Critical Thinking Sections
Instructor Session

First of Three
March 16, 2018

You may find a video of this workshop at:
Part 1 https://youtu.be/q0y02qf85Uk
Part 2 https://youtu.be/QREJJReIErM
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Identifying the Critical Thinking Focus for Your Course</td>
<td>March 16, 2018</td>
<td>Noon – 1:00 and 2:00-3:00</td>
<td>ALB 650</td>
<td>Background and Looking Ahead, Outcomes and Assessment, Mapping Reasoning (Recommended Tool), Identifying Your Course Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Identifying the Critical Thinking Outcomes for Your Course</td>
<td>April 20, 2018</td>
<td>Noon – 1:00 and 2:00-3:00</td>
<td>ALB 650</td>
<td>Bring your Syllabus, Reviewing Your Course Focus, Drafting Learning Outcomes, Considering Alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Assessing and Teaching for Critical Thinking in Your Course</td>
<td>May 11, 2018</td>
<td>Noon – 1:00 and 2:00-3:00</td>
<td>ALB 650</td>
<td>Planning Assessment Methods, Planning Learning Activities, Considering Alignment, Cultivating Critical Thinking Dispositions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Review (Optional)</td>
<td>May 25, 2018</td>
<td>Noon – 1:00 and 2:00-3:00</td>
<td>ALB 650</td>
<td>Questions and Answers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pre-Class Contract Week Check in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Getting Ready</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SESSIONS

Session 1: General CT Framework
Session 2: Course CT Focus
Session 2: Course CT Learning Outcomes
Session 3: Course CT Assessment tools
Session 3: Course CT Learning Activities
"The General Education Program seeks to develop ... qualities of global citizenship in four distinct ways. After completing the general education curriculum, students will:

• **Demonstrate critical thinking, quantitative, and communication skills necessary to succeed in a rapidly changing global society.**
• Demonstrate broad knowledge of the physical, social, and cultural worlds as well as the methods by which this knowledge is produced.
• Recognize that responsible global citizenship involves personal accountability, social equity, and environmental sustainability.
• Apply their knowledge and skills, working in interdisciplinary ways to solve problems.”
AAS Proficiencies

The UW Colleges regards the following areas of proficiency to be of primary importance in the education of our students: Analytical Skills, Quantitative Skills, Communication Skills, and Aesthetic Skills.

Analytical Skills

Students must be able to:
• interpret and synthesize information and ideas;
• analyze and evaluate arguments;
• construct hypotheses and support arguments;
• select and apply scientific and other appropriate methodologies;
• integrate knowledge and experience to arrive at creative solutions; and
• gather and assess information from printed sources, electronic sources, and observation.
Critical thinking lies at the heart of higher education. Critical thinking is one of the skills most often desired by employers. Students don’t make significant critical thinking gains. Potential for us to do something pretty neat.
Fall 1995
- Argument mapping used in the Philosophy Department.

Summer 2015
- Faculty from English, French, History, and Communication collaborated to explore the potential of argument mapping to facilitate critical thinking instruction in those disciplines.

Academic Year 2015 – 2016
- UW-Stevens Point selected argument mapping as the focus of its Quality Initiative in support of its continued accreditation through the Higher Learning Commission.
• Faculty Exploration Groups formed to discuss how argument mapping could be used to teach and assess critical thinking across the curriculum.

• Faculty from UW-Stevens Point conducted workshops in argument mapping for instructors at Mid-State Technical College and Gateway Technical College and extended the discussion of critical thinking to include dialogue mapping.

• Held additional critical thinking luncheons. Broadened the focus from “argument” to “reasoning.” Began meetings with local employers. Drafted critical thinking pilot for Fall 2018.
General Critical Thinking Framework for Transfer of Learning and Application

Flexibility at Course Level for Disciplinary and Instructional Differences
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BACKGROUND & LOOKING AHEAD
All types of reasoning (e.g. scientific reasoning, normative reasoning, decision making, problem solving) in all types of contexts (e.g. the classroom, the workplace) are composed of particular activities.

