



# Small Grant Application

Visit <http://www.apaonline.org/?grantfund> to submit.

## Contact Information

Contact Name: Cameron Evans

Email Address: evanscc@wustl.edu

APA Member?  Yes  No *Only APA members may submit grant applications. Membership will be verified.*

## Funding Information

Fiscal Agent: Washington University Department of Philosophy

Fiscal Agent Contact Name: Dee Stewart (Administrative and Financial Coordinator)

Mailing Address: Washington University in St Louis, CB1073

One Brookings Drive / St. Louis, MO 63130-4899

Email Address: stewart.d@wustl.edu Phone Number: 314-935-6670

Total Funding Amount Requested: \$5,000 *Proposals over \$5,000 normally are not funded.*

## Project Information

Project Title: Prejudice: an interdisciplinary workshop

Abstract: *Maximum 150 words.*

This grant will be used to fund an inaugural interdisciplinary workshop on philosophy of prejudice at Washington University in St Louis in late fall, 2017. We will bring together leading scholars studying prejudice, across disciplinary lines, to develop a better understanding of the nature of prejudice and to develop effective interventions. Over the course of a weekend, this conference aims to (1) enable scholars to educate each other about their understanding of prejudice, (2) create space to explore potential solutions to problems of prejudice within philosophy and (3) foster better ideas for addressing issues of prejudice outside the walls of the university. The conference will encourage collaboration towards these goals in focused break-out sessions. Afterwards, the proceedings will be collected into a published volume reflecting the collective insights and interdisciplinary connections, making the results of this conference available to the wider academic community.

## Steering Committee

Name	Institutional Affiliation	APA Member?
Cameron Evans	Washington U in St Louis	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Kate Schrumm	Washington U in St Louis	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Kit Wellman	Washington U in St Louis	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
		<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
		<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
		<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No

Attach a brief resume for each member of the steering committee (maximum two pages per person) highlighting that member's activities and achievements relevant to the project.

## Project Purpose

*Provide a brief account of the project's purpose, explaining its benefits for the profession and/or how it involves community outreach. Attach additional pages as necessary.*

Prejudice, within the academy, and in philosophy specifically, is a phenomenon some of us are still struggling to fully understand. In recent media, philosophy departments in particular have been the objects of criticism -- for being a "white man's game". Leaders in our profession have been accused (and found guilty of) racial and sexual harassment or worse. Other leaders in our profession call for action and diagnose the problem: practitioners of philosophy are not only mostly white and male. But there are considerable hurdles to diversifying the field. As committee after committee finds it difficult to grapple with diversity in hiring and in the classroom, at the root of many of these problems is prejudice: a preconceived opinion (often of a sex or a race) that is not based on reason or actual experience...

<continues on attached page>

## Project Status

*Describe the groundwork already laid for the project or, in the case of projects involving community outreach, the relationships already developed in the community. Attach additional pages as necessary.*

<see attached page>

## Project Plan and Timeline

*Attach additional pages as necessary.*

The basic plan for this project is to bring leading scholars on prejudice -- at least 7 speakers, from a variety of disciplines -- together so that they may learn from and educate one another about the current state of research in their field. Further, panel-led discussions will single out yet resolved and pressing issues about prejudice within academic communities (a problem especially salient in analytic philosophy) and outside the walls of the academy (a problem especially salient in today's politics of race, immigration, and economy). Attached is a timeline which shows the different steps that will be taken to organize, prepare, and implement the conference.

We have already produced a long-list of potential invitees (not included here) and are in the process of securing potential panelists and speakers. Who we invite depends on (a) the balance of academic disciplines represented at the conference, (b) the balance of types of prejudice studied (e.g., racism, sexism, transphobia), (c) the types of approaches scholars take (inter- and intra- disciplinary), (d) and funding limitations. To reduce costs, panelists for the discussion sessions are likely to be selected from either our presentees or Washington University faculty and graduate students working in relevant areas.

