

## **Teaching Handbook for Instructors in the Department of Philosophy**

Revised August, 2018

This handbook collects the University, College and Department policies most relevant to faculty and graduate teaching assistants in the Department of Philosophy. This handbook does not contain a complete statement of University policies. See the Faculty Handbook ([www.gsu.edu/~wwwfhb/fhb.html](http://www.gsu.edu/~wwwfhb/fhb.html)) for this complete statement. Please direct questions to the Chair of the department.

## Contents

Page	Topic
3	Course Syllabi Requirements
4	Reporting Grades
4	Rules Governing Drops, Withdrawals, and Hardship Withdrawals
6	Canceling Classes
7	Policy on Sick Leave
7	Outside Activities
8	Amorous Relationships Policy
10	Ethical Behavior with Regard to Complimentary Textbooks
11	Guidelines for Copying for Classroom Use
12	Policy on Academic Honesty
22	Plus/Minus Grading
22	Grading Guidelines for 1000-3000 Level Courses
22	Grading Guidelines in Graduate Level Courses
23	Grading Rules for GTAs
24	Grading Guidelines in Graduate Level Courses
26	Phil 1010 Policy
28	Phil 2010 Policy
31	Phil 3000 and Phil 4990 Policy
34	Phil 3010 and Phil 3020 Policy
36	Awarding Incompletes
37	Grade Changes and Removal of Incompletes
38	GTA Absence from Teaching Pre-approval Form
38	Recommendation on Politeness and Keeping It Professional
39	Locker Usage Policy
39	After Hours Use of the Computer Lab

## Course Syllabi Requirements

(Faculty Handbook, Section 401.01)

Course syllabi shall contain the following items of information:

1. complete course title and number [CRN]; name of instructor; semester, year;
2. statement of office hours, telephone number and e-mail address. You must have at least 3 hours of office hours per week.
3. prerequisites (if any) for the course;
4. objectives of the course;
5. course assignments (e.g., required readings and activities) and due dates;
6. specific course requirements (e.g., written and oral tests and reports, research papers; performances). In cross-listed undergraduate and graduate classes, the course requirements will specify any projects and/or other activities required specifically of graduate students [or honors students] taking the course and the criteria by which student work will be judged that differentiate graduate-level from undergraduate-level work; (Graduate-level work must be significantly more rigorous than undergraduate-level work.)
7. grading policy: how the final grade is to be determined with respect to the weights assigned to various course requirements;
8. attendance policy (see current University general Catalog for University guidelines). If there are specific requirements for attendance these should be stated;
9. list of text(s) or other required course materials;
10. make-up examination policy;
11. all syllabi should include the following statement: "The course syllabus provides a general plan for the course; deviations may be necessary."
12. all syllabi should refer to the Policy on Academic Honesty.
13. all syllabi should include the following statement: "Your constructive assessment of this course plays an indispensable role in shaping education at Georgia State. Upon completing the course, please take time to fill out the online course evaluation."
14. all syllabi should include the following statement: "Students who wish to request accommodation for a disability may do so by registering with the Office of Disability Services. Students may only be accommodated upon issuance by the Office of Disability Services of a signed Accommodation Plan and are responsible for providing a copy of that plan to instructors of all classes in which accommodations are sought.

Note: While it is not in the Faculty Handbook, the College practice is grant grievances against instructors who drop or withdraw students from their classes unless the syllabus contains a statement telling the students "if you do X, then you may be dropped/withdrawn from this course."

## **Reporting Grades**

(Faculty Handbook, Section 403.02)

The University considers student grades to be private information and prohibits the posting of grades by name or social security number on bulletin boards or classroom or office doors.

The Department recommends that faculty and GTAs not send advance notification of student's final grades through email. It discourages students who make good grades from filling out the student evaluations and it encourages students who make bad grades to fill them out.

## **Drops, Withdrawals, Incompletes, and Hardship Withdrawals**

(University Catalog, Section 1332)

### **Drops and Withdrawals**

Schedule revisions follow different rules at different periods within the semester.

**During registration:** When the registration system is open to students at the beginning of each term, students may drop or add classes using GoSOLAR. When a class is dropped during this period, no grade is recorded and no record of the student's being enrolled in the class appears on the student's transcript. Registration ends at 5 p.m. on the first Friday of the term.

**During the faculty registration adjustment period:** During this period (determined by the Registrar but always after late registration), faculty have the discretion to request to add or drop students from classes. Factors such as space availability and health and safety regulations may apply to such requests. When a class is dropped during this period, no grade is recorded and no record of the student being enrolled in the class appears on the student's transcript.

**After faculty registration adjustment period and before the midpoint of the term:** During this period, students may withdraw from a class or classes using GoSOLAR. Students will receive a grade of W or WF for any class dropped during this period depending on whether or not they have exceeded their limit of withdrawals with a grade of W. Specifically, students will automatically be awarded a W if they have not exceeded their limit and a WF if they have. Grades of W and WF appear on the student's transcript. (Note: A grade of WF is treated as an F for GPA calculation purposes.)

**After the midpoint of the term:** After the midpoint of the term, voluntary withdrawals cannot occur. See below re Hardship Withdrawals.

### **Adds, Drops, and Withdrawals Web Form**

Here are the instructions for accessing the web form to add, drop, or withdraw a student:

- \* To go PAWS: <http://paws.gsu.edu>, click the "Classes" tab.
- \* On the Faculty Menu (left column), click Online Registration Adjustment Request Form.
- \* Login and follow the instructions.
- \* The "Approving Academic Department E-mail:" is the chair's email address.

**Limits on Withdrawals with a Grade of W**

Students are allowed to withdraw with a grade of W a maximum of six times in their undergraduate careers at Georgia State.

**Emergency Withdrawals**

Students may request an emergency withdrawal when a non-academic emergency situation occurs that prevents them from completing their course work (e.g., severe medical problems, traumatic events) and when the timing or nature of the emergency prevents them from voluntarily withdrawing from their classes. Emergency withdrawals are subject to the following restrictions:

Students must initiate an application for an emergency withdrawal no later than two academic years after the semester in which the courses were taken.

Students may request emergency withdrawals in a maximum of two semesters of their enrollment at Georgia State.

Students may not request an emergency withdrawal after degree conferral.

Emergency withdrawals normally apply to all the courses a student took in a semester. In exceptional cases, emergency withdrawals may be granted for some of a student's courses. Students requesting an emergency withdrawal in some but not all of their courses must provide documentation to justify a partial withdrawal.

If a student is granted an emergency withdrawal, W grades will automatically be awarded. W grades awarded as a result of the emergency withdrawal process do not count against the student's voluntary withdrawal limits.

## **Canceling Classes**

(Faculty Handbook Section 312.01)

Faculty members are expected to provide instruction and student advising as assigned by the departmental chairman. Classroom instruction responsibilities include holding class for the entire period for which the class is scheduled (including the final examination period) and evaluating students' work and assigning grades.

Implementation of this rule in the Department of Philosophy:

- \*You always need chair's approval to cancel your classes.
- \*If you get sick or there is a family emergency, just send an e-mail to the chair with a CC to the staff. Or call the chair at home or at the office.
- \*For professional events (conferences, talks, etc.) you need to give the chair the Travel Request form at least two weeks in advance and arrange to have someone else cover your classes.
- \*If you would like to not teach your classes for a non-professional reason, you need to discuss this with the chair at least two weeks in advance. However, please be aware that instructors are generally *not* allowed to not teach their classes for non-professional, non-emergency reasons. Be sure to discuss such matters with the chair *before* buying tickets or making other such plans.

### GTAs and Canceling Classes

Unplanned: If you are too ill or have an emergency that makes it unwise or impossible for you to teach class, you must call or send an email to the Chair as soon as you possibly can. Give as much notice as you can. When emailing the Chair, explaining that you are ill or have an emergency, CC the CGT and the staff, so that when the Chair approves your absence, it is an easy “reply all” matter for the staff to know to put a sign up on your classroom door(s). You are not allowed to cancel your class without permission from the Chair. Staff members are not allowed to notify your class without permission from the Chair, so do not put them in an awkward position by asking them to do so.