It would be nice to

• identify the **basic activities** out of which all reasoning is composed,
• articulate **the smallest complete set** of such activities,
• situate these activities within a **broader framework**, and
• determine how such activities can be **mastered across the curriculum**.
CRITICAL THINKING IS PURPOSEFUL, REFLECTIVE REASONING ABOUT WHAT CONCLUSIONS TO DRAW OR ACTIONS TO TAKE.
(adopted from Facione, “Critical Thinking: What It Is and Why It Counts”)

- Identifying Reasoning
- Identifying Elements
- Analyzing Reasoning
- Assessing Elements
- Evaluating Reasoning
- Assessing Relationships
- Constructing Reasoning
- Posing Questions
- Communicating Reasoning
- Checking Answers
- Formulating Answers
- Testing an Hypothesis
- Attempting to support a Conclusion
BACKGROUND & LOOKING AHEAD

CRITICAL THINKING IS PURPOSEFUL, REFLECTIVE REASONING ABOUT WHAT CONCLUSIONS TO DRAW OR ACTIONS TO TAKE.
(adopted from Facione, “Critical Thinking: What It Is and Why It Counts”)

ATTACHMENT

(a) CRITICAL THINKING IS PURPOSEFUL, REFLECTIVE REASONING ABOUT WHAT CONCLUSIONS TO DRAW OR ACTIONS TO TAKE

(b) Identifying Reasoning
   - Identifying Elements
   - Tracking Relationships
   - Analyzing Reasoning
   - Assessing Elements
   - Assessing Relationships
   - Evaluating Reasoning
   - Posing Questions
   - Constructing Reasoning
   - Formulating Answers
   - Checking Answers
   - Communicating Reasoning
   - Testing an Hypothesis
   - Attempting to support a Conclusion

(c) (activities involving reasoning)

(d) Elements
   - Relationships between Elements
   - (components of reasoning)
   - Assertion / Assertion
   - Question / Assertion
   - Independent
   - Dependent
   - Objection
   - Support
   - Assertions
   - Questions
BACKGROUND & LOOKING AHEAD

CRITICAL THINKING IS PURPOSEFUL, REFLECTIVE REASONING ABOUT WHAT CONCLUSIONS TO DRAW OR ACTIONS TO TAKE. (adopted from Facione, “Critical Thinking: What It Is and Why It Counts”)
Critical Thinking Learning Outcomes

Critical Thinking is purposeful, reflective reasoning about what conclusions to draw or actions to take.

With diligent effort on their part, students will

1. Recognize critical thinking as a process of identifying, analyzing, evaluating, and constructing reasoning in deciding what conclusions to draw or actions to take.
2. Identify, analyze, evaluate, or construct reasoning as they apply it to general or discipline-specific questions or issues.
OUTCOMES AND ASSESSMENT

Bloom’s Taxonomy

1. Remember: Recall facts and basic concepts (define, duplicate, list, memorize, repeat, state)
2. Understand: Explain ideas or concepts (classify, describe, discuss, explain, identify, locate, recognize, report, select, translate)
3. Apply: Use information in new situations (execute, implement, solve, use, demonstrate, interpret, operate, schedule, sketch)
4. Analyze: Draw connections among ideas (differentiate, organize, relate, compare, contrast, distinguish, examine, experiment, question, test)
5. Evaluate: Justify a stand or decision (appraise, argue, defend, judge, select, support, value, critique, weigh)
6. Create: Produce new or original work (design, assemble, construct, conjecture, develop, formulate, author, investigate)