Our timeline is attached on a separate page.

## Outreach Plan

*Describe how the project will be advertised to the larger philosophical and/or lay public. Attach additional pages as necessary.*

Once we have secured funding and set a date, the steering committee will create a website to advertise the conference: to disseminate information (about goals, invited speakers) and to assess interest (with an RSVP form). As we secure the speakers, we would hope to provide an abstract for each speaker and talk online. An open conference invitation and the website will be advertised on PhilPapers and on the APA website. We will also issue personal invitations to those on our long list we were unable to invite to speak. Further, we will send open invitations to faculty and graduate students at Washington University in St. Louis and other local campuses (this may mean asking for a representative from each of those universities to commit to outreach efforts there).

## Accessibility Plan

*If the proposal involves public lectures, performances, presentations, or films, describe how the project will be accessible for disabled persons, including deaf/hard of hearing and blind/visually impaired individuals. Attach additional pages as necessary.*

In order to assure that a diverse group of people can be involved, accessibility will be a key aspect of this conference. Organizers will inquire about any accommodations our speakers may need and the website will also include a way for attendees make additional requests anonymously. We understand accessibility to include dietary restrictions (e.g., diabetics, vegan, gluten-free, non-alcoholic), challenged to movement, visual and auditory accommodation. Further, we will ask attendees to let us know if childcare or financial disadvantage prevent them from attending.

Speakers and moderators will receive recommendations regarding best practices to ensure cooperative and effective sessions during the event. Part of these recommendations will be that every talk should include some sort of handout or visual aid to be made available to audience members. The conference will be held in accessible spaces at the Washington University in St. Louis. We will thoroughly outline clear expectations for individuals chairing sessions (waiting to call on people, diversifying who gets called on, not letting questioners monopolize Q&A). The conference schedule will involve frequent breaks. Due to the nature of stress involved in traveling and conferencing, we feel it appropriate to devote quiet space for attendees to rest and decompress during the conference. We hope these accommodations enable attendees to remain engaged with as many speakers and discussions as possible.

## Evaluation Plan

*Describe how the project will be assessed at its completion with an eye to what worked and what could be improved. Attach additional pages as necessary.*

<Attached>



## “Prejudice: an interdisciplinary workshop”

### Purpose

Prejudice, within the academy, and in philosophy specifically, is a phenomenon some of us are still struggling to understand. In recent media, philosophy departments in particular have been the objects of criticism -- for being a “white man’s game”. Leaders in our profession have been accused (and found guilty of) racial and sexual harassment or worse. Other leaders in our profession call for action and to diversify the field. But there are considerable hurdles to diversifying the field. As committee after committee finds it difficult to grapple with diversity in hiring and in the classroom, at the root of many of these problems is *prejudice: a preconceived opinion (often of a sex or a race) that is not based on reason or actual experience*. *Prejudice*, in the legal system, is understood as the *harm or injury that results from some action or judgment*. The threat of real *harm* looms as diversity continues to be a problem for philosophy.

But prejudice is not a problem just within academic philosophy. It’s a significant threat to both ethical and epistemic goals throughout society. Prejudice distorts an agent’s moral landscape, misrepresenting other agents. It blocks agents from engaging in morally appropriate behavior (whether to harass, or help). For us to fail to correct for prejudice is to fail at the goal of treating one another as fully human. Our inability to identify prejudice when it occurs also affects our epistemic access to the world. Unique sources of knowledge are closed off for the wrong reasons, and key flaws within our habits of seeking information persist. The consequences of problems are pervasive and not easily avoided, yet it seems the adage is true that “old habits die hard”. Attempts to promote diversity within the academy will continue to stall and falter unless the underlying mechanisms of prejudice are better understood. Only by examining and understanding the problem can a solution be found.

