

Curriculum Proposal Cover Sheet - University-Wide Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

Contact Person(s) Rubenstein, E; Rives	Email Address erubens; rives
Proposing Department/Unit PHIL	Phone x2310

Check all appropriate lines and complete all information. Use a separate cover sheet for each course proposal and/or program proposal.

1. Course Proposals (check all that apply)

New Course Course Prefix Change Course Deletion
 Course Revision Course Number and/or Title Change Catalog Description Change

Current course prefix, number and full title: _____

Proposed course prefix, number and full title, if changing: PHIL 270 Ethics and the Environment

2. Liberal Studies Course Designations, as appropriate

This course is also proposed as a Liberal Studies Course (please mark the appropriate categories below)

Learning Skills Knowledge Area Global and Multicultural Awareness Writing Across the Curriculum (W Course)
 Liberal Studies Elective (please mark the designation(s) that applies – must meet at least one)

Global Citizenship Information Literacy Oral Communication
 Quantitative Reasoning Scientific Literacy Technological Literacy

3. Other Designations, as appropriate

Honors College Course Other: (e.g. Women's Studies, Pan African)

4. Program Proposals

Catalog Description Change Program Revision Program Title Change New Track
 New Degree Program New Minor Program Liberal Studies Requirement Changes Other

Current program name: _____

Proposed program name, if changing: _____

5. Approvals	Signature	Date
Department Curriculum Committee Chair(s)	<i>Brad Rein</i>	1/28/14
Department Chairperson(s)	<i>[Signature]</i>	1.28.14
College Curriculum Committee Chair	<i>[Signature]</i>	1/28/14
College Dean	<i>[Signature]</i>	1/29/14
Director of Liberal Studies (as needed)	<i>[Signature]</i>	4/17/14
Director of Honors College (as needed)		
Provost (as needed)		
Additional signature (with title) as appropriate		
UWUCC Co-Chairs	<i>Gail Schust</i>	4/23/14

Received APR 23 2014 Received APR 17 2014 Received JAN 30 2014
 Liberal Studies Liberal Studies Liberal Studies

Syllabus of Record: PHIL 270 Ethics and the Environment

I. Catalog Description

PHIL 270 Ethics and the Environment

3 class hours, 0 lab hours, 3 credits (3c- 0l-3cr)

Prerequisites: None

Applies ethical theory to environmental issues, including resource depletion, animal rights, biotic endangerment, environmental degradation, climate change, and environmental justice. Considers arguments by which human-caused environmental destruction is intrinsically wrong, wrong independently of human interests and purposes, and arguments for environmental policies by which the following are granted rights, interests, or inherent value: non-human animals, all living things, all natural things, biotic communities, and ecosystems. Also considers arguments that environmental policies cannot be applied globally without injustice to humans, including poor and indigenous peoples.

II. Course Outcomes

Students who succeed in this course will be able to:

Objective 1:

Explain key concepts, theories, and debates in environmental ethics.

Expected Student Learning Outcomes 1

Informed Learners

Rationale:

After being provided a grounding in the major, traditional theories of morality, students are introduced to non-traditional theories specific to environmental ethics and asked to apply both traditional and non-traditional theories to particular topics in environmental ethics.

Assignments range from true/false and multiple choice questions to short answer and essays, designed to test students understanding of basic terms, distinctions, and evaluative principles that are foundational to environmental ethics.

Objective 2:

Give accurate exposition of both anthropocentric and non-anthropocentric theories of intrinsic value.

Expected Student Learning Outcomes 1 and 3

Informed and Responsible Learners

Rationale:

It is widely agreed that moral agents have a duty to protect -- or at least refrain from damaging -- any entities that have intrinsic value. If only human beings have intrinsic value, then anthropogenic environmental degradation, biotic endangerment, and resource depletion are wrong only insofar as they threaten human interests and well-being. Students explore the implications of arguments by which, in contrast, the following have rights or value independent of human purposes: non-human animals, all living things, all natural things, biotic communities, and ecosystems. Assignments and examinations require students to reconstruct these

arguments and their implications for environmental policy. **This objective specifically meets the Informed and Responsible Learner Outcomes as a Global Citizenship elective by emphasizing duties of citizenship in a global context.**

Objective 3:

Critically assess anthropocentric and non-anthropocentric theories of intrinsic value and implications of these theories for environmental policy.