Vanderbilt University Center for Teaching
### OUTCOMES AND ASSESSMENT

#### Taxonomy: Revised Bloom’s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remember</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizing Reasoning</td>
<td>Not Visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical thinking as a process of identifying reasoning and recognizing inference</td>
<td>100/100pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indicator expressions (i.e. because, therefore, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes no distinction between passages that contain reasoning and those that don't.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does not identify inference indicator expressions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Correctly identifies inference indicator expressions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mistakes descriptive passages or controversial statements when inference indicator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expressions are present.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does not distinguish between arguments and explanations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Correctly distinguishes between pieces of reasoning and descriptive passages or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>controversial statements when inference indicator expressions are present.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sometimes fails to do this when inference indicators aren't present.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Correctly identifies and distinguishes between arguments, explanations, and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>descriptive passages regardless of the presence or absence of indicator expressions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Value: 100pts
### UWSP Critical Thinking - Analyzing Reasoning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analyzing Reasoning</th>
<th>Not Visible</th>
<th>Not Meeting Expectations</th>
<th>Partially Meeting Expectations</th>
<th>Meeting Expectations</th>
<th>Exceeding Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical thinking as a process of determining the main conclusion, types of claims (i.e. supporting claims, objections, dependent or independent, etc.), and the relationships (inferences) between claims. 100/100pts</td>
<td>Fails to consistently or systematically distinguish between claims in the reasoning.</td>
<td>Sometimes correctly recognizes the main conclusion in the reasoning. Sometimes mistakes an objection, an assumption, or an unimportant claim for the main conclusion.</td>
<td>Consistently recognizes the main conclusion. Sometimes incorrectly recognizes other components of the reasoning (e.g. fails to correctly identify a claim as a component of the reasoning or misidentifies an irrelevant claim as a component of the reasoning).</td>
<td>Consistently recognizes the main conclusion and other components of the reasoning. Sometimes mistakes the relationships between these components (e.g. incorrectly identifies which ideas are supporting which).</td>
<td>Consistently recognizes the main conclusion. Determines what components are part of the reasoning. Identifies the relationships between these components.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Value: 100pts
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Visible</th>
<th>Not Meeting Expectations</th>
<th>Partially Meeting Expectations</th>
<th>Meeting Expectations</th>
<th>Exceeding Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluating Reasoning**

Critical thinking as a process of evaluating reasoning by assessing the assumptions and inferences and its clear articulation while being influenced by the reasoning.

- Fails to evaluate reasoning at all.
- States a global evaluation of the reasoning.
- Fails to justify that evaluation by citing an assessment of parts of the reasoning.
- Justifies an evaluation of the reasoning by citing an assessment of parts of the reasoning.
- Tends to focus on claims only (e.g., often overlooks inferences, often fails to trace an evaluation of a conclusion to an assessment of assumptions or inferences).
- Consistently evaluates reasoning by assessing its assumptions and inferences.
- Clearly articulates the evaluation.
- Is sometimes not appropriately influenced by the reasoning.
- Consistently evaluates reasoning by assessing the assumptions and inferences.
- Clearly articulates the evaluation.
- Is appropriately influenced by the reasoning.

© 2018 Campus Labs
## OUTCOMES AND ASSESSMENT

### UWSP Critical Thinking - Constructing Reasoning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not Visible 59%</th>
<th>Not Meeting Expectations 70%</th>
<th>Partially Meeting Expectations 80%</th>
<th>Meeting Expectations 90%</th>
<th>Exceeding Expectations 100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constructing Reasoning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical thinking as a process of formulating a clear position,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supporting it with strong evidence and anticipating and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responding to objections.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100/100pts</td>
<td>59pts</td>
<td>70pts</td>
<td>80pts</td>
<td>90pts</td>
<td>100pts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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OUTCOMES AND ASSESSMENT

Possible Assessment Instruments (for Later Discussion)

- Pre-Test / Post-Test
- Embedded Multiple Choice Questions
- Short Answer Questions
- Scaffolded Writing Assignments
- Experiment Design
- Lab Reports

Other??

Idea: Assessment Instrument Bank
MAPPING REASONING

- Objection
- Support
- Assertion
- Question
- Elements
- Relationships between Elements
- (components of reasoning)
- Graphical Representations
- Deliberate Practice
- Corrected by
- Lack of Schema
- High Cognitive Load
- Unwillingness
- Dispositions

CRITICAL THINKING IS PURPOSEFUL, REFLECTIVE REASONING ABOUT WHAT CONCLUSIONS TO DRAW OR ACTIONS TO TAKE.
(adopted from Facione, “Critical Thinking: What It Is and Why It Counts”)
We should require all students at our institution to take (or test out of) two semesters of a second language because familiarity with a second language improves students’ understanding of their first language. Therefore, we should require all students at our institution to take (or test out of) two semesters of a second language.

Learning a second language requires students to focus upon things like conjugation, grammar, and sentence structure.

