

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-ST. LOUIS

Philosophy Department 2011 Five-Year Review

April 2011

Table of Contents

I: Unit Mission	3
1. Statements	3
2. Brief History	3
3. Academic Programs	4
4. Changes Since the Last Review	5
II: Program Excellence	5
1. Measuring and Promoting Teaching Excellence	5
2. Instructional Innovations	7
3. Program Quality: Undergraduate Degrees	9
4. Program Quality: The Master’s Program	10
5. General Education	12
6. Interdisciplinary and Collaborative Connections	13
7. Advising and Retention	13
8. Student Engagement	14
9. Distance Learning	16
III: Research Excellence	18
1. Research Goals	18
2. Faculty and Research	18
3. Research and Scholarship	19
4. Funding	22
5. Overview	23
IV: Community Engagement	23
V: Resources	24
VI: The Future	25
1. Departmental Strategic Plan	25
2. Looking Ahead	26
3. Our Department’s Aspirational Peer	27
VII: Appendices	30
1. Course Evaluation Form	30
2. Student Engagement in Philosophy Survey	33
3. Student Engagement Survey Results: 09/10	35
4. Honors College Courses 2004-2011	38
5. Sample Grading Rubrics for Philosophy Papers	40
6. Zachary Ernst’s CV	46

Philosophy Department 2011 Five-Year Review Narrative

I: Unit Mission

1. Statements

The UM-St. Louis Philosophy Department is committed to the three traditional aims of a university: to preserve, increase, and transmit knowledge through teaching, research, and service. In addition, the Department actively seeks to further the first four goals stated in the campus's G4G plan. That is, we endeavor to provide a quality education for our undergraduate and graduate students as well as valuable stand-alone courses for students from other programs and departments; we seek to recruit and satisfy a diverse array of students, serving those who sample a single Gen Ed course in our department as well as philosophy enthusiasts, future professionals in our field; we aspire to maintain and support faculty research of an extremely high caliber; and finally, we aim to bring all these activities into the public arena in ways that advance the profession as well as the intellectual life and well-being of the St. Louis Metropolitan area.

Our Department's Mission Statement is displayed prominently on our Web page:

The mission of the UM-St. Louis Philosophy Department is to explore and advance the claims of our discipline by producing innovative research, teaching, and service. Our faculty publish their research in highly selective journals, addressing both traditional philosophical problems and diverse present-day applications. They teach courses that engage and empower traditional and non-traditional students, with an instructional menu that serves casual students, undergraduate majors and minors, and master's candidates. And they serve wider constituencies by participating in a variety of learned societies and in public conferences, forums, and colloquia, offering analysis and debate that promises deeper understanding of today's pressing issues. Together these departmental activities further our campus's status as a premier public metropolitan research university.

The Vision Statement that follows notes that:

The overarching goal of the UM-St. Louis philosophy department is to make manifest, through research, teaching, and service, the appeal and wide-ranging application of our discipline. We hope to see ourselves, at the end of ten to twelve years, a flourishing, medium-sized department whose energetic and productive faculty offer the best M.A.-only program in the country.

2. Brief History

The Department of Philosophy was established in 1967 with 7 in-rank faculty. This number increased to 10 by 1972 and stood at 12 in 1999. An M.A. program was added to the original B.A. in 2000. At the time of the last Five Year Review, our FTE had fallen to an all-time low of 6, but amelioration brought us to a new high of 13 FTE. A Fall 2009 retirement yielded our present total of 12 in-rank faculty (8 TT and 4 NTT); unfortunately, two TT faculty expect to resign this Spring to take up appointments in the UK.

Our Department was unusually large in its early days because the university's founders expected that UM-St. Louis would offer a Ph.D. in philosophy. The Department members took care to squelch this idea, as they didn't want to be saddled with a 2nd-rate Ph.D. program. (The calculations were quite different when the M.A. degree was sought in the 1990s.) While the planned Ph.D. never materialized, the UM-St. Louis Department continued to be unusually large and unusually strong. The unit's early growth brought together a cohort of young faculty committed to research who were trained at prestigious Ivy-League institutions. They took care to perpetuate this state by vowing to always seek new hires better than themselves. This policy yielded a 1st Golden Age for the Department starting in the late 1970s. The Department's 12 members held degrees from Yale, Harvard (2), Columbia (2), UCLA, Princeton, Johns Hopkins, U. Chicago, and U. Mass.

For the past several years, the Department has been enjoying a 2nd Golden Age. That earlier cohort has been replenished by a collegial and high-powered set of teacher-scholars. Our 12 FTE faculty are assisted by one Departmental Associate. Department faculty members have established national or international reputations. Their work appears in the most prestigious journals, and their books are published by leading presses. They serve on national committees, review for granting agencies, hold offices in national organizations, and edit or sit on the boards of journals. Their publications have helped shape the discussion in a variety of fields. Their expertise is reflected in their teaching and in their contributions to the communities of which they are a part.

3. Academic Programs

Because philosophy offers both an inherited subject matter and a distinctive methodology, it can meet a variety of interests and needs. Our Department offers undergraduates 3 options: a major, a double major, and a minor in philosophy.

The program for the major in Philosophy provides students with a comprehensive understanding of significant philosophical issues in core areas of the subject as well as a broad grounding in the history of philosophy and an introduction to interdisciplinary connections with the subject. We aim to provide our undergraduate majors with a preparation sufficient for entering a competitive graduate program should they choose.

The double major program is intended to provide students with a similarly broad understanding in philosophy, but with a special emphasis on interdisciplinary connections. The goal of the program is to provide the analytic, critical and logical skills of a sound philosophical training for those who may also be specializing in another field or profession.

The minor is essentially a way of acknowledging the special emphasis that students majoring in another subject have made on their philosophical studies. There are no particular area goals, and the purpose of the minor may be fulfilled by concentration in one or more subdisciplines.

In addition to courses supporting these three programs, we offer intro-level courses that display the wide range of philosophical inquiry and carry Gen Ed credit. We also

provide courses to serve other constituencies and programs on campus: applied ethics classes for Business, Nursing, Computer Science, and Engineering, critical thinking for PLHC, logic and philosophy of science for Math and for several of the natural science departments, philosophy and feminism for Gender Studies, and more.

Our M.A. degree, inaugurated in Jan. 2000, welcomes students from a variety of backgrounds. Some were undergraduate philosophy majors, here or at other institutions; they are expected to build upon the background they bring, broadening their acquaintance with areas of Western philosophy and deepening their analytical skills. A crucial demand we make at this level is that students learn to write what is in effect a journal article – a short, focused paper that presents a philosophical problem, situates it in contemporary and/or classical debate, and proposes an original analysis, solution, extension, etc. Students who come to the program with undergraduate majors in other disciplines are asked to play catch-up; we expect them circle back and acquire the competencies we demand of our undergraduates, while at the same time deepening these so as to merit a graduate degree.

4. Changes since the Last Review

Because our last review was held in 2004, the present exercise is in fact a Seven Year Review. As noted above, the 2004 review took place during a moment of crisis: our faculty FTE had fallen so precipitously that we briefly considered suspending our M.A. program. As a result of the strong endorsement and forceful recommendations that emerged from that exercise, we were able to rebuild the Department and enjoy what could in fact be considered our 2nd Golden Age. The addition, between 2004 and now, of 5 new TT faculty, with specialties in metaphysics (Brogaard), cognitive science (Piccinini), philosophy of science (Northcott), philosophy of social science (Alexandrova), and moral philosophy (Brunero) has created a young, broad, and extremely well-published department.

Unfortunately, those accomplishments are now at risk, as two of our rising stars, Anna Alexandrova and Robert Northcott, will be resigning at the end of this semester to take up jobs in the UK. Since Alexandrova specializes in philosophy of science and philosophy of social science, with special interest in theories of happiness and in modeling in science and economics, while Northcott specializes in philosophy of science, with special interest in philosophy of biology, Darwinism, and the metaphysics of causation, this effectively wipes out our claimed specialty area in the philosophy of science. Given the hiring freeze in place throughout the university, and our place – 4th at best! – on the list of departments the Dean plans to aid once that freeze is lifted, our situation is once again dire. We hope that a possibility, currently under discussion, to hire a visiting professor with specialties in philosophy of science, logic, and game theory, will provide some valuable stop-gap relief.

II: Program Excellence

1. Measuring and Promoting Teaching Excellence

As indicated in our Mission and Vision Statements, the merits of our academic programs begin with and flow from the excellence of our faculty. This connection is crucial. The faculty's range of skills and interests and their research productivity guarantee

that our academic activities are conceived and carried out by leaders in the field. We employ very few adjunct instructors. Senior members of the department teach such intro-level courses as Approaches to Ethics, Major Questions in Philosophy, Logic and Language, and Philosophy of Religion. And while some of our applied ethics courses are taught by graduate students in small online sections, those courses were designed by senior faculty; successful syllabi are handed down.

The Department tries not to standardize or micromanage teaching. We encourage faculty to tailor courses to track their evolving philosophical interests and new trends in the field. We are also responsive to student requests. This summer we are offering a seminar on Scientific Representation and another on Sartre and de Beauvoir; the latter evolved directly from a request from a pair of graduate students. Our moral philosophers redesigned our upper-level offerings to include new courses in Meta-Ethics and in Practical Reason. Our philosophers of science have created specialty courses examining Darwinism, Bayesianism, and modal logic. To serve a less specialized audience, faculty have used the regular call for courses from the Pierre Laclède Honors College to design special courses on terrorism, free will, the history of science, and death, while within the College of Arts and Sciences, new courses have been developed examining happiness, choice and chance, the art of film, and sex.

Our Curriculum Committee, which assembles each semester's schedule, first notes programmatic plans and needs as set out in our posted 3-Year Plan. Faculty are slotted into these courses, but the schedule is then filled out by weighing the requests that come in to teach new or non-scheduled courses. Whenever possible, our TT faculty teach one intro- or lower-level course each semester and also one more advanced course that serves our junior and senior majors and our M.A. students. We advertise each semester's courses by posting detailed descriptions on our departmental website. Word of mouth also makes known the selections.

We evaluate all of our courses at the semester's end using a form we designed (see appendix 1). Students are asked to evaluate course content and delivery along a 5-point scale. There are questions devoted to each of these areas, for example, "The instructor made the course material understandable," "The instructor created an atmosphere that contributed to learning," "The course was well organized and well conceived," "Tests were fair measures of what we've learned in this course," plus a pair of summary evaluations: "My overall rating of this instructor is..." and "My overall rating of this course is..." Continuing use of this evaluation form allows us to make comparative judgments about teaching success across the department and over time. Many faculty also take advantage of the online mid-semester evaluations sponsored by the CTL, and this checkpoint is mandated for all sections taught by graduate students.

Nothing is more depressing than a course that isn't going well. Faculty who find themselves in trouble in any way are quick to seek advice from their peers. Some department members maintain collections of advice to students (how to read a philosophy text, how to write a philosophy paper, etc., etc.) and link to them on their personal web-pages and their syllabi. Faculty have recourse to the Academic Alert system, and many attempt to help all students by insisting on submission of a first draft for major papers. In

addition, faculty are aware of the support available on campus through the Faculty Resource Center and the Center for Teaching and Learning and go there for help with technology as well as ideas on teaching innovations. Perfecting a new course can require a wider set of evaluation techniques. Here our faculty make full use of the standard tools for teaching evaluation, but also add their own to explore the effectiveness of specific methods and course content. Thus we regularly poll students on which of the assigned readings they found the most difficult/interesting/rewarding and update our syllabi accordingly. We treat students' performance on quizzes and tests as an opportunity to revise our plans and methods and to respond to their needs.

Here are a few examples where faculty intervened to improve instruction:

- The Happiness and the Meaning of Life syllabus underwent several tweaks in response to the students' feedback – we expanded the section on the Greeks, contracted the section on Aquinas and even included a session on meditation because it provoked so much interest the first time.
- One semester while teaching his 2000-level course *Minds, Brains, Machines*, Gualtiero Piccinini realized that the students were not performing at all up to expectations. After a particularly disastrous quiz, he put the students into study groups, then circled back to review the previously covered material. He gave a repeat version of the unfortunate quiz and insisted that the students retain and utilize the study groups for the rest of the semester.
- Another instructor, Irem Kurtsal Steen, finding that the majority of her students were finding her intro-level Philosophy of Religion course way too difficult, instituted a series of changes. She switched from primary sources to a textbook, created a set of PowerPoint presentations to more clearly explain the course material, and responded to student requests by incorporating segments on Eastern religion.

