

Teaching Portfolio
Joshua Paschal
jospasch@iu.edu | (540) 522 - 4542

Contents

(Note: ctrl+click to jump to the desired header in the digital version)

Teaching Statement.....	2
Teaching Experience Summary	4
Full Course Evaluations	5
Philosophy & the Environment (Spring 2024)	6
Philosophy & the Environment (Fall 2023)	9
Environmentalism & Extremes (Spring 2023).....	13
Business & Morality (Fall 2022)	16
Sample Syllabi, Overview.....	19
<i>Introductory Courses</i>	
Introduction to Western Philosophy	20
Introduction to Ethics and Political Philosophy.....	22
Critical Thinking and Formal Logic	24
<i>Topical Courses</i>	
Environmental Ethics.....	26
Business Ethics	28
Biomedical Ethics.....	30
Technology and AI Ethics	32
Epistemology	34
<i>Advanced Courses</i>	
Seminar: Philosophy & the Criminal Law	36
Seminar: Jurisprudence (Philosophy of Law)	40
Sample Assignments	
Short Paper (Phil. & the Environ.)	42
Case Study Paper (Business and Morality).....	43
Group Project Pitch (Env. & Extremes).....	44
Additional Course Descriptions	45
Selected Courses Preparable.....	46
Standard Course Inserts and Policies.....	47
Supplement: Sample Slides from CTY Presentation on Socrates.....	49
Supplement: Syllabus Design Workshop Notes	51

Teaching Statement

Philosophy is at its best when it is honest and sincere. I find this is something professional philosophers end up taking for granted after becoming so invested in being direct about what we believe. In my experience, this is difficult at first for the vast majority of students; a few times a semester, I will have a student explicitly say something to me along the lines of “I’ve never had a class that invited me to think for myself like this.” Every time a student says something like that, I am reminded of why I fell in love with philosophy in the first place.

Given this, my fundamental approach to the philosophy classroom is to foster an environment where students are free to express and reflect on their own beliefs and thoughts. Skillfully navigating difficult, often abstract disputes, only comes with sincere practice and effort. To this end, my classroom priorities are (1) building rapport, (2) fostering collaboration, and (3) facilitating discussions toward mutual, even when critical, understanding. After expanding in these priorities, I will expand on my approach to course design, assignments, and changes I want to make.

For an engaging philosophy classroom, I believe that it is necessary to build and maintain rapport. I spend time before every session by asking how students are doing and what is going on in their lives. This is not just to get to know the students but to also establish a welcoming and friendly tone in the class; students also get to know one another some. Sometimes I just ask for everyone to show thumbs-up or thumbs-down, especially near difficult times such as midterms. I use this checking-in style approach, too, with the readings, assignments, or other materials to start a session. Instead of just asking “How was the reading?” I prefer to first ask for thumbs on the reading then, based upon the overall results, questions such as “Okay, of those of who gave a thumb-down, what about the reading was difficult?” This method has the added benefit of making students not feel alone in their sentiments and so, hopefully, they are more likely to share and discuss honestly. After a few responses to questions like that, we have already highlighted what I, in guiding the discussion, need to address in that session and thereon.

I believe that philosophy is its best when it is a shared, collaborative endeavor, and try to resist just framing discussions as debates to win. Part of this is my approach to an average session: in most cases, I will project the assigned reading and walkthrough it together. This is to help them develop their critical reading skills in a way that they are doing together. This helps them start to develop a sense of when major moves are occurring, how to read difficult texts, and how to identify what kind of move is being offered in the argument. Sometimes, I will lecture some and explain a background or related question. Often, I will ask them what they think of some particular point and solicit discussion on a precise, narrower question, usually one that they can draw on their prior knowledge to engage with and develop those interesting, complex connections.

Something I have tried to work on over the years is focusing on readings that successfully do this. Balancing difficulty with engagement is difficult and something I am continuously working on. I also try to balance course rigor and accessibility by adding optional recommendations in my syllabi to help students engage even if a particular reading ends up being too much, as has happened before. But I also welcome students to give me that feedback as part of the flow of the course, not just something that happens at the end with the usual evaluations. It is their classroom, too, in a sense. Discussions in class are usually one of two kinds: either forays into an interesting part of a given text, or discussion following a successful walkthrough. Above all else, I want students to feel comfortable expressing their honest thoughts to not just me but also their peers. Sometimes this

requires me to help defend the less popular view, knowing when to play sides; sometimes this even requires me to think on my feet and argue against the class consensus, something I try to explicitly identify when I am doing and make it a fun opportunity for them to, ironically, think together. Ultimately, I always try to get students to see why the difficult questions are difficult and to be able to articulate both reasons for and against the views we are scrutinizing in a given class session, as I believe that is the most important skill that a philosophy classroom can help instill in students.

Given my approach to the classroom, I am always trying to develop courses in a way that facilitates this. Topics should flow and allow students to draw on previous content. An obvious example of this is covering the hunting debate early in an environmental philosophy course. I remember very distinctly how lively the conversation got one day when three men in the back of one of those sessions just candidly shared how they felt about their own experiences hunting to a class otherwise inclined against it—it was a conversation which thereafter was a touchstone, “Oh, this reminds me of the animal rights argument against hunting.” I always find it particularly rewarding to both students and myself when students organically draw on material earlier in a course to inform a different discussion.

In the past, I have been fairly traditional in my approach to assignments beyond monitoring classroom participation, which I want to change some in the future. My approach has been at home research essays and in-class exams, of which I have tried both in-class essay exams and more traditional multiple-choice exams. I think about exams in terms of the demands of the specific course. In courses where factual retention matters more, such as philosophy of law, I would be inclined to more quizzes and exams; in courses where analysis matters more, such as political philosophy or practical ethics, I would be inclined toward more in-class writing assignments, especially as a way to spread out the pressure of writing by hand in a generation where that is increasingly uncommon, as has been admittedly been a problem before.

When it comes to any writing assignments, I explicitly tell students I evaluate based on “The Three Cs,” which are clarity, charity, and cogency. As my rubric defines, this means the paper’s argument should be clear and understandable, that the argument should be charitable to anything being scrutinized or disagreed with, and that the paper must come together in a way that lacks distractions or disconnections. So, when a student gets marked down, I can specify, “This paper’s argument was not sufficiently...” and then specify why or what else could have been done. Most often students are not quite as charitable as they could be sometimes, students are just unclear, in which case I usually attempt to offer some form of remediation by having them come speak with me and demonstrate their understanding, as sometimes students just need to talk it out instead.

As for changes I would like to make in the future, I have some ideas. First and foremost, I would like to think more about the readings I assign, specifically drawing from more public-facing work in philosophy or work that is traditionally neglected in our pedagogy (For example, ancient philosophy in Egypt and China instead of just Greece). As for assignments, I would like to innovate by using a journal system, where students write, by hand, responses to chosen readings or class sessions so as to eventually create a sizeable document that they get to keep and look back on. I am always open to innovating and making changes to my approach to all courses to best foster growth in students.

Teaching Experience Summary

My teaching experience is primarily in applied topics. All of the following are courses for which I was the **sole instructor of record** and for which **I independently designed the syllabi** with faculty oversight and advice.

- Philosophy & the Environment (Spring 2024) **39 student lecture**
- Philosophy & the Environment (Fall 2023) **37 student lecture**
- Environmentalism & Extremes (Spring 2023) **16 student seminar**
- Business & Morality (Fall 2022) **37 student lecture**

Before my standalone teaching experience, I **assisted** for **three years**, mostly in ethics courses.

- Introduction to Ethics, Aleksy Tarasenko-Struc (Spring 2022)
 - 2 sections: discussion and grading **6 and 11 students (17 total)**
- Biomedical Ethics, John Robison (Fall 2021)
 - Grading responsibility only. **58 students**
- Applied Ethics: Environmental Ethics, Matthew Adam (Spring 2021) (*online*)
 - 2 sections: discussion and grading **21 and 22 students (43 total)**
- Introduction to Ethics: The Good Life, Timothy O'Connor (Fall 2020) (*hybrid*)
 - 2 sections: discussion and grading **20 and 17 students (37 total)**
- Intro. to Philosophy: Appearance and Reality, Adam Leite (Spring 2020) (*hybrid*)
 - No evals collected due to pandemic, believe **around 30 students**
- Intro. To Ethics: Moral Theory and its Critics, John Robison (Fall 2019)
 - 2 sections: discussion and grading **20 and 21 students (41 total)**

I also have some experience designing and presenting public lectures from my time at Johns Hopkins' *Center for Talented Youth*. One of those PowerPoint presentations (On the Death of Socrates) has been included as a **supplement** in this portfolio. I would like to do more things like this both in the classroom and in my greater professional activity.

Full Course Evaluations

I have included my **full course evaluations** for all of the courses that I taught as a **standalone instructor** in the pages that follow this one. Full, original evaluations are available in their original **PDF** form upon request. I believe these, put together, are strong and emphasize my commitment to a welcoming but demanding classroom environment.

Some highlights to summarize the evaluations:

- Consistently higher ratings on student **motivation**, student learning and **development, availability, and recommendability**, when compared to IU-Philosophy *and* campus
 - Average of around +0.3 out of 4.0 on all measures in Spring 2024
 - Spring 2023 compared to CLLC, a specialized living-learning center I taught for following a competitive vetting process (and higher metrics in general there)
- Strong positive comments about **enthusiasm, openness, optimism**, and the quality of in-class **discussions**
 - I am especially proud of how consistent my positive feedback has been over the years and aim to keep up a high standard for myself.
 - This is also why syllabus control is so important to me as a teacher, as I try to select topics where I can make them as interesting as possible for *students*.
- Narrow negative comments, most commonly complaints are about **participation requirements and difficulty of readings**
 - The latter especially I recognize: I now try to tell students that the point is to challenge them. Nonetheless, I am always trying to find a better balance.
 - I will *always* require some degree of student participation: philosophy demands such.

If requested, I can provide evaluations for my time assisting as well, but they are not representative of my teaching as I was then inexperienced and lacked meaningful control over the course content or direction. I always reviewed and learned from them, but I do not think they are evidence for or against my present preparedness to teach a wide range of courses.

A note: **all quantitative measures are out of 4**. Distributions are *not* normalized or reported as percentiles. Comparisons are made to the Indiana University Philosophy Department and to the whole College of Arts and Sciences (see: highlights above for some specific statistics).