Planned: For nonemergency, professional reasons, use the GTA Absence from Teaching Pre-approval Form in section II.E. below and see note at end of this document for details.

## **Policy on Sick Leave**

(Faculty Handbook, Section 501.01, Senate Policy Passed on April 24, 2003)

1. Faculty are responsible for informing their chair of any illness that prohibits their meeting their assigned responsibilities.
2. It is the responsibility of the chair (a) to ensure that the instructional responsibilities for courses are met; and in consultation with an ill faculty member, (b) to determine whether illness has resulted in the faculty member not being able to perform his or her assigned work load.
3. If the chair determines that the illness has resulted in a reduction of work load, the chair, in concert with the faculty member, will determine the amount of sick-leave time that must be reported for the faculty member. Those hours will be reported as required by GSU policy.

GTAs use the GTA Absence form at end of this handbook for all absence requests other than illness or emergency. For illness and emergencies, GTAs email or call the chair, with a CC to the Coordinator of Graduate Teaching and the staff.

## **Outside Activities**

(Faculty Handbook Section 312.04.01)

### **A. Occupational**

1. An employee of the University System shall not engage in any occupation, pursuit, or endeavor which will interfere with the regular and punctual discharge of official duties.
2. All full-time faculty, administrators, and other professional staff members employed by a unit of the University System are expected to give full professional effort to their assignments of teaching, research, and service.
3. Professional employees are encouraged to participate in professional activity that does not interfere with the regular and punctual discharge of official duties provided the activity meets one of the following criteria: (1) is a means of personal professional development; (2) serves the community, state, or nation; or (3) is consistent with the objectives of the institution.
4. For all activities, except single-occasion activities, the employee shall report in writing through official channels the proposed arrangements and secure the approval of the President or his designee prior to engaging in the activities. Such activities include consulting, teaching, speaking, and participating in business or service enterprises. (Emphasis added.)

By Department policy, the rules above apply to GTAs except that the chair approves outside activities.

## **Amorous Relationships Policy** (Faculty Handbook Section 301.08)

The integrity of academic and work relationships is the foundation of the university's educational mission. These relationships vest considerable trust in persons with authority whether as mentor, educator, evaluator and/or administrator. The unequal institutional power inherent in university academic and work relationships heightens the vulnerability of those in subordinate positions. The university must protect itself from influences or activities that interfere with intellectual, professional and personal growth, or with the university's financial interests. Consequently, people in positions of authority within the university community must be sensitive to the potential for conflict of interest as well as sexual harassment in amorous relationships with people over whom they have a professional power/status advantage. (See Section 206.03 of the Faculty Handbook, Section 6-1 in the Classified Employee Handbook, and the GSU General Catalog for the Sexual Harassment Policy of the university.)

The individual in authority bears the primary responsibility for any negative consequences resulting from an amorous relationship. It is in the interest of the university to provide clear direction and educational opportunities to the university community about potential professional risks associated with consensual amorous relationships between members of the university community where a power/status advantage exists.

### 1. Power Advantages

**Academic Relationship Advantage.** A faculty member or other instructor always will be treated as having a power advantage when that faculty member or instructor has authority to assign grades; serves on thesis, dissertation, or scholarship awards committees; provides research and/or training opportunities, etc.

**Staff Advantage.** A staff member will always be treated as having a power advantage when the staff member has the authority to evaluate, determine salary, and/or make employment decisions.

**Other Power Advantage.** Power advantages also can occur between junior and senior faculty, faculty and administrators, and faculty/administrators and staff.

### 2. Conflict of Interest

Relationships that are mutual and consensual may be viewed by others as exploitative and may adversely affect the work environment in that serious conflicts of interests may be perceived to exist. In particular, the parties to an amorous relationship should be aware that such relationships often create general conflicts of interest and the fear from co-workers or students of unfair treatment in terms of promotions, grades, etc.

Therefore, Georgia State University prohibits the parties who are or have been involved in any amorous relationship from evaluating each other.



There are situations sufficiently complex that judgments may differ as to whether there is or may be a conflict of interest, and individuals may inadvertently place themselves in situations where conflict exists. Accordingly, for the common good, should a situation arise in which parties who are or have been involved in any amorous relationship come into a position in which they would normally be called upon to evaluate one another, the individual in authority must promptly report this fact to his or her supervisor. The supervisor will then make arrangements to see that those who are or have been involved in any amorous relationship do not evaluate each other. In particular, if a faculty member has had or comes to have an amorous relationship with a student over whom the faculty member has authority as described above, the faculty member must promptly report this to the department/school chair who will make arrangements for an alternate evaluation mechanism. Should the individual in authority fail to promptly report an amorous relationship with a person the individual in authority evaluates, the individual in authority has violated University policy and is subject to disciplinary action in the Faculty Handbook, Classified Employee Handbook, or appropriate student catalogue, handbook, or college regulations (depending on whether the individual in authority is faculty, staff, or a student).

### 3. Malicious Use of This Policy

It is important to avoid conflict of interests resulting from amorous relationships; it is equally important to recognize that malicious accusations of inappropriate amorous relationships have the potential to severely damage a person's career and reputation.

Therefore, Georgia State University prohibits making knowingly false accusations that an unreported amorous relationship exists or existed between two parties now in a position to evaluate each other.

### 4. Due Process

Due process rights are matters of fundamental fairness; therefore, disciplinary action will be taken in accordance with the procedures set out in the Faculty Handbook, Classified Employee Handbook, or appropriate student catalogue, handbook, or college regulations.

## **Ethical Behavior with Regard to Complimentary Textbooks** (Faculty Handbook Section 313.05)

The distribution of complimentary textbooks is an important part of the process whereby professors review the full range of instructional materials available for their courses. However, the integrity of this process must be respected. Selling complimentary copies of textbooks adversely affects the entire academic community. Professor-authors are deprived of economic return in royalties, and incentives to write textbooks are diminished. Students generally do not benefit from the sale of complimentary copies, as these books are sold at or only slightly below the new book price. Selling complimentary textbooks inflates the cost of all textbooks, as publishers must compensate for revenue lost from the sale of new books. Selling complimentary copies violates the tradition of respect by professors for the intellectual work of their colleagues and for the textbook publishers. The future of availability of complimentary textbooks may be seriously jeopardized by the reluctance of publishers to risk further financial loss. Faculty members receive complimentary textbooks as a result of their position at the University. These textbooks should not be viewed as a source of faculty income. We recommend the following:

1. Complimentary textbooks are not to be resold for faculty profit. The books may be maintained for faculty reference or contributed to a library for student reference.
2. Solicitors for complimentary copies are forbidden from campus.
3. The campus bookstore may not sell copies which are identifiable as complimentary copies whatever their source may be."

## **Guidelines for Classroom Copying in Not-for-profit Educational Institutions with Respect to Books and Periodicals**

The rules and laws regarding copyright are complex and ever changing.

Consult professionals in the Library about these rules.

## **Policy on Academic Honesty**

### **1. Introduction**

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

The University's policy on academic honesty is published in the Faculty Handbook (<http://www2.gsu.edu/~wwwfhh/fhb.html>) and the Student Handbook, On Campus, which is available to all members of the University community (<http://studenthandbook.gsu.edu/>). Academic honesty is a core value of the University and all members of the University community are responsible for abiding by the tenets of the policy. Georgia State students, faculty, and staff, are expected to report all instances of academic dishonesty to the appropriate authorities. The procedures for such reporting are outlined below and on file in the offices of the deans of each college, the Office of the Dean of Students, and the Office of the Provost. Lack of knowledge of this policy is not an acceptable defense to any charge of academic dishonesty. In an effort to foster an environment of academic integrity and to prevent academic dishonesty, students are expected to discuss with faculty the expectations regarding course assignments and standards of conduct. Students are encouraged to discuss freely with faculty, academic advisors, and other members of the University community any questions pertaining to the provisions of this policy. In addition, students are encouraged to avail themselves of programs in establishing personal standards and ethics offered by the university.