Familiarity with a second language improves students' understanding of their first language.
“Learning a second language requires students to focus upon things like conjugation, grammar, and sentence structure so familiarity with a second language improves students’ understanding of their first language. Therefore, we should require all students at our institution to take (or test out of) two semesters of a second language.”

If a perfectly rational person believes the idea at the bottom, will that person believe the idea at the top?

We should require all students at our institution to take (or test out of) two semesters of a second language.

Familiarity with a second language improves students' understanding of their first language.

Learning a second language requires students to focus upon things like conjugation, grammar, and sentence structure.

Is this true?

Is this acceptable to people who don’t already believe the conclusion?

Am I given good reasons to believe this?
“We should require all students at our institution to take (or test out of) two semesters of a second language because familiarity with a second language enhances intercultural competence and because we should do what we can to enhance our student’s intercultural competence.”
“Learning a second language requires students to focus upon things like conjugation, grammar, and sentence structure so familiarity with a second language improves students’ understand of their first language. Therefore, we should require all students at our institution to take (or test out of) two semesters of a second language. Additionally, familiarity with a second language enhances intercultural competence and we should do what we can to enhance our students’ intercultural competence.”
“We should require all students at our institution to take (or test out of) two semesters of a second language. Some people disagree, maintaining that students will resent a language requirement. In fact, however, students appreciate the importance of knowing a second language. And even if they didn’t, we can be justified in instituting requirements that students resent.”
“Learning a second language requires students to focus upon things like conjugation, grammar, and sentence structure so familiarity with a second language improves students’ understand of their first language. Therefore, we should require all students at our institution to take (or test out of) two semesters of a second language. Additionally, familiarity with a second language enhances intercultural competence and we should do what we can to enhance our students’ intercultural competence. Some people maintain that students will resent a language requirement. In fact, however, students appreciate the importance of knowing a second language. And even if they didn’t, we can be justified in instituting requirements that students resent.”
Reasoning Maps – Hypothesis Generation

Hypothesis

- Question
  - "What?"
  - "How?"
  - "Why?"

- Background Knowledge

- Observation or Partially Confirmed Hypothesis
Reasoning Maps – Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis H is Partially Confirmed.
- or-
Hypothesis H is Disconfirmed.

**Experimental Prediction:**
If H is true then under conditions C, X will happen.

**Experimental Result:**
X happened under conditions C.
-or-
X did not happen under conditions C.
Reasoning Maps – Problem Solving

How can we achieve X?
Reasoning Maps – Problem Solving

How can we achieve X?

Let's A.
Reasoning Maps – Problem Solving

How can we achieve X?

Let's A.

We want X.

A will get us X.

A is no worse than other ways of getting X or of living without X.
Reasoning Maps – Problem Solving

How can we achieve X?

Let's A.

We want X.
A will get us X.
A is no worse than other ways of getting X or of living without X.

Let's B.

We want X.
B will get us X.
B is no worse than other ways of getting X or of living without X.

B is better than A.
Reasoning Maps – Problem Solving

How can we achieve X?

Let's A.
- We want X.
- A will get us X.
  - A is no worse than other ways of getting X or of living without X.

B is better than A.

Let's B.
- We want X.
- B will get us X.
  - B is no worse than other ways of getting X or of living without X.

B won't get us X.

Let's C.
Critical Thinking Learning Outcomes

Critical Thinking is purposeful, reflective reasoning about what conclusions to draw or actions to take.

With diligent effort on their part, students will

1. Recognize critical thinking as a process of identifying, analyzing, evaluating, and constructing reasoning in deciding what conclusions to draw or actions to take.

2. Identify, analyze, evaluate, or construct reasoning as they apply it to general or discipline-specific questions or issues.

Where should your course focus?

Please take the D2L Survey “Fall 2018 Course Focus” by April 13.
Results

Has Start Date
4/8/2018

Has End Date
4/15/2018

Completion Summary

11 attempts have been completed

Definition
Blah

Learning Outcomes
Blah

Question 1
Which learning outcome(s) do you plan to address in your course?

Outcome 1 (Recognize critical thinking as a process of identifying, analyzing, evaluating, and constructing reasoning in deciding what conclusions to draw or actions to take.)

Outcome 2 (Identify, analyze, evaluate, or construct reasoning as they apply it to general or discipline-specific questions or issues.)