One ideal vision of the academy is of a place where scholars can pool their resources to address the most important challenges their society faces. Academics have worked tirelessly to identify prejudice and address the harms that result. Nonetheless, scholars often see only part of the picture as disciplinary boundaries can prevent a healthy cross-pollination of ideas. For example, the early history of the psychological study of prejudice is one of a project determined to find a “psychological test” for prejudice divorced of the particulars of the social context in which it occurred. Until sociologists (e.g., Lawrence Bobo) began to attend to the psychological literature, psychologists behaved as though these tests could be used as universal tools for diagnosing prejudice. But the sociologists made it clear that the study of prejudice in a vacuum misconstrued the phenomenon: the expression of prejudice changes over time and by location (e.g., the classic image of the 1950’s American racist vs expressions leading to the genocide in Rwanda, 1994).

One problem we identify in the current state of research on prejudice is the persistence of scholars working unaware of the ways in which practitioners in other fields understand and approach its study. Working only within the confines of their own field, they may stunt a fuller understanding of such an important and complex phenomenon -- one that still claims lives. Our solution is to create a space for experts to come together and build a more global understanding of this phenomenon. By bringing together scholars from different fields (psychology, philosophy,

sociology), who are studying different kinds of prejudice (racism, sexism, transphobia), in different kinds of places (U.S.A., Rwanda, South Africa), this conference will provide a unique opportunity for leading scholars to better understand prejudice. If we are able to understand and intervene on ingrained prejudicial habits, we may find the opportunity to affect real social change: both within the academy (within philosophy) and far beyond the boundaries of the university.

Understood as a flaw or vice, philosophers and other writers have sought to articulate the duties we have as agents in response to prejudice and being prejudiced. Recently, prejudice has been the concern of a variety of prominent philosophers. Philosophers examining prejudice often seek to understand the ethical consequences for agency and responsibility. Consider Elizabeth Anderson's *The Imperative of Integration* or Miranda Fricker's *Epistemic Injustice*; and Michael Brownstein and Jennifer Saul's two edited volume, *Implicit Bias and Philosophy*.

Psychologists, on the other hand, have traditionally explored prejudice on a more individual level, variously as a personality trait or an implicit cognitive trait. Historians, anthropologists and sociologists are more likely to study prejudice as an inter-group dynamic that could not possibly be understood as a "trait" divorced of an historical and cultural context.

Despite the fact these scholars are studying a common problem, there has been very little cross talk between different writers and thinkers working on the problem of prejudice. Different disciplines approach this topic with their own methodologies and assumptions, and often arrive at different recommended solutions. But approaching prejudice through separate, segmented, and isolated projects is ineffective. The causes and consequences of prejudice do not exist in isolation from one another for ease of studying. The study of prejudice as a cognitive trait, isolated from an understanding of prejudice as a social dynamic -- and vice versa -- mischaracterizes the way that prejudice operates in the world. Interdisciplinary conversation has, and (as exemplified in sociology's response to psychology, noted above) has had, the potential to lead us to better ways of managing and reducing prejudice.

Internal attempts to address the issue of "diversity" within academic philosophy often fall flat, serving as empty symbols of our proud commitment to diversity. But philosophy remains predominantly white and male. If our desperate attempts to fix the issue betray any true commitment, we desperately need to better understand the nature of the problem we are dealing with. The history of the study of prejudice demonstrates that understanding (characterization, intervention) requires we examine it from a variety of angles and with a variety of methodologies, pooling resources from many fields.

In light of the lack of interdisciplinary cross-talk, this grant will be used to design a conference especially dedicated to involving experts from many different fields. "Prejudice" is the first interdisciplinary conference dedicated to bringing experts, each taking different approaches to the complex phenomenon, together for a weekend of talks and discussion sessions encouraging interdisciplinary collaboration. Parallel, panel-led discussions will create space in which these top scholars can grapple with difficult questions about the limitations and practical applications of their research. For example, one session in particular will address the issue of prejudice and lack of diversity within academic philosophy. Another session may focus on the current state of research on psychological interventions and what practical consequences the research offers us. Sessions will be tailored to both address pressing

problems (in and out of the academy) and to engage as many of the invited speakers as possible.

