

Curriculum Proposal Cover Sheet - University-Wide Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

Contact Person(s) Rives, B., Rubenstein, E.	Email Address rives; erubens
Proposing Department/Unit PHIL	Phone x2310

Check all appropriate lines and complete all information. Use a separate cover sheet for each course proposal and/or program proposal.

1. Course Proposals (check all that apply)

<input type="checkbox"/> New Course	<input type="checkbox"/> Course Prefix Change	<input type="checkbox"/> Course Deletion
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Course Revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Course Number and/or Title Change	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Catalog Description Change

Current course prefix, number and full title: PHIL 101 Informal Logic: Methods of Critical Thinking

Proposed course prefix, number and full title, if changing:

2. Liberal Studies Course Designations, as appropriate
 This course is also proposed as a Liberal Studies Course (please mark the appropriate categories below)

<input type="checkbox"/> Learning Skills	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Knowledge Area	<input type="checkbox"/> Global and Multicultural Awareness	<input type="checkbox"/> Writing Across the Curriculum (W Course)
<input type="checkbox"/> Liberal Studies Elective (please mark the designation(s) that applies – must meet at least one)			
<input type="checkbox"/> Global Citizenship	<input type="checkbox"/> Information Literacy	<input type="checkbox"/> Oral Communication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Quantitative Reasoning	<input type="checkbox"/> Scientific Literacy	<input type="checkbox"/> Technological Literacy	

3. Other Designations, as appropriate

<input type="checkbox"/> Honors College Course	<input type="checkbox"/> Other: (e.g. Women's Studies, Pan African)
--	---

4. Program Proposals

<input type="checkbox"/> Catalog Description Change	<input type="checkbox"/> Program Revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Program Title Change	<input type="checkbox"/> New Track
<input type="checkbox"/> New Degree Program	<input type="checkbox"/> New Minor Program	<input type="checkbox"/> Liberal Studies Requirement Changes	<input type="checkbox"/> Other

Current program name: _____

Proposed program name, if changing: _____

5. Approvals	Signature	Date
Department Curriculum Committee Chair(s)		12/1/11
Department Chairperson(s)		12/12/11
College Curriculum Committee Chair		12/13/11
College Dean		12/26/12
Director of Liberal Studies (as needed)		2/29/12
Director of Honors College (as needed)		
Provost (as needed)		
Additional signature (with title) as appropriate		
UWUCC Co-Chairs		3/20/12

Received Received Received
MAR 7 2012 FEB 23 2012 JAN 27 2012
Liberal Studies Liberal Studies Liberal Studies

PHIL 101—Informal Logic: Methods of Critical Thinking: New Syllabus of Record

Overview of changes from original syllabus of record – updating to new curriculum

1. The course description has been slightly revised.
2. The course objectives have been changed so that they are aligned with the Expected Undergraduate Student Learning Outcomes.
3. Bibliography has been updated.
4. Minor changes made to Course Analysis Questionnaire.

Current Catalog Description:

PHIL 101 Informal Logic: Methods of Critical Thinking

3c-01-3cr

Develops ability to analyze critically deductive and inductive argumentation, rhetoric, and persuasion by examples drawn from media, textbooks, advertising, scholarly works, personal contacts, etc.

Proposed Catalog Description

An introduction to basic principles of informal logic and critical thinking. Emphasis on different kinds of arguments, methods of argument evaluation, and the analysis of arguments as they arise in various contexts, such as political debate, advertising, science, law, and ethics.

Rationale: The basic elements of the proposed catalog description are the same as those in the current description. The changes are primarily stylistic, but also reflect a slight change in emphasis in how present faculty are teaching the course.

**PHIL 101 Informal Logic: Methods of Critical Thinking
Syllabus of Record**

I. Catalog Description:

PHIL 101 Informal Logic: Methods of Critical Thinking

3 class hours

0 lab hours

Prerequisites: None

3 credits

(3c-01-3cr)

An introduction to basic principles of informal logic. Emphasis is on different kinds of arguments, methods of argument evaluation, and the analysis of arguments as they arise in various contexts, such as political debate, advertising, science, law, and ethics.