2. Instructional Innovations

All our instructors work hard to create courses that are lively, fresh, and rewarding. The previous section noted a variety of experiments with content and delivery. It is a given now that all courses will make use of content available on the web, new technologies for delivering that material, and new varieties of interactivity incorporated into the latest version of Blackboard. Many faculty, building on their experience with My Gateway, have enlivened their traditional courses, creating hybrid formats that keep students busy and engaged. At least two of our courses, Formal Logic and Philosophy of Science, are now offered in two distinct modes – online and the traditional classroom – from which students get to choose. This seems especially useful with logic, as some students master formal material more easily in a classroom setting while others prefer to have the time and lack of pressure that online units allow. With the wealth of videos available on-line, we've been able to make many of our topics much more vivid to students. Irem Kurtsal Steen designed an Honors course exploring the problem of free will around several classic films (*The Manchurian Candidate*, *Mystic River*, *Minority Report*). In Anna Alexandrova's

Feminism and Science course, students watched short videos from nature documentaries to illustrate the alleged claim that nature is aggressive and uncooperative and that every organism is out to fight for survival. The Happiness and the Meaning of Life course used excerpts from TV shows (Mad Men, among many others) and historical films to illustrate the changing conceptions of happiness across time. Students also used an iPhone application to create a record of their happiness across several days. In Philosophy of Science students go online right in class to chat with a robot who is pretending to be a human. All these examples document how we go out of our way to create opportunities for students to engage and to voice their views. Indeed it is hard for them not to do so when the topics are so close to their hearts and minds.

In addition to the ongoing push for delivery options, we also experiment with scheduling. We vary the times and durations of our upper-level courses; many of them meet seminar-style on a single day. We have been quite successful offering Fri. seminars, especially for required entry (the graduate Proseminar) or capstone (the Senior Seminar) courses. We have also participated in the College's experiment with late-start courses, offering compressed versions of several intro-level online courses to serve beginning students who dropped one or more of their initial courses but need to pick up substitutes to maintain their financial aid. We will continue to fine-tune this option. Since we are in effect asking some of the College's more fragile students to work twice as fast as their peers, the late start courses need to be accessible, interesting, and replete with faculty support.

We think of philosophy as tackling timeless questions that are important in any culture and any historical period. But philosophical thinking can also be fruitfully applied to current events particular to our time and our society. To this end we regularly review our curriculum seeking to update our course offerings with courses that answer to particular concerns in the contemporary world. We recently created two such courses: Happiness and the Meaning of Life (discussed above) and Market and Morals. The first course responds to the rise of the science of happiness in psychology and economics, but mixes contemporary findings about happiness with the classic perspectives of Plato, Aristotle, Bentham and Mill. It has been offered twice now and attracted over 80 students. We are particularly glad that most of the students taking this course are entirely new to philosophy and never intended to take philosophy courses before. The feedback from students was phenomenal – many of the students who took the course the second time registered precisely because their friends who took it the first time recommended the course. The course Market and Morals is our attempt to help students understand the interplay of moral and economic issues in the financial crisis of 2008, and to raise questions about the moral basis of global economy.

We take seriously our duty to enhance public understanding of science, art and morality. To achieve these ends, we offer serious and rigorous instruction in a variety of fields of professional ethics including business ethics, medical ethics, computer ethics, and engineering ethics, with the goal of nurturing an ethical approach to all the professions among the regional leaders that the university seeks to train; we offer comprehensive undergraduate training in formal logic for specialists in the formal sciences such as mathematics and computer science; and, we offer education in the philosophy of science to students right across the sciences, with particular emphasis on providing course content that meets the requirements of the state certification in unified science for high school teachers.

3. Program Quality: Undergraduate Degrees

Our requirements for an undergraduate degree in philosophy ensure that our majors will become acquainted with the full range of Western philosophy in the analytic tradition. In particular, distribution requirements entail that students will sample the following fields:

- Logic
- History of philosophy (4 courses)
- Metaphysics/Epistemology
- Normative Philosophy
- Philosophy and other Disciplines (Philosophy of _____, with many ways to fill in the blank!)

They are also required to complete a capstone course, the Senior Seminar.

Together these distribution requirements ensure that the following goals are met:

The philosophy major should:

1. grasp thoroughly the distinctions among the core areas of philosophy; know the history of the subject in its broad outlines from the early Greek philosophers to the present day and have deeper acquaintance with methods of historical study in some particular area;
2. be adept at formalizing and evaluating arguments in ordinary language as well as understanding the proof procedures of modern mathematical logic and their importance/application to philosophy;
3. appreciate the options for argumentation and proof in the evaluative realm, with special attention to the main ethical theories in the Western tradition and their application to dilemmas in a variety of practical realms.
4. understand the connection between philosophy and other disciplines through taking at least one course in this part of the curriculum;
5. be capable of researching a philosophical topic and writing a paper that advances the continuing philosophical conversation. Such papers situate their topic in its scholarly context by presenting and critiquing central claims and supporting arguments in a way that demonstrates both insight and originality.

A student who successfully completes this program should be competitive in the application procedure for major graduate programs at the national level. In all our programs, we stress the importance of an open-minded and reflective approach to philosophical ideas. Our students should understand the diversity of possible answers to philosophical issues rather than just one particular point of view. The department encourages all students in these programs to meet regularly with the Director of Undergraduate Studies to review progress, address problems, and plan future program

decisions. All members of the faculty are active in advising and encouraging students in their courses with respect to course choices in philosophy.

We continually assess our undergraduate program and its participants along a number of dimensions. Each class is evaluated using the methods described above. Students exiting the program are required to take a variable content capstone course, Phil 4491: Senior Seminar, and this provides a useful measure of the philosophical skills they've acquired. The great majority of our courses are writing intensive, as the best way to see whether students have understood an argument is asking them to present it in their own words. Two sample rubrics for philosophy grading are presented in Appendix 5. These provide a general indication of the dimensions along which written work is assessed. Our faculty do not apply such tools in an overly literal manner, as that would fail to capture the countless ways students can be creative, imaginative, and insightful. Finally, our Undergraduate Advisor has started the practice of conducting exit interviews as he counsels our seniors regarding graduation requirements. Deficits in the program will come to our attention as a result of this procedure. We will be working to regularize this practice; we will begin by consulting exit forms used in other departments with a goal towards more formal documentation of these exit discussions.

4. Program Quality: The Master's Program

Our M.A. program, begun in January 2000 with the expectation that it would primarily serve place-bound students whose family or job obligations tied them to the St. Louis Metropolitan area, has greatly exceeded expectations. Due to the strength of our faculty, it was nationally ranked (by Brian Leiter's "Philosophical Gourmet Report") before we even opened for business. Today we remain ranked among the top 9 M.A.-only programs (the ranking system involves 3 separate tiers), this despite the handicap that we are more poorly funded than any of our competitors in terms of money available for graduate student support. While we give as many of our students as possible teaching assistantship packages that carry tuition remission (or, for some out of state students, the option of paying the more affordable in-state tuition), at most we provide a salary of \$6000/AY (\$1500 per each .25 FTE appointment) for students assigned to oversee online course sections. This compares very unfavorably with our competitors, many of whom pay something much closer to a living wage (\$10,000-11,000/AY).

Since we welcome graduate students who were not undergraduate philosophy majors, the program goals for our M.A. program include and amplify those spelled out above for our undergraduate degree. We put in place more rigorous distribution requirements – 4 history courses, 2 courses from metaphysics and/or epistemology, 2 normative courses, and 2 from logic/philosophy of science – while also raising performance expectations in each and every course. In addition, we assume that graduate students will acquire this special skill – the ability to write papers suitable for presentation at a conference and submission to a journal. These are the basic currency of our profession. We require that all M.A. students write a thesis, by either signing up for thesis hours to generate an entirely new piece in an area of their choice, or revisiting and reworking a successful seminar paper so that it meets this higher standard. Theses are defended in public, before the candidate's three-person thesis committee for the first thesis

type, or at a WiP (Work in Progress) session, for the second. While the thesis requirement serves as our capstone exercise, we have a required first course, the Proseminar, that helps acculturate our entering graduate students, indicating our expectations regarding philosophical discussion and critique. It also helps the entering students get acquainted and form a supportive cohort.

Stephanie Ross was Graduate Program Director for the initial 8 years of our M.A. degree. When Eric Wiland succeeded her in Spring 2008, this transition provided a useful opportunity to reexamine and restructure our still young program. Wiland proposed a radical revamping of the original requirements for the M.A. degree. We opted to eliminate comprehensive exams, as our students' response -- memorizing brief answers to narrow questions, and forming study groups so that some of those answers came directly from others -- didn't seem to bring the returns we had hoped. Comprehensive exams were replaced with ramped-up distribution requirements, an attempt to secure through additional course work the breadth at which the exams had aimed, along with a required rather than an optional M.A. thesis. Acknowledging that our M.A. students have various goals, i.e., not all aspire to do Ph.D. work, we instituted the two different thesis options described above.

Our assessment of our M.A. program proceeds much like our assessment of our undergraduate program. Each individual course is evaluated, and the capstone thesis requirement allows us to measure the degree to which essential philosophical skills have been inculcated. We support the great majority of our M.A. students by offering them .25 or .50FTE grading and TA positions. In deciding how to assign students to these slots, the Director of Graduate Studies reviews application materials, consults with department members to find out about classroom performance, and more. Berit Brogaard has now succeeded Eric Wiland as Director of Graduate Studies. She has shown a fine-tuned knowledge of our various students' strengths and interests and used these in making her assignments. Whenever possible, students are first slotted in as graders for a course; they are thus mentored by a faculty member before, say, receiving responsibility for a self-standing online course or, on occasion, a low-enrolling evening section of an introductory-level class. Another measure of the overall success of our graduate program is the number of students who gain admittance to Ph.D. programs in philosophy. We had one of our best years ever in 2009/10; a box on the opening page of our Web pages congratulates the 7 students currently working on advanced degrees at Wash U., Colorado, Connecticut, Iowa, Illinois-Chicago, CUNY, and Nottingham. Although this year will not be quite as stellar, we already have 6 more acceptances to add to that list.

5. General Education

The Department of Philosophy boasts an exceptionally wide range of academic interests among its faculty. This is reflected in the department's general education offerings. The department currently teaches courses that satisfy three of the six goals listed in the college bulletin (beginning in Fall 2011 we will have coverage in four out of six categories). Our course offerings in the general education program cover a wide range of subject matters including courses in the history of philosophy (both Western and non-Western), reasoning and critical thinking, philosophy of religion (including Islamic and other non-Western religions), legal philosophy, aesthetics, art and film studies, ethics and

applied ethics (including bioethics, business ethics, environmental ethics and engineering ethics), and various courses in the philosophy of science (including courses that discuss the history of science, medicine and the psychological sciences). A majority of these courses is taught every semester, often with more than one section offered, including online as well as on-campus sections.

We fully acknowledge that our contribution to the campus's Gen Ed mission is in keeping with the 'Chinese menu' approach currently in place on our campus. We support the moves to both streamline and reform Gen Ed bubbling up within the College of Arts & Sciences as well as the campus overall. We are happy to participate in the redesign of Gen Ed courses within the College. Philosophy faculty are among the guest lecturers in the newly launched Big History course, while our Chair is co-recipient of a Curriculum Development Grant to create an interdisciplinary Gen Ed course examining disagreement, difference, and diversity using resources drawn from philosophy, anthropology, and sociology.

We believe that the expertise of our faculty is one of the best tools for evaluating how well the course content achieves learning goals within the college. With this in mind, courses are routinely staffed by faculty whose area of expertise matches the content of the course. When this is not possible, our faculty serve in supervisory roles. In our general education courses, student learning and achievement is evaluated by a number of means, use of which is at the instructor's discretion. They include: exams (both written and multiple choice), in class writing assignments, take home writing assignments, research papers and in class presentations. In order to assure fairness and a more accurate picture of student learning, the department has had internal discussions concerning the calibration of student grades and assessment. In general, we find that philosophy courses, even at the general education level, can be quite challenging for many undergraduates. In this respect, one of the challenges of teaching philosophy at the general education level is balancing the heavy intellectual demands required by philosophy, with the needs of our general population students.

Here is a listing of our current Gen Ed classes:

Philosophy 1090 Philosophy Looks at the Arts, Philosophy 1091: Great Philosophers; Philosophy 1110 Western Philosophy I; Philosophy 1111 Western Philosophy II; Philosophy 1120 Asian Philosophy ; Philosophy 1125 Islamic Philosophy; Philosophy 1130 Approaches to Ethics; Philosophy 1150 Major Questions in Philosophy; Philosophy 1160 Logic and Language; Philosophy 1175 Arts & Ideas; Philosophy 1185 Philosophy of Religion; Philosophy 2252 Philosophical Foundations of Criminal Justice; Philosophy 2253 Philosophy and Feminism; Philosophy 2254 Business Ethics; Philosophy 2255 Environmental Ethics; Philosophy 2256 Bioethics; Philosophy 2257 Happiness and the Meaning of Life; Philosophy 2258 Medicine, Values and Society; Philosophy 2259 Engineering Ethics; Philosophy 2276 Philosophy of Film; Philosophy 2280 Minds, Brains and Machines, Philosophy 2282; Philosophy of Science in Historical Perspective 1

6. Interdisciplinary and Collaborative Connections

The Department of Philosophy prides itself on its many cooperative connections with other departments, programs, and units on campus. In addition to our Gen Ed curriculum noted above, we provide specific courses that are required or recommended by other programs. Our various applied ethics offerings – Bioethics, Business Ethics, Computer Ethics, Engineering Ethics – all serve other campus constituencies. Our philosophy of science course is an option for certain tracks in Computer Science and the natural sciences; our philosophy of art course serves many studio art and art history majors; a number of programs have recommended or required our informal logic course. We are eager to continue serving the campus in this manner.

