One of my current passions is the study of nineteenth-century English Canadian philosophy, and what continually fascinates me during my studies are the repeated references by various Canadian scholars to the necessity of a philosophical education. In Canada's unrelenting quest to build a society that would have an identity distinct from both that of their English forebears and their American neighbors, both English and French Canadians never failed to consider and understand the importance of an educational system for the survival of a society, of a culture. More importantly, even though it is only the former group that occupies my studies at the present moment, what I discovered was that they never doubted for a moment the central role that "moral and mental philosophy" should have in that educational system.

Subsequent readings led me to discover that one of the more essential characteristics of English Canadian educational philosophy was its insistence on developing a balance between knowledge as critical inquiry and a moral conservatism. This "moral conservatism" must be understood within a nineteenth-century context, where "conservatism" meant not only a respect for a unified moral order, but also implied a pursuit of a commonly perceived social good. Metaphysically, this conservatism was decidedly idealistic, and politically, it was socialistic. The "community good" was understood to be the primary value, and any emphasis on individual interest or on the possession of competitive rights was seen to be in opposition to this "good." Concern for others and the performance of social duties were to be emphasized in the educational process. It is not surprising, therefore, that these philosophers and educators believed that knowledge for its own sake was to be set aside or held in lower esteem than a knowledge that enabled a person to develop as a responsible member of the community.

About this time, some reader might well be asking what these personal reflections on Canadian intellectual history may have to do with the AAPT or the teaching of philosophy in the twentieth century? First, we must consider that these early Canadian thinkers, no less than Plato, Kant, or Hegel, were aware of the role philosophy (especially ethics and philosophical psychology) could and should play in the development of individual character and the preservation of value in the community. Second, we may have reached a time in our history when we do not question relativistic approaches to values or personal assertions of rights. Today, some individuals regard the proposal that objective or universal values really exist as an act of intolerance. We live in an age when many fail to see that the performance of duties may be more fundamental than any assertion of rights. It may be a time when many are too timid to recognize that individuals cannot exist apart from communities, or from responsible interrelatedness with others. Finally, I am somewhat certain that each of us questions our society and its practices, and each of us
has bemoaned the current quality of our students, and each of us may find that we have to engage in a daily struggle to maintain the place of philosophy in the university curriculum. Given this, may we not be well advised to revisit the moral and educational idealism of our philosophical ancestors and neighbors, and try to discover why they had the courage to believe differently—to believe they ought to fight vigorously against “progressivism” in education and all that it might entail, namely, excessive individualism brought on by unrestrained capitalism which dictates the structure and content of academic endeavor and the more dangerous legacy of moral and cognitive relativism?

At this point, there will be some who may wish to accuse me of being illiberal, and so they may. I, however, am not arguing for the imposition of doctrine on education, and neither were my Canadian muses. On the contrary, they believed that a truly liberal education must be free from all dogmas or sectarian biases. As Egerton Ryerson argues: “[T]o employ our intellectual and moral powers according to the principles of reason and truth, is the great end of our existence. It should, therefore, constitute a leading feature in every system of sound education” (17). Ryerson, like his contemporaries, believed that a liberal education enables one to improve him/herself, and consequently the community, on all levels of human activity—physical, mental, and moral.

One would not be wrong if they sensed I am questioning our lack of willingness to be “PROFESSORS.” What is a professor if not one who takes a stand or avows a position, and after that avowal invites rational discussion and disciplined inquiry? What better avowals to make than those that affirm the necessary value of community and the primacy of duties over rights? Perhaps as teachers of philosophy we can take a cue from such nineteenth-century Canadian thinkers as Jacob Gould Schurman, who would argue that any moral proposition necessarily involves a concept of community if the proposition is to be considered relevant in any way (Armour and Trott 194). Or those more convinced by twentieth-century thinkers may look to someone like John Macdonald. In examining Macdonald’s position in his short introductory work on philosophy, The Expanding Community, Armour and Trott reflect that Macdonald believes values develop over a historical period as a result of community activity. They are not expressions of the individual but of the community. For it is in the options which a community makes possible that values can take root and grow. The individual has desires and performs actions; he adopts values as a means of reconciling his own behaviour or conduct with that of others. In a sense the values are endemic to the idea of a community. (399)

Or perhaps in the final analysis we could find our courage as professors in the words of a current Canadian thinker, Charles Taylor, who reminds us that “the modern exaltation of individual freedom ends up eroding the loyalties and allegiances to the wider community which any society needs to survive” (56). Undisciplined freedom, like undisciplined knowledge, may be a source of our current educational discomforts. If we are honest as philosophers and as teachers, we ought not to fear examining that possibility. Perhaps we may discover that a truly liberal and philosophical education is an affirmation of those loyalties and allegiances of which Taylor speaks!

I expect there will be some responses—pro and con—to what I have written here. I welcome such a debate and invite you to join me in a dialogue on AAPT-L.

Note

1 See for example A. B. McKillop, A Disciplined Intelligence: Critical Inquiry and Canadian Thought in the Victorian Era, pp. 5–52. McKillop argues that Canadians always believed that there existed a central moral purpose to education, that education existed to develop a “disposition of mind,” that education was processed according to fixed principles, and that they wished to avoid both relativism and dogmatism in the educational process.

References


TEACHING PHILOSOPHY IN THE NEW MILLENNIUM

The following is a partial, and highly condensed, version of an AAPT panel discussion at the APA Eastern Division meetings in December 1998. It is offered here as a probe: “What do you expect will be the challenges of teaching philosophy in the future?”

Question to TARA HOAG (SUNY, Farmingdale): “We hear a lot about ‘the new students.’ You have done considerable research on higher education. What are some of the demographic trends and cultural factors that are affecting higher education and what are some of the projections for the future?”

The beginning of the new millennium conjures up some vivid imagery for educators. Perhaps your own mental picture includes a scene of students engaged in distance learning, participating in courses via a home computer with real-time audio and video capabilities. Maybe you picture a science class where the instructor uses new media technology to project three-dimensional images of genes on a large screen. While the digital revolution will certainly influence educators for years to come, there is another, more basic force that will compel us to examine teaching and learning even more critically. That force is in numbers. Student demographics in the United States are about to undergo a radical change from anything we have experienced as educators in the past twenty years. Two major demographic events characterize this alteration: the coming of age of the baby boom “echo” generation and the aging of baby boomers. By 2010, educational institutions will simultaneously need to cope with the largest traditional college freshman population, as well as the largest non-traditional, adult student population. Accompanying these demographic shifts is the fact that higher education today has a much different cultural, economic, and social value than it did for previous generations. Demographics can account for part of the picture, but the altered way in which Americans view higher education will also influence how and to whom we teach.