Philosophy & the Environment (Spring 2024)

Question	Course			Department (PHIL)			Institution (IUBLA)		
	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
How clearly were course learning goals and objectives communicated to you?	23	3.5	0.5	442	3.4	0.8	93125	3.5	0.8
Question	Course			Department (PHIL)			Institution (IUBLA)		
	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
How effectively was class time used to help you learn?	23	3.6	0.5	438	3.4	0.8	91888	3.4	0.8
Question	Course			Department (PHIL)			Institution (IUBLA)		
	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
How effectively did out-of-class work (assignments, readings, practice, etc.) help you learn?	23	3.2	0.7	431	3.2	0.9	91459	3.2	0.9
Question	Course			Department (PHIL)			Institution (IUBLA)		
	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
How much did the instructor motivate you to do your best work?	23	3.9	0.3	456	3.6	0.7	104373	3.6	0.7
Question	Course			Department (PHIL)			Institution (IUBLA)		
	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
How much did the instructor emphasize student learning and development?	23	3.9	0.3	455	3.6	0.7	104270	3.6	0.7
Question	Course			Department (PHIL)			Institution (IUBLA)		
	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
How available was the instructor to provide help when needed (in person, by email, office hours, etc.)?	23	3.8	0.4	451	3.6	0.7	104549	3.5	0.7
Question	Course			Department (PHIL)			Institution (IUBLA)		
	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
How likely would you be to recommend this course with this instructor?	23	3.7	0.4	451	3.4	0.9	104742	3.4	0.9

What did you like most about this course and instructor?

Comments
I liked how Instructor Joshua wanted us to actually learn with his assignments, he always encourages us to try our best.
I liked the discussion time.
Instructor was responsive, motivational, and enthusiastic about the class. Inspired me to do my best work for the class.
I liked the discussions in class and not having a ton of assignments.
I like how he interacted with his students to engage in content.
Very knowledgeable instructor. I like how we are able to explore what we want to discuss.
I liked learning about lots of different topics and not just staying in the same area the whole semester. I also enjoyed the discussion and being able to hear what everyone else thinks about the readings and being able to talk openly.
I liked the discussions and engaging in topics that the readings would bring up beyond that of just the readings themselves.
I loved that you came in everyday and asked the class how everyone was doing. You never called anyone out or made anyone feel uncomfortable. I really enjoyed your class even though philosophy wasn't really my cup of tea. Thank you for allowing us to express our thoughts and feelings without making comments, because you don't see a lot of professors/ grad students caring for their students in that way.
How straight-forward he is.
I loved the energy and questions that were asked in class to make us think.
I liked the emphasis on discussion and learning how to engage with high level readings.
I enjoyed the discussions in class.
I loved how interactive and talkative it was. It was up for debate and wasn't structured which I loved.
It was very clear that he was passionate about what he was teaching. As a student, this made it a lot easier to engage with the material. He was also very good at relating the material to our normal lives. Sometimes philosophy papers can become very detached from our normal way of thinking and from what we have seen before. There were good examples and explanations to help make the philosophy more manageable and make it clear what the big points of different philosophies are.
the material covered was very interesting and presented in an interesting way!
Didn't give us the answer, but helped us get there through discussion. Very willing to hear different opinions
I liked the content we covered. I also enjoyed how the instructor always opened up the floor to hear our opinions and thoughts.
He was very relatable and the course let you be optimistic about different opinions. During discussion students were able to debate in an orderly way.
Went through each reading and made sure concepts were recognized
Instructor Paschal was very passionate about the content that was taught in the class. This is one class where I feel like I actually learned a fair amount of material that I did not already know. Overall, the class was very fun!
I liked the discussions we had in class. They helped me understand the readings more, as well as give me whole new perceptions on different topics

What did you like least about this course and instructor?

Comments
I didn't like how participation was a grade.
some of the readings were confusing.
Readings can be difficult on first read, but are explained in the class which helps.
I did not like having to read an article before every class.
I wish the paper instructions were more clear.
Nothing
I do not enjoy writing, so the papers weren't my favorite but only having 2 was not bad at all.
If I did not know too much about the topics being discussed it is hard to join in meaningful conversation.
Sometimes the reading were too long to get through in an hour and completely understand everything
The papers.
I felt like the quiz questions were worded in ways that were hard to understand.
I wish we spent more time learning how to write philosophy papers. We had lots of time to ask our own questions, but I definitely would have benefited from going through example papers and talking about their shortfalls and strengths.
I did not enjoy how long the readings were.
I did not like how many readings there were. It made me unmotivated to do one for every single class.
Occasionally class discussions would take a turn away from the topic of the day and have tangents. Overall though, the tangents were interesting and were normally philosophy related, so this is really nitpicky. I have no meaningful complaints about the course or instructor.
some of the readings were kind of long, but that's ok!
Some of the readings were tricky
I didn't particularly dislike anything about the course or instructor.
The instructor was great and I have no complaints
Some of the readings were heavy, but overall I enjoyed the course and instructor
N/A

Philosophy & the Environment (Fall 2023)

Question	Course			Department (PHIL)			Institution		
	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
How clearly were course learning goals and objectives communicated to you?	27	3.4	0.7	786	3.3	0.8	108848	3.5	0.7
Question	Course			Department (PHIL)			Institution		
	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
How effectively was class time used to help you learn?	27	3.4	0.7	784	3.2	0.9	107408	3.3	0.8
Question	Course			Department (PHIL)			Institution		
	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
How effectively did out-of-class work (assignments, readings, practice, etc.) help you learn?	27	3.0	0.8	764	3.0	0.9	106888	3.2	0.9
Question	Course			Department (PHIL)			Institution		
	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
How available was the instructor to provide help when needed (in person, by email, office hours, etc.)?	27	3.6	0.6	845	3.5	0.6	121026	3.5	0.7
Question	Course			Department (PHIL)			Institution		
	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
How much did the instructor motivate you to do your best work?	27	3.6	0.6	840	3.4	0.7	120692	3.6	0.7
Question	Course			Department (PHIL)			Institution		
	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
How much did the instructor emphasize student learning and development?	27	3.6	0.7	840	3.5	0.7	120583	3.6	0.7
Question	Course			Department (PHIL)			Institution		
	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
How likely would you be to recommend this course with this instructor?	27	3.4	0.8	846	3.1	1.0	121214	3.4	0.9

What did you like most about this course and instructor?

Comments
The classes were pretty awesome, one of the more fun classes I've taken this semester.
I liked how he went into detail and explained the course material clearly. Whenever I had a question or needed assistance for an assignment he did the most to help. I also liked how he encouraged us to ask questions and heard everyone out when they were speaking. I was never scared to raise my hand in this class
I thought this course was interesting and I enjoyed the casual nature of having discussions and having very few large assignments.
Discussing animal rights and gaining knowledge on environmental happenings that I otherwise wouldn't have known about.
I most liked that there were only two papers to write for this course with plenty of time given to think and write the essays. I also enjoyed the format of the class and how there were only 5 open-note quizzes and a fairly easy midterm.
The instructor showed care and understanding for not only the material but also the students. The workload was also light compared to other courses I have taken. I also like the amount of time given to complete the final.
Interactive teaching style.
The amount of passion he had for the topics we were discussing, and also how in depth he went with all the readings.
Professor Paschal was a very kind person and made classes as engaging as possible. A majority of students did not speak during lectures which made discussions difficult, but I could tell he tried his hardest to still make topics entertaining.
The professor was very nice and engaging.
I liked the content.
I enjoyed going to class and talking in class discussions about philosophy, and liked being pushed to think deeper about each topic. I also enjoyed the class structure and how it was very clear with how the course ran.
I really liked the class dynamic.
How we was super relaxed with everything.
I liked that he is genuinely a good person and makes learning easy, especially with hard content.
Personality
I felt that the connections made between all of our assigned readings made the coursework make more sense. We also had so much freedom in what we could talk about and I felt very comfortable sharing my opinion in this class.
I really like how Joshua is very passionate about each and every reading we go over for this class. He is always going into extreme detail in his lectures and is always asking how we feel in general about our lives/ the readings themselves in order to help us in the best way he can.
I enjoyed the how discussion based this class was. It really allowed me to stay engaged in classes and Professor Paschal did well inviting many different ideas.

Continued on next page.

Continued.

I honestly had no intention of wanting to taken Philosophy and the Environment, like I just wanted to take philosophy, but this class ended up being super fun and I learned so much. I learned so much about the environment, the university, philosophy, and everything IU and philosophy.

The instructor is very passionate about the subject which engaged students. He was also very patient when class engagement was low and tried different techniques in getting more participation.

The lectures were very engaging and helped me understand the difficult academic readings we were assigned.

I really enjoyed how passionate the instructor was, you could tell he really cared about philosophy and was super intelligent. He encouraged group discussion but did not force it and was very understanding of things going on in people's lives.

The class discussions were extremely interesting

Learning topics were interesting and teacher was always engaged in topic.

He was animated and clearly very passionate about philosophy as a whole which definitely encouraged active discussion. He was also very understanding and flexible with students if they needed extra time to complete something or had something going on in their personal lives.

What did you like least about this course and instructor?

Comments
n/a
There were so few graded assignments that it was very hard to recover from just missing a single question on the quizzes. Also, the teacher talked most of the entire class time, it would be nice if there were some activities or something to make it more engaging.
The length of some of the readings, especially the outdated ones.
The content was interesting, but I wish we talked about animal rights more with less emphasis on early philosophical papers.
The length of the final.
How old the readings are.
The amount of course work and reading it involved, but that is just part of philosophy as a whole.
Having one hundred points total in a course gives you little room for mistakes. It worked out well for me so I don't have any grievances, but I think it is a bit of a harsh grading system.
I already knew a lot of the subject matter so I was bored and unmotivated.
The instructor made it seem like he had to be the more intellectual than you, which made me not want to learn or try more in the class. Overall, did not seem like he wanted to help us learn.
Sometimes the readings got very long and felt tedious.
N/A

Continued on next page.

Continued.

The super long essays.
I do not think there was anything I particularly did not like about prof. paschal.
Length of material
N/A
I think that assigning more small assignments for this course would be a good idea, maybe like 1 per week about the readings for that week to make sure that students fully understand. Or, even just submitting class notes about lectures for points!
A few of the reading weren't the best, but not much else.
I really didn't like the extent of how hard the reading were. I appreciated the reflections about the readings, but a ton of the readings, I don't think I really understood on my own.
The subject itself wasn't my favorite so my answer might be biased but I didn't like the long readings and discussions every class, I wish there was a little more variety.
Some readings were very long/difficult to read, but after lectures you gain a much better understanding, so I don't really have many complaints.
Sometimes the instructor would ramble on and it was hard to keep track of what he was saying, I wish there were more structured notes to follow along with while he lectured.
N/A
Course requires a lot of reading and same routine every class.
I really dislike the flipped classroom style in general. I find it harder to learn the material and harder to prioritize the work. For people who have a much harder time speaking in class (more so than just "not trying hard enough") its basically a participation death sentence. I don't think he had much say in the style of the course though.

