Date: August 5, 1993

Subject: Writing Summary & TYPE I. PROFESSOR COMMITMENT Approval Request

To: Darlene Richardson, Liberal Studies Director

From: Sharon Montgomery, Philosophy & Religious Studies Dept.

Darlene, attached are the two documents you requested at our July 15, 1993 meeting and in your memo of the same date. I thank you and the Liberal Studies Committee for your TYPE III approval, pending the Writing Summary, of my PH 221-/W/ proposal. As you will note I reconsidered the "revision on screen" provision that we discussed. What I say in my summary is probably what I indicated during my visit to the Liberal Studies meeting when the committee approved my PH 222-/W/ proposal.

I assume that consideration of my TYPE I. PROFESSOR COMMITMENT approval request will not occur until the 1993 Fall term. Thank you for your encouraging comments regarding the nature of my request. I await the decision of the Liberal Studies Committee.

I hope that you enjoy the remainder of the all too rapidly diminishing summer!
DATE: August 3, 1993

SUBJECT: Request for TYPE I. PROFESSOR COMMITMENT Approval for Writing-Intensive Courses

TO: IUP Liberal Studies Committee

FROM: Sharon Montgomery, Philosophy & Religious Studies Dept.

I am requesting TYPE I approval based on my philosophical training in critical thinking (most especially my training and teaching experience in symbolic logic and informal logic) rather than attendance at the IUP writing workshop.

I. RATIONALE

Argument is the essence of philosophical inquiry whether in thought, in speech or in writing. To do philosophy is to argue, i.e., to make claims about various controversial subject matters and to support those claims with good reasons. The key to understanding a philosophical work is to be able to identify and evaluate the arguments that comprise that work. Similarly, the key to producing a philosophical work is to be able to argue effectively for a position on some controversial issue as well as arguing against alternative perspectives on that issue. Philosophical writing therefore is different in nature than writing in most, if not all, other disciplines in its constant emphasis on argumentation. Hence learning to write, as well as writing to learn, philosophy is a matter of developing the skill of constructing arguments and linking arguments together to support one's position on some issue of philosophical significance. That skill is developed through training in logic rather than through training in English composition.

II. RELEVANT TRAINING

1. BA, MA and PhD training, at the University of Pennsylvania, in analytic philosophy including, most especially, courses in symbolic logic, logical positivism, philosophy of language and epistemology as well as courses on the philosophy of Nelson Goodman (taught by Goodman himself) who is noted for his expertise in logical analysis.

2. A graduate summer workshop (six weeks: five 8 hour days per week) in linguistics taught by Henry Hiz and Zelig Harris at the University of Pennsylvania.

3. Years of teaching both symbolic logic and informal logic beginning as a Graduate Teaching Fellow, working under Thomas Patton at the University of Pennsylvania, and continuing to the present time.

4. A semester long Critical Thinking workshop at IUP in F90 taught specifically for the Philosophy & Religious
In summary, I argue that just as an English faculty person is qualified to teach /W/ courses by virtue of their training in, and teaching of, composition, so also am I, a Philosophy faculty person, qualified to teach /W/ courses by virtue of my training in, and teaching of, logic. I have three degrees in analytic philosophy which emphasizes logical analysis, graduate work in linguistics, years of teaching both symbolic and informal logic and have attended numerous critical thinking workshops. I have also taught a preliminary version of PH 222 /W/ (without the /W/ designation) and then the approved PH 222 /W/ several times as well as a preliminary version of the recently approved PH 221 /W/ (without the /W/ designation).