II. Course Outcomes and Assessment (Expected Undergraduate Student Learning Outcomes – EUSLO):

Objective 1:

Identify and articulate the main elements of arguments in various contexts.

Expected Undergraduate Learning Outcome 2:

Empowered Learners

Rationale:

Course exercises and assignments will require students to read passages drawn from various sources and identify the arguments found in them, or, in some cases, determine that no argument is given and that the passage is merely articulating a particular position. Assignments will require students to articulate arguments in terms of their premises, conclusions, and the structural relations between them. These are necessary first steps in argument analysis and evaluation.

Objective 2:

Demonstrate knowledge of the differences between deductive and inductive arguments, the appropriate ways of assessing deductive and inductive arguments, and common forms of fallacious reasoning.

Expected Undergraduate Learning Outcomes 1 and 2:

Informed Learners and Empowered Learners

Rationale:

Course exercises and assignments will require students to evaluate arguments in terms of both their form and their content. Assignments will require students to demonstrate their knowledge of the differences between deductive arguments, in which the truth of the premises is intended to necessitate the truth of the conclusion, and inductive arguments, in which the truth of the premises is intended to confer some degree of probability on the truth of the conclusion. Assignments will also require students to demonstrate their ability to evaluate arguments using the logical notions of validity, soundness, and inductive strength, and to identify standard informal fallacies.

Objective 3: Analyze and evaluate arguments drawn from various contexts.

Expected Undergraduate Learning Outcomes 1 and 2:

Informed Learners and Empowered Learners

Rationale:

Assignments will require students to apply their knowledge of elementary logical notions to arguments drawn from various contexts such as advertising, political debates, and scholarly discussions of morality, law, and science. Students will be required to learn some basic knowledge that informs the arguments under discussion. For instance, they might learn about the distinction between science and pseudo-science, that there are different ways of understanding the term “human” or “person” at work in the abortion debate, or simply what the Equal Protection Clause says and that it’s contained in the Fourteenth Amendment. Assignments will also require students to demonstrate sensitivity to the different contexts and disciplines in which distinct forms of reasoning appear, e.g., that inference to the best explanation (abduction) is a form of reasoning found in many scientific contexts, that analogical reasoning is a form of reasoning found in legal contexts, etc.

Objective 4:

Describe the value of critical thinking.

Expected Undergraduate Learning Outcome 3:

Responsible Learners

Rationale:

The course aims to provide students with the tools to become effective critical thinkers, and to encourage them to put these tools to use in their everyday life. Assignments will require students to articulate the connections between critical thinking and effective decision making, intellectual honesty, and freedom in thought and action.

III. Course Outline

I. Introduction to Informal Logic	(3 hours)
A. What Arguments Are	
B. Justifications and Explanations	
II. The Language of Argument	(3 hours)
A. Argument Markers	
B. Validity, Truth, and Soundness	
C. A Problem and Some Solutions	
III. Deep Analysis	(4 hours)
A. Clarifying Crucial Terms	
B. Dissecting the Argument	
C. Arranging Subarguments	
D. Suppressed Premises	
Exam 1	(1 hour)

IV. Propositional Logic	(6 hours)
A. Conjunction	
B. Disjunction and Negation	
C. How Truth Functional Connectives Work	
D. Testing for Validity and Further Connectives	
E. Truth Tables for Conditionals	
F. Other Conditionals, Necessary and Sufficient Conditions	
IV. Categorical Logic	(4 hours)
A. Four Categorical Forms	
B. Translation into the Categorical Forms	
C. Validity for Categorical Arguments	
Exam 2	(1 hour)
V. Arguments to and from Generalizations	(1 hours)
A. Induction vs. Deduction	
B. Statistical Generalizations	
VI. Inductive Reasoning	(4 hours)
A. Inference to the Best Explanation	
B. Arguments from Analogy	
C. Reasoning about Causes	
D. Concomitant Variation	
VIII. Fallacies	(3 hours)
A. Fallacies of Vagueness	
B. Fallacies of Ambiguity	
C. Fallacies of Relevance	
D. Fallacies of Vacuity	
Exam 3	(1 hour)
IX. Moral Reasoning	(3 hours)
A. Moral Disagreement and the Problem of Abortion	
B. Analogical Reasoning in Ethics	
C. Thomson “A Defense of Abortion”	
D. Marquis “An Argument that Abortion is Wrong”	
X. Legal Reasoning	(3 hours)
A. Questions of Fact, Questions of Law	
B. Discrimination Law, Equal Protection Clause	
C. <i>Regents of the University of California v. Bakke</i>	
D. <i>Grutter v. Bollinger</i>	
E. Burden of Proof	