Though most of the research on prejudice has focused on black-white interaction, our conference will attempt to approach it as a broader problem (sexism, heterosexism, cis-sexism) and the invitees and panels will be curated to reflect a diversity of approaches to studying diverse kinds of prejudice.

There are a number of reasons that make it especially appropriate to hold the conference now and at Washington University in St. Louis. Race relationships, and the interaction between academia and the wider community, are especially salient to scholars here at Washington University and many are eager to apply what they know to address this issue. Scholars within analytic philosophy, such as Sally Haslanger, Kristie Dotson, Talia Mae Bettcher and Charles Mills have each demonstrated a commitment to bringing the tools of philosophy to address problems they face outside of the academy. There is an urgent want and need for academics to be able to engage with topics that matter to the community, and this conference serves as a first-step to bridging the gap.

The philosophy department at Washington University in St. Louis has already demonstrated a commitment to interdisciplinary work through a strong history and culture of valuing the contributions of psychology and neuroscience to the philosophy of mind. The department currently has collaborative ties to Psychology, Neuroscience, Political Science, and Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies. It seems only the next logical step to extend our commitment to interdisciplinary work into other areas of philosophy (e.g., political philosophy, critical race theory). We imagine our departmental outlook will foster a most welcoming environment for like-minded scholars to come and engage in collaborative work on the problem of prejudice.

We hope that the interdepartmental collaboration that occurs stimulates new research into understanding prejudice and intervening on it in ways to rectify problems we are now grappling within philosophy and, more broadly, as a global society.

## **Project Status**

This project emerges from ongoing discussions about prejudice and relationships we've built across disciplinary boundaries here at Washington University in St. Louis. Recently, our feminist philosophy reading group has been exploring the study of prejudice in conjunction with philosophers at the University of Missouri St. Louis, and Saint Louis University. Last year, members of the feminist philosophy reading group (sponsored by Philosophy- Neuroscience- Psychology) were able to hold a conference in direct response to the events that transpired in the wake of the shooting of Mike Brown: racial tensions that again peaked on the one-year anniversary and has remains at a low simmer. This conference was able to put activists, police, psychologists, social workers and philosophers in the same room to critically address the issues faced by our community. We hope our proposed conference is continuous with this conversation, but by pooling our academic resources and better focusing them on developing a better understanding of prejudice. The philosophy department at Washington University in St. Louis -- in their commitment to interdisciplinary understanding -- has formed working relationships with other departments which we intend will be involved in the success of this

conference: Psychology, Neuroscience, Social Work, Political Science, and Women Gender and Sexuality Studies. The ongoing critical discussion among the philosophers attending the feminist reading group and with invited speakers has helped create a community motivated to investigate this topic in a careful and meaningful way.

Both graduate-student members of the steering committee (proposing this grant) are doing dissertation work involving different aspects of prejudice, and each has a passion to further critical study in this area. Our familiarity with the relevant research and standing connections to others working on prejudice will help to make this conference a success.

The plan for implementing the conference (timeline, conference structure, our goals) is clear, as the prior sections should indicate. We hope to garner the most financial support we can to make this conference as successful as possible. Already, the philosophy department has promised \$2,000 *contingent* on whether the APA funds us. We are confident we can raise another \$5,000 from smaller, local (e.g., University-level) resources, matching our budget.

The plan for the conference will move forward according to our timeline. The next step will be to begin paring down the list of speakers, inviting our most desired speakers, reaching out to the Washington University community (and neighboring universities) for further support. Once we have secured our keynote and the majority of speakers, we set a date and begin to advertise.