Environmentalism & Extremes (Spring 2023)

Note: Questions are Collins-Living Learning Center's instead of the philosophy department's default, thus the difference of questions between this evaluation and the others in this portfolio.

Question	Course			Department (CLLC)			Institution		
	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
How clearly were course learning goals and objectives communicated to you?	14	3.6	0.6	119	3.4	0.8	85278	3.5	0.8
Question	Course			Department (CLLC)			Institution		
	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
How effectively was class time used to help you learn?	14	3.1	0.9	119	3.3	0.8	84208	3.4	0.8
Question	Course			Department (CLLC)			Institution		
	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
How effectively did out-of-class work (assignments, readings, practice, etc.) help you learn?	14	3.1	0.7	119	3.1	0.9	83733	3.2	0.9
Question	Course			Department (CLLC)			Institution		
	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
How available was the instructor to provide help when needed (in person, by email, office hours, etc.)?	14	3.4	0.6	119	3.7	0.5	96293	3.5	0.7
Question	Course			Department (CLLC)			Institution		
	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
How likely would you be to recommend this course with this instructor?	14	3.3	0.9	119	3.3	0.9	96441	3.4	0.9
Question	Course			Department (CLLC)			Institution		
	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
How much did the instructor motivate you to do your best work?	14	3.6	0.9	119	3.6	0.7	96056	3.6	0.7
Question	Course			Department (CLLC)			Institution		
	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
How much did the instructor emphasize student learning and development?	14	3.7	0.8	120	3.7	0.6	95936	3.6	0.7

Please describe 2 or 3 activities, assignments, readings, etc. from which you learned the most:

Comments
I really liked the earlier readings about the definition of nature and the value of nature.
The discussions everyday were honestly the most useful part of the class as it allowed for multiple points of view and different opinions.
Aldo Leopold Rachel Carson Val Plumwood
Really enjoyed the ecofascism unit. Love questioning morals on people and things especially if I agree with them. Short paper was a good opportunity to just write about what I was feeling about the topics we covered and helped me flesh out what was actually going on in my head. Also found the Unabomber talk really interesting (totally different from who I thought he was!).
I learned from the readings and the in class videos.
Leopold, Godfrey-Smith, and Carson readings, the short paper was interesting- long enough to illustrate my position without having to expand it
The Unabomber articles, and the pesticide articles.
I learned the most from my final project because I was the most interested in it.
I really liked the Aldo Leopold reading and I liked the way that the short paper we did tied all of the things we've been reading together. Very comprehensive overview, I liked that assignment.
We did a lot of readings out side of class, and in class we discussed our opinions and thoughts on the topics in the readings.
I learned the most from the final project and the readings about the environmental in relation to racial justice.
I would have to say that all my things I learned the most from were not just the readings, but our discussions in class. We were able to create an environment where we could freely speak our opinions and hear opposing sides without it being condescending or attacking which is vital for the spreading of knowledge.

Please describe 2 or 3 activities, assignments, readings, etc. from which you learned the least:

Comments
I think I learned the least from the really long readings just because it was difficult for me to comprehend anything through all that information.
I learned a lot from all of the material though the beginning reading seemed a bit repetitive.
Thoreau
I'm not sure! All of the discussions were really enjoyable. There were a couple that I wasn't very interested in, but I honestly can't even remember them.
The essay and final project.
Muir was a bit unhelpful, Plumwood and Grasswick were a bit dense
N/A
I did not really learn a lot from the readings because they all went way over my head.
I though the Thoreau reading was the least interesting and the least applicable to what we talked about overall in class.
na
Some of the other readings in the beginning of the semester felt unnecessary to me.
The short paper at the beginning of the semester seemed unnecessary, but I think it was just for a grade in the grade book.

What changes would strengthen this seminar?

Comments
I think it was a really good class. I don't have any tips
I think more interactive material, such as videos would be helpful.
I think including more mixed media out of class assignments might make the class and discussion more varied and engaging
More time to work on the project itself! Gave lots of time for the proposal, but now I'm really struggling to actually get the entire thing done.
I would change this to a 50 minute lecture
maybe some way to get more hands on? I get the topic is kind of antithetical to that but if it could be done it would be nice. Maybe a walk through dunn woods or something, I don't know
Less super deep/extensive readings.
I would structure the discussions differently to encourage everyone to participate in different ways, not just the same people volunteering to contribute over and over.
Some times we got a little off-topic, so I think if there was more of a central focus and we got more corralled in sometimes we would have been more productive in our conversations.
slightly shorter readings and or annotations on the readings because sometimes they're difficult to interpret.
I think that people would benefit from a more structured discussion.
I think a few more activities or assignments could be beneficial to the active learning in this class. I feel that I more created and modified my opinions on things.

Do you have other suggestions or comments for the instructor of this course or for Collins' Board of Educational Programming (BOEP), which selects Collins courses?

Comments
Joshua Paschal is really good at leading discussions and getting us to think about a specific point.
It was a really good class with a lot of good and substantial discussion.
I enjoy these courses based on environmental topics! I would love more options around this type of subject
Discovered that I love discussion based classes. Especially with people that actually want to engage (which the people in this course did).
No
not really, fun course with a neat classroom atmosphere
Less super deep/extensive readings.
no
Really fun class, I liked the Philosophical lense that we took, it was very nice to consider environmental issues through that lense.
na
enjoyed the class!
N/A

Business & Morality (Fall 2022)

Question	Course			Department (PHIL)			Institution		
	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
How clearly were course learning goals and objectives communicated to you?	20	3.5	0.6	827	3.4	0.8	99149	3.5	0.8
Question	Course			Department (PHIL)			Institution		
	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
How effectively was class time used to help you learn?	20	3.6	0.7	826	3.3	0.8	97997	3.3	0.8
Question	Course			Department (PHIL)			Institution		
	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
How effectively did out-of-class work (assignments, readings, practice, etc.) help you learn?	20	3.1	0.8	798	3.1	0.9	97472	3.2	0.9
Question	Course			Department (PHIL)			Institution		
	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
How available was the instructor to provide help when needed (in person, by email, office hours, etc.)?	20	3.7	0.7	924	3.5	0.7	117338	3.5	0.7
Question	Course			Department (PHIL)			Institution		
	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
How likely would you be to recommend this course with this instructor?	20	3.5	0.9	926	3.3	0.9	117533	3.4	0.9
Question	Course			Department (PHIL)			Institution		
	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
How much did the instructor motivate you to do your best work?	20	3.7	0.5	923	3.5	0.8	116449	3.6	0.7
Question	Course			Department (PHIL)			Institution		
	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
How much did the instructor emphasize student learning and development?	20	3.8	0.4	923	3.6	0.7	116283	3.6	0.7

What did you like most about this course and instructor?

Comments
I like that this instructor is very lenient and knowledgeable about the philosophy subject. I was able to understand most class discussions and he was very approachable to ask questions. He's an IU student like us, so he was able to understand our commitments too.
The instructor had a positive energy and inspired students to perform their best. While the course material may have been difficult to understand, he provided a great deal of time for questions and provided recounts of readings that stuck to the core principals of each writing. I also thoroughly enjoyed the course material, although I am a tad bit biased (sticking with business and math throughout my courses has made any change of course material more interesting).
The instructor was very knowledgeable, and this helped them guide meaningful discussions every day in class.
I really liked a lot of the readings we did in this class and I thoroughly enjoyed are class discussions. In addition, I mostly enjoyed this course because of my instructor. He was one of the best instructors I have had this year and the reason I liked this course was mostly because of him. He was captivating and also very respectful to all of the students. He was understanding but fair and actually cared about our feedback. Also, he answered emails incredibly fast. I had questions about my final paper and he responded within minutes. I appreciate this because when it takes instructors awhile to respond it can be very frustrating.
The atmosphere for participation was impressive. The course content was accessible either through the use of handouts or the dedicated time taken each meeting for questions. This gave the opportunity for clarification and reiteration that is key for success in philosophy classes. The variety of the material from traditional to more contemporary perspectives and accounts meant that there was little room to not be interested by at least a few of the topics, if not all.
Despite being a journalism major, and this class being simply credit filler for me, for the time that I was here and able to focus on class it was quite intriguing and thought provoking. It was an enjoyable to be a part of and I would definitely recommend the class even though I don't think I gave the class its due justice.
The instructor was very passionate about the material and very informative.
The instructor was very passionate about the material he was teaching.
He was a nice instructor and understood what it was like to be a student since he was a grad student
class structure, related topics to things we would understand, very helpful and understanding
I liked Paschals flexibility when it came to assignments and also understanding life outside of a classroom. It is difficult to have professors who believe their students don't have anything else important outside of their class and I felt that when things came up throughout the semester, as long as I stayed in communication with professor paschal, it worked out.
This course and my instructor was great. I have never been in a class that encourages productive discussion as much as this one. The instructor was great at dictating this discussion.
I liked the freedom that this course offered with its papers. It was enjoyable to be able to write about topics that interest me.
I enjoyed the topics we explored and how the instructor taught them
I found it interesting how we were able to connect philosophy to business
I liked that this class brought a philosophical approach to business issues. As a Finance major, I found this class very useful and insightful.
I liked the discussions
I liked the teaching style and how he made what we were learning more or less fun.
I like how he challenged are beliefs and gave us a broad overview of different philosophies. I also felt like everyday I was learning something new.

What did you like least about this course and instructor?

Comments
Some of the class readings were very lengthy and heavy, which sometimes made class discussions difficult to follow. I believe concise, minimal-length readings are best for students to fully read and grasp the material for in-class discussion.
The amount of readings was a bit high? I have no true gripes with this course, as these were required and necessary to learn for the course so I'll mention what I did not enjoy even though it was entirely vital.
There wasn't much I did not like but sometimes the readings got a little lengthy and confusing. I also have never read college course readings since I am a freshman so maybe it was just me lol.
The instructor did well at flagging the heaviest readings when possible and the use of handouts aided this. Personally I think you can't do enough of this because it helps students with heavy course loads prepare best and makes sure they don't miss class just because the reading for that day was unexpectedly long.
Lots of reading that I just wasn't able to balance well with the fact that I had two clients in my PR classes this semester. Unfortunate, but given a lighter workload I would have probably been far better off.
This course was a lot of reading.
Some of the readings were long and difficult.
The readings were overbearing and to many were assigned and they didn't help learn much
n/a
I felt that there was not enough information with writing the first papers we wrote, which made it difficult to know how to write it.
Nothing bad to say.
I did not like the number of readings assigned. They were very lengthy and difficult to read so it took a lot of time to work through them.
The reading was sometimes heavy
The one thing I disliked about this course was how long some of the readings were.
I did not like that the readings were not consistently posted in the announcements. All readings were posted at the beginning of the semester, but which readings needed to be read before class were not always clearly communicated.
Philosophy was not my thing also grading can get very tedious
It was hard to find readings and assignments in canvas.