No instructor or department may impose academic or disciplinary penalties for academic dishonesty outside the parameters of this policy. This policy applies to all incidents of academic dishonesty, including those that occur before a student graduates but are not discovered until after the degree is conferred. In such cases, it is possible that the application of this policy will lead to a failure to meet degree completion requirements and therefore a revocation of a student's degree.

Many colleges and/or departments provide statements of what constitutes academic dishonesty within the context of their discipline, and recommend penalties for specific types of academic dishonesty. As noted in the Faculty Handbook, all syllabi are required to make reference to the Academic Honesty Policy; syllabi should also include a link to departmental standards where they exist.

### **2. Definitions and Examples**

The examples and definitions given below are intended to clarify the standards by which academic honesty and academically honorable conduct are to be judged. The list is merely illustrative of the kinds of infractions that may occur, and it is not intended to be exhaustive.

Moreover, the definitions and examples suggest conditions under which unacceptable behavior of the indicated types normally occurs; however, there may be unusual cases that fall outside these conditions which also will be judged unacceptable by the academic community.

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

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

**Unauthorized Collaboration.** Unauthorized collaboration means working with someone or getting assistance from someone (a classmate, friend, etc.) without specific permission from the instructor on any assignment (e.g., exam, paper, homework) that is turned in for a grade. It is also a violation of academic honesty to knowingly provide such assistance to another student. Collaborative work specifically authorized by a faculty member is allowed.

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

**Multiple Submissions.** It is a violation of academic honesty to submit substantial portions of the same work for credit more than once without the explicit consent of the faculty member(s) to whom the material is submitted for additional credit. In cases in which there is a natural development of research or knowledge in a sequence of courses, use of prior work may be

desirable, even required; however, the student is responsible for indicating in writing, as a part of such use, that the current work submitted for credit is cumulative in nature.

### 3. Information and Burden of Proof

In determining whether or not academic dishonesty has occurred, the standard which should be used is that guilt must be proven by a preponderance of the information. This means that if the information which indicates that academic dishonesty occurred produces a stronger impression and is more convincing as to its truth when weighed against opposing information, then academic dishonesty has been proved. In other words, the information does not have to be enough to free the mind from a reasonable doubt but must be sufficient to incline a reasonable and impartial mind to one side of the issue rather than to the other. Information as used in this statement can be any observation, admission, statement, or document which would either directly or circumstantially indicate that academic dishonesty has occurred.

### 4. Procedures for Resolving Matters of Academic Honesty

The following procedure is the only approved means for resolving matters of academic dishonesty, except for matters arising in the College of Law, which has its own Honor Code for handling such matters. It is available to all members of the academic community who wish to pursue an action against a student for academic dishonesty. A brief summary of the procedures is presented here; details of these procedures are found in the following sections.

1. The faculty member should discuss the incident with the student before filing a charge of academic dishonesty. The faculty member, in consultation with the department chair, prepares the Notice of Academic Dishonesty. The chair forwards the notice to the college dean, who sends the notification to the student by university email or by certified mail.
2. The student must appeal in writing to the College Dean within 10 business days of the date the email was sent or the certified mail was received if the student wishes to deny the finding of academic dishonesty.
3. If the student does not appeal within 10 business days, the College Dean forwards the notice of academic dishonesty to the Dean of Students.
4. If the student appeals the charges, a College Hearing Committee conducts a hearing and reports its findings to the College Dean regarding guilt or innocence. If the student is found not guilty, the faculty member is notified to assign an appropriate grade. If the student is found guilty, the dean forwards the notice of academic dishonesty to the dean of students.
5. Any recommendation for a disciplinary penalty and a challenge of that disciplinary penalty submitted by the student, if any, is reviewed by the University Senate Committee on Student Discipline. Based on the committee's recommendation, the provost makes a decision and takes action regarding any disciplinary sanction.

6. The dean of students maintains the disciplinary records on all findings of academic dishonesty and is responsible for forwarding notice of multiple findings to the Senate Committee on Student Discipline for review. Multiple findings may result in a disciplinary penalty even if one was not recommended by the faculty member.

#### 5. Initiation of Action

If a member of the academic community believes that a student has engaged in academic dishonesty in a course, on a test, or as a part of an academic program, that individual is responsible for initiating action against the student or bringing the matter to the attention of an individual who may initiate action against the student (i.e., complete and submit a notification of academic honesty). In allegations of academic dishonesty involving course requirements, the course faculty member is required to initiate the action. If the alleged violation involves a departmental program requirement (e.g., comprehensive examination or language competency examination) or an institutionally-required test (e.g., test of Georgia/United States history or Georgia/United States constitutions), or if the individual who discovers the incident is not a faculty member, the individual should bring the matter to the attention of the faculty member and administrator who has responsibility of overseeing the activity (e.g., departmental chair, director of the Testing Office). If that administrator decides to bring charges of academic dishonesty against the student, then that administrator becomes the initiator. (Test proctors, laboratory assistants, and other individuals who are not course faculty members should bring any instances of alleged academic dishonesty to the attention of the course faculty member or their administrative superior. That individual, after weighing the information, may become the initiator by formally charging the student with academic dishonesty.)

The channel of review, recommendation, and decision-making follows the administrative lines associated with the course or program requirement involved. In any instance, however, when the alleged incident does not occur within the context of a course, and when it is unclear which college should have jurisdiction in review and decision-making, any unit may initiate the case.

For the sake of brevity the following processing procedures are written from an academic unit/college perspective. Nonacademic units (i.e., Testing Center) would substitute appropriate supervisory personnel at the respective levels. Herein the initiator will be referred to as faculty member and the administrative unit head will be referred to as chair, designating the departmental chair. Dean will refer to appropriate administrative supervisory personnel at the overall college or division level.

When an allegation of academic dishonesty is made, the relevant dean will inform the Office of the Registrar to place a grade of GP (grade pending) for the student in the course involved. Withdrawal from a course does not preclude the imposition of penalties for academic dishonesty. While the matter of academic dishonesty is pending, the student will be allowed to continue in the course and register for upcoming semesters.

#### A. Penalties to be Imposed

Penalties to be imposed in incidents of academic dishonesty are classified as academic or disciplinary. Academic penalties include assignment of a failing grade for a particular course requirement, or for the course itself, or for other tests or program assignments. They are set by the faculty member, in consultation with the department chair.

Disciplinary penalties can be sought in addition to those considered academic and could include, but are not limited to, the following: suspension, expulsion, transcript annotations (temporary for a period of five years or permanent, as designated). Course credit earned at other institutions while on suspension may not be transferred to GSU. Disciplinary penalties can be requested by the faculty member, in consultation with the chair; they must be reviewed by the University Senate Committee on Student Discipline and they are set by the Provost.

#### B. Action at Administrative Unit (Department and College Level)

As soon as possible after the alleged incident, the faculty member should discuss the matter with the student. This discussion should be conducted in a manner which protects the rights and confidentiality of students. If the faculty member believes that academic dishonesty has occurred, the faculty member, in consultation with the department chair, will determine the appropriate academic penalty. The faculty member and the chair will complete a notice of academic dishonesty form describing the incident and indicating the academic penalty imposed and any recommended disciplinary penalty. The chair will forward the notice of academic dishonesty, which includes a statement of the right to appeal, to the dean of the college, who delivers it either through the student's official university email address or by certified mail.

#### C. Student Action

The student will have 10 business days after receipt of the notice of charges of academic dishonesty (i.e., the date that the email was sent or that the certified mail was received) to submit a written appeal denying the charges and providing any rationale for the appeal. The appeal should be addressed to the college dean of the initiator. In the event the student is found guilty of academic dishonesty, the student does not have the right to appeal the academic penalty assessed by the faculty member, unless the student can prove that such penalty was arbitrarily imposed or applied in a discriminatory manner.

If the student wishes to challenge a disciplinary penalty, the student must submit a written rationale for challenging the disciplinary penalty within 10 business days of receipt of the notice of charges of academic dishonesty. The statement of challenge should be addressed to the college dean. The college dean will forward the challenge to the dean of students for inclusion in the review of the disciplinary penalty by the University Senate Committee on Student Discipline. All disciplinary penalties are automatically reviewed by the University Senate Committee on Student Discipline, regardless of student appeal.

