

## **PHILOSOPHY DEPARTMENT DEGREE PROGRAMS: Ph.D.**

Adopted November 26, 1979; revised Fall 1982; March 7, 1988;  
June 19, 1991; April 3, 2000; May 7, 2001; March 4, 2002; May 12, 2003;  
September 12, 2005

The University of Minnesota confers Ph.D. degrees in philosophy on graduate students who successfully complete the doctoral program of the Philosophy Department. Students are encouraged to consult the Graduate School Bulletin for information about the details of the Graduate School's requirements and procedures. The details of the Department's Ph.D. program are specified in this document. The Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) of the Department is responsible for interpreting specific requirements explained here and for administering the program.

### **I. Advising.**

Advising is a truly important part of a graduate program. Accordingly, students in the Philosophy Department's Ph.D. program are encouraged to consult with their advisers regularly, and they are urged to seek their aid at all of the program's important turning points: at the times of deciding what courses to take and what work to include on a degree program (see sections II and V), when deliberating about the papers to present for the Department's third-year review (see section VII), while preparing a thesis proposal and, later, when writing the thesis or dissertation (sections VIII and XI). (See Appendix A for the timing of the steps of the program and the department's definition of satisfactory progress.)

After an initial conversation and in light of the student's knowledge of faculty and particular interests, the Director of Graduate Studies assigns each student to a member of the Department's faculty as an advisee. Though the student may change his or her adviser earlier, the faculty member initially assigned usually serves in this capacity until the student submits a degree program to the Graduate School. At the time of submitting degree programs, each student is expected to select the member of the faculty who will serve henceforth as his or her adviser. A student may, however, change advisers after selecting one, and if at the time of submitting a degree program there is uncertainty about the subject of the dissertation a student may delay deciding whom to ask to advise the dissertation, though not longer than the date of the defense of the thesis proposal. Students select an adviser by asking a member of the faculty to serve in this capacity and by conveying the positive reply to the Director of Graduate Studies.

### **II. Course and Breadth Requirements.**

Unlike baccalaureate degrees and such post-baccalaureate degrees as the master's, the Ph.D. degree is not primarily a course or credit degree. In the spirit of this fact and with the exceptions of the minor and supporting program, the Graduate School imposes no course or credit requirement on it. Nevertheless, the Graduate School requires students to file degree programs, which specify graduate level work – except in the most unusual circumstances, course work from this and other graduate institutions – that students intend to include as part of their doctoral study. (See section V for details concerning submission of degree programs.) (See Appendix B for a suggested schedule for completing course work.)

The Philosophy Department follows the Graduate School in not imposing an overall course or credit requirement on the work of its doctoral students. However, it requires the programs of study of its

students to include graduate level work that displays a reasonable amount of breadth. In particular, the program must satisfy the following five requirements.

**A. Seminar requirement**

The program must include at least three 8-level seminars other than Phil 8081 and Phil 8085.

**B. Value theory requirement**

The program must include at least two courses, one of which must be from the following list:

- Phil 4310W: History of Moral Theories
- Phil 4321W: Theories of Justice
- Phil 4330: Contemporary Moral Theories
- Phil 4414: Political Philosophy
- Phil 4501: Principles of Aesthetics
- Phil 5415: Philosophy of Law

and the other of which must be another course from the above list or one of the following:

- Phil 4320W: Intensive Study of an Historical Moral Theory
- Phil 4510: Philosophy of the Individual Arts
- Phil 8310: Seminar: Moral Theory
- Phil 8320: Seminar on Medical Ethics
- Phil 8410: Seminar: Philosophy of Law
- Phil 8420: Seminar: Political Philosophy
- Phil 8510: Seminar: Aesthetics Studies.

4-level courses must include its paired 8-level workshop. Students desiring one of our seminars in values are strongly advised to have taken the 4- or 5-level course most clearly relevant to it.