- XI. Scientific Reasoning (3 hours)
- A. Standard Science
 - B. Scientific Revolutions
 - C. Behe “Molecular Machines”
 - D. Kitcher “Living with Darwin”

Final Exam (2 hours)

IV. Evaluation Methods

The final grade will be determined as follows:

<u>Assessment</u>	<u>Percentage of Overall Grade</u>
Exam 1	20%
Exam 2	20%
Exam 3	20%
Exam 4	20%
Exercises, Quizzes, Homework	10%
Group Term Paper	10%

V. Grading Scale

A: 90% or above B: 80-89% C: 70-79% D: 60-69% F: 59% or below

VI. Attendance Policy

Individual faculty members will develop their own policy in compliance with the university attendance policy, as stated in the Undergraduate Catalog.

VII. Required Textbook and Supplemental Books

The following are three examples of current available textbooks from which faculty may select:

Fogelin, Robert, and Walter Sinnott-Armstrong. *Understanding Arguments: An Introduction to Informal Logic*. 8th Edition. (Wadsworth, 2010).

Moore, Brooke Noel, and Richard Parker. *Critical Thinking*. (McGraw-Hill, 2009).

Vaughn, Lewis. *The Power of Critical Thinking*. 3rd Ed. (Oxford, 2009).

The following are examples of books that could be used as supplemental texts:

Kida, Thomas. *Don't Believe Everything You Think*. (Prometheus, 2006).

Tavris, Carol, and Elliot Aaronson. *Mistakes Were Made (But Not By Me): Why We Justify Foolish Beliefs, Bad Decisions, and Hurtful Acts*. (Harcourt, 2007).

VIII. Bibliography:

Browne, M. Neil and Stuart M. Keeley. *Asking the Right Questions: A Guide to Critical Thinking*. 7th Edition. (Prentice Hall, 2003).

Crosswhite, James. *The Rhetoric of Reason: Writing and the Attractions of Argument*. (Wisconsin, 1996).

Eemeren, Frans H. van, et al. *Fundamentals of Argumentation Theory: A Handbook of Historical Backgrounds and Contemporary Developments*. (Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1996).

Fisher, Alec. *Critical Thinking: An Introduction*. (Cambridge, 2001).

Gilbert, Michael. *How to Win an Argument*. (University Press of America, 2008).

Govier, Trudy. *A Practical Study of Argument*. 6th edition. (Wadsworth, 2006).

Grennan, Wayne. *Informal Logic: Issues and Techniques*. (McGill-Queen's, 1997).

Hansen, Hans V. and Robert C. Pinto. *Fallacies: Classical and Contemporary Readings*. (Penn State, 1995).

Reed, Chris, and Timothy Norman. *Argumentation Machines: New Frontiers in Argument and Computation*. (Kluwer, 2003).

Walton, Douglas. *Slippery Slope Arguments*. (Oxford, 1992).

Weston, Anthony. *A Rulebook for Arguments*. (Hackett, 2008).

Sample Assignment for Liberal Studies Course:

Group Paper Guidelines

Due Date: _____

Length: 8-10 pages (12-point font, 1-inch margins, double-spaced)

General Theme: The paper should discuss some controversial current issue and present arguments supporting different views of the issue. Students are expected to conclude the paper by presenting and supporting their own views on the chosen issue.