Sample Syllabi, Overview

Below, I provide some syllabi. **For the sake of brevity, I will only reproduce the minimum to paint the basic picture**, so please pardon exclusion of optional resources or excessive discussion of possible assignments, which I have mostly omitted with some exceptions.

For convenience, I have **subdivided** these sample syllabi into three types: **introductory** courses, **topical** courses, and **seminars**. These are meant to track (1) differences in how I would approach actually teaching such courses and (2) the difficulty of the readings and likely assignments. They likewise track suspected course size, as advanced courses typically are also smaller courses, though this is something I am flexible about.

Of the **introductory** courses, I have designed three for this portfolio: Introduction to **Western Philosophy** (pg. 19-20), Introduction to **Ethics and Political Philosophy**, and **Critical Thinking & Logic**. The broad topics of these courses are intentional: if so desired, they could be designed as more specific or narrower courses (for example, introduction to ethics alone), but I have presented them here as I have to demonstrate my broad competency to teach a wide range of introductions.

Of the **topical** courses, these are courses which I could approach more as an introductory lecture or a more advanced lecture or seminar and thus have been designed flexibly here. Of these, I have taught versions of these already, **Environmental Ethics** and **Business Ethics**; I also have prior experience assisting **Biomedical Ethics**, which helped shape the provided syllabus. Beyond these three courses, I have also recently designed courses in **Technology & AI (Artificial Intelligence) Ethics** and **Epistemology**, totaling for five courses under this category.

Lastly, I have included two advanced **seminar** courses, intended to show the most advanced of topics I am presently prepared to teach. These have been designed with small, intensive courses in mind, though could likewise be adjusted for other styles or modalities. I have designed three of these: **Philosophy & Criminal Law**, and **Jurisprudence** (general philosophy of law).

While quite exhaustive, I wish to note that these are not intended to limit my abilities: while I am primarily trained in normative philosophy, I would more than happily design and teach a variety of courses. For more information on some ideas, see: **Additional Course Descriptions** and **Selected Courses Preparable**, following these sample syllabi.

A final note: for the sake of brevity, I have designed these syllabi minimally, excluding optional resources and excessive discussion of course assignments and evaluations.

Introduction to Western Philosophy

Subtitled: “An Ambitious Survey of Western Philosophy”

The word ‘philosophy’ comes to us from the Greeks, meaning the love of wisdom. The word contains a broad intellectual history spanning thousands of years. While one could spend a lifetime on a particular topic or period, this course attempts to give a wide overview of that tradition in the West and, at times, scrutinize that standard narrative. Students will read texts from seminal figures like Plato, Augustine, and Kant. Lectures will often discuss a range of less recognized complimentary figures. Thematically, the course will strive to understand how grand ideas about God, knowledge, and morality affect how we go about understanding the world and navigating our human lives.

Week 1. *What is Philosophy? Where Did it Come From?*

- Syllabus day
- Read: *The Maxims of Ptahhotep* ([link](#)) (Do not read the whole webpage! Just the one section as labeled)

First Half. —Ancient and Medieval

Week 2. *What Is? On the Pre-Socratics*

- Parmenides, *On Nature* ([link](#))
- Heraclitus, *Fragments* (as composed by William Harris) ([link](#))

Week 3. *Plato: Good and Wrongdoing*

- Plato, *Euthyphro* ([link](#))
- Plato, *Hippias (Minor/Lesser)* (Plato may not have written the longer dialogue also titled *Hippias*, aka the *Hippias Major/Greater*, so I will just say “The Hippias”)

Week 4. *On Aristotle and Skepticism*

- Aristotle, *Metaphysics Lambda* (aka *Book XII*) ([link](#)) Focus on Parts 2, 3, 6, 7 (This is a very tricky text no one really has a full grasp on. Just read it. It is okay if you have no idea what the point is supposed to be, you are not alone!)
- Sextus Empiricus, *Outlines of Pyrrhoism* Sections 1 to 12 ([link](#); the rest is optional and provided for your own pleasure)

Week 5. *On Early Christianity and Philosophy*

- *Romans* 12 to 15 (any version is fine; I would say the King James Version if asked just for historical reasons: [link](#))
- St. Augustine’s sermon on swearing (Sermon 180), sections 1, 2, 3, 4, & 6. ([link](#) to a collection: Sermon 180 starts on pdf page 322)

Week 6. *On the Medieval World.*

- *History of Philosophy Podcast* (since renamed) “Islamic World” episode 140 “Avicenna on God” (aka Ibn Sina) ([link](#); [YT link](#))
- Thomas Aquinas (1273), *Summa Theologiae*, Prima Secundæ Partis Question 94 Articles 1, 3, 4, & 6 (on natural law) ([link](#)) (This is very technical stuff, do not stress over it. Just give it an honest initial read.)

Week 7. *The Renaissance*

- Martin Luther (1517), *95 Theses* ([link](#))
- Niccolo Machiavelli (1532), *The Prince*, chapter 17 ([link](#), pdf pg 123)

Week 8. *Midterm Week*

- Review Day
- Midterm: Multiple-Choice, Short Response, and Short Essay

Second Half. —Modern Philosophy

Week 9. *On The Rationalist Turn*

- Rene Descartes (1641), *Meditations* I and II. ([link](#))
- Gottfried Leibniz (1710), Appendix-Summary of the *Theodicee* ([link](#))

Week 10. *On Empiricism and Skepticism*

- John Locke (1689), *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* Book II., Chapter XVIII ([link](#)) (a bit long, focus on sections 11 to 19, scan rest)
- David Hume (1777), *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding*, Section IV., paragraphs 20 to 25 ([link](#))

Week 11. *On The Kantian Revolution*

- Immanuel Kant (1781), *Critique of Pure Reason*, Introduction, sections I to IV ([link](#))
- Kant (1785), *The Groundwork* Chapter 1 (Preface optional) ([link to full text](#))

Week 12. *On German Philosophy Following Kant*

- Karl Marx (1844), “Critique of Hegel’s Philosophy in General” XXI and XXII only! ([link](#))
- Friedrich Nietzsche (1873), *On Truth and Lie* (1873) ([link](#)) (Just a quick read)

Week 13. *Early Analytic Philosophy*

- G. E. Moore (1908) “Refutation of Idealism” (*Mind* 12 (48), [JSTOR link](#); a bit long, but it is good to practice reading modern academic journal articles, so give it an honest try!)
- Ludwig Wittgenstein (1922), *Tractatus Logico Philosophicus* (1922) Section 1 (pdf page 27) to and sections 6.3 to 7 (pdf pages 85 to 92) ([link](#))

Week 14. *Midcentury Continental Philosophy*

- Simone De Beauvoir (1949), *The Second Sex*, Introduction ([link](#))
- Michel Foucault (1966), *The Order of Things*, Preface ([link](#))

Week 15. *Recent Expansion*

- Interview with Katherine Brading, Anne-Lise Rey, and Penny Weiss on Philosophy as a discipline and expanding the canon from *Extending New Narratives* episode 6 (download and use a media player to listen; online playback seems to be broken for some reason) ([link](#))
- On the rise of Africana philosophy: listen to Cornel West on Peter Adamson’s *History of Philosophy Without Any Gaps* Africana Series episode 140 ([link](#))

Introduction to Ethics and Political Philosophy

What does it mean for something to be good? Or to be right? What makes an action good or right? What makes a state good or right? This course surveys answers to these questions and more. First, we explore major theories of good action, reading figures such as Aristotle, Aquinas, Bentham, and Kant. Second, we survey major views in the history of political thought, such as Hobbes's realism, Locke's contractual liberalism, and Marx's communism. Lastly, we survey some contemporary topics in ethical and political philosophy, such as hate speech and hate crimes, rioting, and moral progress.

Week 1. *Syllabus and the Role of Intuition*

- Syllabus Day
- Matthew Beard (2020), Ethics Explainer on intuition, *Ethics Center* ([link](#))

Unit 1. —Basic Theories of Right and the Good

Week 2. *Anti-realism and Virtue*

- Plato (c. 375 BC), *Republic* I. ([link](#))
- Aristotle (c. 330 BC), *Nicomachean Ethics*, Book I, Chapters 1-5 ([link](#))

Week 3. *Divine Command and Natural Law*

- Augustine (426), *City of God* (426) Book XIX, chapters 2 and 4. ([link](#))
- Thomas Aquinas (1274), *Summa Theologiae* Question 1, Article 1. ([link](#))

Week 4. *Two Modern Theories, Utilitarianism and Deontology*

- Jeremy Bentham (1789), “The Principle of Utility” ([link](#))
- Immanuel Kant (1785), *Groundwork* Chapter 1 ([link](#)).

Week 5. *Critical Theories of Morality*

- Charles Stevenson (1937), “The Emotive Meaning of Ethical Terms” ([link](#)). Skim.
- James Rachels (1986), “The Challenge of Cultural Relativism” ([link](#))

Unit 2. —Political Theory

Week 6. *Human Nature, Social Contrasts, Pessimism and Optimism*

- Thomas Hobbes (1651), *Leviathan* Chapter XIII. ([link](#))
- Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1762), *Social Contract* Book 1, sections 1 through 6. ([link](#))

Week 7. *Early Liberalism and Conservatism*

- John Locke (1689), *Second Treatise* Chapter XIX, sections 222-6 & 242-3. ([link](#))
- Edmund Burke (1790), *Reflections* Sections {277} to {283} ([link](#), use ctrl+F).

Week 8. *Internationalism, Liberal and Communist*

- Kant's *Perpetual Peace* (1795) Second Section. ([link](#))
- Marx and Engels' “Communist Manifesto” Sections I. and IV. (1848) ([link](#))

Week 9. *Critiques of Democracy from Both Ends*

- Emma Goldman (1910), “Anarchism: What It Really Stands For.” Skim ch. 1. ([link](#))
- Giovanni Gentile (1932), “Doctrine of Fascism” First five sections. ([link](#))

Week 10. *Contemporary Democratic Theory*

- John Rawls (1958) “Justice as Fairness” First three sections. ([link](#))
- Alex Guerrero (2014), “Lottocratic Alternative” *Pe&PA* ([link](#))

Unit 3. —Selected Topics in Contemporary Ethics and Politics

Week 11. *Revisiting Utilitarianism*

- Peter Singer (1972), “Famine, Affluence, and Morality” ([link](#))
- Bernard Williams (1973), “Negative responsibility: and two examples” Pdf p. 82. ([link](#)).