**C. ELMS<sup>1</sup> requirement**

The program must include at least two courses in the ELMS area, as follows: one course in epistemology or metaphysics AND one course in philosophy of language or philosophy of science. The eligible courses for each of the four sub-areas are as follows:

Epistemology

- Phil 4105W: Epistemology
- Phil 8130: Seminar: Epistemology
- Phil 8131: Epistemology Survey
- Phil 8311: Feminist Theories of Knowledge

Metaphysics

- Phil 4101: Metaphysics
- Phil 4615: Minds, Bodies, and Machines

---

<sup>1</sup> 'ELMS' is an acronym for 'epistemology, philosophy of language, metaphysics, and philosophy of science'.

Phil 5222: Philosophy of Mathematics  
Phil 8110: Seminar: Metaphysics

#### Philosophy of Language

Phil 4231: Philosophy of Language  
Phil 8180: Seminar: Philosophy of Language

#### Philosophy of Science

Phil 4605: Space and Time  
Phil 4607: Philosophy of the Biological Sciences  
Phil 4611: Philosophy of the Social Sciences  
Phil 4614: Philosophy of Psychology  
Phil 5601: History of the Philosophy of Science  
Phil 5602: Scientific Representation and Explanation  
Phil 5603: Scientific Inquiry  
Phil 5606: Philosophy of Quantum Mechanics  
any of the 86xx seminars.

4-level courses must include its paired 8-level workshop. The 5-level version of a 4-level course satisfies requirement. Students desiring one of our seminars in ELMS are strongly advised to have taken the equivalent of a relevant 4- or 5-level course.

### **D. History of Philosophy Requirement**

The Philosophy Department expects of its doctorates a solid knowledge of the history of philosophy; it only require successful completion of the history of philosophy requirement. The Department offers students three ways to satisfy this requirement, as specified below.

To satisfy the history of philosophy requirement, students must complete courses in accordance with one of the following three options. Option #1 requires completing two courses, and options #2 and #3 each requires completing three courses.

Option #1: Phil 8081: Seminar: History of Philosophy – Ancient Philosophers  
and Phil 8085: Seminar: History of Philosophy – Modern Philosophers.

Option #2: Phil 8081: Seminar: History of Philosophy – Ancient Philosophers  
and two courses, including at least one 4-level course plus 8-level workshop, from the following list:

Phil 4040: Selected Rationalist, plus Phil 8010: Workshop  
Phil 4050: Selected Empiricist, plus Phil 8010: Workshop  
Phil 4055: Kant, plus Phil 8010: Workshop  
Phil 8090: Seminar: History of Modern Philosophy

Option #3: Phil 8085: Seminar: History of Philosophy – Modern Philosophers  
and two courses, including Phil 4010 plus 8-level workshop, from the following list:

Phil 4010: Selected Ancient Philosopher, plus Phil 8010: Workshop  
Phil 4030: Selected Medieval Philosopher, plus Phil 8010: Workshop

### Phil 8080: Seminar: History of Ancient or Medieval Philosophy

This requirement should be completed as soon as possible, and either it or the logic requirement must be completed by the end of the second year.

#### **E. Logic Requirement**

The Department's logic requirement may be satisfied by (1) completing Phil 5201 and Phil 5202 with an average grade over the two-course sequence of B- or (2) passing a four hour examination that examines the materials of these courses.

The requirement of Phil 5201 may be waived by the instructor of Phil 5202 for students with a suitable background in logic. The two courses will be given full TA support, including two discussion sections per week. If the requirement is to be satisfied by examination, the chair will appoint a committee of faculty to prepare, administer, and grade the examination.

This requirement should be completed as soon as possible, and either it or the history of philosophy requirement must be completed by the end of the second year.

In order to be making satisfactory progress in the program a student must have completed both the history of philosophy and logic requirements by the end of his or her third year and have completed the seminar, value theory, and ELMS requirements by the end of his or her fourth year.

It is expected that a graduate student can complete his or her course work in three years of full-time study by taking five courses for credit in each of the first two years and four courses for credit in the third year. The Department strongly encourages a student to register for an additional course each year during the first three years, registering for at least five courses for credit and one as an auditor in each of the first two years and four courses for credit and one as an auditor in the third year. This course load will provide a student with a greater breadth or depth of background than registering for only five or four courses, without taking up too much of the student's time.