Sample Topics:

Is abortion ethical?

Do aliens exist?

Does God exist?

Should euthanasia be legal?

Should marijuana be legalized?

Should professional athletes be allowed to use steroids?

Should college football have playoffs?

Should gay marriage be legalized?

Is the media too politicized?

Should owning a pit-bull be made illegal?

Should the NFL change its policy regarding hits to the head?

Were the 9/11 attacks a product of a US government conspiracy?

Should there be a separation of church and state?

Structure of the Paper: The paper should include an introductory section that explains the issue and its importance. This should be followed by a section summarizing an argument on one side of the issue (~2-3 pages in length), followed by another approximately section summarizing an argument on the other side of the issue (~2-3 pages in length). The paper should conclude with a section (~2-3 pages) that takes a side and attempts to show that one of the arguments is superior.

Group Structure: There should be three students per group. Each student will be responsible for one of the three main sections of the paper. Students are expected to work together to craft the introduction. There will be one student ultimately responsible for the third section (in which the group presents their decision about which side makes the better argument), but this section should reflect the consensus of the group (if a consensus is possible).

More specific suggestions regarding the first two sections:

1. If you're working on these sections you should start by finding out as much about the chosen topic and the arguments given by each.

2. You should then attempt to identify the most important or most common reasons given by each side of the debate for holding the position that it does.

3. Being as fair and objective as possible, explain the main reasons for supporting one side of the debate. Remember, you do not have to personally agree with the position you are discussing.

The important thing is that you spell out the reasons in favor of it.

4. You are *not* evaluating the merits of the arguments given by each side here; you are just explaining what the main arguments are.

More specific suggestions regarding the third section:

1. This section should *not* just be a summary of the two prior sections.

2. Here is where you should attempt to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the arguments given by each side of the debate, ultimately coming to a conclusion about which side makes the better case.

3. Remember our discussions of fallacies and appropriate forms of evidence.

4. Remember our discussions about evaluating arguments.

5. Hopefully, this section will reflect the consensus of the entire group, but it is still one person's responsibility to write this section.

Intermediate Due Dates:

1. **Group Formation:** Everyone needs to be formally committed to a group of three or notify me that you have not found a group and would like me to place you in one by _____. If you have not signed up for a group and I have not heard from you by this date, you will be responsible for completing the whole of the term paper on your own.

2. **Choice of Topics and Responsibilities:** Groups are expected to submit their choice of topics to me in writing by _____. At this point, all groups should also indicate who is responsible for each section of the paper.

3. **Rough Draft of 1st Section:** The student responsible for the arguments for the first side of the debate is expected to submit a rough draft by _____.

4. **Rough Draft of 2nd Section:** The student responsible for the arguments for the other side of the debate is expected to submit a rough draft by _____.

5. **Rough Draft of 3rd Section:** The student responsible for the evaluative section of the paper is expected to submit a rough draft by _____.

Sources: Students need not limit themselves to scholarly sources (e.g. academic books, articles published in academic journals), but sources should be generally credible and representative of at least some section of popular opinion. Well-respected newspapers and magazines are acceptable sources, as are reputable websites and blogs. (If you're not sure about the reliability of a particular source, ask me.) Students need not adhere to any specific citation format, but should clearly show where they get their information and should clearly denote which words and/or phrases come from external sources.

Grading: The term paper as a whole will count for 10% of the overall grade. Each student will be graded both on the section of the paper for which he or she is responsible (5%) and on the overall quality of the entire paper (5%). The rough draft of each section of the term paper will count as a homework grade for the student responsible for that section. The submission of the choice of topic will count as a homework grade for everyone in the group.

Criteria:

A papers generally satisfy the following criteria:

- Are well-written, with a minimum of typographical, grammatical, and spelling errors.
- Demonstrate an understanding of the relevant differences between two sides of the issue under discussion.
- Clearly evaluates strengths and weakness of arguments on each of side of the issue.
- Appeals to appropriate forms of evidence in showing that arguments on one side of the issue are stronger than those on the other side.