Expected Student Learning Outcome 2

Empowered Learners

Rationale:

Assignments and examinations will require students to critique various theories of intrinsic value, raising objections to their own positions and to ones they disagree with. Focus on critical thinking skills is particularly emphasized in Philosophy's 100- and 200-level courses, where students are taught to appraise reasoning, assess arguments, pose objections, and respond. **This objective specifically meets the Empowered and Responsible Learner Outcomes as a Global Citizenship elective by emphasizing critical thinking about duties of citizenship in a global context.**

Objective 4:

Explain diverse feminist perspectives on environmental ethics.

Expected Student Learning Outcomes 1 and 3

Informed and Responsible Learners

Rationale:

Assignments and examinations will require students to explain eco-feminist theories linking anthropogenic environmental degradation with wider social problems of discrimination and exploitation.

Objective 5:

Explain perspectives on environmental justice from outside Euro-American traditions.

Expected Student Learning Outcomes 1 and 3

Informed and Responsible Learners

Rationale:

Assignments and examinations will test students understanding of arguments that the western environmentalist's fixation on *natural* environments leads us to ignore human-built, high-density urban environments and the implications of these environments for poor peoples throughout the world. Assignments also test students' understanding of arguments that environmentalist policies cannot be applied globally without controlling, or even dispossessing, poor, non-western peoples. **This objective specifically meets the Responsible Learner Outcome as a Global Citizenship elective by focusing on perspectives on environmental theory and policy from outside Euro-American traditions.**

Objective 6.

Devise their own strategy for promoting environmentally sensitive practices.

Expected Student Learning Outcome 3:

Responsible Learners

Rationale:

An end of semester group assignment (Sample Assignment 2) will require students to outline a strategy for promoting environmentally sensitive practices that can be implemented locally -- such as minimizing fuel consumption, making changes in food or apparel purchases, or promoting sustainable agriculture. **This objective specifically meets Required Course Content for Global Citizenship elective by asking students to link environmental ethical theory to practices in their own lives and in the wider community.**

Objective 7.

Corroborate exposition of philosophical positions by use of apt quotation and citation.

Expected Student Learning Outcome 3:

Responsible Learners

Rationale: Students' obligations of textual fidelity and expository accuracy will be reinforced in all paper assignments. Rubrics for all assignments prioritize these virtues.

III. Course Outline

A. Traditional Ethical Theory

9 hours [9]

1. Intrinsic v. instrumental value

2. Intrinsic v. instrumental wrongdoing

3. Prudential Anthropocentrism

a. Environmentalism as good for us

b. Environmentalism as good in itself: non-anthropocentric environmentalism

4. Utilitarianism

a. Interest satisfaction as the sole intrinsic good

b. Interests of non-human entities as morally considerable

c. Untenability of Utilitarianism as an environmental ethic: contingencies of calculation

5. Deontological Rights-Based Ethical Theory

a. Autonomy as a necessary condition for rights possession

b. Extension of rights to non-autonomous entities: non-human animals, all living individuals, biological species, ecological systems

c. Traditional critiques of environmentalist extensions of deontology

B. Ethical Treatment of Non-human Animals

6 hours [15]

1. Immanuel Kant's "Human Chauvinism"

2. Peter Singer's "Animal Liberation"
3. Tom Regan's deontological argument for animal rights
4. Carl Cohen's deontological reply to Regan
5. Animal liberation and environmentalism in conflict

In Class Examination on Units A. - B. 1 hour [16]

C. Biocentric Ethics and Ecocentric Ethics: Holism and Intrinsic Value 6 hours [22]

1. Biotic communities as loci of value -- Aldo Leopold's and J. Baird Callicott's Land Ethics
2. Land Ethics as totalitarian?