Registering. Graduate students are expected to register for Fall Semester courses by August 10 and Spring Semester courses by December 30. The College of Liberal Arts imposes minimum student registrations on all 4-, 5-, and 8-level courses and cancels courses not satisfying the minima. So student neglect to register in a timely fashion may contribute to course cancellations.

#### **III. Language.**

The Department of Philosophy does not formally require demonstration of proficiency in a second language for the doctoral degree. It is the Department's judgment, nevertheless, that an ability to read one or more language in addition to English is an extremely useful accompaniment to a program of scholarly research in philosophy. There are also areas of philosophy in which other kinds of knowledge or skills will be useful or indispensable, e.g., methods of statistical analysis in some branches of social philosophy and techniques of manuscript or archival research in some areas of the history of philosophy. The Department relies upon advisers to point out to their advisees the importance of languages or other instruments of research in particular areas.

#### **IV. End-of-First-Year Review.**

Members of the Department's faculty are required to provide students with information about how their performances in philosophy are viewed by writing evaluations of their work in all of the courses that they complete and by placing these evaluations in their files. The Director of Graduate Studies is responsible for providing the faculty with forms for this purpose and for seeing to it that the evaluations get written and properly placed. Students' files are open to them to peruse at their leisure.

At the end of each semester, members of the Department meet to assess the performances of students who have been active in the Ph.D. program for two semesters. The work of each student is considered separately and, on the basis of records of course work, written evaluations, and general information, the faculty reaches one of three decisions:

- (1) to encourage the student to continue in the program;
- (2) to allow the student to continue in the program, but inform him or her of specific concerns the faculty has concerning performance or progress;
- (3) not to permit the student to continue in the program.

Two or more courses with incompletes is viewed as a matter of concern. Decisions of the faculty are communicated to the student by letter immediately following the meeting.

#### **V. Degree Programs.**

During their third semesters in the program, Ph.D. students are required to submit degree programs. Each student is required to submit the documents specified below to the Director of Graduate Studies a reasonable amount of time before the Department meeting at which degree programs are reviewed.

- (1) Degree program: work to satisfy the Department's major and the Graduate School's minor or supporting program requirements,
- (2) Courses to satisfy the Department's history and logic requirements,
- (3) Courses to satisfy the seminar requirement,
- (4) Courses to satisfy the value theory requirement and the ELMS requirement,
- (5) Titles and brief descriptions of three papers to be submitted for Stage One of the third-year review and the preliminary oral examination,
- (6) Names of more than four faculty members, including at least one outside faculty member (typically a department faculty member who holds a graduate appointment outside the department), from which the Director of Graduate Studies will choose the four members of the Stage One and preliminary oral examination committee.

## **VI. End-of-Second-Year Review and Preliminary Written Examination.**

At the end of each semester, members of the Department meet to assess the performances of students who have been active in the Ph.D. program for the equivalent of four semesters. Passing this review will also constitute satisfying the Graduate School's preliminary written examination requirement. (The Graduate School requires students pursuing a Ph.D. to pass preliminary written examinations in their major fields of study, and to file a form in the Graduate School showing this, before they may schedule preliminary oral examinations.) The work of each student is considered separately on the basis of records of course work, written evaluations, and general information. In order for a student's work to constitute satisfying the Graduate School's preliminary written examination, a student must have satisfied either the history of philosophy requirement or the logic requirement, taken at least two courses from the lists of courses that satisfy the value theory and ELMS requirements, and taken five philosophy courses in which the student has satisfactorily completed written papers. When completing this review, the faculty will reach one of three decisions:

- (1) to encourage the student to continue in the program;
- (2) to allow the student to continue in the program, but inform him or her of specific concerns the faculty has concerning performance or progress;
- (3) not to permit the student to continue in the program.

Either decision (1) or decision (2) will constitute satisfying the preliminary written examination requirement. On rare occasions the end-of-second-year review and the satisfaction of the preliminary written examination requirement may be postponed for up to one semester for review of further written work. Decisions of the faculty concerning the end-of-second-year review and the preliminary written examination requirement are communicated to the student by letter immediately following the meeting.