Week 12. *Hate Speech and Hate Crimes*

- Robert Simpson (2013), “Dignity, Harm, and Hate Speech” ([link](#))
- Mohamed Al-Hakim (2010), “Hate Crime Legislation” ([link](#))

Week 13. *Civil Disobedience and Riots*

- Martin Luther King Jr (1963) “Letter from Birmingham Jail” ([link](#))
- Ricky Mouser (2024) “How to Read a Riot” ([link](#)).

Week 14. Climate Change

- Buxton’s “Reparative Justice for Climate Refugees” (2019). ([link](#)).

Week 15. Is there Progress?

- Michelle Moody-Adams (2003), “Moral Progress” *Metaphil* ([link](#))

Critical Thinking and Formal Logic

What is a good argument? In this course, we will explore both formal and informal arguments, covering broad subjects such as fallacies, categorical and propositional logic, translations, proofs, biases, evidence, and the psychology of persuasion. Students will practice these skills through exercises, including identifying and sharing arguments and fallacies from real debates as well as writing their own dialogues featuring both good and bad arguments. The course then concludes with an exploration of philosophical methodologies such as intuitionism, conceptual analysis and engineering, and reflective equilibrium.

*Note: given the unusual nature of this course compared to others, I have listed the *topic* of the given day first. We will use some free online textbooks for readings, which I have linked.

forralx An Introduction to Formal Logic (ed. P. D. Magnus) ([link](#))

Cleave's Introduction to Logic and Critical Thinking ([link](#))

Week 1. *What is an Argument?*

- Syllabus Day
- Arguments and Types. Read **forralx** 1.1, 1.3, 1.4

Unit 1. —Formal Arguments via Basic Logic

Week 2. *Syllogisms and Categorical Logic*

- Basic Syllogisms and terminology Read **forralx** 1.6
- Venn diagrams of basic categorical claims; syllogism practice. Read **Cleave's** 2.17

Week 3. *Logical Operators*

- Definitions via truth table. Read **forralx** 2.2, 3.1, 3.2
- Basic propositional arguments. Read **Cleave's** 1.1, 1.2

Week 4. *Sentential Translation*

- Ordinary language into propositional form practice **Read Cleave's 1.12 as an example**
- Practice: validity and soundness. Read **Cleave's** 1.6, 1.7

Week 5. *Proofs*

- Formal proofs, practice Read **forralx** 6.1, 6.2
- Formal proofs, more practice

Unit 2. —Argumentation

Week 6. *What Makes a Good Argument?*

- Formal proof versus the psychology of persuasion
- Speaking practice: *pathos*, *logos*, *ethos*

Week 7. *Inductive and Probabilistic Arguments*

- Inductions and Inference. Read **Cleave's** 3.1, 3.2
- Probability. Read **Cleave's** 3.5, skim 3.6 through 3.10

Week 8. *Common Argument Forms and Fallacies*

- Survey of argument forms and types; identification of common fallacies. Read **Cleave's** 4.1
- Students bring in examples, class practices evaluating together. Read **Cleave's** 4.2, 4.3

Week 9. *Biases and Norms of Good Dialogue*

- How bias distorts reasoning; how to identify and scrutinize bias
- Norms of good dialogue; watch a historical debate and report back

Week 10. *Practice, Writing*

- Students begin writing a dialogue *and* annotate the dialogue, identifying arguments, argument type, and fallacies. Fun suggested!
- Students continue writing; in-class peer review and discussion time.

Week 11. Philosophical Methodology

- Read: “Intuition” in the *SEP*, Sections 2.1 through 2.3 only. ([link](#))
- Read: Chalmers (2020) ([link](#))

Week 12. Thought Experiments and Practicing Reasoning

- Pure: Brain in a Vat, Mary’s Room ([link](#)), Chinese Room ([link](#))
- Practical: Trolley Problem ([link](#)), Experience Machine, Veil of Ignorance ([link](#))

Weeks 13-15. Student-selected topics

- Earlier in the course, students will suggest and vote on possible topics to explore at the end of the course following in-class discussions. Time will be dedicated in class to students working on their dialogues, too.
- The **final exam** will constitute the main grade of the course, given one of the main goals of the course is the development of demonstrable skills. Students will demonstrate (1) their ability to organize categorical claims and evaluate syllogisms, (2) define common logical operators, (3) solve simple propositional proofs, (4) identify common formal fallacies, (5) translate sentences into propositional form, (6) evaluate simple ordinary language arguments, (7) identify common informal fallacies, and (8) offer counterexamples to fallacious arguments.

Environmental Ethics

This course explores the fundamental problems of environmental philosophy. What is “natural”? What obligations do human beings have regarding non-human animals, endangered species, and the natural environment? How might environmental interests be balanced against human economic interests? Readings mainly from contemporary sources.

(This is a slightly adjusted form of an IU Department standard course description for our PHIL 107, which partially shaped how I designed the course schedule below when I taught such.)

Unit 1. —The Fundamental Questions of Environmental Value

Week 1. *Starting the Course*

- Syllabus day
- William Godfrey-Smith (1979) “The Value of Wilderness”

Week 2. *Background: Some History of Environmentalism*

- John Muir “The Treasures of The Yosemite”

Week 3. *How should we think about humanity’s relationship with the wild?*

- Aldo Leopold “The Land Ethic”
- William Cronon (1995) “The Trouble With Wilderness” ([link](#))

Week 4. *How should we think about humanity’s relationship with nature?*

- Arne Naess (1973) “The Shallow and the Deep, Long-Range Ecology Movement. A Summary”
- Murray Bookchin (2006), “What is Social Ecology?” **pg. 19-37 only!**

Week 5. *On humanity and moral consideration—how special are we?*

- Thomas E. Hill Jr. (1983), “Ideals of Human Excellence and Preserving Natural Environments” ([link](#))
- Ronald Sandler & Judith Crane (2006), “On the Moral Considerability of Homo sapiens and Other Species” ([link](#))

Unit 2. —Animals and Environmentalism

Week 6. Introduction to animal rights.

- *Food Inc.* (2008) ([link](#))
- Alasdair Norcross (2004), “Puppies, Pigs, and People”

Week 7. *What makes an animal count?*

- Joel Feinberg (1974) “The Rights of Animals and Future Generations” ([link](#))
- Walter Veit & Heather Browning (2023) “Defending Sentientism” ([link](#))

Week 8. *Balancing the value of animals with the value of the environment*

- Mark Sagoff (1984) “Animal Liberation and Environmental Ethics: Bad Marriage, Quick Divorce” ([link](#))
 - *Optional:* Lilly Marlene-Russow “Why Do Species Matter?” ([link](#))
 - *Also fun:* Tom Scott on Predator Free Wellington/NZ 2050 (2023) ([link](#))
- 28 Feb. Clare A. Palmer “What (If Anything) Do We Owe Wild Animals?” (2013) ([link](#))
 - *Optional:* Patrick Barkham (*Guardian*) “Cull invasive mammals to save island species, experts urge” (2019) ([link](#))

Week 9: Midterm week

- Optional Review Day
- Midterm Day

Unit 3. —Environmentalism in the 21st Century

Week 10. *Background: The Green Revolution*

- Rachel Carson (1962), *Silent Spring* Chapter 3
- Joe Wertz (2020) “Farming’s Growing Problem” *The Center for Public Integrity* ([link](#))

Week 11. *Should we restore? What is the goal of restoration projects?*

- Robert Elliot (1982) “Faking Nature”
- Eric Katz (2018) “Replacement and Irreversibility: The Problem with Ecological Restoration as Moral Repair” ([link](#))

Week 12. *Obligations across people*

- Garrett Hardin (1975) “Lifeboat Ethics”
- Peter Singer (1972) “Poverty, Affluence, and Morality” ([link](#))

Week 13. *The Anthropocene*

- Hasana Sharp (2020) “Not all Humans: Radical Criticism of the Anthropocene Narrative”

Week 14. *Climate Justice*

- Robert D. Bullard (2001) “Environmental Justice in the 21st Century: Race Still Matters”
- Kian Mintz-Woo and Justin Leroux (2021) “What do climate change winners owe, and to whom?”
 - *Optional.* Ian Stoner “Humans Should Not Colonize Mars” (2017)

Week 15. *What is humanity’s future?*

- 22 Apr. Alan Weisman “Earth Without People” (2005 article) ([link](#))
- 24 Apr. *The Guardian* (Milman, Witherspoon, Liu, Chang) “The climate disaster is here” (2021) ([link](#))
 - *Optional:* Optional: Jared Diamond “The Worst Mistake in the History of the Human Race” (1987)

Business Ethics

This philosophy course will examine an array of the ethical questions related to the practice of business. We will be looking at philosophical, legal, and moral problems that concern the business world. This is a survey course that will cover both theoretical and practical topics. The philosophical topics that this course will cover include theories of morality, competing views of rights, loyalty, duties, deception, and justice. We will also look at and discuss ethical concerns in a wide array of practical topics in business including outsourcing and globalization, hostile takeovers, sustainability, deception of the public, advertising, and corporate use of algorithms and artificial intelligence. The main goal of this course is for students to grasp a wide array of ethical concepts and be able to apply those concepts to analyzing problems in the world of business.

(This is a slightly adjusted form of an IU Department standard course description for “Business & Morality,” which partially shaped how I designed the course schedule below when I taught such. The below syllabus is almost identical to the one I taught before.)

Week 1. *What is the Responsibility of a Business?*

- Review the syllabus and course policies in-class; pre-test/survey
- Milton Friedman’s “The Social Responsibility of Business is to Increase Its Profits” (NYT 1970)
 - *Optional:* R. Edward Freeman’s “The Politics of Stakeholder Theory: Some Future Directions” (BEQ 1994) & Kenneth E. Goodpaster’s “Business Ethics and Stakeholder Analysis” (BEQ 1991). Stakeholder analysis goes beyond Friedman’s view; we will not be going further into this literature in this course though.

Week 2. *What does Moral Theory have to Say about Business?*

- *The Crime of the Century*
- Jeffery Moriarty (2005) “Do CEOs Get Paid Too Much?”
 - *Optional:* Lynn Stout’s “Bad and Not-so-bad Arguments for Shareholder Primacy” (S. Cal. L. Rev. 2002)

Week 3. *Rawlsian Justice*

- John Rawls (1958) “Justice as Fairness.”