D. Deep Ecology 6 hours [28]

1. Arne Næss *contra* "shallow ecology"
2. Biospheric egalitarianism: all living things as possessed of equal intrinsic value
3. Næss' conception of the "Ecological Self"
4. Deep Ecology as misanthropic: Tom Regan's objections
5. "Green missionaries": Ramachandra Guha's objections

E. Ecofeminism 3 hours [31]

1. Gender oppression as fundamental; oppression of nature as derivative
2. Non-reductionist ecofeminism
3. Deep Ecology as disguised colonialism: feminist objections

In Class Examination on Units C. - E. 1 hour [32]

F. Cases 7 hours [39]

1. Feeding people or saving nature?
2. Climate change
3. Intergenerational justice
4. Environmentalism and human rights
5. Environmental justice in a global context

G. Taking Action

3 hours [42]

1. Sustainable living

2. Activism

Cumulative Final Exam

2 Hours [44]

IV. Evaluation Methods

Evaluation methods will vary among instructors. A sample evaluation method is given for the syllabus above:

Multiple, short, in-class writings:	10%
Two Short Papers (2 pages):	20%
Group Project:	10%
Two Mid-Term Examinations:	35%
Final (Comprehensive) Exam:	25%

V. Example Grading Scale

90-100% A, 80-89% B, 70-79% C, 60-69% D, 59% or less F.

VI. Undergraduate Course Attendance Policy

Attendance policy is in conformity with standards set by the University Senate, as outlined in the Undergraduate Catalog: it will be distributed in writing to students during the first week of the course; it will recognize students' need to miss class because of illness or personal emergency; and, it will define some limited level of allowable absence.

VII. Required Textbooks, Supplemental Books and Readings.

Required text: Pojman, L. and Pojman, P., eds., 2010. *Environmental Ethics: Readings in Theory and Application*, 6th ed., Wadsworth.

Alternate text: Light, A. and Rolston, H. III, eds., 2002. *Environmental Ethics: An Anthology*, 1st ed., Blackwell Publishing.

Supplemental Reading Example: Leopold, A., Excerpt from *The Sand County Almanac*, in Light, A. and Rolston, H. III, eds., 2002. *Environmental Ethics: An Anthology*.

VIII. Special Resource Requirements

None.

IX. Bibliography

Agar, N., 2001. *Life's Intrinsic Value*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Aiken, W., 1984. "Ethical Issues in Agriculture", in T. Regan (ed) *Earthbound: New Introductory Essays in Environmental Ethics*, New York: Random House, pp. 274-88.

- Bookchin, M., 1996. *Toward an Ecological Society*, Montreal: Black Rose Books.
- , 1987. “Social Ecology Versus Deep Ecology”, *Green Perspectives: Newsletter of the Green Program Project*, numbers 4, 5 reprinted in Witoszek and Brennan 1999, pp. 281-301.
- , 1990. *The Philosophy of Social Ecology*, Montreal: Black Rose Books.
- Brennan, A., 1998, “Poverty, Puritanism and Environmental Conflict”, *Environmental Values* 7: 305-31.
- Callicott, J.B., 1989. *In Defense of the Land Ethic: Essays in Environmental Philosophy*, Albany: SUNY Press.
- , 1999. *Beyond the Land Ethic: More Essays in Environmental Philosophy*, Albany: SUNY Press.
- , 2014. *Thinking Like a Planet: The Land Ethic and the Earth Ethic*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Carson, R., 2002. *Silent Spring*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Crisp, R., 1998. “Animal Liberation is not an Environmental Ethic: A Response to Dale Jamieson”, *Environmental Values* 7: 476-8.
- Dobson, A. (ed.), 1999. *Fairness and Futurity: Essays on Environmental Sustainability and Social Justice*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Feinberg, J., 1974. “The Rights of Animals and Unborn Generations”, in W. T. Blackstone (ed.), *Philosophy and Environmental Crisis*, Athens: University of Georgia Press, pp. 43-68.
- Gaard, Greta (ed), 1993. *Ecofeminism: Women, Animals, Nature*, Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Gruen, L. and Jamieson, D. (eds), 2012. *Reflecting on Nature: Readings in Environmental Ethics and Philosophy*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Guha, R., 1989. “Radical American Environmentalism and Wilderness Preservation: A Third World Critique”, *Environmental Ethics* 11: 71-83.
- , 1999. “Radical American Environmentalism Revisited”, in Witoszek and Brennan (eds.) 1999, pp. 473-9
- Jamieson, D., 2008. *Ethics and the Environment: An Introduction*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

—, 2003. *Morality's Progress: Essays on Humans, Other Animals, and the Rest of Nature*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Kant, Immanuel. "Duties to Animals and Spirits", in Louis Infield trans., *Lectures on Ethics*, New York: Harper and Row, 1963.

Katz, Eric, 1991. "Restoration and Redesign: The Ethical Significance of Human Intervention in Nature", *Restoration and Management Notes* 9: 90-6.