## **VII. Third-Year Review and Preliminary Oral Examination.**

The Graduate School requires all Ph.D. students to pass a preliminary oral examination. For philosophy graduate students, passing the preliminary oral examination requires passing Stage One and Stage Two of the department's third-year review, described below. The preliminary oral exam committee consists of the four faculty members chosen in accord with the procedures listed in Section V above. One committee member is the outside member, and if the outside member is not a department member, he or she should be informed in advance that the examination may require more than one sitting. Since the examination requires both Stage One and Stage Two of the department's third-year review, the exam should not officially be scheduled with the Graduate School until the date for Stage Two has been determined: consult with the Assistant to the DGS about officially scheduling the exam. Once the committee chair receives the examination form, the committee members will sign the form to record their votes.

The Department's third-year review has two stages. The preliminary oral examination committee conducts the first stage of the review and reports its findings to the Department. The Department as a whole conducts the second stage in light of the preliminary oral examination committee's report and the entire record of the student's work and decides whether the student's work is of sufficiently high quality to satisfy its standards for this evaluation.

## Stage One

It is the responsibility of each student to set the dates of the oral examination of three papers that will constitute Stage One of his or her preliminary oral examination, having reached agreement on this matter with the members of his or her committee. The first meeting of this examination must occur on or before the last day of the first month of the semester following the semester in which the student will have been active in the program for four semesters. The date of the second meeting, if there is to be one, is to be agreed upon at the time of the first meeting and must not be distant from the last permitted date of the first meeting by more than four months. In no case can the third session of the evaluation take place later than the last day of the month preceding the last month of the student's sixth semester in the program. The student should notify the Assistant to the DGS of the date of each session of this oral examination.

The basis of the committee's part of the third-year review is three papers that a student will have presented to it and the oral defense he or she makes of them in discussion with the committee members. The titles and the brief descriptions of the papers that a given committee will consider will have been agreed upon at the Department meeting mentioned in section V above. The papers must be on topics at least two of which represent different areas of philosophy. No single paper may exceed twenty-five pages in length without the unanimous consent of the committee. Students may, but are not required to, submit papers that have been written for courses taken during their four semesters in the program. Students are expected to consult with their advisers, and with the instructors for whom given papers were written, before submitting papers to their committees' members. Papers must be submitted to a committee a considerate amount of time before the scheduled date of a session of the examination (two weeks is usually considered considerate in this context).<sup>2</sup>

After its members have read the papers, a committee meets on the dates for which given sessions of its evaluation have been scheduled to assess its student's papers and to discuss them with the student. A committee is not empowered to make a completely positive or a completely negative report to the Department (see (a) and (d) below) unless its student has defended his or her papers orally at the meeting on the basis of which this report is made. After each session of the examination a committee makes one of four reports to the Department, which it presents in writing to the Assistant to the DGS.

- (a) In the Committee's judgment the papers and oral defense are of a quality that meets the Department's standards for the purpose of this evaluation.
- (b) In the Committee's judgment not all of the papers, perhaps none of them, meet the Department's standard of quality, but the student should be given the opportunity to rewrite and resubmit the deficient papers for further evaluation by either the full committee at a subsequent meeting or a subcommittee of one or more members if agreed to unanimously by

---

<sup>2</sup> The Philosophy Department Council has approved a statement that explains the criteria that evaluation committees employ during the first stage of the third-year review. This statement appears as Appendix C of this document.

the full committee (no departmental action is required in the case of this report, but the report must specify which papers are to be rewritten and who will evaluate them).

In case a subcommittee is formed, a date will be set by the full committee by which either the subcommittee will have approved the revised paper or informed the student as to what further revisions are required and that the full committee will need to convene for the next session. Note that subcommittee evaluation counts as a continuation of the meeting in session, and it can be followed only at the first or second session.

- (c) In the Committee's judgment not all of the papers, perhaps none of them, meet the Department's standard of quality, but the student should be given the opportunity to make up the deficiencies, at least partly by replacing deficient papers with other work (this report requires departmental action, and it must specify the new work to be evaluated).
- (d) In the Committee's judgment the papers and oral defense are not of a quality that meets the Department's standards and the student should not be permitted to continue further with this part of the evaluation.