Changing Values

We have all encountered anecdotal evidence suggesting that the social and economic value of a college education has changed. Just a glance at any college catalog reveals whole curricula (for example, industrial psychology, multimedia design, or professional writing) that would not have been considered part of a traditional university fifty years ago. In general, the emphasis of a four-year college degree has changed from providing students with a broad background in the liberal arts to furnishing college graduates with the skills and technical knowledge necessary to succeed at specific jobs. When did this shift begin to occur? The GI Bill of 1944 began a debate about the role of federal funding for education, and the gradual shift in educational policy starting in the 1950s, higher education enrollments grew as servicemen went to college and as the effects of various federal financial aid programs were realized. College enrollments overall increased 45 percent between 1969 and 1979 as the postwar baby-boom generation reached college age.

At about this time (1960s–70s) a shift in educational policy from selectivity to access fundamentally changed the demographic profile of the traditional college student. It could no longer be assumed that the typical college student was an 18- to 24-year-old white upper-class male paying his own way as a full-time student. Policies emphasizing access meant that more women, minorities, immigrants, and students of both sexes from working-class families could attain a college education. At the same time, important cultural shifts such as the return of women to the workforce, a rise in the divorce rate, and increased immigration had wide-reaching implications for higher education. The student profile altered as more first-generation college students, students from single-parent families, and adult students seeking to enhance career skills enrolled in colleges. Non-traditional student groups provided an alternative market for educators, and demographics took on new importance to college administrators, who began to realize that enrollment projection would no longer be as simple as figuring out the number of graduating high-school seniors.

The evolving mission of higher education is most dramatically reflected in our students. In a statistical profile of incoming 1997 college freshman, 72 percent gave “to be well off financially” as their goal of attending college, while only 41 percent cited “the opportunity to develop a meaningful philosophy of life” as a goal. In 1970, 80 percent of all incoming freshmen ranked the latter choice as important. While it is tempting to locate the cause of this utilitarian shift with the students themselves, to do so would overlook other factors affecting higher education. The attainment of a college education has become inextricably intertwined with the American dream: it gives individuals the blueprint to pursue a rewarding career, which in turn provides the financial stability needed to make dreams into reality. College literally pays. The figures are compelling. On average, college graduates earn 77 percent more than high school graduates.

The Baby Boom Echo

Now, higher education is in the midst of two major demographic trends. First is the effect of the baby-boom echo generation. Between 1975 and 1990, the number of children born per year in the U.S. increased an average of 2 percent per year, for a total increase of 32 percent in the birth rate overall. There were 4.16 million births in 1990, a number that is a scant 3 percent short of
the 4.32 million births at the height of the baby boom in 1961. Educated baby boomers postponed families to pursue careers, resulting in an upswing in the birth rate through 1990 that is popularly known as the baby-boom echo. This demographic anomaly is expected to result in a 20 percent increase in the number of high-school graduates between 1995 and 2005. Because the high school completion rate nationwide is also on the rise, the high school graduating class of 2008 is expected to be at least 7 percent larger than the graduating class of 1979. Thus, our traditional market for higher education will be much larger than what we have encountered in recent decades.

This increase will not be felt equally across the nation, however. According to U.S. Census Bureau projections of population by age, and state-level projections of high school graduates, nine out of the ten states with the fastest population growth rate are in the West. The Western region of the U.S. can also expect a 34 percent increase in the number of high school graduates by 2005, compared to a 17 percent increase in the Northeast, an 8 percent increase in the Midwest, and 17 percent increase in the South. This is historically significant, since the West has always had the smallest high school graduating classes in the nation. Aside from their increased numbers, the baby-boom echo generation will also differ socially and culturally from their predecessors. The most significant characteristic of future college students will be their ethnic diversity. By the year 2000, one-third of the school age population across the United States will consist of African American, Asian, Native American, and Latino students. Nonwhites and Latinos accounted for 28 percent of the nation's high school graduating class of 1995.

Nonwhite college enrollment rates are also increasing at a higher rate than white student enrollments. Between 1982 and 1992, there was an 8.7 percent increase in the number of white students, compared to a 26.6 percent increase in Black student enrollment, an 80 percent increase in Latino students, and an 88 percent increase in the number of Asian students. Gaps in the college enrollment rates for 18- to 24-year-olds by family income are also narrowing. Of those college students with a family income of $50,000+ in 1993, 58.4 percent were white, 47.4 percent were African American, and 50 percent were Latino (U.S. Census Bureau).

Despite both a rise in the number of nonwhite students and a slight increase in the rate of doctorates awarded to nonwhites, minorities are not choosing higher education as a career. The number of higher education faculty members, administrators, or boards of trustee members has remained relatively stable over the past thirty years, and people of color account for only 12 percent of full-time faculty members. College faculties and administrators will need to find new ways to address the demands of an increasingly multicultural student body.

The Greying Academy

Another significant demographic change that will affect higher education is the aging of the baby-boom generation. By the year 2000, more than 40 percent of the population will be over 40. If birth rates continue to decline, the number of older Americans relative to the rest of the population will only increase. Not only are people living longer, they are continuing to work later in life. And, they continue their education. In 1997, about 44 percent of all college students were age 40 or older (U.S. Census Bureau). Older students form the crux of what is considered the "non-traditional" student market, and their needs and demands are driving changes in higher education. A recent study conducted by the Educational Resources Institute and the Institute for Higher Education policy examined the motivations and aspirations of these older students. The study found that the typical 40+ student is white, female, and married. Most attend college on a part-time basis, and cite increased educational requirements for employment, changing life circumstances, and personal growth as the primary factors motivating their return to school. Students over 40 in general have better grades than their younger counterparts, but take longer overall to finish their degrees. The study also found that employers are playing an increasingly important role in facilitating higher education, by providing tuition assistance or partnering with universities and other entities to offer post-secondary education and training.

The aging of the student population will necessitate changes in the way we deliver higher education. Among the needs of older students are: more flexible schedules to accommodate their work and family life, alternative means of accessing classes and resources remotely, increased need for health services and mature housing on campuses, rethinking of the curriculum to accommodate changing work force requirements, and a reexamination of the educational financing system that currently focuses aid efforts on high-school seniors. Perhaps the most compelling effect of this demographic change is that it will occur at the same time as the influx of younger students from the baby-boom echo generation — and little research or planning has been done thus far to address the impact of this simultaneous participation in higher education. Despite these challenges, the future looks bright for post-secondary institutions that can respond to changing student needs: tomorrow's students will be older, younger, and more ethnically diverse, and there will definitely be more of them.