Week 4. *Replies to Rawlsian Liberalism*

- Excerpts from Robert Nozick’s *Anarchy, State & Utopia* (1974)
- Excerpts from G. A. Cohen’s *Rescuing Justice and Equality* (2008)

Week 5. *Some Difficult Dilemmas*

- *Masterpiece Cakeshop v. Colorado Civil Rights Commission* (2018) (Syllabus, Kennedy opinion, Kagan concurrence, & Ginsburg dissent; all found here: [link](#)).
- Robert Larmer (1992) “Whistleblowing and Employee Loyalty”

Week 6. *Employer-Employee Relations*

- *American Factory*; lecture on moral partiality
- Excerpts of Keller (2009), *The Limits of Loyalty*

Week 7. *Power of Employers Over Employees*

- DesJardins & Duska (1987) “Drug Testing in Employment”
- Excerpts of Elizabeth Anderson (2017) *Private Government*

Week 8. *Bullshit Jobs*

- Excerpts from David Graeber (2018) *Bullshit Jobs*

Week 9. *Midterm Week*

- Optional review day
- Midterm day

Week 10. *Sustainability Concerns in Business*

- *Food Inc.*; **case study paper assigned.**
- Denis Arnold & Keith Bustos (2005) “Business, Ethics, and Global Change”

Week 11. *Deceit: Manipulation, Bluffing, & Lies*

- Alex Barber (2019) “Lying, Misleading, and Dishonesty”
- Alan Strudler (2010) “The Distinctive Wrong in Lying”
 - *Optional:* Albert Carr’s “Is Business Bluffing Ethical?” (HBR Magazine: <https://hbr.org/1968/01/is-business-bluffing-ethical>)

Week 12. *Tort Reform and Manipulation*

- *Hot Coffee*
- Marcia Baron (2003) “Manipulativeness”

Week 13. *Hostile Takeovers & Writing Workshop*

- Michael Kinsella (2017) “Hostile Takeovers—An Analysis Through Just War Theory”
- In-class workshop on case study papers: bring drafts if possible!

Week 14. *Future Directions: Algorithms & Advertising*

- Kirsten Martin (2019) “Ethical Implications and Accountability of Algorithms”
- Palmer & Hedberg (2013) “The Ethics of Marketing to Vulnerable Populations”

Biomedical Ethics

This course explores the moral foundations governing modern healthcare. In the first unit of the semester, we will use the AMA Declaration of Professional Responsibility and challenge its tenets through a series of problem cases. The second unit of the course shifts from professional principles to the deep-seated philosophical debates surrounding the human body, technology, and the market. We will discuss the abortion debate, disability rights, the commodification of human health and bodies, and problems in death and dying. The third unit discusses ethical problems in public health such as obesity and weight loss drugs, mandatory vaccinations, and drug use and harm reduction policies.

Unit 1. —Principles & Problems.

Week 1. *The AMA and Doctor Death*

- The AMA *Declaration of Professional Responsibility* (2001) ([link](#))
- Douglas O. Linder (2019), “The Trials of Jack Kevorkian” ([link](#))
 - Optional: *60 Minutes* interview with Dr. Kevorkian ([link](#))

Week 2. *Bad Doctors*

- Steven H. Mills (2004), “Abu Ghraib: its legacy for military medicine” ([link](#))
- Chapman, Kaatz, & Carnes (2013), “Physicians and Implicit Bias: How Doctors May Unwittingly Perpetuate Health Care Disparities” ([link](#))

Week 3. *The Limits of Doctors’ Duties*

- Rulli & Millum (2014) “Rescuing the Duty to Rescue” ([link](#))
- “Ethics roundtable debate: Is a physician–patient confidentiality relationship subservient to a greater good?” (2004) ([link](#))

Week 4. *Big Topics: Research Reform and Longtermism*

- Raddar & Smiers (2025) Section 1 only: “Medical research without patents: It’s preferable, it’s profitable, and it’s practicable” ([link](#))
- Persson & Savulescu (2024) “On the prospects of longtermism” ([link](#))

Week 5. *Sociological Problems in Medicine*

- Hersh & Goldenberg (2016) “Democratic and Republican physicians provide different care on politicized health issues” ([link](#))
- Chopra, Edelson & Sain (2016) “Mentorship Malpractice” ([link](#))

Unit 2. —Contentious Areas of Medicine and Technology.

Week 6. *Abortion*

- Judith Jarvis Thomson (1971), “A Defense of Abortion” ([link](#))
- Don Marquis (1989), “Why Abortion is Immoral” ([link](#))

Week 7. *Eugenics and Procreative Beneficence*

- Frederick Osborn (1937), “Development of a Eugenic Philosophy” ([link](#))
- Walter Veit (2018), “Procreative Beneficence and Genetic Enhancement” ([link](#))

Week 8. *Disability*

- Harriet McBryde Johnson (2003), “Unspeakable Conversations” ([link](#))
- Elizabeth Barnes (2009), “Disability and Adaptive Preferences” ([link](#))

Week 8. *Commodification*

- Jeanette Beebe (2019), “You can now make money selling your own health data” ([link](#))
- Radcliffe-Richards et. al. (2013) “The case for allowing kidney sales” ([link](#))

Week 9. *Death & Dying*

- Michele Goodwin (2018) “Revisiting Death” ([link](#))
- Anand Sergeant (2024) “The problem of value change” ([link](#))

Unit 3. —Public Health

Week 10. *Obesity and Ozempic*

- Doctor Mike with Dr. Mike (2024), “An Uncomfortable Conversation About Obesity” ([link](#))
 - One of my favorite podcasts: many episodes could merit a day in this class, but this one I think is particularly interesting, difficult discussion. It is also an excellent example of how to discuss serious disagreement respectfully.
- Ryan and Savulescu (2024), “The Ethics of Ozempic and Wegovy” ([link](#))

Week 11. *Vaccination*

- Julian Savulescu (2020), “Good reasons to vaccinate” ([link](#))
- Uwe Steinhoff (2024), “The case against compulsory vaccination” ([link](#))

Week 12. *Harm Reduction to Prohibition*

- Robert J. MacCoun (2012), “Moral Outrage and Opposition to Harm Reduction” ([link](#))
- Grill & Voigt (2016), “The Case of Banning Cigarettes” ([link](#))

Week 13. *Global Resource Allocation*

- Barsdorf and Millum (2017), “The Social Value of Health Research and the Worst Off” ([link](#))
- Persad and Emanuel (2017), “The Case for Resource Sensitivity” ([link](#))

Technology and AI Ethics

This course explores the ethical challenges posed by our evolving technological landscape. We begin by questioning the fundamental relationship between human progress and innovation. Students will engage with a diverse range of perspectives from classic science fiction and foundational computer science papers to contemporary critiques of “surveillance capitalism” and the intricacies of AI alignment. By the end of this course, students critically evaluate how digital systems shape our privacy, politics, and human intimacy.

Week 1. *The Technological Question*

- Syllabus Day
- Diamond (1987), “The Worst Mistake” ([link](#))

Unit 1. —Tech Ethics

Week 2. *Social Media*

- Nguyen (2018) “Escape the echo chamber” ([Aeon link](#))
- Bhargava & Velasquez (2021) Section 1 “Ethics of the Attention Economy” ([link](#))

Week 3. *Information*

- van Doorn (2023) “On the consequences of misinformation” ([link](#))
- Abath (2025) “What’s Going On?” ([link](#))

Week 4. *Privacy*

- Frye (2025) “Ever Thought Your iPhone Was Listening to You?” ([link](#))
- Chomaski & Lauwaert (2023) “Online consent” ([link](#))

Week 5. *Intimacy*

- Pataranutaporn *et al* (x) “My Boyfriend is AI” ([link](#)) Focus on section 6.
 - *Optional* @Weathergirl (2025) “On AI Boyfriends and Moral Panics” ([link](#))
- Proust (2025) “Cyber-Intimacies” ([link](#))

Unit 2. —AI Ethics

Week 6. *Sci-Fi Origins: Asimov’s Laws of Robotics*

- Asimov (1942) “Runaround” (from the *I, Robot* collection, [link](#))
 - *Optional*. Williamson (1947) “With Folded Hands...” ([link](#))
- Asimov (1950) “The Evitable Conflict” ([same link](#))
 - *Optional*. Williams (2002) “Prime Intellect” ([link](#)) Warning: **graphic**.

Week 7. *AI Consciousness*

- Turing (1950), “Computing Machinery and Intelligence” ([link](#))
- Chalmers (2023) “Could a Large Language Model Be Conscious?” ([link](#))

Week 8. *AI Risk*

- MIT’s AI Risk Repository ([link](#)). Learn and explore the “Domain Taxonomy”
- Regina Rini (2017) “Raising good robots” ([Aeon link](#))

Week 9. *AI Bias*

- Angwin, Larson, Mattu & Kirchner (2016), “Machine Bias” ([link](#))
- Shoshana Zuboff (2015), “Big Other: Surveillance Capitalism” ([link](#))

Week 10. *AI Safety*

- Bostrom (2013), “Existential Risk Prevention as Global Priority” ([link](#))
- Amodei *et al.* (2016), “Concrete Problems in AI Safety” ([link](#))

Week 11. *AI Alignment*

- Huffington (2025) “The Human-AI Alignment Problem” ([TIME link](#))
 - *Optional* Claude’s Constitution ([link](#))
- Anthropic (2024) “Alignment faking in large language models” ([link](#))

Week 12. *The Singularity*

- Sam Altman (2025) “The Gentle Singularity” ([link](#))
- Nate Silver (2026) “The singularity won’t be gentle” ([link](#))

Week 13. *All for Nothing?*

- Luke Munn (2023) “The uselessness of AI ethics” ([link](#))

*Last few weeks reserved for student presentations, especially important in this class as I assume students will be competent users of AI tools and, thus, more likely to get around the traditional writing process. Talking through a paper is a more reliable demonstration of knowledge and understanding.

Epistemology

How do we know what we know? And what does it mean to know? In this course on the theory of knowledge, we will explore historical, conceptual, and social and political theories about knowledge. We will explore rationalism, empiricism, and skepticism and replies. We will then study justified true belief, Gettier problems, the foundations of knowledge, pragmatism, and questions about collective knowledge and intentions. Lastly, we will discuss disagreement, testimonial and epistemic injustice, expertise, the media, and contemporary epistemological problems about technology and democracy.

Week 1.