If the student has also filed an appeal denying the charges of academic dishonesty, any review of disciplinary penalty recommended will be delayed pending review of the charges of academic dishonesty by the college hearing committee.

## D. College Action

1. No Appeal by the Student. If the student does not submit a written appeal to the college dean or challenge the disciplinary penalty within 10 business days, the college dean will notify the chair/faculty member to post any pending grade(s) immediately. The college dean will then forward the notice of academic dishonesty to the dean of students for inclusion in the student's disciplinary file. Any recommendation of a disciplinary penalty will also be forwarded to the dean of students for appropriate review by the Senate Committee on Student Discipline.

### 2. Appeal by the Student.

a. If the student submits a written appeal of the charges of academic honesty, the college dean will forward the charges to the chair of a college hearing committee and will notify the faculty member to set forth in writing a comprehensive response describing the incident of academic dishonesty. This statement will be presented to the committee and to the student at least five (5) business days prior to the hearing.

b. If the student wishes to challenge the disciplinary penalty without appealing the charges of academic honesty, a college hearing committee will not be convened; instead, the college dean will forward the challenge to the dean of students for inclusion in the review of the disciplinary penalty by the University Senate Committee on Student Discipline.

### 3. Student Hearing Committee Process. Guidelines that Govern the Hearing of the Appeal by the College Student Hearing Committee

a. Within ten (10) business days after the committee receives the charges of academic dishonesty, a hearing date will be determined. The committee will notify the faculty member and the student of the time, date, and the place of the hearing. Copies of all charges of academic dishonesty and related materials for the hearing will be provided to the student at least five (5) business days in advance of the hearing.

b. The faculty member and the student will be allowed to make oral presentations, call witnesses, and present any documentary information regarding the incident in question. The hearing will be recorded on audio tape. The hearing will not be open to observers.

c. At the conclusion of the hearing, the committee will meet in closed session and will make its recommendation as to the guilt or innocence of the student based on a preponderance of information with respect to the charge of academic dishonesty. The committee chair will forward to the college dean its findings and recommendations in a written report within five (5) business days of the hearing.

4. College Decision on Appeals. Within five (5) business days of receiving the committee's written report, the college dean will make the final decision regarding guilt or innocence. The college dean will notify all appropriate parties of the decision.



If the college dean finds the student not guilty, the matter will be terminated and no notice of charges will be filed with the dean of students. The college dean will notify the chair to post the pending course grade promptly and will notify the registrar to remove the GP (grade pending) on the student's transcript.

If the college dean finds the student guilty, the notice of charges of academic dishonesty will be forwarded to the dean of students for inclusion in the student's disciplinary file. The academic penalty stipulated by the faculty member will be imposed. The college dean will notify the chair to insure that any pending grade is posted promptly. The college dean will notify the registrar to remove the GP (grade pending) on the student's transcript if only an academic penalty was involved.

If a disciplinary penalty has been recommended, the college dean will notify the registrar to continue the GP (grade pending) annotation until the disciplinary penalty can be reviewed by the University Senate Committee on Student Discipline.

5. Appeal of the Decision of the Dean. If the student or initiator wishes to appeal the decision of the college dean regarding guilt or innocence of the charges of academic dishonesty, the student or initiator may appeal to the provost. The subsequent appeal route would be to the president and then the Board of Regents. The student or initiator must submit a written statement of appeal to the provost within 10 business days of notification of the dean's decision. The basis of the appeal must be on the grounds that the decision was arbitrary, capricious, or discriminatory.

#### E. UNIVERSITY SENATE COMMITTEE ON STUDENT DISCIPLINE ACTION

In cases where a disciplinary penalty has been recommended, the Senate Committee on Student Discipline will conduct a hearing to review the disciplinary penalty. The committee will review the faculty member's notice of academic dishonesty and the student's statement of challenge of the disciplinary penalty, if any. The faculty member and the student will be allowed to appear at the hearing to discuss the imposition of disciplinary penalties. Only the recommendation concerning the disciplinary penalty to be imposed will be considered by this committee. Issues of guilt or innocence are determined at the college level (see II.4 C and D above).

The Senate Committee will conduct the hearing in accordance with its regular hearing procedures. Copies of these procedures may be obtained from the Provost's Office.

The Senate Committee on Student Discipline will provide its recommendation within five (5) business days of its hearing to the provost regarding appropriateness of the disciplinary penalty recommended by the college and/or whether other disciplinary penalties are to be imposed in addition to or in lieu of those already recommended by the college.

#### F. PROVOST ACTION

1. Decision of the Provost. The role of the provost in handling student appeals regarding the charge of academic honesty has been explained (see II.E.5 above). Based on the recommendation, the Provost will render a decision within ten (10) business days of receipt of the recommendation of the Senate Committee. The provost will notify the student, the referring dean, the department chair and the faculty member of the Senate Committee's recommendations and of the provost's decision. At that time the provost will also notify the registrar to annotate the student's transcript, if necessary.

2. Appeal of the Decision of the Provost. If the student wishes to appeal the decision of the provost regarding the imposition of a disciplinary penalty, the student may appeal to the president, and then to the Board of Regents. The student must submit a written statement of appeal to the president within ten (10) business days of notification of the provost's decision. The basis for such an appeal must be on the grounds that the decision was arbitrary, capricious, or discriminatory.

#### G. STUDENTS INVOLVED IN TWO OR MORE INCIDENTS OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

A student is subject to disciplinary action in addition to any already undertaken once it is determined that the student has been found guilty in a previous incident of academic dishonesty. In such cases, the dean of students will forward a report to the University Senate Committee on Student Discipline regarding the incidents of academic dishonesty which have been reported. The dean of students is responsible for initiating this report within ten (10) business days of notification of the proceedings of any subsequent finding of academic dishonesty.

The University Senate Committee on Student Discipline will review the report of the dean of students. The student may submit supplemental written documents for the committee's review and may request to appear before the committee in its deliberations. After reviewing the matter, the committee will send a report to the provost with the recommendation for disciplinary penalty to be imposed. The provost will proceed as in G above.

#### H. GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES FOR ACADEMIC MATTERS

1. Each of the undergraduate colleges has stated policies for settling grievances of students for academic matters. Refer to the office of the dean of each college for policies.

2. Obligation to Report Suspected Violations. Members of the academic community, students, faculty and staff are expected to report all instances of academic dishonesty to the appropriate authorities. The procedures for such reporting are on file in the offices of the deans of each college.

3. Penalties. The University takes the matter of academic honesty most seriously. Penalties for violations vary, but include both suspension and permanent expulsion from the institution.

## Georgia State University – Notice of Academic Dishonesty

TO THE STUDENT: This serves as notification to you that the below signed individual has found you in violation of the University policy on academic honesty and has established the penalty(ies) described below.

You have a right to deny this finding of academic dishonesty and request a college hearing to determine your guilt or innocence. The academic penalty recommended below cannot be challenged. If a disciplinary penalty has been recommended below, you have a right to challenge the disciplinary penalty (whether or not you accept the finding of academic dishonesty) and to appear before the University Senate Committee on Student Discipline; this committee automatically reviews all recommendations for student disciplinary sanctions.

To deny the finding of academic dishonesty or to challenge a recommendation for a disciplinary penalty, you must submit a written statement to the college dean within 10 business days of receipt of this notice requesting either or both of these actions. If you do not respond within 10 business days, it will be assumed that you have accepted this finding of academic dishonesty and this notice of academic dishonesty will then be included in your disciplinary file in the Office of the Dean of Students. This information (unless the disciplinary penalty recommended below, if any, specifically indicates otherwise) is not included in your permanent academic record and is used for disciplinary purposes only. Multiple findings of academic dishonesty may result in additional recommendations for disciplinary sanctions.

Definition of penalties and a summary of review and processing procedures can be found below. A complete copy of the university's policy and procedures regarding academic honesty can be obtained from the dean of the college or the dean of students or online ([codeofconduct.gsu.edu](http://codeofconduct.gsu.edu)).