—, 1997. *Nature as Subject*, New York: Rowman and Littlefield.

King, Y., 1989. "The Ecology of Feminism and the Feminism of Ecology", in J. Plant (ed.), *Healing the Wounds*, Philadelphia: New Society Publishers: 18-28.

King, Y., 1989. "Healing the Wounds: Feminism, Ecology, and Nature/Culture Dualism", in A. M. Jaggar and S. R. Bordo (eds.) *Gender/Body/Knowledge: Feminist Reconstruction of Being and Knowing*, New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, pp. 115-41.

Leopold, A., 2013. *A Sand County Almanac and Other Writings on Conservation and Ecology*, New York: Library of America.

Light, Andrew and Rolston, Holmes (eds.), 2003. *Environmental Ethics: An Anthology*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Næss, A., 1973. "The Shallow and the Deep, Long-Range Ecology Movement", *Inquiry* 16, reprinted in *Sessions* 1995, pp. 151-5.

—, 1989. *Ecology, Community, Lifestyle*, trans. and ed. D. Rothenberg, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

—, Dregson, A., and Devall, B., 2010. *The Ecology of Wisdom: Writings by Arne Naess*, Berkeley: Counterpoint Press.

O'Neill, J., 1992. "The Varieties of Intrinsic Value", *Monist* 75: 119-137.

Ouderkirk, W. and Hill, J. (eds.), 2002. *Land, Value, Community: Callicott and Environmental Philosophy*, Albany: State University of New York.

Plumwood, V., 1993. *Feminism and the Mastery of Nature*, London: Routledge.

Pojman, L., and P. Pojman, 2011. *Environmental Ethics*, Stamford, CT: Cengage.

Regan, T., 2006. *Defending Animal Rights*, Champaign: University of Illinois Press.

Regan, T. and Singer, P. (eds.), 1976. *Animal Rights and Human Obligations*, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Rolston, H., 1975. "Is There an Ecological Ethic?", *Ethics* 85: 93-109.

—, 1988. *Environmental Ethics: Duties to and Values in the Natural World*, Indiana: Temple University Press.

—, 2011. *A New Environmental Ethics: The Next Millenium for Life on Earth*, London: Routledge.

Routley, R., 1973. "Is there a need for a new, an environmental ethic?" *Proceedings of the 15th World congress of Philosophy*, vol. 1 pp. 205-10, Sophia: Sophia Press (see also Sylvan, R.).

Routley, R. and Routley, V., 1980. "Human Chauvinism and Environmental Ethics" in Mannison, D., McRobbie, M. A., and Routley, R. (eds.) *Environmental Philosophy*, Canberra: Australian National University, Research School of Social Sciences, pp. 96-189.

Schmidz, D. and Willott, E., 2011. *Environmental Ethics: What Really Matters, What Really Works*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Singer, P., 2009. *Animal Liberation: The Definitive Classic of the Animal Rights Movement*, New York: Harper Perennial Modern Classics.

Sylvan, Richard, and Bennett, David, 1994. *The Greening of Ethics*, Cambridge: White Horse Press.

Varner, G., 2002. *In Nature's Interests? Interests, Animal Rights, and Environmental Ethics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press

—, 2000. "Sentientism", in D. Jamieson (ed.) *A Companion to Environmental Philosophy*, Oxford: Blackwell, pp.192-203.

Warren, K. J., 1990. "The Power and Promise of Ecological Feminism", *Environmental Ethics* 12: 125-46.

—, 1999. "Ecofeminist Philosophy and Deep Ecology", in Witoszek and Brennan (eds.) 1999, pp. 255-69.

Warren, K. J., 2000. *Ecofeminist Philosophy*, Lanham, MA: Rowman and Littlefield.

Williams, B., 1992. "Must a Concern for the Environment be Centred on Human Beings?", reprinted in his *Making Sense of Humanity and Other Philosophical Papers*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995: 233-40.

Witoszek, N. and Brennan, A. (eds), 1999. *Philosophical Dialogues: Arne Næss and the Progress of Eco-Philosophy*, New York: Rowan and Littlefield.

COURSE ANALYSIS QUESTIONNAIRE

A. Details of the Course

A1. How does this course fit into the programs of the department? For which students is the course designed? (majors, students in other majors, liberal studies). Explain why this content cannot be incorporated into an existing course.