B papers generally meet the following criteria:

- Demonstrate a basic understanding of the issue under discussion.
- Demonstrate an understanding of the relevant differences between two sides of the issue under discussion.
- Evaluation of strength and weaknesses of arguments is insufficient and/or lacks clarity.
- Are generally well-written, with some mistakes.

C papers generally:

- Are not clearly organized.
- Do not demonstrate a clear understanding of the relevant differences between the two sides of the issue under discussion.
- Do demonstrate at least a general understanding of the issue under discussion.

D papers generally:

- Are poorly written.
- Demonstrate minimal understanding of the issue under discussion.
- Demonstrate no understanding of the relevant differences between the two sides of the issue under discussion.

F papers generally:

- Make use of material found online that is simply cut and pasted into the document. (This will trigger an investigation into whether standards of academic honesty were violated.)
- Fail to properly cite quoted material. (Serious failures will trigger an investigation into whether standards of academic honesty were violated).
- Demonstrate a complete lack of effort on the part of the student.

Answers to Liberal Studies Questions

1. Multiple sections, taught by multiple instructors, will typically be offered each semester. By relying on the syllabus of record, as well as through regular meetings and discussions about the goals of our lower-level, introductory type courses, we will be able to ensure that a similar range of topics are being taught, and that all who teach this class will share in the same objectives and learning outcomes. This is a practice we already have in place, to ensure a high degree of uniformity across different sections and faculty, while still giving faculty room to tailor the course as they see fit.

2. Given the generality of the subject matter of informal logic, and given that PHIL 101 does not cover the history of logic or the contributions of particular logicians, it is particularly difficult for PHIL 101 to meet the requirement of including “perspectives and contributions of ethnic and racial minorities and of women.” However, care will be taken to include, whenever appropriate, discussions and arguments concerning issues related to racial and gender equity. For instance, in the syllabus above one week is devoted to a discussion of legal reasoning, and the cases considered (*Bakke*, *Grutter*) concern affirmative action in university admissions policies. Students will be required to grapple with this issue, understand the nature of the Equal Protection Clause, and consider the relevant legal arguments involved. One week is also devoted to moral reasoning, where the topic is the moral permissibility of abortion and students will read a famous paper on the topic by the philosopher Judith Jarvis Thomson. Although the focus in these sections will be on arguments, rather than on the contributions and perspectives of women and minorities, the subject matter of the arguments themselves, we believe, is sufficient to satisfy this requirement.

3. In addition to the textbook, students will read essays and opinion pieces on various topics. For instance, in the syllabus above, students read two scholarly essays on the morality of abortion, two Supreme Court opinions on equal protection, and two essays on Darwin.

4. As philosophy courses aren’t typically offered in high schools, most students have no exposure to the discipline prior to college. Given this, we, like most Philosophy Departments, don’t offer introductory courses designed for majors, as the vast majority of our majors declare after taking an introductory course. All of our knowledge area courses are thus designed to introduce the discipline to students rather than introducing students into the discipline.

Course Analysis Questionnaire

A. Details of the Course

- A1. The course will be open to all IUP students.
- A2. This course does not require changes in any existing Philosophy department courses.
- A3. This course is taught on a regular basis.
- A4. This is not a dual-level course.
- A5. This course may not be taken for variable credit.
- A6. Courses similar to PHIL 101 are offered at institutions throughout the country. Here are three examples:
 - University of Maryland, College Park: Introduction to Logic (PHIL 170)
 - San Jose State University: Logic and Critical Thinking (PHIL 057)
 - Hamilton College: Critical Thinking (PHIL 100F)
- A7. This course is not required by the American Philosophical Association.

B. Interdisciplinary Implications

- B1. This course will be taught by one instructor.
- B2. This course does not duplicate or affect courses offered by other departments.
- B3. This course will not be cross-listed.
- B4. This course will be open to all enrolled undergraduate students, with no prerequisites in place. No seats will be set aside in particular for Continuing Education students, though they are welcome to register.