Student \_\_\_\_\_ Panther ID \_\_\_\_\_

Course Subject & Number \_\_\_\_\_ CRN # \_\_\_\_\_ Term/Yr \_\_\_\_\_

College A&S Department Philosophy Instructor \_\_\_\_\_

Department Chair \_\_\_\_\_

Statement of finding of academic dishonesty by initiator:

Academic penalty recommended: \_\_\_\_\_

Disciplinary penalty recommended, if any: \_\_\_\_\_

Charges discussed with student (check one): In Person  By Email  Date \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Initiator's Signature                      Date    Date Received by College

\_\_\_\_\_  
Department Chair Signature      Date    Date Student Notified by College

Student Notified by College via (check one): Email  Certified Mail

**DEFINITION OF ACADEMIC PENALTY:** Sanction sought for academic dishonesty will be considered an academic penalty if the initiator wishes to assess penalty for academic assignments only, such as a failing grade to the student for a particular course assignment, or for the course itself, or for other tests or program requirements involved in the incident. The academic penalty cannot be challenged.

**DEFINITION OF DISCIPLINARY PENALTY:** Sanction sought for academic dishonesty will be considered a disciplinary penalty if the initiator wishes to seek sanction in addition to those considered as academic. Disciplinary penalties could include, but are not limited to, the following sanctions: suspension, expulsion, transcript annotation(s). Students may challenge a disciplinary penalty regardless of whether the student accepts findings of academic dishonesty. All disciplinary penalties are automatically reviewed by the University Senate Committee on Student Discipline.

**STUDENT DISCIPLINARY RECORD:** The Dean of Students' Office maintains a disciplinary record for any student who has been reported for any disciplinary sanction, including cases of academic dishonesty. This record is not a part of the student's permanent academic record unless disciplinary sanction imposed is specifically designated to be public record (e.g., transcript annotation). If two or more incidents of academic dishonesty are filed against a student, or if record of other disciplinary problems exists, additional disciplinary sanctions may be imposed by the Senate Committee on Student Discipline.

**SUMMARY OF REVIEW AND PROCESSING PROCEDURES:** For the sake of brevity, the following review and processing summary is written from an "academic unit/college" perspective. Non-academic units (i.e., Testing Center) would substitute appropriate supervisory personnel at the respective levels.

1. The faculty member should discuss the incident with the student before filing a charge of academic dishonesty. The faculty member, in consultation with the department chair, prepares the Notice of Academic Dishonesty. The chair forwards the notice to the college dean, who sends the notification to the student by university email or by certified mail.
2. The student must appeal in writing to the College Dean within 10 business days of the date the email was sent or the certified mail was received if the student wishes to deny the finding of academic dishonesty.
3. If the student does not appeal within 10 business days, the College Dean forwards the notice of academic dishonesty to the Dean of Students.
4. If the student appeals the charges, a College Hearing Committee conducts a hearing and reports its findings to the College Dean regarding guilt or innocence. If the student is found not guilty, the faculty member is notified to assign an appropriate grade. If the student is found guilty, the College Dean forwards the notice of academic dishonesty to the Dean of Students.
5. Any recommendation for a disciplinary penalty and a challenge of that disciplinary penalty submitted by the student, if any, is reviewed by the University Senate Committee on Student Discipline. Based on the committee's recommendation, the provost makes a decision and takes action regarding any disciplinary sanction.
6. The Dean of Students maintains the disciplinary records on all findings of academic dishonesty and is responsible for forwarding notice of multiple findings to the Senate Committee on Student Discipline for review. Multiple findings may result in a disciplinary penalty even if one was not recommended by the faculty member.

## Policy on Plus/Minus Grading

All philosophy courses must use plus/minus grades. Instructors are not allowed to give only whole-letter grades.

In graduate classes, A+ indicates work that merits recommendation to a top-five philosophy PhD program. This policy applies only to courses taught by philosophy faculty.

## Grading Guidelines in 1000-3000 Level Courses

The Department has established guidelines for grades in all 1000, 2000, and 3000 level courses. *Since these are guidelines, not absolute requirements, they should not be presented as firm rules in a course syllabus or used as justification for a particular student's grade.* It is to be expected that there will be exceptional sections for which these guidelines are not appropriate. For example, a section of 12 students taught 8 am MWF might by random chance have very good or very poor students. Moreover, many instructors teach more than one section. In these cases, the guidelines refer to the total number of students enrolled as one group, not to each and every section one teaches. Thus, it is only over a sufficiently large number of students that grades should fall within the following guidelines:

1. The total number of A+ grades should be between 0-5%
2. The total number of grades in A range (A+, A, and A-) should be between 20-30%.
3. The total number of grades in the A range and B range should be between 50-75%.
4. The total number of D and F grades plus Ws should aim to be lower than 15%.

## Grading Rules for GTAs

GTAs must grade on a 0-100 system using the following rules of transfer from the 1-100 scale to the letter scale:

A+	4.3	98 - 100
A	4.0	93 – 97
A-	3.7	90 – 92
B+	3.3	87 – 89
B	3.0	83 – 86
B-	2.7	80 – 82
C+	2.3	77 – 79
C	2.0	73 – 76
C-	1.7	70 – 72
D	1.0	60 – 69
F	0.0	0 – 59

GTAs grades must be submitted and reviewed by the CGT prior to final submission.

## Grading Guidelines in Graduate Level Courses

The Department emphasizes that faculty are free to assign grades as they see fit.

Nevertheless, to provide guidance to graduate students and encourage appropriate levels of consistency of grading across courses, the Department has approved the following rough guidelines for the meaning of grades given to graduate-level assignments.

The following guidelines mention letters of recommendation to philosophy PhD programs.

However, it is important to emphasize that grades are only one of many factors considered when instructors write such letters. Other factors may include but are not limited to: the trajectory of the quality of a student's work, the quality of the student's MA thesis, the quality of the writing sample, activity in the profession (e.g., conference presentations), teaching performance, maturity, organizational skills, responsibility, and the student's future goals. In general, a letter of recommendation to a philosophy PhD program is an instructor's evaluation of an individual's promise as a philosophy professor and therefore letters may reflect anything relevant to that evaluation.

In the following, "assignment" refers to a significant course assignment, e.g., a paper or an essay exam.

Students should not take the grade on a particular assignment as a global evaluation of their work. When grading an assignment, instructors evaluate only that particular assignment. For example, when grading a paper, an instructor considers only that particular paper. In contrast to letters of recommendation, the grade on a particular assignment does not consider a student's other work, a student's maturity, a student's teaching performance, etc.

A+ Consistent production of work of this assignment's quality would be one factor indicating recommendation to any philosophy PhD program, including the most highly-regarded.

A Consistent production of work of this assignment's quality would be one factor indicating recommendation to a very highly-regarded philosophy PhD programs.

A- Consistent production of work of this assignment's quality would be one factor indicating recommendation to widely-respected philosophy PhD programs, but not the very highly-regarded ones.

B+ Consistent production of work of this assignment's quality would be one factor indicating that a student's work was at the minimum level needed for recommendation to a philosophy PhD program.

B Consistent production of work of this assignment's quality would be one factor indicating awarding of the MA but not recommendation to a philosophy PhD program.

<= B- Consistent production of work of this assignment's quality would indicate that improvement will be required to earn the MA.

## Phil 1010 Policy

**Purpose.** The Critical Thinking course is about understanding and evaluating arguments. Students learn how to (i) distinguish arguments from non-arguments, (ii) identify the premises and conclusion, (iii) comprehend the relation between main and subordinate arguments, and (iv) critically evaluate the arguments of others. Secondly, the purpose of the course is to show students how learning the above skills will help them successfully complete their other courses in the core curriculum and major.