Committees meeting for a third time must make reports of the first or last type.

## **Stage Two**

The Department meets in a timely manner to receive and act upon reports of Stage One examination committees and, where appropriate, to conduct its stage of the third-year review. Prior to any such meeting the Director of Graduate Studies will check a student's record to see whether he or she has satisfied the history and logic requirements. A student is not considered to be making satisfactory progress in the program if he or she fails to complete the Department's history of philosophy and logic requirements by the end of his or her sixth semester. Upon receiving reports of the first and fourth type, the faculty of the Department considers separately the whole record of each evaluated student and reaches one of three decisions:

- (1) the student's work to date is of sufficiently high quality to satisfy the criteria of the Department's third-year review;
- (2) the student's work to date is not of sufficiently high quality to satisfy the criteria of the Department's third-year review, but the student should be given further opportunity to improve it (detailed specifications of additional work, and time limits for the completion of it, are given to the student in this case);
- (3) the student's work to date is not of sufficiently high quality to satisfy the criteria of the Department's third-year review and the student will not be given the opportunity to proceed further with the evaluation.

Decisions of the faculty concerning the third-year review are communicated to the student by letter immediately following the meeting. In the circumstance that the third decision above is reached, the Director of Graduate Studies sends a letter to the Graduate School terminating the student from the Department's Ph.D. program.

### **VIII. Oral Defense of Thesis Proposal.**

Although from the standpoint of the Graduate School students in doctoral programs become candidates for the Ph.D. degree when they successfully complete their preliminary oral examinations, the Department does not regard a graduate student as a candidate for the Ph.D. degree until he or she has successfully completed an oral defense of a thesis proposal. The committee for this examination will consist of the three faculty members who are intended to serve as inside members of the student's final oral examination committee and, if he or she agrees, the outside member of that committee. Students are responsible for arranging the date of this examination with their committee members. A considerate amount of time before the date of the examination, each student is required to present a description, of reasonable length, of the thesis he or she proposes to write. A thesis proposal should include details of organization, secondary material to be considered, the conclusions to be argued for, and some specification of the steps that will be taken to arrive at them. The Assistant to the DGS should be notified of the date of this examination.

Students must receive positive votes from at least three members of the examination committee in order to pass the examination. The examination committee can, if it judges that the student's performance on the exam warrants it, recess the examination to meet on another occasion. If it does reach this decision, it should convey to the student, preferably in writing, what the student needs to do to prepare for the next session of the examination. It should also notify the Department of this decision.

A student is expected to pass the oral defense of a thesis proposal by March of his or her fourth year. A student must have passed the oral defense of a thesis proposal by December of his or her fifth year in order to be making satisfactory progress in the program.

### **IX. Thesis Title and Proposal Form.**

The Graduate School requires graduate students to file the title and a brief statement of their thesis with the Graduate School by one semester after successful completion of their preliminary oral examination. The Graduate School will accept this thesis proposal form before a student has taken the preliminary oral examination, but because of the timing of the preliminary oral examination in philosophy's program, philosophy students are advised not to take advantage of this opportunity. The Graduate School appoints the final oral examination committee upon recommendation from the Director of Graduate Studies when it approves the thesis proposal form. Since a philosophy graduate student will ordinarily not file this form until after his or her defense of a thesis proposal, he or she should meet with the Director of Graduate Studies in advance of the defense of a thesis proposal to settle the membership of the final oral examination committee. Unlike the case of a preliminary oral examination committee, the chair of a final oral examination committee cannot be the candidate's thesis adviser.

### **X. Subsequent Reviews.**

The Graduate School requires that there be a yearly review of every graduate student. These reviews are held at the Department's May meetings. For end-of-fourth-year review and beyond, it is the responsibility of a student's adviser to call attention to any questions regarding the student's progress in the program. If there are none, the student will be considered to be making satisfactory progress. All students who will have completed their fourth year will be checked to see if they have satisfied the seminar, value theory, and ELMS requirements. All students who will have completed their fifth year will be checked to see if they have successfully completed their oral defense of a thesis proposal.