Sources


Question to JAMES CAMPBELL (University of Toledo): “Tara ended on a fairly positive note. Given your research interests in the history of American philosophy, what are some of the differences between the turning of the 20th century and the turning of the 21st? Do you think we should be optimistic or pessimistic as we go into the new millennium?”

The institutional mood leading up to the turn of the last century was extraordinarily positive. Then, there was the birth of a stream of well-funded universities like Johns Hopkins (1876), Clark (1889), and Chicago (1892). Now we have such institutions as the University of Phoenix and the Western Governors’ University. Then, there was the expansion of many colleges into universities—Harvard and Yale, Michigan and Virginia—by the expansion of faculties, the creation of powerful graduate schools and well-funded university presses, etc. Now the move to university status all too often means little more than an expanded M.B.A. program and a new letterhead. Then, graduate study meant a year or two of interaction with the available literature, followed by creative personal work. It also led directly to a fulfilling career, sharing this learning and research with students in a traditional academic position. Now, graduate study means attempting to navigate a tidal wave of secondary literature and being forced to work on some narrowed philosophical shard. It also usually leads to part-time teaching with little possibility of anything better. Then, there was a palpable commitment to academic excellence and a faith in the humanities to mollify the problems of the coming century. Now, there is little or no belief in the relevance of the humanities. Our institutional commitments are elsewhere: to the acquisition of grant money, a quest that disenfranchises the humanities; to the retention of students, something that should be the result of successful educational programs rather than the goal of administrative initiatives; to efficiencies like the overuse of part-time instructors, which fragment education.

I think it is of utmost importance to talk with students about the meaning of education. My message includes: that learning matters; especially that learning in the humanities matters; that experience is to be trusted over inherited doctrines; that in democracy there should be access for all to the height of their abilities; that few jobs available at present are worth having, let alone preparing for during the brief moment of higher education, etc. I usually rely on such figures as Ralph Waldo Emerson, John Dewey, and Benjamin Baber.

Unfortunately, I feel that this message is disconnected from students in today’s economic and academic climate. I teach at a public university of more than 20,000 students that is open to all high school graduates. Our classes are full of mostly working-class, first-generation students, many of whom are not the traditional eighteen- to twenty-two-year-olds. We have a modest, introductory-level humanities requirement that students often fulfill in their senior year, when they are more concerned with job interviews than with how the humanities can enrich their lives. My message emphasizes the primacy of getting an education over getting a degree, but contemporary students—banded in by economic responsibilities and uncertainties, and unhelped by academia’s current trends—are more inclined to pursue the latter.

I still think that it is of utmost importance to talk with students about the meaning of an education. But, in the present climate, I do not see such discussions as having much effect. Overall, my sense of the near future is not very positive. I hope that others have a more positive sense, and that they are right.

Questions to JAMES FRIEL (SUNY, Farmingdale): “What are the changes that you think are most important and how are they affecting the way you teach?”

I am in the English-Humanities Department at the State University of New York at Farmingdale. Farmingdale is a college with about 5000 students. It has a Liberal Arts Department with about 500 students, numerous technical programs which grant Associate in Arts degrees, four-year technical programs—some of them, such as Securities Systems, leaders in their field. Clearly our college has a melange of programs.

The student body is also diverse. Most students are first-generation college students. Most students are white, many of Hispanic background, and a smaller population are of African-American descent. There is also a sizable population of new immigrants from around the world representing countries such as Poland, Somalia, Pakistan, Nigeria, Yemen, Iran, Hong Kong, and India.

Some general comments about Farmingdale’s population that might also be made, in varying degrees nationally, are: older students make up a growing minority, people who have lost their jobs are going to college for retraining, and everyone seems to be jamming into technical fields.

The job market, which drives the various curricula, is a bit like an accordion. Some fields expand rapidly, and then they just as quickly collapse. A good example of this is the nursing field. A few years ago nursing students were told that the A.A. degree would soon be insufficient for their field and that they would need a B.S. Incredibly, what happened is that the A.A. degree became one of overqualification instead, and a series of lesser degrees and certificates became standard certification for the field. Some areas of certification involve only a six-week technical course after which one receives a certificate. Obviously a revolution has occurred within this field and this revolution shows how dangerous it is to predict the needs in these fields, and, consequently, the kinds of students we will be teaching in areas such as philosophy.
There are other fluidities as well. Mergers in corporate America, for example, are changing the relationships between education, getting a job, and commanding a good salary. Many new jobs are for part-time, contract workers with lower salaries and fewer or no benefits. Meanwhile, ever-changing political pressures affect the funding of higher education. Tuition is on the rise, and university governing boards are engaged in efforts to dictate academic standards and to eliminate remedial courses.

Against this changing background, how does one teach a philosophy course, recognizing that often the student will take only one such course in his or her lifetime? The answer: with great difficulty.

First of all, I agree with James Campbell that a historical perspective is essential in education. I think we should teach what American culture has meant up until now, what it still means, and how it is changing. Freedom, for example, is a concept central to the United States. Tracing its roots, debating its meaning, and considering both its consequences and its limits are philosophical inquiries that, while not limited to American interests, can nevertheless enrich our understanding of our heritage and culture.

Secondly, I feel it is necessary for me to involve the student in the class in an active way. Lecturing doesn’t work today as it used to, when students were passive spectators, unskilled in asking questions. Many students have already experienced active learning in their high school classrooms and prefer it. In my classes, for instance, I regularly use The New York Times. This paper gives the class a vast number of articles to use in discussion. Important skills, such as reading comprehension, are also developed. In addition, I draw extensively upon Teaching Philosophy, the leader in the field of teaching philosophy. Finally, I use an internship program in writing and volunteering/citizenship through Aitia/Humanities Magazine, which I edit.

I encourage oral presentations as a major part of my course. I give a double grade, one for the research on which the presentation was based and the other for the talk itself. I give extra credit for a particularly effective presentation, and students who give the first few talks are given announced special consideration. As a result of this approach, instead of twisting arms to have people go first, there is a clamor among students to go first.

Thirdly, I try to develop more of a sense of community in the classroom. My primary technique, mentoring, involves teaming up people who can help each other. In my classes, for example, oral presentations are done by teams, and the students in each team develop very positive mentoring relationships with each other.

While I have never tried it, mentoring can also be used in test taking. Some students already use this approach, in studying together. It would be interesting to have team testing. By taking a test together in groups, the students could help teach each other. There would be a tendency for the brighter student to pull up the grade of the academically lower student, and vice-versa. Collaboration is not such a bad idea, especially if it is seen as a preparation for the real world.