Syllabus Day

Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy “Epistemology” **Section 2 only** ([link](#))

Unit 1. —Some Modern Classics

Week 2. *The Early Modern Division*

- Rene Descartes (1641), *Meditations*, **Second Meditation** ([link](#))
- John Locke (1690), *Understanding*, Book 2 Chapter 1 ([link](#))

Week 3. *Varieties of Skepticism*

- David Hume (1748), *Enquiry*, Section IV Part 1 ([link](#))
- Hilary Putnam (1981), “Brains in a Vat” ([link](#))

Week 4. *Some Modern Answers to Skepticism*

- G. E. Moore (1925), “A Defense of Common Sense.” Skip to section IV. ([link](#))
- Susanna Rinard (2018), “Reasoning one’s Way out of Skepticisms.” ([link](#)) Try to read it all!

Unit 2. —Analytic Topics in Epistemology

Week 5. *Kant and the Analytic-Synthetic Distinction*

- Immanuel Kant (1780), *Critique of Pure Reason*, Introduction, esp. section IV ([link](#))
- Gottlob Frege (1948), “Sense and Reference” ([link](#))

Week 6. New Empiricism

- W. V. O. Quine (1951), “Two Dogmas of Empiricism” ([link](#))
- Nelson Goodman (1955), “The New Riddle of Induction” ([link](#))

Week 7. *Justified True Belief and Gettier Cases*

- Edmund Gettier (1963), “Is Justified True Belief Knowledge?” ([link](#))
- Alvin Goldman (1967), “A Causal Theory of Knowing” ([link](#))

Week 8. *The Foundations of Knowledge*

- Ernest Sosa (1980), “The Raft and the Pyramid” ([link](#)), both class sessions, it is a long one!

Week 9. *Pragmatism about Knowledge*

- William James (1896), “The Will to Believe” ([link](#)) Section I through VI.
- John Dewey (1941), “Propositions, Warranted Assertibility, and Truth” ([link](#))

Unit 3. —Social and Political Epistemology

Week 10. *Epistemic Injustice and Hijacking*

- Listen to Miranda Fricker present “Epistemic Equality?” ([link](#))
- Rachel Keith “Mental Illness Terms and Hermeneutic Hijacking” ([link](#))

Week 11. *Oppression and Gaslighting*

- Briana Toole (2019), “Epistemic Oppression” ([link](#))
- Cynthia Stark (2019), “Gaslighting, Misogyny, and Psychological Oppression” ([link](#))

Week 12. Social and News Media

- C. Thi Nyugen (2017), “Escape the echo chamber” ([Aeon link](#))
- Alex Worsnip (2020), “The Obligation to Diversify One’s Sources” ([link](#))

Week 13. *Expertise and Trespassing*

- David Coady (2006), “When Experts Disagree” ([link](#))
- Nathan Ballantyne (2019), “Epistemic Trespassing” ([link](#))

Week 14. *Fake News, Disinformation, and Astroturfing*

- M. R. X. Dentith (2017), “The Problem of Fake News” ([link](#))
- Jovy Chan (2024), “Online astroturfing” ([link](#))

Week 15. *Technological Problems*

- Regina Rini (2020), “Deepfakes” ([link](#))
- Robert Mariani (2023), “The Dead Internet to Come” ([link](#))

Seminar: Philosophy & the Criminal Law

Perhaps no area of law captures public attention and imagination more than criminal law. This course focuses on the big philosophical questions of criminal law. What are we responsible for? When is the use of force justified? Why do we punish? We will first focus on the substantial questions of criminal law by looking at the idea of *mens rea*, justifications, and excuses. The second half of the course focuses on questions in legal practices, such as the role of juries, plea bargaining, and sentencing. The course concludes with discussions on the theory of punishment and the debate around the death penalty.

First Half: Substantial Criminal Law

Week 1. Syllabus and Definitions

- Syllabus Day
- Why should we be bound by laws?
 - **Read:** Plato's *Crito* ([Gutenberg link](#))

Week 2. Liberalism and Paternalism

- What is the business of law? What can be prohibited?
 - **Read:** *On Liberty*, Chapter 1 pg. 1-18 ([Gutenberg link](#))
- The business of law, pt. 2.
 - **Read:** Gerald Dworkin (1972), "Paternalism," *The Monist* 56 (1): 64-84. ([doi link](#))
 - Optional: read Gerald Dworkin (1999), "Devlin Was Right." ([W&M link](#))
 - Note: G. Dworkin's use of 'paternalism' is broader than it is sometimes used, we will discuss this, just take note of that when we discuss it.

Week 3. *Mens rea* 1: intention and knowledge

- *Mens rea*, culpability levels, and modern thinking about such
 - **Read:** Model Penal Code 2.02, explanatory notes optional ([link](#), pardon the blurry text)
- Knowledge and oblique intent
 - **Read:** Glanville Williams (1987), "Oblique Intention," *The Cambridge Law Journal* 46 (3): 417-438. ([JSTOR link](#)) Focus on the idea of oblique intention and less on the particular cases/rulings Williams discusses.
 - Optional: Alison MacIntyre's Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy article on the Doctrine of Double Effect, a related idea in moral philosophy ([SEP link](#))

Week 4. Justification.

- Necessity
 - **Read:** *R v Dudley and Stephens* (1884) 14 QBD 273, DC. Focus on pgs. 1-2, 9-10 ([text link](#))
 - Optional: watch Quimbee's summary of the facts ([Youtube link](#))
 - Optional: Lon Fuller's *Speluncean Explorers* ([text link](#)). *Spelunceans* goes a bit beyond the scope of this course since it gets into questions in the theory of Constitutions but is a very common first-year law school reading and so I highly recommend it to any prospective law students. That and it is a fun fictionalization, unlike *Dudley*.
- Battered women and the limits of self-defense (content warning, particularly difficult discussion but an important one since it touches on some of the biggest ideas of the criminal law)
 - **Read:** Joshua Dressler (2006), "Battered Women and Sleeping Abusers: Some Reflections," *Ohio State Journal of Criminal Law* 3 (457): 457-471. ([text link](#))

- Optional: (especially sections B and D) Joshua Dressler (2002), “Battered Women Who Kill Their Sleeping Tormenters: Reflections on Maintaining Respect for Human Life while Killing Moral Monsters,” in Stephen Shute, and Andrew Simester (eds), *Criminal Law Theory: Doctrines of the General Part*, *Oxford Monographs on Criminal Law and Justice* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press). ([OUP link](#)) (Note: it should have been ‘tormentor’)

Week 5. *Mens rea* 2: recklessness and negligence

- Recklessness/carelessness
 - **Read:** *Commonwealth (of Massachusetts) v. Welansky* (316 Mass. 383, 55 N.E.2d 902, 1944). ([Justia link](#)). Just get a grip on the facts of the case and the meaning of ‘wanton carelessness’.
- Negligence: should negligence ever be grounds for criminal culpability?
 - **Read:** H. L. A. Hart (2008; 1968), “Negligence, *Mens Rea*, and Criminal Responsibility,” chapter VI from *Punishment & Responsibility*, 136-157. (File will be uploaded, not available online)
 - Optional: read Larry Alexander and Kimberly Kessler Ferzan (2011), “Against Negligence Liability,” in Paul H. Robinson, Stephen Garvey, and Kimberly Kessler Ferzan (eds), *Criminal Law Conversations* (New York, Oxford University Press), ([OUP link](#))

Week 6. Excuses.

- The insanity defense
 - **Read:** J. Thomas Dalby (2006), “The Case of Daniel McNaughton: Let’s Get the Story Straight,” *The American Journal of Forensic Psychiatry* 27 (4): 17-32. ([ResearchGate link](#), pardon the tilt)
 - Optional: Natalie Jacewicz (2016), “After Hinckley, States Tightened Use Of The Insanity Plea,” NPR. ([NPR link](#)). This is about the legal fallout after the 1981 attempted assassination of President Ronald Reagan.
- Intoxication, alcoholism, and responsibility
 - **Read:** the summaries of the various opinions from *Powell v. Texas* (392 U.S. 514, 1968), full case optional. ([Justia link](#)) ([Oyez summary](#) to help with the basics)
 - Optional: Andrea Lavazza (2018), “If Criminal Intentions Are Nonvoluntary, Mandatory Neurointerventions Might Be Permissible,” *AJOB Neuroscience* 9 (3): 154-156. ([link](#))

Week 7. History Week: Perjury, *Mens Rea*, and Treason

(Fun week, take time to work on paper!)

- From Perjury to Modern *Mens Rea*
 - **Read:** Augustine’s Sermon on Matthew, Swearing, and Perjury (“Sermon 180,” file will be uploaded)
- Treason, against the People
 - **Read:** excerpt from Thomas Hobbes’s (1680) *Behemoth*, Dialogue III, pages 144-156. ([internet archive link](#), [pdf pages 164-176](#)). *Behemoth* is less known than Hobbes’s seminal *Leviathan*, but is a good example of an alternative perspective on the English Civil War.
 - Optional: Chris Dite (2022), “The Philosopher Who Helped Kill the King,” *Jacobin* ([link](#))
 - Optional: watch “The Trial of Charles I (1649),” *Historia Civilis*, posted Feb 6, 2020. ([Youtube link](#))

Second Half: Criminal Procedure and Contemporary Questions

Week 8. Some Background

- Violent Crime by the Numbers
 - **Watch/Listen:** Randy Roth (2013), “Why Is the United States the Most Homicidal Nation in the Affluent World,” National Institute of Justice,” posted 2019 by the National Institute of Justice ([Youtube link](#)). *This is mainly for the numerical comparison, I do think his causal story is dubious, but we will discuss that in class.*
 - Optional: Pew Research Center on crime in the US ([link](#))
- “Overcriminalization”
 - **Take a look at:** The FBI Crime Data Explorer ([link](#))
 - **Read:** Douglas Husak (2017), “Overcriminalization,” in *Reforming Criminal Justice Volume I.: A Report by The Academy for Justice*. ([text link](#))
 - Optional: check out the Academy for Justice at Arizona State University ([webpage link](#))

Week 9. Policing and Bargaining

- Policing
 - **Read:** Luke William Hunt (2021), “Policing, Brutality, and the Demands of Justice,” *Criminal Justice Ethics* 40 (1): 40-55. Focus on section V. ([PhilPapers link](#)).
- Does plea bargaining promote injustice?
 - **Read:** Andrew Ingram (2013), “A (Moral) Prisoner's Dilemma: Character Ethics and Plea Bargaining,” *Ohio State Journal of Criminal Law* 11 (1): 161-177. ([PhilPapers link](#))
 - Optional: watch TED-Ed’s “What happened to trial by jury?” ([Youtube link](#))
 - Optional: read Michelle Alexander (2012), “Go to Trial: Crash the Justice System.” ([NYT link](#))

Week 10. Jury Trials

- The problems with juries
 - **Read:** Curley, Dror & Munro (2022), “Juries are subject to all kinds of biases when it comes to deciding on a trial,” *The Conversation* ([link](#))
 - Optional: watch Vox on jury selection ([Youtube link](#))
- Jury nullification
 - **Read:** Travis Hreno (2013), “Jury Nullifications and the Bad Faith Juror,” *Law, Ethics and Philosophy* (1) 1: 53-64. ([link](#)).
 - Optional (background): CGP Grey video on Jury Nullification ([Youtube link](#))
 - Optional (background): Burgoyne and Johnson (2023), “Understanding Jury Nullification: Definition, Examples, And Implications,” *Forbes* ([link](#))

Week 11. Theory of Punishment, Week 1.