**Content.** Critical Thinking is a skills course: its aim is to foster the understanding of good reasoning in general. Students ought to be able to apply the skills they learn in this course to a variety of topics. The first sentence of the course description for Phil 1010 in the university catalogue reads: “Development of practical, logical, and problem-solving skills important to all disciplines, with emphasis on the composition of argumentative essays.” While there is nothing wrong with assigning some philosophical essays, the argumentative essays that the students are assigned to read and write about should not focus primarily on philosophical topics. Given that one emphasis is on preparation for successful completion of core and major courses, exercises and articles for writing should include examples from other academic fields.

**Common Topics.** All sections of Phil 1010 must cover

1. Identifying, standardizing, and evaluating various elementary deductive syllogisms and inductive arguments including statistical, causal and analogical

and at least the following topics

- a. distinguishing arguments from non-arguments
- b. identifying premises and conclusions; distinguishing deductive and inductive methods
- c. comprehending relations between main and subordinate arguments
- d. understanding concepts of validity and soundness; inductive strength and cogency
- e. recognizing simple valid and invalid argument forms
- f. identifying common fallacies, including inductive fallacies

Individual instructors may add additional topics if they wish.

**2. No Symbolic Logic:** Phil 1010 is a two credit course, thus formal logic should be limited. No symbolic logic should be included. Philosophy majors and minors are strongly encouraged to take Symbolic logic, Phil 2500.

**3. NOT Intro to Philosophy:** Phil 1010 is NOT an introduction to philosophy. This should be explained to students in 1010 so that (a) they do not expect the course to deal with topics like the problem of evil, free will, or ethics and (b) so that they can be encouraged to take Phil 2010 where they will be introduced to such topics. It should also be pointed out that Phil 1010 is not a

prerequisite for Intro to Phil (Phil 2010).

**Common Text and Final for GTAs:** There is a common text, a common syllabus and common midterm and final exam for Phil 1010. GTAs will be required to use these materials. Lecturers and tenure-track faculty are encouraged to use the default materials but may use their own materials if they wish.



## PHIL 2010 Policy

### 1. Purpose:

The Introduction to Philosophy course addresses problems and proposed solutions to philosophical issues through lecture, class discussion, analysis of arguments, and selected readings of philosophers of historical import, but it is *neither* a history of philosophy course *nor* one that focuses exclusively on just a few philosophers or just a few topics. It establishes a basic vocabulary of issues, positions, and terms foundational for the course and for further work in philosophy. Finally, it stimulates as powerfully as possible an interest in the value of philosophy as an integral part of the liberal arts curriculum and as relevant for personal meaning and decision-making. Ideally, students should leave the course wanting to study more philosophy, and they should be encouraged to do so (especially PHIL 3000, but also 2030, 3010, 3020, 3060, or 3710, 3720).

### 2. Content:

A. *Proper reasoning and philosophical terminology.* The course must include at least an introduction to the structure of arguments (many students will not have taken PHIL 1010). Ideally, students would be introduced to crucial distinctions and terms: premises, conclusions, inductive and deductive arguments, validity and soundness, necessary and sufficient conditions, counterexamples, logical consistency, possibility and necessity, and perhaps also some informal and formal fallacies, some common valid argument forms (e.g., modus ponens), and the difference between factual and normative questions, and so on. Many of these concepts can be introduced in the context of discussions of the topics below; some instructors include one or two lectures on the structure of arguments.

B. *Metaphysics.* The course must include must at least one topic in metaphysics. Sample topics include, but are not restricted to:

1. Debates about free will, determinism, and moral responsibility;
2. The mind-body question, possibly including applied areas such as artificial intelligence, mental disorders, the scientific study of the mind;
3. The existence of God or the problem of evil.

C. *Epistemology.* The course must include must at least one topic in epistemology. Sample topics include, but are not restricted to:

1. Rationalist vs. empiricist approaches to knowing;
2. Perception and the external world;
3. Arguments for and against skepticism;
4. The nature of scientific knowledge and potential limits of science.

D. *Value Theory*. The course must include at least one topic in value theory. Sample topics include, but are not restricted to:

1. Major ethical theories (e.g., utilitarianism, deontology, contractarianism, virtue ethics);
2. Applied ethics and/or social, political, or legal philosophy (e.g., mass incarceration, legalization of drugs, immigration, terrorism, free speech vs. hate speech, gender identity, animal rights, abortion, euthanasia, death penalty, the meaning of life).

E. *Diversity*. Instructors are strongly encouraged to include some selections from philosophers who are minorities or non-Western thinkers. Instructors are strongly encouraged to have at least 20% of the readings written by women authors.

### 3. Organization:

The course may include both classical selections and contemporary sources in the proportions deemed appropriate by the instructor. Ideally, each class would include some combination of lecture and classroom discussion and debate. With these requirements one could teach only 4 major topics in considerable depth in the Introduction to Philosophy course. These minimums, however, are an outer limit. Most sections of PHIL 2010 cover a greater number of topics, the task being one of finding a proper balance between considerations of breadth and of depth, historical and contemporary readings.

### 4. Writing:

The course must include a writing component such as a paper, essay tests, journals, short essays, or summaries of readings. Instructors teaching multiple sections of large classes should carefully consider how to structure writing assignments so that grading them in a timely manner will be possible.

## **PHIL 2010 sections taught by GTAs**

When Graduate Student Teachers (GTAs) teach PHIL 2010, they are required to observe a full-time faculty member teach the course during a prior term. Their syllabus schedule of readings, tests, and handouts must be approved by the Coordinator of Graduate Teaching. GTAs are required to follow the policies outlined above, to have at least 20% of the readings' authors be women, and to use readings that are available on iCollege or on-line so that students do not need to purchase a textbook.

## **Pedagogical Recommendations for PHIL 2010**

1. Stimulate significant student discussion and debate of ideas.
2. Draw students into the course by relating to their interests, backgrounds, and majors, showing them how important philosophy is to their own lives, and why, whether they know it or not, they are already involved in philosophy.
3. Show why this is a very important course in undergraduate education, in general relating philosophy to (but also distinguishing it from) science, religion, common sense, psychology, moral decision-making, etc.
4. Include some selections come from non-philosophers who have written engaging philosophical pieces that students easily relate to, e.g., Ta-Nehisi Coates, Clarence Darrow, Martin Luther King, B.F. Skinner, Carl Sagan, Gloria Steinem, Virginia Woolf. Also consider using relevant selections from literature, film, or current events. (This helps students to see the relevance of philosophy to other arenas.)
5. Ensure that students develop a rudimentary understanding of how to recognize an argument and distinguish between premises and conclusion(s) (see 2A above). (Many will not have had PHIL 1010.)
6. Include some selections from philosophers who are women, minorities, or in the non-Western tradition.

Note: We make every effort to staff 2010 sections with instructors who:

- A. Are clear, well organized, and reasonably dynamic (high energy) in class.
- B. Relate to students well and encourage office visits (are available).
- C. Show that they like to teach and generally enjoy being there.
- D. Teach to *average* as well as high-performing students, inspiring all to take further philosophy courses and some to become philosophy majors.
- E. Revise content to engage students, not merely to conform to University regulations.

A primary goal of this course is to make philosophy both intellectually and personally interesting to a degree sufficient to cause students to want to take more philosophy courses. It stresses the importance of philosophy in preparation for and, we hope, in anticipation of further focus on specific philosophers and philosophical questions in upper-division courses.

## PHIL 2030 Policy

### 1. Purpose:

The Introduction to Ethics course addresses ethical problems through lecture, class discussion, analysis of arguments, and selected readings of philosophers of historical import, but it is *neither* a history of philosophy course *nor* one that focuses exclusively on just a few philosophers or just a few topics. It establishes a basic vocabulary of issues, positions, and terms foundational for the course and for further work in philosophy. Finally, it stimulates as powerfully as possible an interest in the value of ethics as an integral part of the liberal arts curriculum and as relevant for personal meaning and decision-making. Ideally, students should leave the course wanting to study more philosophy, and they should be encouraged to do so (especially in PHIL 3000, but also in 2010, 3010, 3020, 3060, 3710, or 3720).