In addition to providing individual courses, we also participate in the creation of interdisciplinary minors, certificates, and programs. Our members have been very active in a recent wave of UMSL curriculum development. Several faculty have contributed to and in some cases led efforts to develop new interdisciplinary certificates or minors in Evolutionary Studies, Neuroscience, Studies in the History and Philosophy of Science, and Science Literacy. Just recently, we signed off on another new venture, Environmental Studies. These new programs, those already in place as well as the ones which are being established, will offer exciting new options to UMSL undergraduates. Philosophy faculty have also participated in creating a First Year Experience course to help attract and retain freshman. In addition, they guest-lecture in other courses (e.g., Big History) and occasionally co-teach with members of other departments.

Our collaborative ventures include research as well as teaching partnerships. Philosophy faculty have established interdisciplinary research collaboration with faculty across the UM-St. Louis campus (for example, from Physics and Astronomy, and from Psychology) as well as faculty from non-philosophy departments at other universities (for example, Computer and Electrical Engineering at UMass, Asian and Near-Eastern Languages and Literatures at Wash U.). These collaborations result in joint research programs, joint grants, and co-authored papers. Philosophy faculty participate in interdisciplinary research talk series and workshops. Two of our members have secondary appointments in the Psychology Department and one accepted an invitation to join the Center for Neurodynamics.

7. Advising and Retention

Since philosophy is not taught in primary or in secondary school, many students come to UM-St. Louis unaware of our discipline. They discover philosophy only by chance when they dabble with an elective or fulfill a one-course requirement that embellishes an otherwise vocational course of study. Thus we capture as philosophy majors those students who become wide-eyed in our classes, succumb to the “gosh-golly, gee whiz” fascination inherent in so many of the basic questions philosophy addresses, and sign on for more. In one sense, this is as it should be. A philosophy major is not for everyone, despite the many vocational advantages we spell out on our website. Nonetheless, we remain convinced that some amount of philosophy can please and benefit

almost anyone. Accordingly, we believe that recruiting future students is every bit as important as advising and retaining those we have.

To this end, we regularly participate in the structured recruiting opportunities created on campus. Our Undergraduate Advisor is a regular at UMSL Days. Our Chair attended the initial meetings that led to the creation of the Freshman Year Experience, and we maintain a module in that course as well. We make additional attempts to publicize our department and our discipline through our website. We maintain a page touting the practical advantages of a philosophy degree, with many supporting links. We also post extended descriptions of each semester's classes on the web, so that students can get a better sense of our offerings. This Spring we launched a new recruitment tactic: each student who received a grade of A or A- in a lower-level course received a personal letter from the Chair, congratulating the student on this achievement and urging him/her to consider a follow-up course. In all these efforts, we recognize that some students are drawn to the enduring problems philosophy addresses while others appreciate the practical payoff that philosophical methods can deliver. We try to broadcast that the analytical skills and habits of mind inculcated in each and every philosophy class are highly portable, as attention to analysis, evaluation, argumentation, and proof can aid in the negotiation of any subject matter.

Because a drop in majors for AY 2009/2010 landed us on the UM Low Performing list, we now consider undergraduate recruitment one of our highest priorities. We are moving on several fronts here: adding fresh lower-level courses, joining in on new interdisciplinary ventures, seeking routes for more vigorous advertising, trying to better support our current majors so that word of mouth will bring in others. We have invited the Chair of UMKC, which currently boasts 50 undergraduate majors, to speak in our colloquium series later this month. We will be sure to pick his brain about undergraduate recruitment.

8. Student Engagement

Our former Chair, Ronald Munson, devised a Student Engagement in Philosophy questionnaire that we have been regularly running (see Appendix II). The brief survey gives us an indication of the degree to which students find their philosophy instructors interested in the course material, accessible, and responsive; it also asks students whether they are acquiring useful skills and lets them indicate changes that might improve the class. We administer this questionnaire to a representative sample of our classes each Fall. The results from Fall 09 and Fall 10 (See Appendix III) suggest that we are doing quite well at engaging our students and meeting their needs.

While we are happy with the improvements made to specific courses as well as more general changes curricular made to our graduate degree, we would like to enhance the overall culture and camaraderie of our program. An earlier generation of graduate students chartered an organization, the Philosophers' Forum, that adds greatly to the intellectual life of the department. The Forum sponsors a WIP (work in progress) series in which faculty and students present ongoing work, puts on a Graduate Philosophy Conference, national in scope, that will enjoy its 6th annual instantiation (with keynote speaker Eric Schwitzgebel

from UC Riverside) April 8-10, and a stages a variety of social outings. We believe that attending colloquia and putting together the annual conference provide our grad students an extremely valuable apprenticeship in the profession. But we need to work harder as a department to ensure that all our graduate students understand the importance of participating in these activities. We have experimented with various ways to increase participation -- sending exhortations from the Chair and the Graduate Director, convening a meeting of all M.A. students to outline expectations, posting lists of pointers for graduate students – and will continue to work on this.

Undergraduate majors and minors are invited to all Forum events. Juniors and seniors do often take part. But we would also like to do more to reach out to our undergrads, both as a recruiting device and because their interests and needs are not the same as those of the grad students. Two initiatives have been attempted this Spring. We put together a Bad Art Festival, inviting our students to enjoy pizza while viewing a truly bad movie (Plan 9 from Outer Space). Opening remarks from our resident philosopher of art put this exercise in a larger philosophical context. And some of our graduate students are debuting a new Big Question discussion series that will feature moderated noontime debates. These measures are a start, but we feel it is imperative that we grow a greater feeling of connection and community amongst our undergraduate students.

In our 2004 Five-Year Review, the following action items were proposed regarding undergraduate success and engagement:

The department might address these issues by the following measures:

1. Faculty should identify particularly strong undergraduate papers and encourage and mentor the authors of these papers in researching and developing them for submission to one of the many undergraduate philosophy conferences;
2. Students with a special interest in an area of professional ethics should be encouraged to seek internships in their area, and the department should institute a concerted effort at identifying and advertising such openings to its students;
3. The department should continue and enhance its already extant efforts at collaborative programs with other departments such as Communications, Criminology and Criminal Justice, and Education;
4. The department should actively promote study-abroad programs that expose students to philosophical study in other countries, and should consider starting its own travel-study program;
5. The department should maintain contacts with graduates from our programs – perhaps with the introduction of an online newsletter – and encourage them to report on their professional successes.

Four of these items have been addressed. The inauguration this Fall of the Munson Prizes, departmental awards honoring the best undergraduate and graduate paper of those submitted, have gotten the ball rolling re: mentoring undergraduate research (#1). In fact, the undergraduate winner (now enrolled in our M.A. program) is presenting at not one but two student conferences. The culture of conference presentation has gotten well established amongst our grad students; we will continue to work to promote the trickle-down to the undergraduate level. The department has been contributing to interdisciplinary and collaborative programs (#3) at a riotous pace, as noted above. With regard to study

abroad (#4), two department members, Jon McGinnis and Irem Kurtsal Steen, have been working with Joel Glassman in the Center for International Studies to develop a new and distinctive program that will be based in Turkey. Kurtsal Steen is a native and has contacts there; McGinnis is a specialist in the origins of classical and Islamic natural philosophy. The program will be housed in Bogazici University in Istanbul, and take students on trips to important sites throughout the country. Since that region was a nexus for cultural, religious, and scientific developments embracing several civilizations, the program will offer terrific study opportunities for our students. AP Glassman has recently secured a partner for this venture – UMKC – so we have a green light to proceed with its development. Finally, with regard to communication with our graduates, we have produced a series of newsletters. Each contained short articles by department members on their research or areas of interest as well as announcements of upcoming events and requests to alums that they get in touch and tell us how they're putting their degrees to use. The finished newsletters are posted on our departmental website and sent as electronic attachments to our current students. Unfortunately, our attempts to get them into the hands of our graduates are hampered by the proprietary and protective attitude that the Development Office takes towards alumni e-mail lists. (And they are the only unit on campus that maintains these.)

9. Distance Learning

The Philosophy Department has participated in Distance Learning since telecourses first came to our campus well over a decade ago. We agreed to house a ready-made course, *The Humanities through the Arts*, produced by a California community college. It comprised 30 half-hour videos narrated by Maya Angelou, with an accompanying textbook. Stephanie Ross worked to adapt the course for UMSL students by creating assignments that sent them out to encounter and write about works of art in the St. Louis metropolitan area. At the same time, David Griesedieck and later Andrew Black worked to develop a second intro-level telecourse, *Significant Figures in Philosophy*. For a time, the videos for both courses were broadcast on the HEC television network.

Those early antecedents testify to the Department's commitment to distance learning. Two or so years ago, the College offered funds to support conversion of existing video courses to the new online format meeting the standards set out in the Quality Matters rubric. To date, 4 of our courses have been updated, and other remakes are in progress. Difficult questions have yet to be resolved regarding cost-sharing between the existing Colleges and the campus's newly-created UMSL Online division. But since courses created or improved in response to the Quality Matters standards are grandfathered in – the Department will continue to receive online fees for 5 years after the new versions are launched – we are happy to participate in this exercise. Here is a sampling of the current courses we have created in response to this challenge:

PHIL 1190: Philosophy Looks at the Arts (Stephanie Ross)

The course consists of a series of nine essays – a general introduction followed by essays addressing the arts of painting, photography, sculpture, architecture, music, literature, drama, and film – with numerous links to material on the web: virtual museum tours, film clips, classical music sites, and more. The essays are supplemented by readings in an assigned text and interactive discussion board activities. In addition to quizzes on each of the course units,

students select four arts on which to write papers. Whenever possible, these assignments take them out to encounter artworks in the St. Louis Metropolitan area.

PHIL 3360 Introduction to Formal Logic (Waldemar Rohloff)

The course includes a full set of online lectures. These combine a video recording of Waldemar explaining concepts while matching written information appears on the screen in tandem. Also, the course uses a computer software program that generates responses and helpful hints to students who are working through examples. Waldemar assesses the learning of students in the online course by comparing them with the students in the ground section of the course which he also teaches. In particular, students for the online section generally do all of the same homework problems as on-campus students. He frequently works in person with the online students during office hours.

PHIL 4458 Ethics and the Computer (Irem Steen)

The course includes detailed handouts, powerpoint presentations, and one audio recording, all of which aim to elucidate the material covered in the textbook. Students write weekly assignments and three essays. They also regularly participate in the discussion board, for which they receive a weekly grade. This course used to be taught in the classroom with many fewer written assignments. The instructor notices that students who take the online course do the reading assignments a lot more whole-heartedly than the students who took the ground classes used to. Perhaps because computer science majors are experienced at studying independently, the learning outcomes are often met very impressively. Irem assesses this by reading the weekly assignments. Extensive comments are left on these assignments, and students get more feedback than they usually do in a ground course. This course was upgraded in Spring 2010, where it was approved by the Dean's Office as meeting the "Quality Matters" rubric, a standard of high quality that UMSL has adopted as an ideal for online courses.

PHIL 2254 Business Ethics (David Griesedieck)

Sections of this course are taught by our graduate students, under the supervision of David Griesedieck, with one exception noted below. All of the sections have basically the same syllabus. The course has proved to be an extremely popular online option for business majors at UMSL. Given that most students have a demanding schedule of other business-related courses and (usually) jobs, the online course is very convenient. We have been somewhat slow to develop a satisfactory evaluation instrument to compare this online course with those taught on the ground. However, for the spring semester of 2010, the same set of questions was used in all courses. The results in the online courses tracked those in other courses very closely. In particular students in the online courses reported that they found the work informative and challenging. The course is definitely writing-intensive, with numerous essays required. These involve stating and defending coherent solutions to ethical dilemmas that are posed. Of course, with these, there is ample opportunity for feedback from the instructor via email. A major objective, which we continue to work on, is to develop an online counterpart to the discussion and debate that would take place in a classroom philosophy course. One approach is to require contributions to the class discussion board. This certainly generates some participation, but not necessarily the give-and-take which would be desirable. More simply put, many students make their mandatory posting and offer nothing more. So we are working to provide stimulating discussion topics and incentives to take part. In fact, one section of Business Ethics, taught by faculty member Irem Steen already includes a discussion board requirement where such give-and-take is richly rewarded and mere mandatory posting is graded with a C+. Another objective is to upgrade this course according to the Quality Matters rubric, especially so as to add more content areas which enrich the learning experience take the student beyond what is in the textbook. At the moment students get instruction from their teachers a) on the discussion board, b) in personal email exchanges, c) during office hours, and d) in the form of comments on their written work.

PHIL 1161 Ethics and Argumentation (Irem Steen)

This is an 8-week online course which will launch in the middle of the Spring 2011 semester. Its design is ongoing. In this course we will experiment with using the social network Facebook as a medium for community building and natural exchange of ideas both among the students and between them and the instructor. Students will be expected to supply and share with one another on Facebook examples and applications of course concepts. This course will be *essentially* online, not an online version of a course which could be taught on the ground. The course will tap into students' existing habits of internet and other media use and in so doing help

them directly connect their academic lives with their everyday experience—a desirable result in their understanding of both ethics and argumentation.

