



Analytical Papers & General Education

**PHIL 102
Ethics, Politics, & Law
Spring**



General Education

- **Eastern's history with Gen Ed**
 - Old, old, Gen Ed
 - Old, new Gen Ed
 - New Gen Ed
- **Learning outcomes and assessment**
- **Accreditation**
- **Our course is a “pilot” for Gen Ed assessment**



Outcomes

- **Learning outcomes**
- **Gen Ed outcomes**
- **“Thinking clearly, critically, and effectively”**
- **Identifies and explains issues, recognizes contexts and assumptions, acknowledges multiple perspectives, [supports conclusions with (good) evidence]**
- **Critical Thinking**



Rubric for Critical Thinking Assessment

- **Rubrics**
- **Three assessment “grades”**
 - Proficient
 - Adequate
 - Developing

“Proficient” Critical Thinking

- Identifies and explains issues
- Recognizes contexts and assumptions
- Acknowledges multiple perspectives
- Evaluates evidence to reach conclusions
- [Supports conclusions with (good) evidence]



“Adequate” Critical Thinking

- Can often identify and explain issues
- Generally recognizes contexts and assumptions
- Acknowledges multiple perspectives
- Can often evaluate evidence to reach conclusions
- [Supports conclusions with (some) evidence]



“Developing” Critical Thinking

- Inconsistently identifies and explains issues
- Ignores contexts and assumptions
- Is not able to acknowledge multiple perspectives
- Inconsistently evaluates evidence to reach conclusions
- [Fails to support conclusions with evidence]



Communications

- Not part of this pilot
- “Demonstrate the ability to **read**, **write**, communicate, taking into consideration purpose, audience, and occasion”
- Proficient
 - Consistently writes clearly and effectively and edits carefully and accurately
 - Documents sources accurately
- Adequate
 - Writes clearly and effectively and edits carefully most of the time
 - Somewhat inconsistently documents sources
- Developing
 - Fails to write clearly and effectively or edit carefully and accurately
 - Fails to document sources



Grades



- **A** – overwhelmingly “proficient”
- **B** – lots of “proficient”
- **C** – overwhelmingly “adequate”
- **D** – lots of “developing”
- **F** – overwhelmingly “developing”

Analytical Paper Assignment



We have seen that “the right to privacy” plays a huge role in the Supreme Court’s thinking about contraception, abortion, right to die, gay rights, and potentially gay marriage. The starting point for all of this is *Griswold v. Connecticut*. Write a short paper analyzing the Court’s disagreement about whether there was a constitutional right to privacy in the Bill of Rights and/or the 14th Amendment, and if so, where this right was to be found in the Constitution.

Analytical Paper Assignment



- 800 to 1500 words
- Double-spaced
- On the “above” topic
- **Required** organizational structure
 - Short introductory section
 - Analysis of **one** of the “pro-privacy” opinions [Douglas, Goldberg, Harlan, or maybe White]
 - Analysis of **one** of the dissenting opinions [Black or Stewart]
 - Your defense of why there is, or is not, a constitutional right to privacy

Analytical Paper Assignment



- Excerpts from the opinions in *Giswold v. Connecticut*
- 1st draft due, in class, 5/8/08
- **Required attendance 5/8/08**
- Peer review drafts
- Final draft due 5/15/08
- 30% of course grade

Academic Papers



- **Taking part in an academic discussion**
- **In-text citation**
 - Quotes: “privacy as a broad and multi-faceted cluster concept” (DeCew, p. 61)
 - Paraphrases: she also attempts to balance privacy against other values (DeCew, p. 61)
 - Bibliography: DeCew, Judith Wagner, *In Pursuit of Privacy*. Ithica, Cornell University Press, 1997.

My Students as Writers



- **My disappointment**
- **My responsibility**
- **My advice**
 - Why you are at a disadvantage
 - Assume the role of the expert
 - Your audience
 - Be a teacher
 - Have a thesis
 - Have an outline
 - Write in sections

One Way of Writing a Paper



- **Find an academic debate**
- **Find a spokesperson for one side**
- **Find a spokesperson for other side**
- **What do you think about this debate?**
- **Outline**
 - Very short introduction
 - Section One: Spokesperson’s A’s argument
 - Section Two: Spokesperson’s B’s argument
 - Section Three: Defense of your thesis