### 2. Content:

A. The course must include an introduction to the structure of arguments (many students will not have taken PHIL 1010). Ideally, students would be introduced to crucial distinctions and terms: premises, conclusions, inductive and deductive arguments, validity and soundness, necessary and sufficient conditions, counterexamples, logical consistency, possibility and necessity, and perhaps also some informal and formal fallacies, some common valid argument forms (e.g., *modus ponens*), and the difference between factual and normative questions, and so on. Many of these concepts can be introduced in the context of discussions of the topics below; some instructors include one or two lectures on the structure of arguments.

B. The course must include must at least one topic in normative theory and at least one topic in applied ethics. Sample topics include, but are not restricted to:

1. Normative theories: utilitarianism, deontology, contractarianism, virtue ethics, feminist ethics;
2. Applied ethics: mass incarceration, legalization of drugs, immigration, terrorism, free speech vs. hate speech, gender identity, animal rights, abortion, euthanasia, death penalty, the meaning of life.

C. Instructors are strongly encouraged to include some selections from philosophers who are minorities or non-Western thinkers. Instructors are strongly encouraged to have at least 20% of the readings written by women authors.

### 3. Organization:

The course may include both classical selections and contemporary sources in the proportions deemed appropriate by the instructor. Ideally, each class would include some combination of lecture and classroom discussion and debate. With these requirements one could teach only the six required major topics in considerable depth, but most sections of 2030 cover a greater

number of topics, the task being one of finding a proper balance between considerations of breath and of depth, historical and contemporary readings.

#### 4. Writing:

The course must include a writing component such as a paper, essay tests, journals, short essays, or summaries of readings. Instructors teaching multiple sections of large classes should carefully consider how to structure writing assignments so that grading them in a timely manner will be possible.

#### **PHIL 2030 sections taught by GTAs**

When Graduate Student Teachers (GTAs) teach PHIL 2030, they are required to observe a full-time faculty member teach either PHIL 2010 or PHIL 2030 during a prior term and to use a syllabus, schedule of readings, tests, and handouts approved by the Coordinator of Graduate Teaching. GTAs are required to follow the policies outlined above, to have at least 20% of the readings' authors be women, and to use readings that are available on iCollege or on-line so that students do not need to purchase a textbook.

#### **Pedagogical Recommendations for PHIL 2030**

See the pedagogical recommendations for PHIL 2010.

## **PHIL 3000 Policy**

### **1. Purpose:**

This seminar, required for all majors, serves as the introduction to the Philosophy major. It is meant to cover a specific philosophical topic (or set of related topics) in great depth. It has a limited enrollment to encourage and allow close attention to and revision of written work and to allow stimulating class discussion. It is a Critical Thinking Through Writing (CTW) course designed to improve students' analytical and writing skills. This in-depth investigation of a topic should allow students to develop an informed position and the argumentative skills necessary to defend it successfully, both orally and in writing.

In addition, PHIL 3000 should prepare students to take more advanced philosophy courses, reinforcing skills and concepts covered in 2010 and developing students' abilities to read and comprehend challenging texts, to formulate ideas and arguments in oral and written form, and to understand the nature of philosophical debates and arguments. By exposing students to a variety of approaches towards and arguments about a fascinating topic of interest to the instructor, PHIL 3000 should also inspire students to consider majoring in philosophy or to continue the Philosophy major. Ideally, it will also introduce undergraduates to the Philosophy department's community and inspire them to become an active part of it.

### **2. Content:**

Within the general guidelines, the content of these courses is entirely up to the instructor. The seminars should cover one topic or set of related topics in depth, and ideally should present several approaches to answering questions about this topic. Students must gain further exposure to crucial skills for proper reasoning and philosophical concepts they will be expected to understand in higher-level philosophy courses. The course must include at least a review of the structure of arguments and crucial terms, such as validity and soundness (all students will have taken 2010 and some will have taken 1010). Students should also be introduced to other distinctions and terms that will be important for understanding the reading and discussion in advanced philosophy courses (keeping in mind that some students may not take symbolic logic). Samples of these are: premises vs. conclusions, inductive vs. deductive arguments, validity and soundness, necessary and sufficient conditions (and counterexamples to them), logical consistency, conditionals and biconditionals, possibility vs. necessity, informal and formal fallacies (e.g., false dichotomy, affirming the consequent), common valid argument forms (e.g., modus ponens, disjunctive syllogism), differences between factual and normative questions, realism vs. anti-realism, objectivism vs. subjectivism, a priori vs. a posteriori, conceptual analysis, thought experiments, the is-ought fallacy, intentional fallacy, identity, reduction, types vs. tokens, infinite regress, Occam's razor, paradox, the principle of charity, tautologies, and begging the question. Many of these concepts can be introduced in the context of discussions of the philosophical topic, though some may be introduced separately.

### 3. Organization:

As in PHIL 2010, this course may include both classical selections and contemporary sources in the proportions deemed appropriate by the instructor, and may be arranged historically or topically, as best fits the course content. Class meetings should include a combination of lecture and classroom discussion and debate; consistent with the smaller size of these classes, students should be actively encouraged to participate in discussion.

### 4. Writing:

The course will be organized around the production (through multiple drafts) of a final seminar paper, though instructors may require more than one paper and may or may not require outside research for the paper (though teaching research skills is encouraged). See sample paper assignment below. *At least 40% of the final grade in these courses must be based on written work.*

### 5. CTW Policy:

The professors will give each student's final draft two grades: one on critical thinking and one on writing. The grades will be given on the A-F scales with +/- . See grading scale below. In philosophy, critical thinking is the skill of correctly evaluating the arguments made by others and composing good arguments of one's own. In this document, "writing" refers to the skill of writing clear, well organized, and grammatically correct English prose. This information, probably jointly with other assessment data collected, the professor's qualitative impressions of student work, and a draft assessment report written by the Assessment Coordinator will be discussed at the Department's annual assessment meeting. The report will, if necessary, indicate recommended changes to the CTW courses or the assessment of CTW. The CTW ambassador will then revise the report as needed and submit it to the College CTW program.

### Sample Paper Assignment

Topic description: Due date

A topic description is a statement of the issue you will consider in your paper. It does not have to state your view on the issue (although it may), but it should indicate you have read the relevant text(s) and considered the argument you will be addressing. It should be no more than one page.

Research overview: Due date

Here you will provide a one-page explanation of at least two articles, not covered in this class, that discuss your topic. The articles must be from sources listed in The Philosopher's Index or Philpapers.org and they must have been written since 1990. You must provide the complete citation for each article in Chicago style format.

Thesis statement: Due date

A thesis statement states your view on the issue you have chosen. It should be no more than one page.

First draft: Due date

The first draft of the paper is not a rough draft. It is complete and finished product that will receive a grade.

Final draft: Due date

The final draft of your paper should carefully respond to each and all of the comments I make on your first draft.

Each of these assignments should be well written. None of them is a rough draft. In each case, the quality of your writing is a major grading criterion. In particular, students sometimes fall into the trap of thinking that because the first assignments are short, they do not need to spend too much time making sure that their prose is clear and grammatically correct. Be sure that you avoid this mistake.



## PHIL 3010 and PHIL 3020 Policy

### 1. Purpose:

PHIL 3010 and 3020 are required of all philosophy majors. They are intended to provide students with a background in the history of philosophy and prepare them for a wide range of 4000-level courses.

### 2. Content:

- A. *Proper reasoning and philosophical terminology.* The course should reinforce and sharpen critical thinking and writing skills developed in introductory courses. The course should also introduce students to important philosophical vocabulary from ancient and modern philosophy— for example, hylomorphism, teleology, *eudaimonia*, corpuscularianism, primary vs. secondary qualities, substance vs. accident, sovereignty, and so on.
- B. *Metaphysics and Epistemology.* Instructors must devote a significant portion of the course to topics such as the following:
  - a. Change over time, the nature of substance, appearance vs. reality;
  - b. The nature and limits of scientific explanation;
  - c. The nature of the soul/mind and its relation to the body;
  - d. The nature of thought and its relation to sense perception;
  - e. Arguments for and against skepticism;
  - f. The existence and nature of god.
- C. *Value Theory.* Instructors must also devote a significant portion of the course to topics such as the following:
  - a. The nature and value of the virtues;
  - b. The good life for a human being;
  - c. The nature of moral judgment;
  - d. The roles of reason and sentiments in ethics;
  - e. The ideal state, and the nature and justification of political sovereignty
  - f. The nature of aesthetic judgment.
- D. *Diversity.* Instructors are encouraged to engage with non-canonical authors or important historical developments in science, religion, politics, and culture. Examples of this would be the emergence of Judaism and Christianity in the Mediterranean, the impact of African thought on ancient or early medieval philosophy, the writings of women philosophers and scientists in early modern era, the impact of the Protestant Reformation, and the rise of capitalism or colonialism.