### Project Plan and Timeline

<b>Summer 2016</b>	
<b>03/2016</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Broach conference idea with faculty. Generate list of potential invitees</li> </ul>
<b>05/2016</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Research and follow up on other possible sources of funding</li> <li>● Prepare grant to APA</li> </ul>
<b>06/2016</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Curate first, second and third rounds for desired invitees and contingency plans for differing levels of funding</li> <li>● Submit APA Small grant</li> </ul>
<b>06-09/2016</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Secure other sources of funding (small grants within the university). Update committee as we generate more commitments.</li> <li>● Secure keynote (contingent on having gathered enough funding)</li> </ul>
<b>11/2016</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Determine whether we need to adjust our plan according to funding (esp. APA decision)</li> <li>● Set tentative date for conference (largely contingent on keynote)</li> <li>● Invite other key speakers (tier one desired speakers), asking to reply by 1/2017</li> </ul>
<b>01/2017</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Collect acceptances from first round</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Invite candidates from second round as needed, asking to reply by 03/2016</li> </ul>
<b>03/2017</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collect acceptances from second round, re-evaluate whether we need to adjust plans in alignment with our goals and values</li> <li>• Invite candidates from a third round if necessary, asking for a reply by 04/2016</li> <li>• If possible at this point, finalize program and begin outreach plan</li> </ul>
<b>04/2017</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If not already underway, finalize program and start outreach</li> <li>• Collect information about interest (and how many people we need to plan for) via RSVP form on website</li> </ul>
<b>05/2017</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Re-evaluate progress so far, make adjustments to plans if necessary</li> <li>• Sort/confirm speakers' travel arrangements (ask whether they have research funds for travel and offer smaller honorarium)</li> <li>• Double check room confirmations</li> </ul>
<b>09-10/2017</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make catering reservations</li> <li>• Make dinner reservations (speakers &amp; invitees only)</li> </ul>
<b>10-12/2017</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Broad range for possible conference timing. Will may need to be flexible to the needs of those we are inviting, especially if we secure an attractive keynote.</li> <li>• Consider publishing a collection of the proceedings</li> </ul>
<b>12-01/2017</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluate success of conference (e.g., via surveys, follow-up discussions). What we could have done better, what went well.</li> <li>• Begin to contact publishers</li> </ul>

## **Evaluation Plan**

The conference will be assessed along several dimensions. As the project develops the steering committee will repeatedly assess (based on the proposed timeline and plan) whether organizers are meeting the goals and values we've set for the conference. Regularly scheduled meetings will be held to assess forward progress and to set-up a final conference schedule that represents interdisciplinary expertise on prejudice. Once the schedule is finalized and the conference adequately advertised, we will gauge interest (as RSVPs) and respond with adequate adjustments to the plan. The budget will be monitored closely at these meetings.

In weeks leading up to the conference regular meetings will increase as we assess whether we are prepared for the arrival of our speakers and guests.

The weekend of the conference there will be at least one committee member designated to monitor the timing of the conference. To facilitate the best discussion, the conference will be held on time while nonetheless ensuring that the conference attendees have their needs met. The conference will be considered successful in part based upon the number of attendees, but also on the quality of the interaction between attendees. While this assessment will be difficult to assess and respond to on-the-fly, we will plan ahead of time for common problem-scenarios (pooling the knowledge of those we know who have executed successful conferences), this assessment will be made primarily by asking participants (speakers and guests) for feedback via survey before they leave or by follow-up e-mail.

The conference will have met its goal if participants and speakers were able to engage with different approaches to the study of prejudice and if the conference has caused researchers to reflect on the potential limitations of their own approaches. Connections made between experts can be essential to fostering and encouraging future work on the topic, though assessing this dimension would be nearly impossible immediately after. The committee will assess interest in publishing the proceedings of the conference. If the proceedings are published, the authors would be given additional time to reflect and polish their comments. The success of interdisciplinary collaboration may then prove evaluative in terms of the speakers' own reflections as they reveal the impact the conference had on them within the new article.