Students who have not completed the doctorate within fifteen months of their end-of-seventh-year review will be terminated from the program. Such students may however be readmitted for one semester if and when an adviser certifies the dissertation is complete and ready for defense. The Department may, upon recommendation of the Director of Graduate Studies, approve exceptions to this termination policy for particular students in particular circumstances for time limited periods. The Director of Graduate Studies will inform each student in writing of the results of the yearly reviews.

### **XI. Thesis.**

A philosophy thesis, or dissertation, should constitute an original contribution to the field of philosophy, and it must at least display mastery of the area of philosophy to which it is a contribution. Dissertations should be written in good English prose. It might prove helpful to the candidate in the midst of writing a dissertation to consult with his or her thesis readers as well as his or her adviser, but the adviser bears primary responsibility for providing aid and encouragement. A candidate might also profitably arrange to present a portion of his or her work in a colloquium, for the criticisms and suggestions that such a presentation will generate may prove helpful in getting over rough places.

Before the date of a final oral examination may be officially set, a signed thesis reviewer's report form, which certifies that a thesis is ready for defense, must be filed with the Graduate School. The Graduate School adheres rigidly to the rule that at least a week's time must elapse between the date of the filing of the thesis reviewer's form and the date of the final oral examination. Since conscientious thesis reviewers read every line of a thesis carefully and require all major difficulties to be worked out before signing a thesis reviewer's form, degree candidates are encouraged to submit completed copies of their thesis to their thesis reviewers well in advance of the date on which they wish their final oral examination to be held. The Assistant to the DGS should be notified of the date of the final oral examination.

### **XII. Final Oral Examination.**

The Philosophy Department holds its final oral examinations in locations on campus suitable to the occasion of the examination. In compliance with the policy of the Graduate School, all Ph.D. final oral examinations will be open to the public, and if attended by the public will have the format specified by the Graduate School. Notification of the place and time of an examination will be posted on the Department's bulletin board and on the graduate student bulletin board, and the examination will be publicized more broadly if the student so wishes. At a final oral examination a degree candidate defends his or her thesis in light of criticisms raised by the four or five members of the examining committee. Candidates must receive favorable votes from all committee members but one to pass the examination. The members of the committee of a successful candidate recommend their candidate to the University for the conferring of the doctoral degree.

### **XIII. General Remarks.**

The faculty believes that graduate education does not end in the classroom or in the fulfilling of requirements or passing of examinations. Informal discussions with faculty and students, and active participation in the Department's colloquium program, are perhaps as valuable as the activities described in this document. We are here to learn from one another and to avail ourselves of the resources of our community. Don't hesitate to meet and discuss your interests and work with your fellow students, your adviser, other members of the faculty, and the public at large.

## Appendix A

### Ph.D. student progress: schedule of departmental and graduate school actions

This schedule defines satisfactory progress in the Philosophy's Ph.D. program. Students may seek to arrange extensions in the schedule by consulting with their adviser, the DGS, and the department.

<u>Year in program</u>	<u>Step</u>	<u>Timing</u>
1 <sup>st</sup>	end-of-first-year review	May
2 <sup>nd</sup>	graduate student programs	December
2 <sup>nd</sup>	preliminary written examination and end-of-second-year review	May
3 <sup>rd</sup>	three paper evaluation 1 <sup>st</sup> session 2 <sup>nd</sup> session, if necessary 3 <sup>rd</sup> session, if necessary	by September 30 by January 31 by April 30
3 <sup>rd</sup>	preliminary oral examination and third-year review	December or May <sup>3</sup>
4 <sup>th</sup>	thesis proposal defense	by December <sup>4</sup>
4 <sup>th</sup>	end-of-fourth-year review	May <sup>5</sup>
5 <sup>th</sup>	end-of-fifth-year review	May <sup>6</sup>
5 <sup>th</sup>	final oral exam	by May <sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Students whose work is not judged to be satisfactory in the department's third-year review by the latter date are considered to be making unsatisfactory progress.