Mentoring can also be extended to helping students assist one another with choices like majors in college, professions they are going to pursue, and in the whole array of their personal choices. I would see my role as encouraging students to work together in many ways, and in helping students overcome the isolation that dominates the lives of so many of them. This approach would be a variation on the old Biblical theme: a student helped by a student is like a strong city.

I do a great deal of mentoring of students myself, and in unexpected ways. I have walked students across the campus to psychological services (with their consent of course) to get help with big problems. I have also accompanied students to the administration to help them resolve some academic or personal problem. The problems vary from the very serious, e.g., suicidal tendencies or threats to a student’s life, to those that are less dramatic, such as a loss of health insurance because the student couldn’t get a course needed to be fully matriculated. The list is endless.

In conclusion, I think it is important to teach philosophy as best as we can, by actively engaging the students. I also think it is essential to develop individual academic skills and also a sense of community. Lastly, I think we must keep in mind that we are teaching men and women who have a number of concerns and problems that have to be dealt with and are not being dealt with. This latter point can probably be summed up by stating that the teaching enterprise is built on mutual respect among persons.

Questions to BETSY DECYK (California State University, Long Beach) and ROBERT TIMKO (Mansfield University): “Tara opened with a futuristic scenario of computer learning. Not only are the students changing but also the technologies for teaching are changing. Why should we use the new technologies, such as computers, for teaching? How best can we use them? What are some of the current limitations? And what skills might we need to develop to use them better?”

Betsy: Bob, you have had quite a lot of experience in computer-assisted learning and distance learning. What has motivated the use of computers at Mansfield University?

Bob: Computer instruction has been developed at Mansfield to meet the needs of the “new” student. Last term, easily 25 to 30 percent of my students were older, lower income, first members of their family to seek higher education, often single parents with full-time jobs. E-learning communities give them a chance to participate asynchronously. Courses can be delivered to students when they are able to participate, rather than forcing them to meet the instructor’s or the university’s schedule. Many of these “new” students commute as much as 50 to 60 miles one way to class, and during the winter months or when a child is not well, this becomes “iffy,” if not treacherous.

Betsy: In Southern California, of course, we do not usually have bad weather to force telecommuting, but other factors do
favor asynchronous learning. We, too, have older students, and students with children and/or day jobs. And, of course, we have traffic and pollution problems.

While there are more and more homes with computers, it is still not clear to me that many of our students have adequate access to computers or the computer literacy to use them. I used e-mail discussion groups one semester, but it did not work very well. There seemed to be both access and support problems—many students did not seem to have computers at home, and at school they seemed to have access, but not technical help from the people at the computer center to get on and make it work. Do you find that you as the instructor are the one who has to provide the technical assistance?

Bob: Unfortunately, I did have to provide all the technical assistance. The upside to this was that I learned a great deal about computer technologies and that the students also learned about computer languages and technologies. The downside was that there was less time spent on the content of the course and the students’ critical thinking and writing processes. A balance needs to be struck between the learning process and its instruments of delivery.

Betsy: What have you used for computer instruction and how did it work?

Bob: A key component of my e-community learning is the linked e-mail or “Bulletin Board,” an exercise in which students post their ideas for others to read and make comments. One thing about linked e-mail or “Bulletin Boards” I have found is that students will write their own ideas and will comment on what others say more readily than they will participate in asking questions or engaging discussion in the classroom. This occurs on e-mail even though their identity is known to all. Perhaps giving them time to reflect and “compose” what they have to say is useful.

Betsy: Have you discovered any specific problems moderating discussions in this format?

Bob: Typically, students are reluctant to create a discussion on their own. You must give them a specific question to respond to. Also, instructors have to be able to step back and not comment on everything students write in such an exercise, and sometimes you have to really resist the temptation to correct spellings and grammar. Should the need arise, corrections can be made diplomatically in a private e-mail to the student.

Betsy: Can you give some specific examples of questions or “prompts” that you have used?

Bob: I believe that there are two stages to the discussion—“initiation” and “continuation”—each requiring its own kind of prompt. To initiate discussion, I have used precise direction, viz., students are given a specific reading assignment and are asked a particular question or given a specific direction in writing about the assignment. Eight to twelve of these assignments will occur during a term. In the early weeks the questions should be very precise: e.g., “In your own words, restate theory X”; or “Imag-
student are the moral-political ones, ones with immediate relevance to their lives. Technology may be pushing us not only to reconsider the form of our teaching, but more importantly it may be driving us to reconsider the content of that teaching.

Betsy: Right now, we have a very messy set of theories about intelligence and learning. Howard Gardner writes of multiple intelligences (Frames of Mind, 1983), Robert J. Sternberg writes about multiple thinking styles (Thinking Styles, 1997) and others talk of learning styles. Do you think that the on-line experiences “reach” different learners than traditional classroom techniques?

Bob: The technology, I believe, works better for visual learners than others, and works better for the learner who is attracted to detail (those who are stimulated by bits and bytes) rather than for the individual who approaches problems holistically.

We must also be aware, however, that the computer-assisted learning may form obstacles for students who are visually impaired. Last term I had a student who couldn’t read a computer screen even when we enlarged the fonts, and we had to employ a tutor to read e-mails and quizzes to the student and assist in typing in responses. The student became frustrated with the arrangement and opted to have traditional assignments, etc.

You have done work on learning and thinking styles. What do you think about computer-based instruction in these areas?

Betsy: I believe that you are right that the computer can benefit visual learners. However, I believe we can do more than just making text available on screen. We can, for instance, build web links that connect philosophy to the historical culture or current issues. Someone studying Plato or Aristotle, for example, could take a virtual tour of Greece and someone studying 17th-century philosophy could also see examples of seventeenth-century art.

Furthermore, a significant number of my students identify themselves as kinesthetic learners. This means that they prefer to learn by doing something, rather than listening or watching. Indeed, active learning exercises work very well in my classes. I think we have a great opportunity to help these students do philosophy on line.

The discussion groups are a start, but I would like to see us really think about what the strengths of computer learning are, and capitalize on them to engage more students, different kinds of students, in philosophy. For example, we might be able to develop a set of instructional materials in which students would identify at the outset their learning strengths and then could choose instruction primarily in that mode. In addition, students might opt or be required to try learning in other modes to have more practice in those modes that are less developed.

Bob: Can you give a brief description of what materials might be used to assess learning strengths prior to participating in a web-based course?

Betsy: There are a variety of ways to assess learning strengths and weaknesses. Thomas Armstrong has written a book called Seven Kinds of Smart: Identifying and Developing Your Many Intelligences. This book, which popularizes the multiple intelligences Gardner identified in Frames of Mind, has checklists that students can use to assess their own strengths and weaknesses.