III: Research Excellence

1. Research Goals

The Department is strongly committed to furthering the aims of philosophical inquiry. This characteristically involves engaging in on-going philosophical discussions through publication and by participating in professional meetings and organizations. Goals must be seen in this context.

- Provide opportunities and promote a congenial environment for conducting significant research in various fields of philosophy and related interdisciplinary areas (e.g., cognitive science, practical reasoning, philosophy of science);
- Participate in interdisciplinary endeavors within the university and the community to bring to bear the methods, insights and concerns of contemporary philosophy;
- Advance philosophical knowledge and understanding through participation in professional associations, publication of books and articles and the use of other modes of exchanging ideas.

2. Faculty and Research

Professors

Stephanie A. Ross (Ph.D., Harvard)

Associate Professors

Berit Brogaard (Ph.D., State University of New York, Buffalo)

Jon McGinnis (Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania)

Gualtiero Piccinini (Ph.D., University of Pittsburgh)

Eric Wiland (Ph.D., University of Chicago)

Assistant Professors

Anna Alexandrova (Ph.D., University of California, San Diego)

John Brunero (Ph.D., Columbia University)

Robert Northcott (Ph.D., London School of Economics)

Teaching Professors

Andrew Black (Ph.D., University of Massachusetts, Amherst)

David Griesedieck (M.A., Princeton)

Assistant Teaching Professors (Non-regular, supported by soft money subject to ad hoc approval)

Waldemar Rohloff (Ph.D., University of California, Irvine)

Irem Kurtal Steen (Ph.D., Syracuse University)

The number of in-rank faculty has increased from 6 to 8 since the last review in 2004; however, 2 of these will be leaving in 2012, thus returning the number to the 2004 level. This number should be compared with the 12 faculty we had at the time of the 1999 review as well as with other comparable philosophy departments.

We have 1 more Assistant Professor and 3 more Associate Professors as compared with the 2004 level; however, we have dropped from 3 Full Professors to 1 between reviews.

The number of non-regular faculty has remained the same.

3. Research and Scholarship

In the humanities, the primary measure of research and scholarship is sustained publication in highly selective, peer-reviewed professional journals and books as well as frequency of publication. Because of the low acceptance rates at top journals in the field, publication of even one article a year represents an above average rate of productivity for many research-oriented departments at major universities. Also publication of articles in the form of book chapters or in professional symposia is a similar means for measuring scholarship and research. The economics of academic publishing makes publishers reluctant to publish collections of articles and symposia, unless convinced that the stature of the authors and the quality of the contributions will produce significant sales by major libraries and by scholars in the field. Another measure for judging scholarship and research within the humanities is the number of delivered refereed papers at conferences and invitations to speak at professional meetings and at universities. A final measure is success in securing funding for research applications and receiving research awards by external agencies, which is treated in the section "Funding: Activity for the Past Seven Years". It will be obvious to anyone who considers the UMSL philosophy department's record that it has been extremely successful judged by any and all of these measures.

The number of publication by the faculty of the UMSL Department of Philosophy is well above that of departments in similarly ranked universities and even universities ranked significantly higher. The faculty is publishing in prestigious journals in the field such as the *Journal of Philosophy*, *Philosophy of Science*, *Philosophical Studies*, *Ethics* and *Phronesis*, which frequently have a 10% (or less) acceptance rate. Books by UMSL philosophers are coming out through such well-known academic publisher such as Oxford University Press as well as several other reputable publishing houses.

Departmental members present both refereed and invited papers at conferences, colloquia, and colleges across the globe, including venues throughout the US, Canada and Mexico, South America, England, France, Finland, Turkey and as far as Australia and Beijing, China. UMSL philosophers present between 1 to 7 papers per year, with an overall departmental average of 3.667 presentations per annum.

- Jon McGinnis (along with his co-PIs at Washington University in St. Louis) has received a Mellon grant to host the John E. Sawyer Seminars on the Comparative Study of Cultures for two years.
- Both Gualtiero Piccinini and Robert Northcott have received NSF grants for 2009–2010; having *two* NSF recipients in a humanity department simultaneously is itself a unique accomplishment.
- Jon McGinnis was elected to Membership at the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton in the 2005–2006 academic year, and was supported by a NEH Faculty Fellowship.

Since the last review in 2004, the productivity of the Department has remained extremely high. The Department scorecard of refereed publications is as follows:

Refereed articles and book chapters in print: 118
 Refereed articles, book chapters accepted: 20
 Encyclopedia entries, reviews, short works (published or forthcoming): 65
 Books (published only): 5
 Anthologies, edited works (published or forthcoming): 3

Although small by most standards, the faculty has achieved national and international recognition for its work. Of the two Professors in the Department during at least part of the review period—Munson (emeritus) and Ross—each has significant standing in their respective subfields: bioethics and philosophy of medicine and aesthetics. Munson, who retired at the end of 2008, is the author of *Raising the Dead* (Oxford, 2004) and of recent *The Woman Who Decided to Die: Challenges and Choices at the Edge of Medicine* (Oxford, 2009). The *New England Journal of Medicine* described this work as an “outstanding example of narrative ethics.” His highly influential *Intervention and Reflection* has now gone into its ninth edition and is the most widely used bioethics in the United States. Until this past year, when Ross became the first female chairperson of the UMSL Department of Philosophy, she was the Book Review Editor for the leading journal in her field, *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, and she has also served as an officer in the national association in aesthetics. Her work on the aesthetics of gardens is internationally known, and she is part of a new movement to view gardens as works of art.

Our four Associate professors have distinguished themselves in their respective fields. Berit Brogaard, who came to us as our metaphysician, also has a degree in neuroscience. Within the past few years, she has begun focusing on rare brain disorders such as synesthesia and blindsight, brain intervention and emotional regulation, publishing literally a score of ground-breaking articles on various aspects of the subject. Jon McGinnis is considered one of the foremost experts on medieval physics or natural philosophy undertaken in Arabic. In addition to numerous articles, he has published three books: *Classical Arabic Philosophy*, of which one reviewer writes, it “will no doubt become the standard text used in many medieval philosophy, Islamic philosophy, and religious studies course”; a two-volume translation and edition of Avicenna’s *Physics*, which represents the first complete translation in any European language of this historically

influential work; and finally *Avicenna* with Oxford UP (2010). Gualtiero Piccinini is a leading philosopher of cognitive science and computation and has recently received an NSF grant to pursue his research on mechanistic account of what it takes for a physical system to perform computations. Eric Wiland works primarily in ethics and reason with an emphasis on investigation into problems in practical philosophy and is currently completing the first book dedicated to reason and rationality accessible to a general audience; he is also one of the co-organizers of the St. Louis Annual Conference on Reason and Rationality (SLACRR) of which more will be said below.

The three junior members of the Department have already started to make significant professional marks. Anna Alexandrova is the Department's philosopher of social science, focusing on methodological issues in economics and psychology. Her essay "Making Models Count" won the Philosophy of Science Association Recent Ph.D. Essay prize in 2008. Sadly, Cambridge University has seduced her away and she will be leaving for England at the end of this academic year. John Brunero, together with Eric Wiland, is a co-organizer for SLACRR, which is the first and most acclaimed conference on Reason and Rationality in the world today. He publishes regularly in some of the most selective ethics journals in the world, ones with rejection rates of more than ninety percent. Robert Northcott, who will also be leaving us for England to take up a position at Birkbeck College London, is our resident philosopher of science with a concentration on causal explanation. His research extends to three distinct areas: metaphysics and both theoretical and applied philosophy of science. He has been awarded an NSF grant for his work on causation and evolution.

Not included in the scorecard totals above are works by the full-time Teaching and Assistant Teaching Professors in the Department. Andrew Black is an expert on Cartesian philosophy and has published on both Descartes and Malebranche in leading international journals. He also collaborated with Munson on a revision of an introductory logic book, and is developing an introductory book on the philosophy of science for high school science teachers. David Griesedieck has published his own text in Asian philosophy, which is widely marketed. Irem Kurtsal Steen has an article in *Philosophical Studies*, one of the most prestigious journals in the field, and has presented her work at national and international conferences. Waldemar Rohloff's principle research interests are in the history of analytic philosophy and its intersection with the philosophy of mathematics. He has written papers on figures such as Kant, Bolzano, Frege and Wittgenstein. Indeed, in terms of publications and level of academic attainment, the current corps of Teaching Professors in the Department ranks as well as, if not better than, many small philosophy departments and most teaching colleges in this country.

The Department of Philosophy comprises extraordinarily talented, productive, and prominent faculty at every level.

4. Funding

Activity for the Past Seven Years:

Even during this time of limited financial prospects, the UMSL Department of Philosophy has aggressively, creatively and successfully sought traditional and new sources of research funding. This fact is amply witnessed by the following figures. The figures are based upon the activity of eight (8) in-rank faculty members in the Department. At any given time during the past seven years six faculty were active. During this time over \$3 million in the form of grants, fellowships, stipends, travel costs and similar funds was sought from internal sources and numerous prestigious external agencies, such as the National Institute of Health, the National Science Foundation, National Endowment for the Humanities, the Mellon Foundation and the MacDonald Foundation. Of the funds sought Departmental members were awarded \$673,256. From the funds awarded \$494,912 came from external funding agencies, \$100,265 from the UM System, and \$98,079 from the University of Missouri-St. Louis. While it is true that the Department's success rate is slightly better than 20%, this percentage must be understood in context. The cold facts are that there is virtually no money in the humanities, certainly by comparison with the hard science, and so a humanities department that gets any significant amount of grant money at all is unusual. Consequently, that the UMSL Department of Philosophy faculty—small by comparison with other philosophy departments in comparable institutions—found over \$3 million in potential funding is astounding and that they should have won nearly \$700k is little short of miraculous. Thus, to summarize the most salient points of the past seven years' funding activity for the Department of Philosophy:

\$3,222,889 were sought in the form of grants, fellowships, etc.
\$673,256 were awarded to departmental members.

Scholarly Results of Funding:

The most significant incentive offered by the Department to support scholarship through funding is to allow research leaves. During the past seven years, seven in-rank faculty members have been on leaves of various sorts that bought out their teaching (e.g., support from the UM Research Board, UMSL Research Awards, NEH, NSF, ANU, OSU).

The uninterrupted research time provided by these grants and fellowships has given rise to significant scholarship by faculty members during the time of the survey. The Department uses the number of articles, books and the like produced by its faculty to evaluate how successfully the funding efforts have lead to scholarship. Thus, the funding has either directly or indirectly led to 118 refereed articles or book chapters, 5 books and over 200 professional papers presented at national and international conferences by departmental members. Likewise, it has allowed one of its members to take up residence for a year at the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton. Thus, to summarize the most salient points of the Department's scholarship made possible through research leaves:

7 philosophy faculty have received course buyouts to conduct research;
Scholarly output in part made possible through research leaves:

118 refereed articles or book chapters;
 5 books;
 Approximately 230 professional papers presented
 1 Membership at the Institute for Advanced Study.

5. Overview

The Department seeks to give foundation to its instructional programs through a highly qualified, active and nationally recognized research faculty. Current research strengths in the Department include ethics, philosophy of science, practical reasoning and the history of philosophy. Given the small size of the Department, we are best served by trying to enhance these areas of research excellence. The Department expects to continue and grow its national reputation for high quality scholarship.

IV: Community Engagement

Our department has been particularly active in terms of engaging with the community. One way in which this engagement has occurred has been in the form of writing popular articles about philosophy and related topics for mainstream magazines. Our faculty have contributed to Lance Armstrong's LIVESTRONG, Hello! Magazine, Orato magazine, How To, and many others. Our faculty have also been the subjects of articles. This interaction with popular media has given us a lot of media attention. For example, Dr. Northcott, Dr. Alexandra and Dr. Piccinini were featured in a local newspaper for their achievements. Dr. Brogaard has been interviewed on several radio shows.

Faculty members from our department have also been engaged in a counseling program between the Gender Studies program and a domestic violence program in South Korea. The interaction has taken place via video conferences. Our faculty give advice to women in South Korea on a regular basis.

Participation in fund-raising events is another way in which we have engaged with the department. One recent event in which some of us partook was a fund-raising dinner for Safe Connection, to help protect rape and abuse victims. One faculty member regularly visits high schools through the gender studies program to inform the students about safe sex and what to do in the event of disease or pregnancy.

Until his retirement, our philosopher of medicine Ronald Munson was a regular participant in Ethics Rounds for surgical residents and faculty at Washington University's Medical School. He was also member of the Human Studies Committee of that school, a member of the Ethics Panel of the St. Louis Science Center, an active member of the St. Louis Ethics Consortium, and the medical ethicist for national longitudinal studies in various medical fields. One of the reasons that hiring a new bioethicist is the top priority in our Strategic Plan is to rebuild this component of community outreach and engagement.

Other sorts of community engagement straddle the line between activism and more traditional sorts of academic outreach. For example, in Spring 2009 Andrew Black gave the keynote address "Freeplay and Sober Science: Imagination and the Scientific Method"

at the annual Junior Science, Engineering, and Humanities Symposium that brings together and honors young high-school researchers. Eric Wiland and John Brunero have founded SLACCR, an annual conference on Reason and Rationality that is held in U.City's Moonrise Hotel and open to the general public. Last year's conference brought together participants from several continents! Two department members have participated in the meetings with representatives from Express Scripts, with an eye to designing research programs that the company would fund. We hope to recruit a visiting philosopher who is extremely active on this front and has grant proposals ready to submit that will have practical real-world consequences.

