts</strong></td>
<td>Provides abstracts of journal articles, books, book chapters, and dissertations, and citations to book reviews drawn from over 1,500 serials publications. Covers all aspects of the study of language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oxford University Press Journals</strong></td>
<td>Provides access to over 180 online journals published by Oxford University Press in the humanities, law, life sciences, mathematics, physical sciences, medicine, and social sciences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Periodicals Index Online (formerly PCI/Periodicals Contents Index)</strong></td>
<td>Index to millions of articles published in 4,698 periodicals in the humanities and social sciences. Covers 37 key subject areas in the humanities and social sciences and offers vast variety within these subject areas. PCI currently indexes 15.1 million articles since the eighteenth century and every article in each journal is indexed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Philosopher's Index</strong></td>
<td>Bibliographic database covering scholarly research in the fields of philosophy, published in journals and books since 1940. Records cite journal articles, books, contributions to anthologies, and book reviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political Science Abstracts, Worldwide</strong></td>
<td>Provides citations, abstracts, and indexing of the international serials literature in political science and its complementary fields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Muse</strong></td>
<td>Provides full text access to recent issues of more than 40 key journals in the humanities and social sciences. Relevant subject areas include language and linguistics, law, mathematics, medicine and health, medieval and renaissance studies, philosophy, philosophy and science, politics and policy studies, psychology, religion, and women's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Database</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsycARTICLES (at EBSCOhost)</td>
<td>Searchable full text articles on current issues in psychology. The database contains more than 39,000 searchable full text articles from 44 journals published by the American Psychological Association and 8 from allied organizations. Relevant to the Department’s Neurophilosophy track.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsycEXTRA</td>
<td>A grey literature database relating to psychology, behavioral sciences, and health. Full-text is available for the majority of records in addition to a complete abstract record. Relevant to the Department’s Neurophilosophy track.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Supreme Court Records and Briefs, 1832-1978</td>
<td>Searchable database of approximately 11 million pages and more than 350,000 separate documents. Approximately 150,000 Supreme Court cases are featured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Chicago Electronic Journals</td>
<td>Includes over 50 journals in the social sciences, humanities, education, biological, medical and physical sciences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web of Science</td>
<td>Indexes more than 8,000 peer-reviewed journals cover-to-cover in the sciences and social sciences. Includes the Arts &amp; Humanities Citation Index, the Social Sciences Citation Index, and the Science Citation Index.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Studies Encyclopedia</td>
<td>Online version of the 3-volume <em>Women's Studies Encyclopedia</em>, published by Greenwood Press in 1999. Covers all aspects of women's studies from the sciences; literature, arts, and learning; history, philosophy, and religion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Studies International</td>
<td>Covers the core disciplines in Women’s Studies to the latest scholarship in feminist research. Supports curriculum development in the areas of sociology, history, political science &amp; economy, public policy, international relations, arts &amp; humanities, business and education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worldwide Political Science Abstracts</td>
<td>Provides citations, abstracts, and indexing of the international serials literature in political science and its complementary fields, including international relations, law, and public administration / policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**S. GALILEO Databases**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEDLINE with Fulltext (at EBSCOhost)</td>
<td>Combines the National Library of Medicine's bibliographic database with the complete text of articles from nearly 90 leading medical journals. Covers all aspects of biomedicine, allied health fields, and biological and physical sciences. Relevant to the Department’s Neurophilosophy track.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology &amp; Behavioral Sciences Collection (at EBSCOhost)</td>
<td>Includes more than 470 full-text journals covering topics in emotional and behavioral characteristics, psychiatry &amp; psychology, mental processes, anthropology, and observational and experimental methods. Relevant to the Department’s Neurophilosophy track.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsycINFO (at EBSCOhost)</td>
<td>Contains citations and summaries of journal articles, book chapters, books, and technical reports, as well as citations to dissertations, in the field of psychology and psychological aspects of related disciplines. Journal coverage includes international material selected from more than 1,700 periodicals from nearly 50 countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion &amp; Philosophy Collection (at EBSCOhost)</td>
<td>Contains more than 243 full-text journals covering topics in spiritual, ethical, philosophical, cultural, and historical aspects of the world’s major religions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science &amp; Technology Collection</td>
<td>Contains over 800 leading full text journals covering relevant aspects of the scientific and technical community. Relevant to the Department’s Neurophilosophy track.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*Appendices H1
Comparison Placement Data
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year and school</th>
<th>Number of graduates</th>
<th>Graduates securing tenure-track positions</th>
<th>Positions secured.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M, 2006-2008</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+Visiting Assistant Professor, Texas A&amp;M University at Qatar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*Assistant Professor of Philosophy, Greenville College; Assistant Professor, New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+ Adjunct Assistant Professor, Virginia Commonwealth University,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Kentucky, 2002-2007</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>+Adjunct Instructor, University of Evansville,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+Adjunct Faculty, Asbury Seminary and Asbury College, +Full-time Instructor, University of Kentucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+ Lecturer, Mississippi State University,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>*Assistant Professor, Montana State University-Billings, *Assistant Professor, Rollins College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*Assistant Professor, Indiana University Southeast, +Visiting Assistant Professor, University of North Dakota, Translator, Heidelberg, Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*Assistant Professor, McKendree College,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>*Assistant Professor, Lorain County Community College, *Assistant Professor, University of the Incarnate Word, *Assistant Professor, Mt. Angel Seminary, *Associate Professor and Chair of Philosophy, Bluegrass Community and Technical College, Whereabouts unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>University Name</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>+Postdoctoral Research Fellow at SUNY Buffalo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>*Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Universidad Nacional del Sur, Bahía Blanca, Argentina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>+Adjunct Assistant Professor, Appalachian State University, +Instructor, USC Lancaster, SC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>*Assistant Professor, San Antonio College, +Lecturer, University of Central Oklahoma, +Instructor, Queens University, Charlotte NC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>*Assistant Professor, Ottawa University, Ottawa, KS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>*Assistant Professor, Bethel College, +Postdoctoral Fellowship, Instituto de Filosofia da Linguagem, Lisbon, +Instructor, USC Aiken, +Visiting Assistant Professor, Furman University +Visiting Instructor, Georgia State University +Fulltime Faculty, Greenville Technical College, Peace Corps Volunteer, Cameroon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>*Assistant Professor, College of the Canyons, +Lecturer, University of San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>