The course will be open to all IUP undergraduate students.

A2. Does this course require changes in the content of existing courses or requirements for a program? If catalog descriptions of other courses or department programs must be changed as a result of the adoption of this course, please submit as separate proposals all other changes in courses and/or program requirements.

This course does not require changes in any existing Philosophy courses or programs.

A3. Has this course ever been offered at IUP on a trial basis (e.g. as a special topic) If so, explain the details of the offering (semester/year and number of students).

This course has not been offered on a trial basis.

A4. Is this course to be a dual-level course?

This is not a dual-level course.

A5. If this course may be taken for variable credit, what criteria will be used to relate the credits to the learning experience of each student? Who will make this determination and by what procedures?

This course may not be taken for variable credit.

A6. Do other higher education institutions currently offer this course? If so, please list examples (institution, course title).

Courses similar to the one being proposed are offered at many institutions in the United States. The following are three examples:

**University of Oregon: *Environmental Ethics*, ENVS 345
Otterbein College: *Environmental Ethics*, Philosophy 291
George Mason University: *Global Environmental Ethics*, PHIL 243**

A7. Is the content, or are the skills, of the proposed course recommended or required by a professional society, accrediting authority, law or other external agency? If so, please provide documentation.

The content and skills of the proposed course are not required by the American Philosophical Association (APA). In general the APA does not provide recommendations for undergraduate curriculum content.

B. Interdisciplinary Implications

B1. Will this course be taught by instructors from more than one department or team taught within the department? If so, explain the teaching plan, its rationale, and how the team will adhere to the syllabus of record.

This course will be taught by only one instructor at a time and always by the Philosophy Department.

B2. What is the relationship between the content of this course and the content of courses offered by other departments? Summarize your discussions (with other departments) concerning the proposed changes and indicate how any conflicts have been resolved. Please attach relevant memoranda from these departments that clarify their attitudes toward the proposed change(s).

This course does not duplicate or affect courses offered by other departments.

B3. Will this course be cross-listed with other departments? If so, please summarize the department discussions concerning the course and indicate how consistency will be maintained across departments.

This course will not be cross-listed.

B4. Will seats in this course be made available to students in the School of Continuing Education?

This course will be open to all enrolled undergraduate students, with no prerequisites in place. No seats will be set aside in particular for Continuing Education students, though they are welcome to register.

C. Implementation

C1. Are faculty resources adequate? If you are not requesting or have not been authorized to hire additional faculty, demonstrate how this course will fit into the schedule(s) of current faculty. What will be taught less frequently or in fewer sections to make this possible? Please specify how preparation and equated workload will be assigned for this course.

The department will offer one fewer section of PHIL 100 (Introduction to Philosophy) in semesters when PHIL 270 runs.

C2. What other resources will be needed to teach this course and how adequate are the current resources? If not adequate, what plans exist for achieving adequacy?

No additional space, equipment, supplies, or library materials are needed.

C3. Are any of the resources for this course funded by a grant? If so, what provisions have been made to continue support for this course once the grant has expired?

None of the resources for this course are funded by a grant.

C4. How frequently do you expect this course to be offered? Is this course particularly designed for or restricted to certain seasonal semesters?

The course will usually be offered once every three semesters.

C5. How many sections of this course do you anticipate offering in any single semester?

We expect to offer one section each semester the course is offered.

C6. How many students do you plan to accommodate in a section of this course? What is the justification for this planned number of students?

A PHIL 270 section will be capped at 55.

C7. Does any professional society recommend enrollment limits or parameters for a course of this nature?

The American Philosophical Association does not recommend maximum enrollments for this type of course.

C8. If this course is a distance education course, see the Implementation of Distance Education Agreement and the Undergraduate Distance Education Review Form in Appendix D and respond to the questions listed.

This course will not be offered as a distance education course.

D. Miscellaneous

None.