As one final way of reaching out to the community, the Department has – following the advice of Dean Yasbin – assembled an Advocacy Board of distinguished St. Louisans who are supportive of our activities. Our five-member Board includes Theodore Vitali, Chair of Philosophy at Saint Louis University, Mark Rollins, past Chair of Philosophy at Washington University, Ira Kodner, a Professor of Surgery at Washington University and past Director of the Washington University Center for the Study of Ethics and Human Values, Joseph Feder, a microbiologist and president of ISTO Technologies Inc., a biotech company that develops replacement parts for human tissue, and Henry Mohrman, recently retired as general counsel for a group of St. Louis companies as well as for the Ronald Coase Institute which he helped to found. Both Feder and Mohrman have special ties to UMSL, as Joe's son Gavreal graduated with a degree in philosophy, while Henry's wife Mary Beth is Associate Professor and Coordinator for Accounting in the Business School. The Advocacy Board met with department members and Dean Yasbin this past Fall; we will continue to keep them apprised of our department's fortunes.

V: Resources

Philosophy is a low-overhead discipline. Our faculty are productive researchers whose teaching reaches many students and serves many campus constituencies. Faculty workload is determined in a way consistent with the practices of the other humanities departments. Taking into account the high rejection rates (approaching 90%) of top-ranked philosophy journals, our faculty are rewarded with reductions from the UM system's 3/3 base teaching load (we label this level "research oriented") if they are deemed research active (3/2) or research intensive (2/2). Our M.A. program is nationally ranked; many of our faculty have international reputations. Overall, then, our Department gives the campus a lot of bang for its buck. In addition to our S&W Budget of \$955,638, we receive \$19,815 in E&E. The great bulk of this is used to fund our graduate students. We support as many of them as possible with grading and TA positions. We also draw on our E&E to fund colloquia, travel to conferences (for both faculty and students whose papers are selected), and departmental events that reach out to our students.

Eric Wiland proposed some calculations to demonstrate how affordable we are compared to other departments in the College. Here is his tabulation that compares student credit hours to S&W across the College:

MoCode Description	FY'10 E&E*	S&W		Total SCH		SCH per \$1K of Costs	Nat'lly ranked program
		Allocations, July 2009	Total Costs	FY 2010	Costs/SCH		
FOREIGN LANG & LIT	\$20,074	\$ 993,796	\$ 1,013,870	30,836	\$32.88	30.41	
ENGLISH	\$44,645	\$ 2,111,101	\$ 2,155,746	25,803	\$83.55	11.97	
SOCIOLOGY	\$7,627	\$ 325,135	\$ 332,762	3,667	\$90.75	11.02	
ANTHROPOLOGY	\$15,263	\$ 734,473	\$ 749,736	6,890	\$108.82	9.19	
HISTORY	\$26,534	\$ 1,390,614	\$ 1,417,148	12,708	\$111.52	8.97	
PHILOSOPHY	\$19,815	\$ 955,638	\$ 975,453	7,968	\$122.42	8.17	Yes
MATHEMATICS	\$50,485	\$ 2,460,271	\$ 2,510,756	19,901	\$126.16	7.93	
PSYCHOLOGY	\$48,776	\$ 2,127,483	\$ 2,176,259	14,800	\$147.04	6.80	
BIOLOGY	\$120,325 Includes \$70,000 lab supplies	\$ 1,996,189	\$ 2,116,514	13,915	\$152.10	6.57	Yes
ECONOMICS	\$19,348	\$ 1,224,319	\$ 1,243,667	7,812	\$159.20	6.28	
CRIMINOLOGY/JUSTICE	\$90,894 Includes \$53,000 lab supplies	\$ 1,525,564	\$ 1,616,458	9,569	\$168.93	5.92	Yes
PHYSICS & ASTRONOMY	\$36,396 Includes \$10,000 lab supplies	\$ 1,143,054	\$ 1,179,450	6,278	\$187.87	5.32	
POLITICAL SCIENCE	\$33,835	\$ 1,410,942	\$ 1,444,777	6,477	\$223.06	4.48	
CHEMISTRY	\$32,870	\$ 1,865,213	\$ 1,898,083	7,265	\$261.26	3.83	

* E&E numbers are from an email to chairs from Terry Thiel on 5/13/09

Our teaching and research needs will be spelled out in the following section. Our unit's present administrative structure and policy-making processes seem well-suited to the pursuit of the goals described below. The executive officer of the department is the Chair, who is elected every three years. Course offerings and scheduling are determined by a Curriculum Committee, and a Colloquium Committee arranges for talks during the year. A Director of Undergraduate Studies and a Director of Graduate Studies deal with issues connected with the respective programs. The size of the department makes representation unnecessary, and most policy decisions are made at meetings of all full-time regular and non-regular members of the department. Internal discussions are often handled via email, which keeps the number of meetings low. A consensus is usually reached without wrangling. In sum, the administrative structure and policy-making operate smoothly with minimal burden on most members of the department, allowing the unit to effectively set, pursue, and meet its goals.

VI: The Future

1. Departmental Strategic Plan

Last year, we set forth a Strategic Plan (available in full here: <http://www.umsl.edu/~philo/StrategicPlan.html>) outlining how we aim to strengthen our department and its academic program. Here is a summary of the nine main points of that Strategic Plan, listed in order of importance.

As a department, we aim to:

- 1) fill the gap left by Ronald Munson's retirement by hiring (at the entry-level) a philosopher specializing in bioethics, thereby allowing us to maintain important partnerships with community medical institutions.
- 2) emphasize the department's overarching research emphasis on Reason and Rationality.
- 3) increase the funding available to our graduate students to a level comparable to that offered by our competitors.
- 4) offer courses with new formats, including 1 and 2 credit courses.

- 5) lobby for the creation of a campus-wide course requirement in ethics.
- 6) make both students and potential donors more aware of departmental activities and offerings.
- 7) partner with the Institute for Women's and Gender Studies to hire a philosopher specializing in gender studies.*
- 8) enhance the intellectual life of the department by funding a colloquium series and creating an area within Lucas Hall to serve as lounge for students and faculty, thereby promoting intellectual exchange.**
- 9) to hire a historian of philosophy working on Kant and/or early modern philosophy.

*(Note that this plan was formulated prior to the dissolution of the IWGS.)

** (Revised to include all students, undergraduate as well as graduates, among our targets.)

Each of these nine priorities is clearly in line with the aims and guiding principles of the Gateway for Greatness Campaign. Further details of how we are planning to meet each of these nine goals are available within the Strategic Plan itself.

2. Looking Ahead

Since the formulation of our Strategic Plan last year, two challenges have arisen that require immediate attention. The first is the imminent loss of our two philosophers of science. Happily, we have a unique opportunity to recruit a visiting professor, Zachary Ernst, whose areas of expertise, philosophy of science, game theory, and logic, nicely mesh with our needs. Moreover, Ernst does empirical research on the nature of rational choice that perfectly aligns with the needs and interests of Express Scripts, our corporate campus partner. Ernst recently had to table \$2 million dollars in grant applications he had prepared for a number of federal agencies because of financial instability at his temporary academic home, the Center for Intelligence at Mississippi State University. He is eager to submit these grants through our campus and ORA; he is also poised to create a start-up company to market some of the concrete applications that flow from his research and would very much like to partner with our IT Business Incubator in birthing this company.

We believe that his visiting appointment is a win/win situation. It meets our urgent pedagogical needs and also makes financial sense. The funding would come from our two pending resignations; replacing two departing faculty with one would allow the Dean to support this hire while also putting some money towards deficit reduction. The overhead from the anticipated grant activity is a further financial incentive.

The second challenge confronting our department is the drop in majors for AY 2009/10 that moved us onto the Low Performing Program list. The situation has already been ameliorated somewhat by improved counting procedures (double-majors were not included in the initial lists). Having expended considerable energy of late fine-tuning our M.A. program, we are now eager to extend similar treatment to our undergraduate degrees. Some aspects of this oversight are already implicit in our Strategic Plan as it stands (items 2,4,5, 6,&8 have a bearing on undergraduate education.) Assuming this action is taken, then our previously formulated Strategic Plan remains an accurate indication of our ongoing aspirations, though some fine-tuning is called for. Maintaining a research and

teaching presence in the intersection of bioethics/philosophy of science remains one of our top priorities. This would allow us to support new partnerships (the College of Nursing has just sounded us out regarding the creating of a new track for their students who don't gain admittance to the clinical program) and to more effectively lobby for a college-wide ethics requirement. We also want to press the case for a campus-wide requirement in critical thinking. This is clearly consistent with other campus initiatives in the areas of logical and scientific literacy. And finally, looking to the further future, we would like to one day add another historian of philosophy to our ranks, perhaps someone specializing in Kant and 19th-century philosophy, as this would also bring further strength to our coverage of moral philosophy.

3. Our Department's Aspirational Peer

We aspire to be in the same peer group as the Department of Philosophy at Georgia State University (GSU). In order to achieve that level of success, our unit aims to 1) increase the number of tenured / tenure-track (T/TT) faculty in the Department to a number comparable to our peer institutions, 2) establish specialized tracks within the M.A. program building off of our departmental strengths.

Let us explain why we've selected GSU as our aspirational peer and why increasing the number of T/TT faculty is necessary. Here is the latest (2009) ranking of terminal M.A. programs in the U.S. in terms of faculty quality, according to the Blackwell's Philosophical Gourmet Report, edited by Brian Leiter (University of Chicago).

Nationally Ranked M.A. Programs

Tier 1	Tufts University
Tier 2	Brandeis University Georgia State University Northern Illinois University University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University
Tier 3	University of Houston University of Missouri, St. Louis Western Michigan University
Tier 4	California State University, Los Angeles Colorado State University San Francisco State University Texas Tech University.

Our Department aspires to move from Tier 3 to Tier 2. So, we've selected an aspirational peer from among the current members of Tier 2. Among the Tier 2 members, GSU is particularly noteworthy in that they have continued to expand and improve as a Department, even in these tough economic times. That's why we've selected them as our aspirational peer.

With the retirement of our distinguished medical ethicist Ronald Munson, and the departures of Professor Alexandrova (who is moving to Cambridge University) and Professor Northcott (who is moving to Birkbeck College, London), our Department will have only **six T/TT faculty members**. Without increasing the T/TT members of the faculty, we will be unable to move up to Tier 2, and will have serious difficulty maintaining a Tier 3 position. The remaining six faculty members all have excellent reputations in the philosophical community, but with such a small number of faculty (and some important areas of philosophy not covered by those six faculty members), the overall reputation of the M.A. program will likely decline.

Here are the number of T/TT faculty in each of the other Departments listed above (based upon visits to Departmental websites on 2/18/2011) with indications of which Departments are currently hiring (based upon their placement of advertisements in the American Philosophical Association's current volume of *Jobs for Philosophers*):

<u>Nationally Ranked M.A. Programs</u>		<u># of T/TT Faculty</u>
Tier 1	Tufts University	12
Tier 2	Brandeis University	10
	Georgia State University	15 (and currently hiring for 1 position)
	Northern Illinois University	11
	University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee	14 (and currently hiring for 1 position)
	Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University	7 (and currently hiring for 2 positions)
Tier 3	University of Houston	11
	University of Missouri, St. Louis	6
	Western Michigan University	8 (and currently hiring for 1 position)
Tier 4	California State University, Los Angeles	14
	Colorado State University	14
	San Francisco State University	11 (and currently hiring for 1 position)
	Texas Tech University	8 (and currently hiring for 1 position)

At UM-St. Louis, we are not currently hiring for any positions. So, next year, we will have **three fewer** T/TT faculty members than any of these ranked M.A. programs, including the Tier 4 programs. It will indeed be quite difficult for our department to compete with these departments, many of whom will be more than double our size.

A second reason why we've selected GSU as our aspirational peer is that GSU's Department currently offers three tracks to the M.A.: a traditional track, a specialized Neurophilosophy track, and a J.D. / M.A. track offered in conjunction with the College of Law at GSU. The Department has particular strengths in philosophy of mind and cognitive science, as well as within legal and political philosophy. In structuring the M.A. program around these strengths, GSU is able to attract quality applicants interested in these particular areas. At, UM-St. Louis, we hope to follow suit and structure our M.A. program around our particular strengths. We hope that by doing so, we'll be able to recruit strong applicants in these areas.