<sup>4</sup> Students who take their thesis proposal defense before March of their 4<sup>th</sup> year may compete for a dissertation fellowship in that year without prejudice to their progress.

<sup>5</sup> Students who have not completed the seminar, value theory, and ELMS requirements by the end of their 4<sup>th</sup> year are considered to be making unsatisfactory progress.

<sup>6</sup> Students who have not completed their thesis proposal defense by December of their 5<sup>th</sup> year are considered to be making unsatisfactory progress.

<sup>7</sup> Students may extend their dissertation work into the 6<sup>th</sup> year without prejudice to their progress.

## Appendix B

### Graduate student credit and non-credit course work under semesters

Individual student programs may vary from these patterns in some respects with the consent of the student's adviser, the DGS, or the department. Faculty who teach philosophy graduate students should view the graduate student as taking three courses per semester and arrange the workload for their courses accordingly.

	<u># of courses</u>
<b>A. Courses for credit</b>	
Required areas: <sup>8</sup>	
ELMS (epistemology, language, metaphysics, science)	2
history	2
logic	2
non-philosophy (courses with non-philosophy designators) <sup>9</sup>	2
value theory	2
Elective courses: <sup>10</sup>	4
Seminars: three courses from the above must be 8-level seminars other than Phil 8081 and Phil 8085	
<b>B. Audited courses</b>	3
	<hr/> 17
Schedule of courses:	
1 <sup>st</sup> year	6
2 <sup>nd</sup> year	6
3 <sup>rd</sup> year	5
	<hr/> 17

---

<sup>8</sup> The numbers listed here are minima.

<sup>9</sup> These courses and two philosophy courses from the required areas or elective courses constitute the "supporting program"; students may choose a supporting program in an area of specialization or an area of competence. Two or more additional non-philosophy courses may be required of students with a minor (as contrasted with a supporting program).

<sup>10</sup> The number here is an approximation.

## Appendix C

Stage One of the Department's third-year review is the occasion on which a graduate student demonstrates his or her ability to do the kind of written work demanded in a Ph.D. dissertation.

Except in unusual circumstances, a paper that receives an 'A' in a course is not of sufficient quality for purposes of this evaluation, but is a paper that, with revisions and polishing, will become such a paper. It is expected that in the three papers submitted the student will exhibit the first three of the following abilities; it is to be hoped that he or she will exhibit the fourth. (Of course, all of these abilities need not be exhibited in every one of the three papers, but each ability should be exhibited in at least one paper.)

- (1) The ability to give a clear, coherent, and intelligible exposition of a complex philosophical position or argument.
- (2) The ability to survey the relevant literature on a given topic, showing an awareness of what the important rival positions are.
- (3) The ability to present intelligent and plausible criticism of a philosophical position.
- (4) The ability to do the kind of original work looked for in a Ph.D. dissertation.

There may be some overlap in the cases of (3) and (4), for a student could display some of the originality looked for in a Ph.D. dissertation in the kind of critical assessment he or she makes of a philosophical position. Nevertheless, (4) may be taken to be desirable for but not essential to meeting the Department's standards for this evaluation. On the other hand, some sort of originality in one's critical work will be expected, not in the sense that one will have come up with a criticism that no one else has come up with, but in the sense that one will have come up with a criticism of one's own, i.e., independently of having first read it in someone else's work, or will have developed a criticism in one's own way.

Given the above considerations, it will be the normal course of events for an evaluation to be recessed after its first meeting and for one or more papers to be rewritten. It is expected that during a session of the evaluation, and afterwards in consultation with individual evaluators, the student will be given suggestions as to what needs revision and indications of the directions in which to make needed changes. Even in cases where it is clear to the evaluating committee before meeting with the student that the evaluation will have to be recessed, the evaluation will be held for the purpose of providing direction concerning revisions. In cases where the student is reluctant to submit a paper for evaluation, believing quite strongly that it is not without defects and preferring to receive a negative report on that round of the evaluation, he or she should nevertheless submit it to get suggestions for improvement.