## Budget<sup>1</sup>

### Budget proposal

Project Expense Item	Anticipate d date(s) of expense	Budget Amount	Amt. confirmed or requested from other sources <sup>†</sup>	Amt. requested from the APA
Total expense 7 invited speakers (itemized below)	09-10/17	Min. \$4620 Max \$7189	\$2000 from department contingent on APA funding \$1500 from the Chancellor's Graduate Fellowship program	
Total expense one invited speaker**		Min. 660 Max. 1027		
-- hotel		\$130/n, \$260/2n \$327/3n		
-- flight		\$3-600 domestic		
-- ground transport (in STL and on their end)		\$100		
Keynote honorarium	10/17	\$1000		
Fresh coffee, tea and snacks during breaks	09/17	\$200		
Dinner for speakers and invited guests (~14)	10/17	\$910/d \$1820/2d		
Reserving space (within the University)	09/17	\$100/r/d \$300/3d		

<sup>1</sup> **NB** We have planned this budget assuming a few things about the structure of the conference -- which may be updated contingent on who accepts our invitation and the full amount of funding we are able to collect. E.g., (1) a singly keynote on opening, (2) full days both Sat and Sun, and (3) dinner provided only two of the nights

Cleaning crew	04/17	\$70		
Incidental expenses**	04/17	\$200		
<b>TOTAL</b>	--	\$8-10,000*	\$3,500 <sup>†</sup>	\$5,000

<sup>†</sup> There are many Washington University internal resources for small amounts of funding (We estimate up \$5000) which we are in the early process of negotiating.

\* Actual expense will depend on the needs of the speaker we are hosting (whether they are local, domestic or international travellers). Ideally invitation would be constrained only by the goals of the conference; however, budget will likely be the primary constraint on our ability to invite.

\*\* By former conference organizers, I was told that there should always be a pool for unforeseen incidental small expenses (e.g., something breaks, we need to make last minute copies of slides for a speaker, respond to the dietary needs of one of the speakers)

## **Cameron C. Evans**

Washington University in St Louis  
1 Brookings Drive, Dept. Philosophy  
St. Louis, MO 63130

evanscc@wustl.edu  
evanscc.weebly.com  
(314) 435-1007

### **Areas of Specialization**

Ethics (Applied, Normative); Moral Psychology

### **Areas of Competence**

Women, Gender and Sexuality Studies; Philosophy of Mind

### **Education**

Ph.D. (in progress) *Philosophy-Neuroscience-Psychology*,  
ABD. Expected 2019  
with Graduate Certificate in *Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies*  
Washington University in St Louis

M.A. (2016), *Philosophy-Neuroscience-Psychology*  
Washington University in St Louis  
Pre-ABD

M.Sc. with honors (2013) *Mind, Language and Embodied Cognition*  
University of Edinburgh  
Dissertation: "Moral Perception"  
Advisor: Dr. Dave Ward

B.A. (2012) *Bioethics*  
William Jewell College  
Thesis: "Ethics and Embodiment"  
Advisor: Dr. Randall Morris

B.A. (2012) *Molecular Biology*  
Oxbridge Honors Program  
William Jewell College

Visiting student, 2010-2011  
University of Cambridge, Department of History and Philosophy of  
Science

## **Presentations (Works in Progress): Conferences and Workshops**

“Not feminist, not queer: why we need reparative Trans theory”

- (10/2016) *Feminist Epistemology, Methodologies, Metaphysics, and Social Sciences* conference 6 (FEMMSS 6)
- (10/2016) International Gender and Sexuality Studies Conference at the University of Central Oklahoma
- (06/2016) Trans\* Experience in Philosophy Conference
- (04/2016) *Revolutions: Scientific and Social* at Concordia University, Montreal
- (04/2016) *Worldly Matters: Issues in Applied and Socially Engaged Philosophy* at Central European University (unable to attend)

“What does it mean to beg the question?”