At CSU Long Beach the learning assistance center gives a test to students to identify different learning styles. If your campus has a learning assistance center, you could check there. There is also a learning style inventory web site at http://www.hcc.hawaii.edu/hccinfo/facdev/lsi.html

In addition to these sources, in my critical thinking classes as an assignment early in the semester the students have to reflect on their own learning successes and difficulties, both in school and outside of school, and try to identify their own learning and thinking styles. The students find this self-assessment very helpful. Before the assignment, students often either blame the teacher or blame themselves for their difficulties. With the assignment they begin to see that there are other possibilities—for example, the class may not be taught in a way that they learn best. With this kind of awareness, the students gain some control over their learning by changing the information from the way it is presented to the way they learn best. With computers, it may be easier to learn the material in ways that fit a particular style, or learn material in multiple ways. Educationally, I actually think that the latter is the best.

Bob: Do you have any other ideas about changes in teaching and learning that you anticipate?

Betsy: Because I am trained as a mediator, one of my interests is in communication and the different dimensions of communication. Many misunderstandings can be traced to mismatches in communication styles and expectations. In a sense, e-communication forms a new linguistic community, and it may be that we will need to rethink how we talk with each other, in order to communicate effectively. Certainly you and I have had misunderstandings and miscommunications via e-mail. I suspect we will all need to develop skills for overcoming these problems, and these skills will go beyond merely e-mail etiquette and the emotional signs to add feelings to e-mail messages :)

Bob: I think you are right about the new technologies challenging and changing our ways of communicating with others. Last term I did a video-linked course with a colleague in Ontario. One of the ways we tried to reduce misunderstandings was through extensive advanced planning. A number of “tools” had to be prepared and their use discussed in detail. We also discovered it was necessary to carefully script the course.

Betsy: Yes, computers and other technological advances are so “fast” and have the potential for providing flexibility in instruction, but they also have their own limitations and pose challenges. The bottom line for me is quality of education for our students. How can we use the advances in technology to improve philosophical teaching, learning, and inquiry?

Bob: I think we both recognize that technology is not a panacea for educational ills and that using technology forces us to confront problems in our teaching. As we confront these problems and find solutions, we will be improving teaching and learning in the new millennium.
Hints for Teaching Demonstration Classes at Interviews

Dr. Erin Livingston
Bermuda College, Bermuda

1) Planning (things to do before you go on the market — start now!)
   a) Keep track of lessons students or colleagues find appealing/interesting. A file of potential lessons for fly-outs lessens the stress when you are on the market.
   b) Create a syllabus for every course listed as an AOS or AOC on your C.V. (These may be requested by schools with whom you interview anyway.)
   c) Create at least one fully developed lesson for each of these syllabi. (These are also useful during the initial interview process.)
      i) Choose the area with which you are most familiar.
      ii) Avoid fresh or controversial topics.
   d) Turn these lessons into presentations/slide shows.
      i) Gets students' attention.
      ii) Serves as notes for you without being obvious.
      iii) Is easily modifiable to fit different situations.
      iv) Demonstrates some mastery of technology.

2) Preparation (starts when you get the call for the fly-out)
   a) Get all the details for the presentation. Also, ask for items you need for support — overhead projectors, etc.
   b) Do the research necessary for directing your lesson appropriately.
   c) Choose a topic.
   d) Modify an existing presentation to fit the parameters for the demonstration.

3) Practice (a lot!)
   a) Practice reading the lesson to yourself until you know the material cold.
   b) Be comfortable enough with the lesson that you do not need notes, but have them available anyway, just in case.
   c) People to practice in front of:
      i) Family and friends
      ii) Fellow graduate students and faculty
      iii) Your students
      iv) Colleagues' classes (this is the best choice)
   d) Make the practices dress rehearsals.

4) Performance (teaching the lesson)
   a) Speak slowly, make eye contact, smile.
   b) Be sensitive to facial expressions, attitudes; talk with/to the students, not at them. Do not expect too much participation from the student audience.
   c) Expect the unexpected, be flexible, go with the flow. Possible problems:
      i) Technology glitches
      ii) Lack of interest or participation
      iii) Students unable to read the materials
      iv) Disruptive/unruly students.

Submissions to AAPT News

Submissions on disk or as e-mail binary attachments are much appreciated. Most major PC word processor file formats are fine, but WordPerfect (5.1 and later), Microsoft Word for Windows, or Microsoft Word for Macintosh 6.0 are preferred. I prefer MS-DOS diskettes, but Macintosh diskette formats can be read. If you submit a file on a Mac diskette, be sure to save your file in text (ASCII) format in case we can’t read your word processor’s file format. Please include a paper copy of your submission.

Files may be sent as e-mail attachments from virtually any e-mail system to bdeycy@csulb.edu, or by FAX to (562) 985-7135. If you need help, call me at (562) 985-4346.—Betsy Decyk
MARK LENSSSEN

On March 17th, 1999, Mark Lenssen collapsed of an apparent heart attack while playing a noontime game of basketball. He died at Lima Memorial Hospital. He was 50 years old. He leaves his wife, Debra, daughters Anneka and Elisa, and his brother, John.

What do you remember about Mark Lenssen?

Gary Talsky writes of meeting Mark at the 1992 AAPT Workshop/Conference in Burlington, Vermont. “Mark was one of the first people I met at my first AAPT conference. Ever the persistent newsletter editor, Mark tried his best to get me to write up my reflections as a first-timer, but I ultimately declined. Nevertheless, because of his welcoming and encouraging attitude, I knew then that this was an organization of people who truly cared about teaching and growing as a teacher.”

All of us who knew Mark have our favorite memories. His eager participation in AAPT workshops. His well-considered advice at Board meetings. His disarming smile. His witty, but gentle humor. The flash of a tennis racquet.

My own favorite memory is of a long conversation Mark and I had at the 1994 barbecue in Montreal. As we talked into the growing twilight of a northern summer evening, I was impressed with his depth: the depth of his listening, the depth of his care and concern for teaching and for people — both students and colleagues. I felt first-hand how he could reach into the soul of someone else to encourage and to inspire.

As members of the AAPT we have much to thank Mark for. First of all, for his dedication to excellence in teaching philosophy. According to his brother, John, Mark was inspired to study philosophy by a high school history teacher who expected students “to look at the deeper issues and assumptions behind historical events.” True to this beginning, Mark used creative teaching techniques, such as dialogues and other writing assignments, to engage students in asking difficult questions and uncovering hidden assumptions, particularly about environmental and professional ethics.

We are also grateful for his dedication to the AAPT. As co-editors of the AAPT News, he and Daryl Close kept the AAPT members in communication. Always innovative, Daryl and Mark were the first to link us together electronically as well.