Traditionally, our department has been strong within the philosophy of science, the philosophy of mind, and ethics. Of course, we need to repair our anticipated losses in philosophy of science before carrying out the plans sketched in this closing section. We've

been able to maintain a position on the list of ranked M.A. programs for the last decade largely because of the research reputation of the faculty working in these areas. We don't yet have any specific proposals about how to set up different tracks within the M.A. program. For instance, we haven't yet considered proposals about how to set up the course distribution requirements for different tracks. But we'd like to move in this direction. One clue on how to proceed has emerged from earlier discussions surrounding our Strategic Plan. At one time Ronald Munson proposed that we found a Center for the Public Understanding of Science. A good deal of the department's research activity would have fit under that umbrella, including Munson's own work (in bioethics and philosophy of medicine) which incorporated elements of both ethics and philosophy of science. However, subsequent conversation indicated that the many department members favored an even larger tent; they proposed we form a Center for Reason and Rationality. These terms point to the essence of philosophical activity while effectively embracing the two poles just noted. We would like to find a way to highlight our areas of strength while working within this unifying theme. Following GSU's lead, we'd like to advertise ourselves (both to prospective applicants, and to the broader philosophical community) as having research strengths in these areas. This could be done by including short paragraphs about faculty research in each of these areas of strength on the departmental website, as GSU has done here: <http://www2.gsu.edu/~wwwphi/4621.html>. We'd also be emulating the University of Kent, whose philosophy department offers an M.A. degree through its Centre for Reasoning; no such degree is currently available in the States.

In summary, we've selected GSU as our aspirational peer because we wish to mimic their improvement and expansion over the past few years. We believe that hiring new faculty is a necessary means to being included in that peer group, and to achieving the more modest aspiration of keeping the peers we currently have. And we believe that establishing tracks within the M.A. program based on our research strengths would be an effective way to recruit applicants, and make the other philosophers (including those responsible for the ranking of M.A. programs) aware of the particular virtues of our

Appendix 1: Course Evaluation Form

Department of Philosophy Course Evaluation

Please note: The Identification Number on the opscan sheet is the *course reference number*. This number should have been provided by the instructor and can be found on the evaluation packet envelope. *Do not put anything on the opscan sheet other than the reference number and your answers to the questions below.*

Use only a #2 pencil on the opscan sheet and fill in the circles completely. *Opiscans answered in ink will not scan, so they will be discarded.*

Using the scale below, rate the following statements according to your classroom experience.

Mark your answers on the opscan sheet.

A: High/Strongly Agree	B: Above Average/Agree	C: Average/Agree Somewhat	D: Below Average/Disagree	E: Low/Strongly Disagree
-------------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------------	---------------------------------

1. The instructor conveyed an interest in the subject matter.
2. The instructor was prepared for class and knowledgeable about the material.
3. The instructor put class time to good use.
4. The instructor made the course material understandable.
5. The instructor welcomed questions and discussion in class.
6. The instructor created an atmosphere that contributed to learning.
7. The instructor was available to answer questions outside of class.
8. My overall rating of this instructor is
9. If English is not the native language of the instructor, rate clarity of his/her communication in English.
10. The course was intellectually stimulating and challenging.
11. The course was well organized and well conceived.
12. Assigned readings were interesting and worthwhile.
13. Assignments were appropriate and well related to course material.
14. Tests were fair measures of what we've learned in this course.
15. Grading was just and impartial.
16. I have done my fair share to make this course worthwhile.
17. My overall rating of this course is
18. I would recommend this course to a friend.
19. I would recommend this instructor to a friend.
20. I would consider taking another philosophy course.

Short Answer- Write your comments in the space provided.

Instructor's Name _____

Course _____

Your current major: _____

Your year in college: FR SO JR SR GRAD

What are the instructor's strengths? _____

What, if anything, would you suggest the instructor do differently? _____

Which of the assigned readings did you find the most interesting and why? _____

Which of the readings did you find the least interesting and why? _____

Any further comments or recommendations? _____

Appendix 2: Student Engagement in Philosophy Survey

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT IN PHILOSOPHY COURSES

Course: PHIL _____

Year at UMSL (please circle one): FR SO JR SR GRAD

1. Have you had any personal contact (e.g. conversation before or after class, e-mail exchange, discussion in office) with your instructor so far this semester? a. yes b. no
2. Do you feel that if you wanted to talk to your instructor she/he would be willing?
a. yes b. no c. no opinion
3. Have you ever arranged to meet with your instructor at a time convenient for both of you?
a. yes b. tried but was unsuccessful c. never tried
4. In classes in which My Gateway is used, do you think its use has deepened your engagement with your instructor and other students? a. yes b. no c. no opinion
5. How does the number of papers or other written assignments (e.g. exercises) in this course compare with other courses at the same level you are taking or have taken?
a. more b. about the same c. fewer
6. How much opportunity do you have to ask questions or participate in discussion in this class?
a. as much as needed b. some c. not enough
7. Do you think your instructor would be willing to advise you about your academic program or about taking some other course? a. yes b. no c. no opinion
8. Does your instructor seem engaged with this class? a. yes b. no c. no opinion
9. Has your instructor successfully conveyed his or her interest in philosophy and in the subject matter of this course? a. yes b. no c. no opinion
10. How much do you think that the analytical and critical skills you have gained in this class will carry over to other classes and perhaps even to your work experience?
a. Quite a bit b. somewhat c. not at all
11. Do you feel you have done what is required (e.g. come to class regularly, done the reading, asked questions, participated in discussions, etc.) to become engaged with this class? a. yes b. no
12. What might make this class better?
a. more written assignments
b. more opportunity for discussion
c. the chance to work with small groups of other students during class
d. the chance to work with small groups of other students outside of class
e. nothing in particular, the class seems all right as it is.
13. How challenging are the demands of the course compared with courses at the same level that you have taken or are taking? a. not very b. about right c. unreasonably high

Appendix 3: Student Engagement Survey Results 09/10

Fall 2009 Philosophy Student Engagement Survey

Questions-->	1			2				3				4				5				6				7			
	a	b	N/A	a	b	c	N/A	a	b	c	N/A	a	b	c	N/A	a	b	c	N/A	a	b	c	N/A	a	b	c	N/A
1130	36	14	0	49	0	1	0	6	1	43	0	25	12	13	0	10	33	5	2	41	8	1	0	42	2	6	0
1150	39	25	0	59	0	4	1	10	0	54	0	46	8	10	0	6	45	13	0	39	18	7	0	52	3	9	0
1185	16	8	0	19	4	1	0	6	0	18	0	10	5	9	0	1	11	12	0	15	6	3	0	16	1	7	0
2255	5	2	1	8	0	0	0	1	0	7	0	2	2	4	0	0	8	0	0	8	0	0	0	7	0	1	0
2256	28	18	1	46	0	1	0	3	0	44	0	27	10	10	0	1	24	22	0	44	2	1	0	28	1	18	0
3360	15	2	1	18	0	0	0	11	0	7	0	5	6	6	1	2	12	3	1	17	1	0	0	14	1	3	0
3374	3	4	0	7	0	0	0	1	0	6	0	5	1	1	0	0	6	1	0	6	1	0	0	4	0	3	0
4401	13	0	0	13	0	0	0	6	0	7	0	9	0	3	1	2	11	0	0	12	1	0	0	12	0	1	0
4478	3	0	2	5	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	1	0	4	0	3	2	0	0	5	0	0	0	5	0	0	0
4482	7	0	0	7	0	0	0	4	0	3	0	1	1	5	0	0	7	0	0	7	0	0	0	7	0	0	0
TOTALS	165	73	5	231	4	7	1	49	1	193	0	131	45	65	2	25	159	56	3	194	37	12	0	187	8	48	0
PERCENTAGE	68	30	2.1	95	1.6	2.9	0.4	20	0.4	79	0	54	19	27	0.8	10	65	23	1.2	80	15	4.9	0	77	3.3	20	0

8				9				10				11			12					13				
a	b	c	N/A	a	b	c	N/A	a	b	c	N/A	a	b	N/A	a	b	c	d	e	N/A	a	b	c	N/A
49	0	1	0	48	1	1	0	17	26	6	1	46	3	1	3	5	6	0	36	0	4	45	1	0
64	0	0	0	60	2	2	0	27	33	4	0	54	9	1	5	13	9	3	34	0	7	56	1	0
17	5	2	0	15	5	4	0	0	13	11	0	21	3	0	10	6	3	0	5	0	2	12	10	0
8	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	8	0	0	3	0	1	0	4	0	0	8	0	0
46	0	1	0	44	0	3	0	24	20	2	1	44	3	0	1	3	7	2	34	0	8	39	0	0
16	1	1	0	15	0	3	0	6	10	2	0	18	0	0	1	1	6	1	9	0	0	14	4	0
7	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	0	7	0	0
13	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	10	3	0	0	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	12	0	0	13	0	0
5	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	5	0	0
7	0	0	0	6	0	0	1	4	3	0	0	7	0	0	2	0	1	1	3	0	0	7	0	0
232	6	5	0	221	8	13	1	99	117	25	2	222	19	2	25	29	33	8	148	0	21	206	16	0
95	2.5	2.1	0	91	3.3	5.3	0.4	41	48	10	0.8	91	7.8	0.8	10	12	14	3.3	61	0	8.6	85	6.6	0

Fall 2010 Philosophy Student Engagement Survey

Questions-->	1			2				3				4				5				6				7			
	a	b	N/A	a	b	c	N/A	a	b	c	N/A	a	b	c	N/A	a	b	c	N/A	a	b	c	N/A	a	b	c	N/A
1090-001 (8)	6	2	0	8	0	0	0	1	0	7	0	5	1	2	0	2	6	0	0	8	0	0	0	7	0	1	0
1130-001 (39)	24	15	0	35	1	3	0	2	0	36	1	17	12	9	1	1	32	16	0	23	12	3	1	26	5	8	0
1150-001 (64)	36	27	1	58	2	4	0	5	1	58	0	38	11	14	1	10	45	9	0	45	18	1	0	52	3	9	0
1185-001 (26)	22	4	0	24	1	1	0	11	1	14	0	17	7	2	0	2	17	7	0	21	5	0	0	19	2	5	0
2256-002 (21)	18	3	0	21	0	0	0	1	0	20	0	10	5	6	0	1	18	2	0	20	1	0	0	17	0	4	0
3304-001 (9)	7	1	1	9	0	0	0	3	0	6	0	4	3	2	0	0	9	0	0	6	3	0	0	9	0	0	0
3360-001 (8)	8	0	0	8	0	0	0	6	0	2	0	4	1	3	0	1	4	2	1	7	1	0	0	6	0	2	0
3374-001 (18)	14	4	0	18	0	0	0	5	0	13	0	16	1	1	0	1	16	1	0	17	1	0	0	14	0	4	0
3380-001 (15)	9	6	0	13	0	2	0	3	1	11	0	10	2	3	0	1	7	7	0	11	3	1	0	11	0	4	0
4445 (13)	13	0	0	13	0	0	0	9	0	4	0	6	3	3	1	3	9	1	0	12	1	0	0	12	1	0	0
TOTALS	151	60	2	199	4	10	0	45	3	164	1	122	45	43	3	20	157	45	1	162	45	5	1	166	11	36	0
Percentage	0.7	0.3	0	0.9	0	0	0	0.2	0	0.7	0	0.6	0.2	0.2	0	0.1	0.7	0.2	0	0.7	0.2	0	0	0.8	0	0.2	0

8				9				10				11			12					13				
a	b	c	N/A	a	b	c	N/A	a	b	c	N/A	a	b	N/A	a	b	c	d	e	N/A	a	b	c	N/A
7	0	1	0	6	0	2	0	4	2	2	0	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	0	0	8	0	
34	0	5	0	32	4	3	0	7	20	12	0	33	6	0	7	7	4	1	20	0	5	27	7	0
62	0	2	0	60	0	4	0	29	32	3	0	60	2	2	3	7	10	3	39	2	4	58	1	1
22	2	2	0	24	2	0	0	7	15	4	0	22	3	1	2	3	6	2	13	0	3	22	1	0
21	0	0	0	21	0	0	0	9	11	1	0	21	0	0	2	1	2	0	16	0	2	19	0	0
9	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	7	2	0	0	8	1	0	0	3	1	0	5	0	0	9	0	0
8	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	2	5	1	0	7	0	1	0	0	2	0	6	0	1	4	2	1
18	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	10	8	0	0	18	0	0	1	0	3	0	14	0	1	17	0	0
14	0	1	0	14	0	0	1	8	4	3	0	15	0	0	1	4	1	0	9	0	3	12	0	0
11	1	1	0	11	1	1	0	8	5	0	0	12	1	0	1	0	0	1	11	0	1	11	0	1
199	3	11	0	197	7	8	1	87	102	24	0	196	13	4	17	25	29	7	133	2	20	179	11	3
0.9	0	0	0	0.9	0	0	0	0.4	0.5	0.1	0	0.9	0.1	0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0	0.6	0	0.1	0.8	0	0