- (04/2016) Rocky Mountain Philosophy Conference

“Prejudice” (2014) *Video and art installation* in which I informally investigate viewers’ interpretations of found video showing ambiguous white-black interactions (much like). Parabola Collabora

“Rationalism vs Sentimentalism: What does the empirical literature tell us about moral psychology?”

- (04/2013) *FiESTa*. University of Edinburgh Conference on Social Philosophy

## **Professional Administration, Service and Awards**

Graduate Student Association President (2016-17)

Co-organizer, *COMPASS* conference for undergraduate women philosophers (2015- )

Big Brother, *Big Brothers Big Sisters* (2016)

Graduate Student Administrative Coordinator (“Cave Czar”), Dept. Philosophy, Washington University in St Louis (2014-2016)

Chancellor’s Graduate Fellowship, Washington University in St Louis (2013)

Student representative for Mind, Language, Embodied Cognition, University of Edinburgh (2013)

Co-Organizer and Submission Referee. *Embodied Music Cognition Conference*, University of Edinburgh (2013)

# KATE SHRUMM

One Brookings Drive, Wilson 208 ◊ Department of Philosophy, CB 1073 ◊ St. Louis, MO 63130  
(720) · 284 · 1365 ◊ shrumm@wustl.edu

## EDUCATION

---

### Ph.D

Washington University in St. Louis  
Philosophy, Neuroscience, and Psychology

*Expected Spring 2019*

### M.A.

Washington University in St. Louis  
Philosophy, Neuroscience, and Psychology

*May 2016*

### B.S.

Colorado State University *summa cum laude*  
Psychology Major; Philosophy Minor  
Honors Thesis: *Inquiry and the Ethics of Belief*

*May 2012*

## AREAS OF SPECIALTY

---

### AOS

Moral Psychology, Ethics

### AOC

Feminist Philosophy, Philosophy of Cognitive Science, Epistemology

## RESEARCH PROJECTS

---

### Papers

Moral Testimony and Implicit Bias  
Admiration and Moral Improvement

*Works In Progress*

### Academic Research

Moral Foundations and Obedience in Milgram's Experiments  
Race and Gender in Philosophy Thought Experiments

*Ongoing*

### Teaching Citation

Evidence-based Professional Development Program  
Research topic: The effects of peer-editing in undergraduate philosophy classes

*Summer 2016*

## PRESENTATIONS

---

### Easy or Hard: Moral Psychology of Virtue

Washington University in St. Louis, Philosophy-Neuroscience-Psychology

*October 2015*

### Introduction to Testimonial Injustice

*September 2015*

Washington University in St. Louis, Philosophy

**Stereotype Threat and Cognitive Control in the Classroom**

*December 2015*

Washington University in St. Louis, Psychology

**Contempt Fails to Answer Vice**

*April 2015*

American Philosophical Association, Pacific Division Meeting Poster Session

Peer-reviewed Presentation

**SERVICE**

---

Graduate Student Offices Coordinator	2016-2017
Organizer Philosophy Neuroscience Psychology Club	2016-2017
Peer Mentoring and First Year Programming	2014-2016
Graduate Writing Group	Summer 2015
Philosophy Department Hiring Committee	Fall 2014
Graduate Student Development Committee	2013-2014