How shall we remember Mark Lenssen?

Mark’s family has suggested that contributions be made in Mark’s name to either the Mid-Ohio Chapter of the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation or the American Cancer Society.

At its meeting in May at the APA Central Division meetings in New Orleans, the AAPT Board discussed ways for the AAPT to memorialize Mark. One suggestion was to sponsor a graduate-student essay competition with the winning essay to be published in AAPT News. The Board welcomes additional suggestions.

The finest tribute to a person, however, is when we try to carry on what we have admired in that person. Daryl, Mark’s friend for almost twenty years, offered this kind of tribute to Mark at the memorial service. Daryl said: “Mark’s philosophical namesake, the great Stoic philosopher and emperor Marcus Aurelius, wrote:

Do not act as if you would live ten thousand years. Death hangs over you. While you live, while it is in your power, be good. (Meditations, IV:17)

Mark did that. He was a good husband and father. A good teacher. A good athlete. A doer of good deeds. A good friend. Mark was a good man in the classical Greek sense of the words. I loved you as I loved my own brother. I will be good while it is in my power. I will not live ten thousand years.”

I will begin by taking up this kind of personal tribute to Mark. May others do so as well.

Betsy Decyk
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Professor of Philosophy Richard E. Hart has been named the first recipient of the Cyrus H. Holley Professorship in Applied Ethics at Bloomfield College. The Holley Professorship in Applied Ethics is the College’s first endowed professorship in its 131-year history. The professorship will be used to foster teaching and scholarly/creative activity within the philosophy program and the College as a whole, with particular emphasis on applied ethics.

Richard has been active in the AAPT for many years. Most recently he has served the AAPT as its Treasurer. He has also given numerous workshops at AAPT conferences over the years. Besides his contributions to the AAPT, Richard has served on the boards or executive committees of the Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy and the Long Island Philosophical Society, and on the editorial committees of The Personalist Forum, Metaphilosophy, and Aitia.

Richard joined Bloomfield College in 1986, having taught previously at Hofstra University, Long Island University/C.W. Post from 1980 to 1986. He has delivered some 65 lecturers and presentations at conferences, professional societies, and universities through the United States, Canada, and England. Additionally, Richard has edited or co-edited three books: Ethics and the Environment (1992), Philosophy in Experience: American Philosophy in Transition (with Douglas Anderson) (1997), and Plato’s Dialogues: The Dialogical Approach (with Victorino Tejera) (1997). He has authored some 50 articles and reviews in the field of ethics, social philosophy, philosophy and literature, American philosophy, the teaching of philosophy, and on such figures as Martin Buber, Socrates, John Dewey, Justus Buchler, and John Steinbeck. His work has appeared in Transactions of the C. S. Peirce Society, The Personalist Forum, Process Studies, The Journal of Speculative Philosophy, Ethics, Teaching Philosophy, Business and Professional Ethics Journal, Vera Lex, Aitia, and as chapters in several books.

Founded in 1868 as a Presbyterian seminary, Bloomfield College today is an independent, four-year coeducational institution offering programs in the liberal arts and sciences and in pre-professional studies. The College has earned national recognition for its innovative, high-quality academic and co-curricular programs. Cyrus H. Holley, the donor of the professorship, was a 10-year member of the Bloomfield College Board of Trustees (1987–1997) and is retired executive vice president/chief operating officer of the Engelhard Corporation. He has been an active advocate for education, primarily through various state and national Partners in Education programs.
Rosalind Ladd
Honored

Rosalind Ladd, one of the six recipients of the 1998 AAPT Award of Merit, was presented her award at a special reception at the APA Central Division meetings in New Orleans in May. The award, which recognizes both excellence in teaching and leadership and service to the AAPT, is sponsored by Teaching Philosophy and was presented by Arnold Wilson.

Although she began teaching at Smith College, Roz has spent most of her teaching career at Wheaton College. In addition to her many contributions to her students in the classroom, Roz initiated a monthly series of teaching workshops at Wheaton in which she has remained actively involved. She has also promoted excellence in teaching through her organizational service. She was AAPT Vice President from 1986 to 1988 and AAPT President from 1988 to 1990. She was also Chair of the APA Committee on Pre-college Instruction in Philosophy from 1991 to 1994 and most recently she served as the Chair of the APA Committee on Teaching, and as Chair, also on the APA National Board, from 1996 to 1999.

Roz’s special interests in children’s rights and medical ethics have resulted in numerous professional and public presentations, articles in both philosophical and medical journals, and, in addition, have coalesced into three books: Children’s Rights Re-visioned: Philosophical Readings (edited), Ethical Dilemmas in Pediatrics: A Case Study Approach (with E. N. Forman), and Readings in the Problems of Ethics (edited). In addition to her position at Wheaton, she currently holds an appointment as Lecturer in Pediatrics in the Brown Medical School and teaches a course in Bioethics at Brown. She is also presently serving on the ethics committees of three hospitals.

If you didn’t know all this about Roz, don’t be distressed. Ever modest, when people ask her what she does, Roz says she sits around, reading novels and eating chocolates!

The other 1998 Award of Merit recipients were Martin Benjamin, Terry Bynum, James Campbell, Daryl Close and Mark Lenssen. Martin, Terry, James and Daryl were honored at the Mansfield Conference, which Roz and Mark did not attend. Mark would have also been presented his award in May if he had attended the APA Central Division meetings. Instead, Mark’s award was sent to his family.
AAPT ACTIVITIES

Even though the 1998–99 academic year is between the biennial AAPT workshop/conferences—and hence potentially a time for the organization to rest a bit—representatives of the AAPT have nevertheless been very active.

American Philosophical Association Divisional Meetings
(reported by Betsy Decyk)

The AAPT was on the program of all three divisional meetings of the American Philosophical Association during this period. At the Eastern Division meeting in Washington, D.C., the AAPT presented a panel discussion “Teaching Philosophy in the New Millennium.” The panel was organized by James P. Friel and the presenters included Tara Hoag, James Campbell, James P. Friel, Richard Hart, Betsy Decyk, and Robert Timko. (See the article elsewhere in this issue for comments from this session.)

At the Pacific Division meeting in Berkeley, California, the APA Committee on Philosophy at Two-Year Colleges and the AAPT presented a session “New Approaches to Elementary Textbooks.” The session was arranged by Louisa Moon, Chair of the APA Committee on Philosophy at Two-Year Colleges, and was chaired by Betsy Decyk. The speakers were Nina Rosenstand, the author of The Moral of the Story, and Max O. Hallman, the author of Transversing Philosophical Boundaries.