### 3. Organization:

Different instructors will meet the above content requirements in different ways, depending on the instructor's own philosophical interests and pedagogical judgment. But instructors are expected to cover A and at least one or two topics from both B and C. Courses devoted entirely to Plato's theory of tyranny or Locke's rejection of innate ideas, for example, would be too narrow. For the sake of stimulating student interest and reflecting recent developments in scholarship, instructors are also encouraged to incorporate some elements listed under D. It is expected that class sessions will contain a balance of lecture and discussion that fits the level and purpose of these courses.

#### 4. Writing:

PHIL 3010 and 3020 must include a substantial writing component—such as a final paper, take-home essay tests, or reading response papers—that includes evaluation of others' arguments or advancement of arguments of one's own. Instructors teaching multiple sections of large classes should carefully consider how to structure writing assignments so that grading them in a timely manner will be possible.

#### **PHIL 3010 and 3020 sections taught by GTAs**

When GTAs teach PHIL 3010 or 3020, it is expected that they will consult with the tenure-track professors or lecturers who typically teach these courses in order to design a syllabus, select readings, and develop assignments that will serve these goals; the final syllabi, readings, tests, and handouts must be approved by the Coordinator of Graduate Teaching.

## **Awarding Incompletes**

An incomplete (an “I”) may be given to a student who, for nonacademic reasons beyond his or her control, is unable to meet the full requirements of a course. In order to qualify for an "I", a student must:

- Have completed most of the major assignments of the course (generally all but one); and
- Be earning a passing grade in the course (aside from the assignments not completed) in the judgment of the instructor.

A grade of incomplete is awarded at the discretion of the instructor and is not the prerogative of the student. Conditions and deadlines to be met for removing a grade of incomplete are established by the instructor. However, these conditions and deadlines must conform to the University policies for removal of incompletes. See below.

No student may graduate with an "I" on his or her record.

Incompletes are awarded by assigning the grade of “I” in GoSOLAR. (A paper form is no longer necessary.) Instructors must send an email to the student’s official GSU email address that outlines the conditions and deadlines to be met for removal of the incomplete.

GTAs are not allowed to assign an “I” to any student without advance permission of the CGT. We want to make every effort to minimize if not eliminate the use of “I’s” because GTAs are often not on campus the following term.

## **Removal of Incompletes and Grade Changes**

The University requires that a grade of I be removed no later than the end of the second academic term after the grade of I was assigned. The University specifies that registering in a subsequent semester for a course in which a grade of incomplete has been received will not remove the grade of incomplete. The Office of the Registrar will assign a grade of F at the end of the second academic term unless it receives an approved grade adjustment request from the instructor.

To remove an incomplete or change a grade, use the Grade Change Request link under the Faculty Menu in GoSOLAR.

- Log in to GoSOLAR.
- In the Main Menu, click on Faculty Menu.
- Click on Grade Change Request and follow the instructions.

## GTA Absence from Teaching Pre-Approval Form

The absence from work by any GTA must be approved in advance and in accordance with the following procedure. This form must be used for all absences other than immediate illness or emergency.

1. When you know in advance, for example, that you will be reading a paper at a conference, or attending an invitation from a doctoral program to which you are applying, your first job is to figure out what to have your students do in your absence. Then ask a fellow GTA to cover your class.
2. This form must be submitted at least two weeks in advance to the Coordinator of Graduate Teaching. Included in the submission should be an explanation and reason for the cause of absence (for example, that the GTA is reading a paper at a professional conference), as well as the details of how the GTA intends to cover the classes missed (for example, providing the name of another GTA who has agreed to teach the missed classes).
3. The Coordinator of Graduate Teaching will make a recommendation to the Chair of the department that the request be granted or denied, based on the explanation and reason for the absence.
4. The Chair of the department will approve or disapprove the request.

Name of GTA: \_\_\_\_\_

Date/Times of Missed Classes: \_\_\_\_\_

Reason/Explanation for Absence:

SIGNED by GTA \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

SIGNED by CGT \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Initial Recommendation by CGT: Grant Deny

APPROVED \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
Department Chair

## **Recommendation on Politeness and Keeping It Professional**

This section is not department policy. It is nothing more than some words of wisdom from the Department Chair.

When dealing with students, especially when delivering bad news or interacting with students who are upset, it is important to be polite, professional, and calm. If a student gets upset or insulting, one natural human reaction is to get upset and respond in kind. This natural reaction should be resisted. It generally leads to escalation. On the other hand, it is also important to resist another natural human reaction—the desire to give the student what s/he wants even though s/he does not deserve it just because the student is upset and bothering you.

If you are talking to an upset student in person, it is best not to cut the student off. Let them saying their piece while nodding and listening. Only when the student is finished should you respond.

In e-mails, it is important to be polite and professional. It is also important to respond promptly. Here is an example.

### **-----Original Message-----**

>>> John Doe <jdoe1@student.gsu.edu> 9/5/2016 7:52 AM>>>

To: jinstructor@gsu.edu                      Subject: You are so stupid

My name is John Doe. I can't believe that you will not let me into your class! I know we are in the fourth week of classes but I need it to graduate and I was dropped due to problems in financial aid. I can't afford another semester here! There are so many stupid people like you at GSU!

### **-----Bad Response -----**

>>> Jane Instructor <jinstructor@langate.gsu.edu> 9/15/2016 9:55 AM >>>

To: jdoe1@student.gsu.edu                      Subject: Your request

Get off my case. There is no way you can get the material if you start in the fourth week!

### **-----Good Response -----**

>>> Jane Instructor <jinstructor@langate.gsu.edu> 9/5/2016 9:55 AM >>>

To: jdoe1@student.gsu.edu                      Subject: Your request

Dear Mr. Doe,

Thank you for your e-mail. I fully understand your difficulties with regards to finances and the University, and you have my sympathies for these troubles.

However, at this point in the semester, you have missed the majority of the foundational material for the class. I think it would be extremely difficult for you to do well. For this reason, I must regretfully decline your request.

Sincerely, Jane Instructor

## **Locker Usage Policy**

- Lockers are assigned on a first-come, first-served basis
- You must provide your own lock.
- Lockers are semester-base usage only. At the end of each semester, you must clear out all contents of your locker. Failure to do so will result in the cutting of your lock and the discarding of its contents.
- No food/beverages, hazardous, or illegal materials may be stored in the lockers.
- Lockers should be used to store school/teaching supplies and personal items necessary for use at the university.
- You are solely responsible for the contents of the locker. The Department assumes no responsibility for loss or damage of any item(s) in a locker; locked or unlocked.
- You must keep your locker in good condition.
- There is a fee for damaged lockers. It is the cost to repair the lockers plus \$25.
- Failure to comply with the usage guidelines may result in loss of privileges.
- All lockers are the property of GSU. Although the Department will attempt to respect the privacy of locker occupants, the Department reserves the right to cut the occupant's lock at any time. The Department also reserves the right to alter the policies governing the use of lockers.

## **After Hours Use of the Computer Lab**

Students currently enrolled in a philosophy graduate program may use the Philosophy Department computer lab outside of University business hours. However, access is student ID swipe-card controlled. Each individual student must swipe in using their own card and guests are not permitted. Providing floor and/or computer lab access to another person will result in loss of computer lab privileges. For example, graduate students may not let other graduate students or the students in the classes they are teaching into the computer lab. So that we have a complete record of who is on the floor after hours, graduate students who are in the computer lab when the office closes will need to leave the lab and swipe back in.