C. Implementation

- C1. Faculty resources are currently adequate.
- C2. No additional space, equipment, supplies, or library materials are needed.
- C3. None of the resources for this course is based on a grant.
- C4. The course is offered each semester.
- C5. Several sections.

C6. 55 students is the present enrollment we set for lower-level classes.

C7. The American Philosophical Association does not recommend maximum enrollments for this type of course.

C8. This is also offered as a distance education course. The course was recently approved as such, and we have been advised that we need not resubmit the paperwork for that approval.

D. Miscellaneous.

None

GENERIC SYLLABUS

I. CATALOG DESCRIPTION

PHILOSOPHY 102 GENERAL LOGIC: METHODS OF CRITICAL THINKING 3 credits
Prerequisites: None

Designed to develop students' ability to critically analyze deductive and inductive argumentation, rhetoric, and persuasion by examples drawn from media, textbooks, advertising, scholarly works, personal contacts, etc.

II. COURSE OBJECTIVES

1. Students will learn to recognize, analyze, and evaluate arguments:
 - a. to distinguish arguments from unsupported opinions,
 - b. to identify conclusions and premises,
 - b. to evaluate arguments as to validity and soundness.
2. Students will develop the skills of abstract logical thinking, critical analysis, decision making, and other aspects of the critical process by studying and applying fundamental principles of critical reasoning.
3. Students will apply the techniques of critical reasoning to actual arguments from philosophy and elsewhere and to current issues, ideas, institutions, and events.
4. Students will become acquainted with some of the major areas of philosophy through the analysis of arguments from those areas.

III. COURSE OUTLINE: varies with instructor and includes at least some of the following:

- A. Analyzing Deductive and Inductive Arguments: Premises & Conclusion, Charitable Interpretation / Philosophical Applications
- B. Evaluating Deductive Arguments: Validity & Soundness / Philosophical Applications
- C. Informal Fallacies / Applications: Sexual and Racial Equality
- D. Evaluating Inductive Arguments: Generalization, Causal Arguments, Arguments from Analogy / Philosophical Applications

III. EVALUATION METHODS: varies with instructor and includes at least some of the following:

- A. Examinations
- B. Papers
- C. Final Examination

IV. REQUIRED TEXTS: : varies with instructor and includes the following:

1. Critical thinking text: Some possibilities are:
 - Jerry Cederblom & David W. Paulsen. *Critical Reasoning*, 2nd ed. Wadsworth, 1986.
 - Howard Kahane. *Logic and Contemporary Rhetoric [The Use of Reason in Everyday Life]*, 4th ed. Wadsworth, 1984.
 - C. A. Missimer. *Good Arguments [An Introduction to Critical Thinking]*. Prentice-Hall, 1986.
 - Merrilee H. Salmon. *Introduction to Logic and Critical Thinking*. Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1984.
 - Bruce N. Waller. *Critical Thinking [Consider the Verdict]*. Prentice Hall, 1988.
 - Perry Weddle. *Argument [A Guide to Critical Thinking]*. McGraw-Hill, 1978.

2. Arguments taken from selected readings in philosophy:
Sample below.

PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION

Proofs for God's existence
Anselm & Descartes, ontological argument
Aquinas, cosmological arguments
Pailey, teleological argument
Hume, teleological argument
Problem of Evil
Hick, solution
defense of atheism (Nagel or Mackie)
Adequate Evidence: Should we believe in God without it?
Pascal, wager
James, Will to Believe
criticism of James & Pascal (Clifford or Stich)

VALUES: Sexual and Racial Equality
Richard Wasserstrom, "Racism and Sexism"
Allison Jagger, "Political Philosophies of Women's
Liberation"

EPISTEMOLOGY: Skeptical Arguments
Descartes, Meditation I
Ayer, "Argument from Illusion"

METAPHYSICS: The Mind-Body Problem and the Problem of
Personal Identity
Descartes, Meditation II
Hume, "the Self"
Perry, "Dialogue on Personal Identity & Immortality"