The AAPT also sponsored its own group session at the Central Division meetings in New Orleans. Robert Timko and Debra Penna-Fredericks discussed “The Effect of Technology on Teaching Health Care Ethics,” complete with on-line as well as off-line computer demonstrations of new teaching techniques.

AAPT Well Represented at Marquette University Graduate Conference
(reported by Gary Talsky)

After Marquette University graduate student Andy Gustafson attended the 12th Annual AAPT Workshop/Conference at Mansfield University (participating in Martin Benjamin’s Graduate Seminar), he returned home with the idea of pursuing the topic further: he organized a conference on teaching philosophy at his institution in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, held February 26–28, 1999. The AAPT was well represented at this conference, particularly in the two keynote speakers, Arnold Wilson (AAPT Vice President and Executive Editor of Teaching Philosophy), who reflected on “The Socratic Craft as a Profession,” and Eric Hoffman (AAPT member and Executive Director of the APA) who addressed “Our Response-Ability” in teaching philosophy. Arnold Wilson also held a session on “Student Relativism in the Classroom.”

Donna Engelmann of Alverno College co-presented (with Tim Riordan) a session on “Teaching Philosophy for Outcomes at Alverno,” and James Davis of Boston University presented “Educational and Economic Dilemma of Adjuncts and Part-time Faculty.” Erin Livingston, another participant in the Mansfield Graduate Seminar, shared her reflections on “What to Teach at an Interview.” Stephen Wandemacher of Michigan State discussed “The Cynical Student and Teaching Intro to Philosophy” and subsequently joined our organization.
Others attending the conference included AAPT Board members Nancy Hancock, Executive Director; Betsy Decyk, Interim Newsletter Editor and a former President; and Gary Talsky, Treasurer.

Other topics in the conference were “Teaching Philosophy with Argumentation Maps,” “The Fallacy Game for Teaching Informal Fallacies,” “Interdisciplinary Teaching,” “Service Learning,” “Teaching with Critical Thinking Exemplars,” “Virtue Theory and the Self,” “The Use of Student Web Pages,” “Learning Close Reading by Teaching Close Writing,” “Logic and the Undergraduate Term Paper,” and “Doctoring 101 Strangely (or How I Learned to Stop Bombing and Love the Worry).” Saturday afternoon included a panel discussion entitled “Advocacy and Neutrality in Light of Multiculturalism,” and a presentation hosted by Oscar Brenifier from Paris, France, on “Maieutics or Philosophy as a Practice.” The final sessions were on “Teaching via the Ancients,” “Teaching Nontraditionally,” and “Values in the Classroom.”

At its conclusion on Sunday afternoon, most, if not all, of the nearly sixty participants agreed that it was a stimulating and thought-provoking conference.

Pictured below are Dr. John D. Jones, Chair, Department of Philosophy, Marquette University; Arnold Wilson, Executive Editor of Teaching Philosophy and Vice President of the AAPT; Andy Gustafson, graduate student at Marquette University; and Eric Hoffman, Executive Director of the American Philosophical Association.
About a year ago, my department's chair called me in his office and gave me a handful of papers to “distribute, post, or otherwise disseminate.” Among other posters, brochures, and notices, I found an application for an upcoming graduate student teaching seminar as part of an AAPT/APA Teaching Seminar/Conference, which was scheduled for later that year. At the time, I was the Graduate Student Organization's secretary, so I made sure all graduate students received the information about the graduate student teaching seminar. Curiously, however, I was the only person to apply.

I attended the teaching seminar, funded jointly by the APA (which covered $250 of my travel expenses) and my department (which covered the rest). I am happy to say that attending the seminar was one of the most fruitful things I have done for my teaching career. In addition, as far as conferences go, the AAPT was the first conference I attended that made me feel like I was part of an organization.

Mansfield University, in north central Pennsylvania, hosted the Seminar/Conference in June of 1998. Martin Benjamin served as the moderator for the graduate student teaching seminar, which took place for the most part during the morning hours. (That way the participants could take advantage of the conference presentations in the afternoon.) Accommodations were rustic, but adequate. The setting for the seminar was conducive to learning: a beautiful campus nestled in mountains, and a nice, ample room with plenty of light, set up in a roundtable fashion.

What made the teaching seminar experience particularly enriching was that the thirteen participants came from widely diverse backgrounds. The gamut ran from newly appointed teaching assistants to just-graduated Ph.D. holders, from people who had only taught one introductory course to people who had proposed and taught courses in their own specialized field. Some student teachers had total freedom to teach their classes as they saw fit; others had the course designed for them.

Martin sent a selection of readings a month or two before the seminar to all the participants. These included historical excerpts such as “Kant as a Teacher,” as well as articles on topics specifically encountered when teaching philosophy, like the question of whether to teach ethics as an advocate or in a neutral way. These readings formed the basis for some of the discussions.

I left the seminar with an actual list of things to do (which is already more than I expected). Here is a short list of the salient topics from which I benefited:

- We paid particular attention to the importance of the first day of classes. The instructor sets the tone for the entire course in the first few hours of the class. The instructor should bear in mind that some (if not most) of the students on the first day of class are still “shopping around” for the right instructor. Some are looking to sit and listen, some want a seminar-style discussion group. By being up front about your expectations and general direction of the course you are allowing the student to make an informed decision.

- The course syllabus can (and should) serve as a written contract between the instructor and the student. As such, in addition to a schedule of topics to be covered, it should contain a list of course objectives, a list of course requirements, a breakdown of what you consider an “A” paper, essay, or test, what a “B” one, etc., and a clear description of how the final grade is figured.

- The issue of advocacy versus neutrality is important. Should you take a side on an issue or remain neutral and let the students form opinions on their own? That you take a position need not exclude the possibility that the students form their own opinions, but it does make it more difficult. The seminar actually affected my teaching style in this aspect. The class discussions convinced me that, for my style of teaching at least, being neutral is more effective.

I would be remiss if I left out some aspects of the Seminar/Conference that could be improved, so here is another short list:

- I met a few graduate students who attended the conference, but who had no idea the graduate student teaching seminar was taking place. The number of actual applications to the seminar was never openly discussed, but the impression I got was that all those who applied were accepted and that nobody was denied a slot. Both these things tell me that there is a problem in getting the word out about the seminar. If the information was distributed to all graduate level programs in philosophy in the U.S., then I find it positively intriguing to see that only thirteen people applied.

- The conference coordinators attempted to arrange the sessions so that the ones that might interest the teaching seminar participants took place in the afternoons. Still, there were a few conflicting presentations I wished I could have attended. I propose that next time the seminar start a day or two before the conference kicks off. That way, Martin can spend more time (a full day or two instead of several half-days) conducting the seminar. After the seminar is over, the participants can take full advantage of the conference.