Liberal Studies Course Approval Questions

- 1. Typically there will be one section offered every three semesters, with different faculty members teaching the course in different semesters. By relying on the syllabus of record, as well as through regular meetings and discussions about the goals of our lower-level, introductory type courses, we will be able to ensure curricular consistency and a shared understanding of objectives and learning outcomes. This is a practice we already have in place.**
- 2. Care will be taken to include, whenever appropriate, discussions and arguments concerning issues related to women and minorities. In the course syllabus provided above, examples include ecofeminist theories and critiques of environmentalism from contemporary feminists, and critiques of environmentalist policies from authors outside Euro-American cultures.**
- 3. Instructors of this course will typically use an anthology of primary texts. In addition students may read particular essays and opinion pieces on various topics not found in the anthology of choice. The combination of the two will ensure that this requirement is met.**
- 4. Philosophy courses aren't typically offered in high schools, so most students have no exposure to the discipline prior to college. For this reason, we don't offer 100- or 200-level courses designed for majors, because the majority of our majors declare only after taking an introductory course. Students who decide to major in Philosophy will simply build on what they have learned in this 200-level course.**

SAMPLE ASSIGNMENT 1 FOR LIBERAL STUDIES COURSE: PHIL 270 (Ethics and the Environment)

PHIL 270 Short Essay

Explain the main points in the debate between Tom Regan and Carl Cohen regarding our treatment of non-human animals. Then defend your own stance on the use of animals in factory farming and medical experimentation. I recommend that you structure your essay around the following three tasks, organized as you choose.

- a. Each author defends a different stance on the question of whether animals have moral status. Explain this debate.
- b. Each author derives different conclusions concerning the status of factory farming and/or medical experimentation. Explain these differences.
- c. State your position on the moral status of non-human animals and implications for our treatment of them, explaining how your stance on status is consistent with your position on treatment.

Rubric for Short Essay/30:

a. Moral Status /10

9 - 10: Very clear and complete on the Regan/Cohen bar-setting debate about capacities relevant to moral status.

8 or 8.5: Clear and correct on this debate.

7 or 7.5: Somewhat unclear or sometimes incorrect on this debate.

6 or 6.5: Debate discussed but very incompletely.

5: Debate not discussed.

b. Implications for Treatment of Animals /10

9 - 10: Very clear and complete on the implications of the bar-setting debate for factory farming and medical experimentation.

8 or 8.5: Clear and correct on these implications.

7 or 7.5: Somewhat unclear or sometimes incorrect on these implications.

6 or 6.5: Implications discussed but very incompletely.

5: Implications not discussed.

c. Articulation of Own Position /10

9 - 10: States a consistent position regarding both moral status and implications for treatment of animals.

8 or 8.5: Implications for treatment of animals not well shown to be consistent with the stance taken on moral status.

7 or 7.5: Implications for treatment of animals not clearly consistent with the stance taken on moral status.

6 or 6.5: Implications for treatment of animals not discussed or no stance taken on moral status.

5. Own position not discussed.

SAMPLE ASSIGNMENT 2 FOR LIBERAL STUDIES COURSE: PHIL 270 (Ethics and the Environment)

PHIL 270 Group Project on Environmentally Sustainable Practices

Many of us have little idea what changes we might make in our own lives to promote environmentally sensitive practices. Your group will select a practice to research. You'll get my approval for that choice and then begin your research. I want you to find out all you can about how your chosen practice might be implemented locally -- such as minimizing fuel consumption, making changes in food or apparel purchases, or promoting sustainable agriculture. Your group will be asked to do a short presentation on your selected practice.

Here's a suggestion on how to start. Make a list of the ways you might promote minimized fuel consumption in your community or alter dietary practices (for two examples). Sit down with other members of your group and find out how to effectively 'green' the relevant practices. Be creative and as thorough as possible in the time you've got. When you are dividing up the labor in your group, think about who is going to write the paper, who is going to do the presenting, etc. After you've done your investigating, your group should write a short, 2-3 page summary of what you learned. You will then do a brief presentation for the class. Each group member must also submit a Group Project Self-Report.

Your grade for this project will be based on three components: the written work your group produces, your in-class presentation, and the Group Project Self-Reports.

Try to have some fun with this project, and use it as an opportunity to learn and inform. You may not like what you discover about your own lived practices, but it is better to know than to not.

Group Project Self-Report

Name: _____ **Environmental Practice:** _____

1. What did you contribute to the project?
2. What could you have done better as member of the group (be it interactions with others, the amount/quality of work you did, etc.)?
3. Other Members: Use grades (A, A-, B+, etc)

Name	Quality of their work	Quantity of their work
a.		
b.		
c.		
d.		

4. Based on your comparison with the other groups' presentations, what grade should your group receive?

5. What individual grade do you deserve as a group member? Why?