Appendix 4: Honors College Courses 2004-2011

HONORS Classes Offered by Philosophy Faculty and GTAs
Fall 2004-Spring 2011

				Crossed With
Fall 2004	Griesedieck	Honors 3010-003	International Business Ethics	N/A
	Munson	Honors 3010-004	Medicine, Values & Society	PHIL 2258-001
	Wiland	Honors 3010-005	Ancient Philosophy	PHIL 3301-001
Spring 2005	Streeter	Honors 3010-002	Theories of Knowledge	PHIL 4440-001/5540-G01
	Munson/Reidhead	Honors 3010-003	Medicine, Values & Society	PHIL 2258-001
Fall 2005	Griesedieck	Honors 3010-003	International Business Ethics	N/A
	Munson	Honors 3010-004	Medicine, Values & Society	PHIL 2258-001
	Wiland	Honors 3010-005	Classical Ethical Theory	PHIL 4435-001
Spring 2006	Griesedieck	Honors 3010-004	20th Century Philosophy	PHIL 3305-001
Fall 2006	Griesedieck	Honors 3010-003	International Business Ethics	N/A
	Munson	Honrs 3010-004	Medicine, Values & Society	PHIL 2258-001
Spring 2007	Gabriel	Honors 2010-004	Critical Thinking	PHIL 1160-002
	Gabriel	Honors 2010-004	Critical Thinking	PHIL 1160-003
	Northcott	Honors 3010-002	The Darwinian Heritage	PHIL 2281-001
Fall 2007	Muckler	Honors 2010-001	Critical Thinking	N/A
	Griesedieck	Honors 3010-003	International Business Ethics	N/A
	Munson	Honors 3010-004	Medicine, Values & Society	PHIL 2258-001
Spring 2008	Muckler	Honors 2010-004	Critical Thinking	PHIL 1160-003
	Griesedieck	Honors 3010-005	American Philosophy	PHIL 3307-001
Fall 2008	Richeson	Honors 2010-001	Critical Thinking	PHIL 1160-002
	Griesedieck	Honors 3010-003	International Business Ethics	N/A
	Munson	Honors 3010-004	Medicine, Values & Society	PHIL 2258-001
	Wiland	Honors 3010-006	Humor & Laughter	PHIL 4474-001
Spring 2009	Richeson	Honors 2010-003	Critical Thinking	PHIL 1160-002
	Steen	Honors 3010-001	Free Will & Moral Responsibility	PHIL 4451-001
Fall 2009	Richeson	Honors 2010-001	Critical Thinking	PHIL 1160-002
	Richeson	Honors 2010-002	Critical Thinking	PHIL 1160-003
	Griesedieck	Honors 3010-003	International Business Ethics	N/A
Spring 2010	Rohloff	Honors 2010-001	Philosophy As Therapy	PHIL 2250-002
	Richeson	Honors 2010-002	Critical Thinking	PHIL 1160-001
	Wiland	Honors 2010-006	Philosophy of Death	PHIL 2250-001
	McGinnis	Honors 3010-002	Medicine, Values & Society	PHIL 2258-001
Fall 2010	Gavin	Honors 2010-001	Critical Thinking	PHIL 1160-002
	McGinnis	Honors 3010-002	Metaphysical Study of the Nature	PHIL 2258-001
	Griesedieck	Honors 3010-003	International Business Ethics	N/A
Spring 2011	Gavin	Honors 2010-001	Critical Thinking	PHIL 1160-003
	Gavin	Honors 2010-002	Critical Thinking	PHIL 1160-002
	Piccinini	Honors 2010-005	Minds, Brains & Evolutions	PHIL 2280-001
	McGinnis	Honors 3010-002	Medicine, Values & Society	PHIL 2258-001
	Griesedieck	Honors 3010-005	American Philosophy	PHIL 3307-001

Appendix 5: Some Sample Grading Rubrics for Philosophy Papers

Philosophy Paper Grading Rubric

	Excellent	Good	Poor / Needs Improvement	Unacceptable
Argument				
Thesis	A clear statement of the main conclusion of the paper.	The thesis is obvious, but there is no single clear statement of it.	The thesis is present, but must be uncovered or reconstructed from the text of the paper.	There is no thesis.
Premises	Each reason for believing the thesis is made clear, and as much as possible, presented in single statements. It is clear which premises are to be taken as given, and which will be supported by sub-arguments. The paper provides sub-arguments for controversial premises. If there are sub-arguments, the premises for these are clear, and made in single statements. The premises which are taken as given are at least plausibly true.	The premises are all clear, although each may not be presented in a single statement. It is also clear which premises are to be taken as given, and which will be supported by sub-arguments. The paper provides sub-arguments for controversial premises. If there are sub-arguments, the premises for these are clear. The premises which are taken as given are at least plausibly true.	The premises must be reconstructed from the text of the paper. It is not made clear which premises are to be taken as given, and which will be supported by sub-arguments. There are no sub-arguments, or, if there are sub-arguments, the premises for these are not made clear. The paper does not provide sub-arguments for controversial premises. The plausibility of the premises which are taken as given is questionable.	There are no premises—the paper merely restates the thesis. Or, if there are premises, they are much more likely to be false than true.
Support	The premises clearly support the thesis, and the author is aware of exactly the kind of support they provide. The argument is either valid as it stands, or, if invalid, the thesis, based on the premises, is likely to be or plausibly true.	The premises support the thesis, and the author is aware of the general kind of support they provide. The argument is either valid as it stands, or, if invalid, the thesis, based on the premises, is likely to be or plausibly true.	The premises somewhat support the thesis, but the author is not aware of the kind of support they provide. The argument is invalid, and the thesis, based on the premises, is not likely to be or plausibly true.	The premises do not support the thesis.
Counter-Arguments	The paper considers both obvious and unobvious counter-examples, counter-arguments, and/or opposing positions, and provides original and/or thoughtful responses.	The paper considers obvious counter-examples, counter-arguments, and/or opposing positions, and provides responses.	The paper may consider some obvious counter-examples, counter-arguments, and/or opposing positions, but some obvious ones are missed. Responses are non-existent or mere claims of refutation.	No counter-examples, counter-arguments, or opposing positions are considered.
Understanding				
Text	The paper contains highly accurate and precise summarization, description and/or	The summarization, description and/or paraphrasing of text is fairly	The summarization, description and/or paraphrasing of text is fairly	The summarization, description and/or paraphrasing of text is

	paraphrasing of text. The paper uses appropriate textual support for these.	accurate and precise, having textual support, but other passages may have been better.	accurate, but not precise, and the textual support is inappropriate.	inaccurate and/or has no textual support.
Ideas	The paper contains a highly accurate and precise description of the issue or problem, along with a careful consideration of possible alternatives or solutions. The paper contains relevant examples, and indicates the salient issues the examples highlight.	The description of the problem or issue is fairly accurate and precise, and possible alternatives or solutions are considered. Examples are given, but similar examples may have been better.	The description of the problem or issue is fairly accurate but not precise, and possible alternatives or solutions are either not considered, or ill-described. Examples are given, but it is not made clear how they are relevant.	The description of the problem or issue is inaccurate, and possible alternatives or solutions are not considered, and examples are not provided.
Analysis	The paper successfully breaks the argument, issue, or problem into relevant parts. The connections between the parts are clear and highly accurate.	The paper successfully breaks the argument, issue, or problem into relevant parts. The connections between the parts are fairly accurate.	The paper breaks the argument, issue, or problem into parts, but some parts may be missing or unclear. The connections between the parts are somewhat accurate.	The parts identified are not the correct and/or relevant ones. The connections between the parts are completely inaccurate.
Synthesis	The paper successfully integrates all relevant parts from various places into a coherent whole. The connections between the parts are clear and insightful.	The paper integrates most relevant parts from various places into a mostly coherent whole. The connections between the parts are generally clear.	The paper integrates some parts from various places into a somewhat coherent whole. The connections between the parts are somewhat unclear.	The parts to be integrated are not clear and/or relevant. The connections between the parts are unclear.
Evaluation				
Argument	The paper evaluates the argument in question by checking for adherence to various standards (validity, soundness, etc.), and checking for informal fallacies. The paper suggests how the argument could be made better according to the appropriate standard.	The paper evaluates the argument in question by checking for adherence to various standards (validity, soundness, etc.), and checking for informal fallacies.	The paper evaluates the argument in question by checking only the truth of the premises and/or the conclusion, and does not check for informal fallacies.	The paper evaluates the argument in question by whether the author agrees or disagrees with the conclusion or a premise.
Position	The paper evaluates the position in question by checking for support in an argument and internal consistency, and by exploring unmentioned plausible alternatives.	The paper evaluates the position in question by checking for support in an argument and internal consistency.	The paper evaluates the position in question by considering its plausibility.	The paper evaluates the position in question by whether the author agrees or disagrees with it.
Creation				
Thesis	Thesis is original, interesting, and relevant.	The thesis is interesting and relevant.	The thesis is slightly off-topic, obviously true (or false), or not really	The thesis is totally irrelevant.

			worth writing about.	
Examples	Examples are original, relevant, insightful, and well-used.	Examples are original, relevant, and well-used.	Examples are unoriginal, minimally relevant, or not well-used.	Examples are missing, irrelevant an/or misused.
Alternative Positions	Previously unmentioned alternative positions are explored.	Alternative positions are explored.	Alternative positions are mentioned but not explored.	Alternative positions are ignored.
STYLE				
Clarity	All sentences are complete and grammatical. All words are chosen for their precise meanings. All new or unusual terms are well-defined. Key concepts and theories are accurately and completely explained. Good, clear examples are used to illuminate concepts and issues. Information (names, facts, etc.) is accurate. Paper has been spell-checked and proofread, and has no errors, and no rhetorical questions or slang.	All sentences are complete and grammatical. Most words are chosen for their precise meanings. Most new or unusual terms are well-defined. Key concepts and theories are explained. Examples are clear. Information (names, facts, etc.) is accurate. Paper has been spell-checked and proofread, and has very few errors, and no rhetorical questions or slang.	A few sentences are incomplete and/or ungrammatical. Words are not chosen for their precise meanings. New or unusual terms are not well-defined. Key concepts and theories are not explained. Examples are not clear. Information (names, facts, etc.) is mostly accurate. Paper has several spelling errors, rhetorical questions and/or uses of slang.	Many sentences are incomplete and/or ungrammatical. The author does not acknowledge that key words have precise meanings. Information (names, facts, etc.) is inaccurate. Paper has many spelling errors, rhetorical questions and/or uses of slang.
Organization				
Introduction	Thesis is clear, and contained in the introduction. The topic is introduced with minimal fanfare. It is made clear how the paper will get to this conclusion, not in a detailed outline of the paper, but rather in a concise summary of the steps in argument.	Thesis is contained in the introduction. The topic is introduced with little fanfare. It is generally clear how the paper will get to this conclusion, not in a detailed outline of the paper, but rather in a description of the steps in argument.	Thesis is not contained in the introduction. The topic is introduced with too much fanfare. The flow of the paper is described as an outline, and not as a description of the steps in argument.	Only the topic is introduced, with no description of the paper. Or, the paper is described inaccurately.
Body	It is very easy to follow the argument. It is made explicit which claims are being used as premises, and how these premises are supposed to support the thesis. New premises are each introduced in new paragraphs or sections. If there are sub-arguments, it is made explicit which argument is the main one, and which are the secondary ones.	It is generally easy to follow the argument. It is clear which claims are being used as premises, and how these premises are supposed to support the thesis. Usually, new premises are introduced in new paragraphs or sections. If there are sub-arguments, it is clear which argument is the main one, and which are the secondary ones.	It is somewhat difficult to follow the argument. It is somewhat unclear which claims are being used as premises, and/or how these premises are supposed to support the thesis. Separate premises are lumped together in the same paragraphs or sections. If there are sub-arguments, it is not clear which argument is the main one, and	It is impossible to follow the argument. It is completely unclear which claims are being used as premises. It is completely unclear how the premises are supposed to support the thesis. Premises are discussed randomly, or not at all. There seem to be many arguments, and it is completely

			which are secondary.	unclear which is the main one.
Conclusion	The paper uses the conclusion to tie up loose ends. For example, the paper considers objections to the argument to which it is acknowledged there is no space or expertise to respond. Or, the paper briefly considers the implications of the acceptance of the conclusion for a larger argument, or for a larger issue or problem. Or the paper explains what further work may be needed in this area.	The paper uses the conclusion to tie up some loose ends, but combines this with a restatement of the introduction.	The conclusion is merely a restatement of the introduction.	The conclusion is missing.

GRADING RUBRIC FOR PHILOSOPHY PAPERS

I. Argumentation (30 or 40%)

An exemplary paper:	.95	.85	.75	.65	.55	An unsatisfactory paper:
Presents, in a clear manner, strong and well-developed arguments in support of its central claims. Addresses any relevant counterarguments and also anticipates and defuses potential objections to its central claims and arguments. Is in many ways subtle, original, and insightful.						Fails to adequately defend its central claims. Fails either to rebut relevant counterarguments or to anticipate and defuse potential objections to its central claims and arguments. Is always trite, trivial, or unoriginal.

II. Exposition and Mastery of the Pertinent Material (30 or 40%)

An exemplary paper:	.95	.85	.75	.65	.55	An unsatisfactory paper:
Demonstrates mastery of the pertinent philosophical views, concepts, and arguments. Gives an accurate and charitable exposition and interpretation of the pertinent philosophical texts and views, providing textual support where appropriate. Fully explains key philosophical terms, concepts, and distinctions in an illuminating way, using the author's own words, examples, and descriptions.						Fails to demonstrate mastery of the pertinent philosophical views, concepts, and arguments. Provides an incomplete, inaccurate, and/or uncharitable exposition and interpretation of the pertinent philosophical texts and views. Fails to provide adequate explanations for key philosophical terms, concepts, or distinctions.