Both Outcome 1 and Outcome 2

Question 2
Which of the following broad skill sets do you plan to focus on? Please select all that apply, but it might be a good idea to narrow it down to no more than three.

Modeling critical thinking as a process.

Identifying reasoning

Close
Question 3

If you plan to tailor the critical thinking outcome(s) to your selected focus and your discipline, how might you word your course learning outcome(s) for critical thinking?

Answers

For this coming semester, I don't think I will tailor the learning outcomes--I will likely use them pretty much as they are.

To demonstrate a geographic perspective when analyzing a phenomena, event, or geographic issue.

Draft: Provide analyzed data to support your claim. Show trends, comparisons and/or relationships among variables. Defend your evidence using relevant and established scientific concepts.

My course is taught from a criminology perspective, where the intention is the same but the terminology is different. Arguments are constructed on the basis of evidence of evidence, and the authentication of evidence is central to a position. Instead of identifying, the term is investigate. Instead of analysing reasoning, it is deductive reasoning. This leads to preponderance and inductive reasoning. The way I word this, in brief, is to explicitly state the following two expected course outcomes: 1) Introduce the investigative process and develop skills to preserve, evaluate, verify, and authenticate evidence 2) Reconstruct computer crimes using deductive reasoning based on the preponderance of evidence, and use inductive reasoning to build out ideographic digital profiles for computer criminals. Hope this helps.

Students will identify the application of a specific theoretical approach (approach = theory + method of data collection) to a particular data set, analyze how the theoretical approach interprets the data set to produce an interpretation, and evaluate how well the application of the theoretical approach has been supported. As a further (but necessarily higher order) application students will successfully apply a theoretical approach to a data set and support their interpretation.

I give up! These are the two learning outcomes I would like to refashion to reflect critical thinking objectives. Students will be able to recognize how humans have affected the climate and be able to identify how past climate changes can be used to understand possible future climate change. Students will acquire the necessary tools and background to decipher climate change fact from fiction and make informed decisions about future climate policy.

My current learning outcome that I thought I would work on, related to critical thinking, is: Students will be able to diagnose common insect damage and other common damage agents with examples in the lab and in the field. To add a critical thinking component to that learning outcome, it could read: Students will be able to diagnose common insect damage and other common damage agents in the lab and in the field, and justify the results of the diagnosis through constructive reasoning.

Use the language of film analysis to break down the component elements of film (visual and auditory signifiers) in order to describe the process of meaning-making and emotional impact in a cinematic text. Maybe? This is just a really quick crack at it. But the idea is to get them to see how films use a variety of visual, auditory, and narrative cues to construct meaning. Arguments, really, about ways to be in the world... Here's the existing LO, which needs revision anyway: "Use the language of film analysis to describe what they see and hear when they watch a movie and to discuss and write critically and effectively about the ways films move us aesthetically, intellectually, and emotionally."
Participants FEG Luncheon Meeting on Friday, March 16, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>CNMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sarah Jane</td>
<td>Alger</td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Valerie</td>
<td>Barske</td>
<td>History and International Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Karin</td>
<td>Bodensteiner</td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>Dettman</td>
<td>Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Todd</td>
<td>Huspeni</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Aaron</td>
<td>Kadoch</td>
<td>IA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Samantha</td>
<td>Kaplan</td>
<td>Geography and Geology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mary Jae</td>
<td>Kleckner</td>
<td>SBE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Vera</td>
<td>Klekovkina</td>
<td>WLL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>Krause</td>
<td>CNMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Dejan</td>
<td>Kuzmanovic</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Lentz</td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Lyna</td>
<td>Matesi</td>
<td>Business &amp; Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ismaila</td>
<td>Odogba</td>
<td>Geography and Geology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Jodi</td>
<td>Olmsted</td>
<td>SHCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Holly</td>
<td>Petrillo</td>
<td>CNR/Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Cady</td>
<td>Sartini</td>
<td>CNR-Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Shefferly</td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Slemmons</td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Theo</td>
<td>Geography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Sterling</td>
<td>Wall</td>
<td>HPHD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Dona</td>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>Wisinski</td>
<td>Writing Lab, University College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Zinser</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[3/13/18]