**AWARDS, GRANTS, FELLOWSHIPS**

---

**Second Place, Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Poster Competition** *May 2016*

The Teaching Center, Washington University in St. Louis

**Graduate School Enrichment Funding (\$300)** *June 2015*

Washington University in St. Louis

**Graduate Student Travel Funding (\$400)** *April 2015*

Washington University in St. Louis

**Graduate Student Travel Funding (\$1000)** *July 2014*

Washington University in St. Louis

**TEACHING**

---

**Instructor of Record**

Biomedical Ethics, Summer 2016

Middle School Summer Challenge: Theory and Reality, Summer 2016

Middle School Summer Challenge: Theory and Reality, Summer 2015

**Teaching Assistantship**

Biomedical Ethics, Spring 2016

Problems in Philosophy, Fall 2015

Great Philosophers, Spring 2015

Present Moral Problems, Fall 2014

**Professional Development Workshops**

Incorporating Active Learning into Lectures

Designing an Online Course

Strategies for Virtual Student Engagement

Teaching with Discussion

**CHRISTOPHER HEATH WELLMAN**  
**Professor of Philosophy**  
**Washington University in St. Louis**

**Education:**

University of Arizona (Ph.D. in Philosophy, 1994)  
University of North Carolina (B.A. in Philosophy and Economics, 1989)

**Fields of Specialization:**

Political and Legal Philosophy; Moral Theory; Applied Ethics

**Books:**

A Theory of Secession: The Case for Political Self-Determination (Cambridge University Press, 2005).

For & Against: Is There a Duty to Obey the Law? coauthored with John Simmons (Cambridge University Press, 2005).

A Liberal Theory of International Justice coauthored with Andrew Altman (Oxford University Press, 2009).

Debating the Ethics of Immigration: Is There a Right to Exclude? coauthored with Phillip Cole (Oxford University Press, 2011).

Liberal Rights and Responsibilities: Essays on Citizenship and Sovereignty (Oxford University Press, 2014).

Rights Forfeiture and Punishment (forthcoming with Oxford University Press).

**Edited Books:**

A Companion to Applied Ethics, edited with R.G. Frey (Blackwell, 2003).

Contemporary Debates in Applied Ethics, edited with Andrew I. Cohen (Blackwell, 2005); a second edition was published by Blackwell in 2014.

**Sample Journal Articles:**

“On Conflicts Between Rights,” Law and Philosophy 14: 271-295, 1995.

- “Liberalism, Political Legitimacy, and Samaritanism,” Philosophy & Public Affairs 25: 211-37, 1996.
- “Associative Allegiances and Political Obligations,” Social Theory and Practice 23: 181-204, 1997.
- “Liberalism, Communitarianism, and Group Rights,” Law and Philosophy 18: 13-40, 1999.
- “Gratitude as a Virtue,” Pacific Philosophical Quarterly 80: 284-300, 1999.
- “Relational Facts in Liberal Political Theory: Is There Magic in the Pronoun ‘My’?”  
Ethics 110: 537-562, 2000.
- “Toward a Liberal Theory of Political Obligation,” Ethics 111:735-759, 2001.
- “Friends, Compatriots, and Special Political Obligations,” Political Theory 29: 217-236, 2001.
- “Lincoln on Secession,” (with P. Lindsay) Social Theory and Practice 29: 113-135, 2003.
- “The Paradox of Group Autonomy,” Social Philosophy & Policy 20: 265-285, 2003.
- “A Defense of Stiffer Penalties for Hate Crimes,” Hypatia 21: 62-80, 2006.
- “Humanitarian Intervention and Political Assassination,” (with A. Altman) Ethics 118:228-257, 2008.
- “The Deontological Defense of Democracy: An Argument from Group Rights,”  
(with A. Altman) Pacific Philosophical Quarterly 89: 279-293, 2008.
- “Immigration and Freedom of Association,” Ethics 119: 109-141, 2008.
- “Rights and State Punishment,” The Journal of Philosophy 106: 419-439, 2009.
- “Reinterpreting Rawls’s The Law of Peoples,” Philosophy & Social Policy 29: 213-232, 2012.
- “Taking Human Rights Seriously,” Journal of Political Philosophy 20: 119-132, 2012.
- “The Rights Forfeiture Theory of Punishment,” Ethics 122: 371-393, 2012.
- “Procedural Rights,” Legal Theory. 20: 286-306, 2014.