III. Introduction and Conclusion (10%)

An exemplary paper:	.95	.85	.75	.65	.55	An unsatisfactory paper:
Has an introduction that motivates the project and defines a sharp focus by clearly stating its central aim(s), e.g., a thesis or controlling idea relating to the assigned topic.						Has an inadequate introduction, one that fails to motivate the project or establish a clear focus by stating a thesis or controlling idea that relates to the assigned topic.
Has a conclusion that summarizes results clearly, explores implications/limitations of those results, and leaves readers with a sense of the paper's importance.						Has an inadequate conclusion, one that fails either to summarize results or to explain their implications, limitations, and importance.

IV. Organization (10%)

An exemplary paper:	.95	.85	.75	.65	.55	An unsatisfactory paper:
Has a clear and logical organizational plan, wherein the ordering of ideas, sentences, and paragraphs builds naturally toward the achievement of its central aim(s). Provides a user-friendly guide to the organizational plan by using transitional words/phrases/sentences to show how the various ideas, sentences, and paragraphs relate to the paper's central aim(s) and to each other.						Has an illogical or indiscernible organizational plan—the paper is a hodgepodge of ideas. Fails to provide a clear guide to the organizational plan, e.g., by failing to use adequate transitions or jumping from one idea or point to another without establishing any connection between them.

V. Writing (10%)

An exemplary paper:	.95	.85	.75	.65	.55	An unsatisfactory paper:
Exhibits a sophisticated (but unpretentious) writing style as it presents its ideas clearly, concisely, and precisely, such that what's being said is almost never open to misinterpretation and contains almost no unnecessary words, imprecision, or irrelevant content. Employs good diction. Contains virtually no errors in grammar, spelling, or punctuation, and documents sources properly. Is free of typos.						Has a writing style that significantly detracts from the argument, involving repetitive and simplistic sentence structures, unnecessarily inflated language, imprecise wording, and/or language that is unclear, wordy, repetitive, or contains irrelevant content. Often employs poor diction. Is riddled with grammatical, spelling, or punctuation errors and/or fails to acknowledge sources properly. Is riddled with typos.

Appendix 6: Zachary Ernst's CV

Zachary Ernst

Associate Professor
Department of Philosophy
University of Missouri-Columbia
438 Strickland
Columbia, Missouri 65211
ernstz@missouri.edu

Research Associate Professor
Center for Intelligence and Security Studies
University of Mississippi
620 Old Athletics Building
Oxford, Mississippi 38677
zernst@olemiss.edu

Education

- 2002 Ph.D. in Philosophy, University of Wisconsin-Madison
1996 MA in Philosophy, Western Michigan University
1995 BS in Philosophy (minor in General Mathematics), Western Michigan University

Areas of Specialization

Logic, Game Theory, Philosophy of Science

Areas of Competence

Decision Theory, Ethics

Articles and Contributed Chapters (* = peer reviewed)

- invited “Models of Common Knowledge: Problems of Interpretation,” for special issue of *Episteme*, Paul Weirich, Ed.
- invited “The Evolution of *Homo Economicus*,” in Ken Binmore and Samir Okasha, *Evolution and Rationality: Decisions, Cooperation, and Strategic Behavior*. Cambridge University Press, forthcoming.
- 2009 Zachary Ernst and Andre Ariew, “What Fitness Can’t Be,”* *Erkenntnis*, 71(3), pp. 289-301.
- 2008 Sara Rachel Chant and Zachary Ernst, “Epistemic Conditions for Collective Action,”* *Mind*, 117, pp. 549-573.
- 2008 Zachary Ernst. “Philosophical Issues Arising from Genomics,” *The Oxford Handbook of the Philosophy of Biology*. Michael Ruse, Ed.
- 2007 Zachary Ernst and Sara Rachel Chant. “Collective Action as Individual Choice,”* *Studia Logica*, 87(7), pp. 415-434.
- 2007 Zachary Ernst. “Philosophical Issues Arising from Experimental Economics,”* *Philosophy Compass*, 2(3), pp. 497-507.
- 2007 Zachary Ernst. “Game Theory in Evolutionary Biology,” in *The Cambridge Companion to the Philosophy of Biology*. Michael Ruse and David Hull, Eds. Cambridge University Press.
Reprinted in *Philosophy After Darwin: A Reader*, Princeton University Press, 2009.
- 2007 Sara Rachel Chant and Zachary Ernst. “Group Intentions as Equilibria,”* *Philosophical Studies*, 133, pp. 95-109.
- 2007 Zachary Ernst. “The Liberationists’ Attack on Moral Intuitions,”* *American Philosophical*

Quarterly, 44(2), pp. 129-142.

- 2005 Zachary Ernst. "A Plea for Asymmetric Games,"* *The Journal of Philosophy*, 102(3), pp.109-125.
- 2005 Zachary Ernst. "Robustness and Conceptual Analysis in Evolutionary Game Theory,"* *Philosophy of Science (supplemental)*, 72, pp. 1187-1196.
- 2002 Zachary Ernst, Branden Fitelson, Kenneth Harris, and Larry Vos. "Shortest Axiomatizations of Implicational S4 and S5,"* *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic*, 43(2), pp. 169-179.
- 2002 Zachary Ernst. "Completions of $TV \rightarrow$ from $H \rightarrow$,"* *Bulletin of the Section of Logic*, 31(1), pp. 7-14.
- 2001 Zachary Ernst, Branden Fitelson, Kenneth Harris, and Larry Vos. "A Concise Axiomatization of $RM \rightarrow$,"* *Bulletin of the Section of Logic*, 30(4), pp. 191-194.
- 2001 Zachary Ernst. "Explaining the Social Contract,"* *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, 51(1), pp. 1-24.

Encyclopedia Entries

- forthcoming Zachary Ernst. "Elliott Sober, The Nature of Selection" (250 words), in *The Harvard Companion to Evolution*. Michael Ruse and Joe Travis, Eds. Harvard University Press.
- forthcoming Zachary Ernst. "Richard Dawkins, The Selfish Gene" (500 words), in *The Harvard Companion to Evolution*. Michael Ruse and Joe Travis, Eds. Harvard University Press.
- forthcoming Zachary Ernst. "Evolutionary Games" (1000 words), in *The International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*. William A. Darity, Ed. Thomson Gale Press.

Talks (* = peer reviewed)

- 2011 Comments on Christina Bicchieri's "Trustworthiness is a Social Norm but Trusting is Not," Symposium on Realistic Decision-Making, University of Missouri-Columbia.
- 2010 "Research at the Center for Intelligence and Security Studies," Five Eyes Analytical Workshop, Bolling Air Force Base.
- 2010 "Kicking Two Dead Horses: Newcomb's Problem and Frankfurt-Style Counterexamples," Londong School of Economics.
- 2010 "Research at the Center for Intelligence and Security Studies," Five Eyes Analytical Workshop, Bolling Air Force Base.
- 2010 "The Evolution of Stupidity,"* Philosophy of Biology at Madison, University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- 2010 "Individual and Collective Irrationality,"* Collective Intentionality VII, Basel, Switzerland.
- 2010 "Comments on Ernest Sosa," Kline Workshop on Experimental Philosophy, University of Missouri-Columbia.
- 2010 "Convention and Bounded Rationality," Colloquium Series, University of Missouri-St. Louis.
- 2009 "Models of Common Knowledge and the Finite Model Property," University of California-Irvine/National Academy of Sciences Seminar on Game Theory and the Social Contract, Irvine, California.
- 2008 "Comparative Genomics: Ten Projects for the Philosophy of Science," Future Directions in Genomics Workshop, Washington University in St. Louis
- 2007 Commentator for Workshop on Bargaining and Justice, University of North Carolina-Chapel

Hill.

- 2007 “Why Fitness Isn’t a Propensity,”* American Philosophical Association (Pacific Division), San Francisco. With André Ariew.
- 2006 “Collective Action as Individual Choice,”* Formal Epistemology Workshop, University of California-Berkeley.
- 2006 “Tree Automata as Infinite Models of Propositional Calculi,” Workshop on Automata Deduction, University of New Mexico.
- 2005 “The (Un)reliability of Moral Intuitions: Evidence from Neuroeconomics,”* Southern Society for Philosophy and Psychology. With Eddy Nahmias.
- 2004 “Robustness and Conceptual Analysis in Evolutionary Game Theory,”* Philosophy of Science Association.
- 2004 “Playing Games in Ethics,” Texas Tech University Colloquium Series.
- 2004 “Logics Lacking the Finite Model Property,” Argonne National Laboratory.
- 2003 “Syntax of YQE,” Argonne National Laboratory.
- 2002 “Completing the Lattice of Substructural Logics,” Argonne National Laboratory.
- 2003 “Evolution of Metaethical Intuitions,” Florida State University Werkmeister Conference on Biology and Values.
- 2002 “Modeling Populations Using Game Theory,” Florida State University Department of Anthropology.

Works in Progress

“Free Logic Now!” Textbook in logic, with chapters on syntax and semantics of propositional and first-order logic, computation (including uncomputable functions and the Halting Problem), and Gödel’s Incompleteness Theorems.

“The Epistemology and Metaphysics of Collective Action” (with Sara Rachel Chant) Book manuscript on interactive epistemology and its relation to conceptual issues in the philosophy of collective action.

“The Evolution of Stupidity” Recently begun book manuscript on adaptiveness of cognitive limitations, focusing on foundational issues concerning rational choice models of collective behavior.

Grants in Preparation

- 2011 “Bayesian Networks for Judgment Aggregation.” to be submitted to the Intelligence Advanced Research Projects Agency, \$1.4 million requested.
- 2011 “Large-Scale Psychological Analysis of the Dark Web,” to be submitted to the Department of Homeland Security, \$487,000 requested.

Academic Honors

- 2007 College Alumni Achievement Award. Western Michigan University College of Arts and Science.
- 2001 Oliver Prize. Best graduate student essay for “Quine’s Regress Argument Against Conventionalism.”

- 2001 University Dissertator Fellowship. University of Wisconsin-Madison.
1999 Passed preliminary examination with distinction. University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Professional Appointments

- 2008 – Associate Professor, University of Missouri-Columbia
2006 – 2008 Assistant Professor, University of Missouri-Columbia
2003 – 2006 Assistant Professor, Florida State University
2004 Visiting Research Faculty, Argonne National Laboratory
2003 – 2006 Guest Faculty, Argonne National Laboratory
1998 – 2000 Visiting Assistant Professor, Texas Tech University
2002 University Fellow, University of Wisconsin-Madison
2001 – 2003 Special Term Research Appointment, Argonne National Laboratory
2000 – 2002 Lecturer, University of Wisconsin-Madison
1997 – 1999 Teaching Assistant, University of Wisconsin-Madison
1995 – 1996 Teaching Assistant, Western Michigan University

Grants Received

- 2004 First Year Assistant Professor Award. Grant for summer salary awarded by Florida State University.
2004 Planning Grant. Internal grant of \$10,000 awarded by Florida State University to support graduate research assistant and travel to Argonne National Laboratory.
2004 Argonne National Laboratory Summer Research Position. Research appointment awarded by Division of Educational Programs for summer salary. Conducted research on logics lacking the finite model property with Dr. William McCune in the Mathematics and Computer Science Division.

Service

Associate Editor for *Studia Logica* (2007 – 2009)
Referee for the journals *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, *Economics and Philosophy*, *History and Philosophy of Science*, and *The Journal of Automated Reasoning*.
Referee for manuscripts for Oxford University Press, Princeton University Press, Longman Publishing.
Graduate Affairs Committee, University of Missouri-Columbia (2007 - present).
Masters Thesis Committee for Garrett Pendergraft (Philosophy) and Ashton Sperry (Philosophy). University of Missouri-Columbia.
Dissertation Committee for Ashton Sperry (Philosophy) and Collin Rice (Philosophy).
Dissertation Supervisor for Yasha Rohwer (Philosophy).
Prepared proposals for new courses at graduate and undergraduate level in the Philosophy of Biology, University of Missouri-Columbia (2006).

Courses Taught

Decision Theory (University of Mississippi)
Critical Reasoning (University of Missouri-Columbia)
Seminar in Game Theory and the Social Contract (University of Missouri-Columbia)
Philosophy of Biology (University of Missouri-Columbia)
Formal Logic (University of Missouri-Columbia)
Seminar (University of Missouri-Columbia)
Advanced Symbolic Logic (University of Missouri-Columbia)
Senior Seminar: Game Theory (Florida State University)
Philosophy of Science (Florida State University)
Independent Study in Automated Theorem Proving (Florida State University)
Graduate Seminar: Philosophy of Biology (Florida State University)
Graduate Seminar: Philosophy of Science (Florida State University)
Independent Study in Modal Logic (Florida State University)
Contemporary Moral Issues (University of Wisconsin-Madison)
Introduction to Ethics (University of Wisconsin-Madison, Texas Tech University)
Graduate Seminar in Business Ethics (Texas Tech University)
Introduction to Formal Logic (University of Wisconsin-Madison, Texas Tech University)
Critical Reasoning (Western Michigan University)

References

Ken Binmore
Department of Economics
University College London
Gower Street, London WC1E 6BT
k.binmore@ucl.ac.uk

Alexander Rosenberg
Department of Philosophy
201 West Duke Building
Duke University
Durham, NC 27708
alexrose@duke.edu

Elliott Sober
Department of Philosophy
5185 Helen C. White Hall
600 North Park Street
Madison, WI 53706