- Finally, this seminar is important enough that I find it almost a crime that it is offered only every other year. Such an utterly beneficial seminar should be an annual event. Perhaps we can continue to improve the seminar program by increasing its profile, both by advertising it more and by turning it into an annual event.
A CALL FOR PROPOSALS FOR:

THE SCHOLARSHIP OF TEACHING

Preparation Future Faculty, Fall Conference

When: November 5, 1999
Where: Milwaukee, Wisconsin
Submission Deadline: September 13, 1999

The Preparing Future Faculty Programs of Marquette University and the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee invite proposals from faculty and graduate students for their upcoming conference on Scholarship and Professional Development. We welcome individual presentations, panels, round tables, and workshops on various aspects of Scholarship and Teaching, broadly defined, theoretical or practical, from any discipline. We are particularly interested in proposals that include interaction with the audience, but standard paper presentations are welcome as well. Proposals (which include an estimation of time length) should be 100-300 words. Presentations of various lengths will be considered. Standard papers should not greatly exceed 12 pages. Proposals must be postmarked by September 13, 1999. Accepted proposals will be announced by October 5, 1999.

Preparing Future Faculty is a nationwide program dedicated to helping graduate students develop as scholars and teachers. With this in mind, we have provided a list of possible paper topics (this list is by no means exhaustive!):

- Discovery-Teaching and Learning
- Understanding and Valuing Teaching as Intellectual Work
- How Scholarship Does/Should Affect Teaching
- How to Be a Teaching Scholar
- Research on College Teaching
- Teaching, Scholarship, and the Internet
- Utilizing Research in the Classroom
- Balancing the Demands of Teaching and Scholarship
- How My Teaching Affects My Scholarship
- Assessment of Student Learning as Scholarship
- What NOT to Do: Useless Scholarship, and Useless Teaching Methods

Please send proposals or abstracts to either of the following:

Andy Gustafson, PFF Coordinator
Graduate School
Marquette University
PO Box 1881
Milwaukee, WI 53201-1881
(414) 288-5957
52q8gustafson@marquette.edu
OR mupff@marquette.edu

Benjamin Schneider, PFF Coordinator
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
PO Box 604
Milwaukee, WI 53201
(414) 229-6638
terrapin@uwm.edu

We hope that this conference will be an opportunity for faculty and students to share questions and experiences related to teaching and scholarship. Our keynote speakers have not yet been selected, but that information will be forwarded to you ASAP. Registration is $20, and includes bagel breakfast and evening reception in downtown Milwaukee. (Checks can be made out to “Preparing Future Faculty.”) We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Andy Gustafson
Announcements

Notice of New Address and E-mail for AAPT

Please note that the AAPT home office has a new address. All membership dues and correspondence should be sent to:

Dr. Nancy S. Hancock, Executive Director
American Association of Philosophy Teachers
Department of Philosophy
University of Louisville
Louisville, KY 40292

Please also note that the e-mail address for the AAPT is now: aapt@philosophers.net

Program Co-Chairs for AAPT Conference in 2000

The AAPT is pleased to announce that Jim Cadello and Joe Givvin have accepted the positions of Program Co-Chairs for the next AAPT International Workshop/Conference on Teaching Philosophy, which will be held in the summer of 2000.

Go On Line with Other Philosophy Teachers

The AAPT maintains a list serve site. People can ask questions about teaching practices and get ideas about texts, syllabi, and course designs. To subscribe to AAPT-L, e-mail to LISTSERV@LSV.UKY.EDU the following one-line message:

SUBSCRIBE AAPT-L <your first name> <your last name>

AAPT on the Web

The AAPT web site address is:

http://www.mnsfld.edu/depts/philosophy/aapt.html

Reviews (continued)

As with other submissions to AAPT News, review submissions on disk or as e-mail are much appreciated. Files should be sent to bdecyk@csulb.edu. Submissions may be faxed to me at (562) 985-7135 or mailed to:

Betsy Decyk
Department of Philosophy
California State University, Long Beach
1250 Bellflower Boulevard
Long Beach, CA 90840-2408

For help, call me at (562) 985-4346.
AAPT BOARD MEMBERS

Nancy Slonneger Hancock, Executive Director
University of Louisville
aapt@philosophers.net

Robert M. Timko, President
Mansfield University
rtimko@mansfield.edu

Arnold Wilson, Vice President
The University of Cincinnati
Arnold.Wilson@uc.edu

James Campbell, Past President
The University of Toledo
jcampbe@stet.edu

Gary F. Talsky, Treasurer
Sacred Heart School of Theology
GFTalsky@aol.com

H. Phillips Hamlin, Board Member at Large
University of Kentucky
phamlin@uky.edu

Amy Bachr, Board Member at Large
Moravian College
mbachr@mec.org

Martin Benjamin, Board Member at Large
Michigan State University
benjamin@pilot.msu.edu

Joseph Givvin, Program Co-Chair
Thomas More College
jgivvin@mtm.mercy.edu

James Cadello, Program Co-Chair
Central Washington University
cadelloj@cwu.edu

Betsy Newell Decyk, Interim Newsletter Editor
California State University at Long Beach
bdecyk@csulb.edu

Calendar of Events

August 5–7, 1999 — 14th Annual Conference on Computing and Philosophy, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA

September 16–18 — Education and Technology II: Exploring Ethical Issues and Interactions, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA. Contact Richard Deitrich, 106 Materials Research Lab, Penn State University, University Park, PA 16802 (e-mail: rad119@psu.edu)

October 14–16, 1999 — Philosophical Issues in Ethics Across the Curriculum, Rochester Institute of Technology, Rochester, NY

October 15–17, 1999 — Michigan State University Graduate Student Conference in Philosophy, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI

November 5, 1999 — The Scholarship of Teaching, Marquette University and University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. (See additional information elsewhere in this newsletter.)

December 27–30, 1999 — American Philosophical Association, Eastern Div., Boston. AAPT contact: Jim Friel (516)420-2047

April 5–8, 2000 — American Philosophical Association, Pacific Division, Albuquerque, NM. AAPT contact: Louisa Moon, lmoon@mcc.miracosta.cc.ca.edu

April 20–23, 2000 — American Philosophical Association, Central Division, Chicago. APA/AAPT Teaching Workshops. AAPT contacts: Betsy Decyk, bdecyk@esulb.edu and Debra Penna-Fredericks, pennaf@slu.edu

From The Philosophical Calendar, ed. Nancy Simco, published by The Conference of Philosophical Studies.
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