- Forfeiture theory, the state of nature, and early liberalism
 - **Read:** John Locke (1689), *Second Treatise*, Chapter II, Sections 6 to 13. ([Gutenberg link](#))
 - Optional: Brian Calvert (1993), “Locke on Punishment and the Death Penalty,” *Philosophy* 68 (264): 211-229. ([JSTOR link](#))
- Utilitarian Theory of Punishment
 - **Read:** Jeremy Bentham (1789), *Principles*, chapter XIII. ([Liberty Fund link](#))

Week 12. Theory of Punishment, Week 2.

- Punishment as Condemnation

- **Read:** Joel Feinberg (1965), “The Expressive Function of Punishment,” *The Monist* 49 (3): 397-423 ([JSTOR link](#))
- Restorative Justice and Criticism
 - **Read:** Stephen P. Garvey (2003), “Restorative Justice, Punishment, and Atonement,” *Utah Law Review* 303 (1): 303-317 ([link](#))
 - Optional: watch Shannon Sliva (2019), “How restorative justice could end mass incarceration” TEDx ([Youtube link](#))

Week 13. Actual Sentencing.

- Federal Sentencing Guidelines
 - **Read:** Matthew Van Meter (2016), “One Judge Makes the Case for Judgment,” *The Atlantic*. ([link](#))
- Artificial Intelligence in Criminal Sentencing
 - **Read:** Keith Brannon (2024), “AI sentencing cut jail time for low-risk offenders, but study finds racial bias persisted,” *Tulane News* ([link](#))
 - Optional (difficult): Jesper Ryberg (2024), “Criminal Justice and Artificial Intelligence: How Should we Assess the Performance of Sentencing Algorithms?” *Philosophy and Technology* 37 (1): 1-15. ([link](#))

Week 14. Hate Crimes.

- Against hate crime penalty enhancements
 - **Read:** Heidi Hurd (2001), “Why Liberals Should Hate ‘Hate Crime Legislation’.” *Law and Philosophy* 20 (2): 215-232. ([Springer link](#))
- More on hate crime legislation
 - **Read:** Marcia Baron (2016). “Hate Crime Legislation Reconsidered.” *Metaphilosophy* 47 (4-5): 504-523. ([DOI link](#))

Seminar: Jurisprudence (Philosophy of Law)

What is law? What should it be? What is the rule of law and where does its authority come from? This course provides a comprehensive survey of the philosophical underpinnings of legal systems. We begin by examining the classic tension between natural law and legal positivism, reading figures such as Aquinas, Blackstone, Hart, and Devlin. We will also study legal realism, feminist legal theory, and critical legal studies. The second half of the course shifts from theory to applied legal problems. We move through specific legal domains, analyzing how philosophical commitments shape our commitments across constitutional, criminal, family, immigration, and international law.

Week 1. *Syllabus and Warm-Up*

- Syllabus Day
- Lon Fuller (1949), “The Case of the Speluncean Explorers” ([link](#))

Unit 1. —Law and Morality

Week 2. *Natural Law*

- Thomas Aquinas (1273), “Treatise on Law” ([link](#))
- William Blackstone (1769), *Commentaries* Introduction, Section 2 ([link](#))

Week 3. *Classic Critiques of Natural Law*

- Jeremy Bentham (1776), *A Fragment on Government* Introduction and Chapter 1 ([link](#))
- Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr. (1897), “The Path of Law” ([link](#))

Week 4. *Legal positivism and response*

- H. L. A. Hart (1958), “Positivism and the Separation of Law and Morals” ([link](#))
- Patrick Devlin (1959), “The Enforcement of Morals” ([link](#))

Week 5. *Legal realism and response*

- Ronald Dworkin (1967), “The Model of Rules” ([link](#))
- Joseph Raz (1985), “Authority, Law and Morality” ([link](#))

Week 6. *Feminist legal theory*

- Catharine A. MacKinnon (1983), “Feminism, Marxism, Method and the State” ([link](#))
- Angela P. Harris (1990), “Race and Essentialism in Feminist Legal Theory” ([link](#))

Week 7. *Against Moral Philosophy in Legal Reasoning*

- Richard A. Posner (1998), “The Problematics of Moral and Legal Philosophy” ([link](#))
- The above is very long but worth it, divide it into halves, say section G or H.

Week 8. *Critical Legal Studies*

- Mark Tushnet (1994), “The Critique of Rights” ([link](#))
 - Optional: Stewart (2020), “Demystifying CLS” ([link](#))
- John Finnis (1985), “On ‘The Critical Legal Studies Movement’” ([link](#))

Unit 2. —Problems within Certain Areas of Law

Week 9. *Constitutional Law: Interpretation*

- Listen to Scalia & Breyer discussion of the Constitution (2009) ([link](#))
- H. Jefferson Powell (1985), “The Original Understanding of Original Intent” ([link](#))

Week 10. *Criminal Law: Reprobation and Paternalism*

- Joel Feinberg (1965), “The Expressive Function of Punishment” ([link](#))
- Gerald Dworkin (2005), “Moral Paternalism” ([link](#))

Week 11. *Criminal Law: Punishment*

- Gary S. Becker (1968), “Crime and Punishment: An Economic Approach” ([link](#))
- Benjamin Yost (2010), “Kant’s Justification of the Death Penalty Reconsidered” ([link](#))

Week 12. *Business Law: Responsibility*

- Milton Friedman (1970), “The Social Responsibility of Business” ([link](#))
- Donaldson & Preston (1995), “The Stakeholder Theory of the Corporation” ([link](#))

Week 13. *Family Law*

- Skim *Obergefell v. Hodges*, skim dissents if possible, too ([link](#))
- J. D. T. Walters (2022), “The Best Available Parent” ([link](#))

Week 14. *Immigration Law*

- Daniel Weltman (2021), “Territorial Exclusion: Against Closed Borders” ([link](#))
- David Miller (2005), “Immigration: The Case for Limits” ([link](#))

Week 15. *International Law: Sovereignty and Self-Determination*

- International Court of Justice, Accordance ... in respect of Kosovo (2010) ([link](#))
- Hsin-wen Lee (2012), “The Identity Argument for National Self-Determination” ([link](#))

Sample Assignment: Short Paper (Phil. & the Environ.)

In the first unit of this course, we have discussed a variety of accounts of the value of nature and the value of the experience of being in nature. Now, it is time for you all to share your thoughts in the form of an argumentative paper.

- What makes nature valuable?
- What precisely do you mean by nature?
- Consider another view for the value of nature.
- What does that account miss out on?
- Consider a possible objection to your own view.
- Respond.
- Conclude with a further point for future consideration.

Each of the above bullets should receive at least one long (5-8 sentence) paragraph of treatment.

Two paragraphs is fine, too. The overall paper should be between **3 and 7 pages (double-spaced!)**.

Do *not* aim for 7 pages: the paper should focus on being concise but thorough.

I would also like you all to cite at least two of the readings. You *may* also cite outside resources, but it is *not* required. Please provide a full citation for any *non-course* resource used. Basic parentheticals are sufficient for course resources (ex: Lastname, pg. 7).

The papers will be graded on three grounds:

Clarity • Every sentence is clear; the main point is stated outright. • The structure follows the prompt; transitional sentences are clear. • Wording is simplified; anyone that has done the readings can understand the commentary.	Charity • The paper seeks to develop any opposing view favorably. • The paper is in good faith; positions are taken seriously; no merely rhetorical points.	Cogency • The paragraphs of the paper end up connecting to the main point. • The paper is free of derailing tangents or side-matters outside of notes (footnotes allowed).
---	---	--

I will provide a good amount of written feedback on the paper; do come talk to me if you find my comments unclear.

Please email me if you want any help! I may not respond to last-minute questions, so try to do your work before the deadline.

Sample Assignment: Case Study Paper (Business and Morality)

So far in this course we have discussed theories of moral action and justice, analyzed concepts such as privacy and loyalty, and looked at cases in films like *The Crime of the Century* and *American Factory*. Now, it is your turn. The basic assignment: **write a paper explaining and analyzing a case of your choice**. This is a fairly broad request, so allow me to clarify some expectations.

Pick a case where there is something to say. Do not choose to write about something you think is uninteresting. Pick a case where either something, in your view, went *wrong* or, alternatively, is an *open dispute*. And be sure to engage with the other side! You should always take possible objections seriously. Focus on what you want to *argue* when picking a case: X did Y thing, and Y thing was bad for Z reason.

Connect to the course material. You are not restricted to *only* using the philosophical material from the course, but your research should meaningfully connect to something we have discussed. For example, if part of the relevant considerations is loyalty, discuss at some point the Keller piece. Or if the case is about abuses of power, perhaps discuss Rawls or Anderson.

Technical Specifications

Word count: 2,400 words to 4,500 words. This amounts to about 7 to 15 standard format pages. You should always default to appropriate formatting; something like Times 12-point, 1.5 spaced. With the amount of time, you have on this paper, I **will** penalize for sloppiness this time around. Otherwise, the standards of grading will be the same as before: **clarity, charity, cogency**. If you are unsure what this means, revisit the Short Paper assignment for a basic rubric to keep in mind.

GROUP OPTION: You are allowed to work in a pair or trio for this assignment. You must let me know if you are doing this in advance.

Pairs: 3,300 to 6,000 words (approx. 11 to 20 pages) || Trios: 4,500 to 9,000 words (approx. 15 to 30 pages)

This is not perfect scaling because I *also* expect pair/trio papers to be more cleanly revised and refined; I do, however, seriously encourage you to work in pairs/trios if you want to. It is an enriching experience to work with peers on a research project like this.

MY ROLE

I am happy to help in the writing process. However, what is appropriate to expect of me depends upon distance from the deadline. Do not send me full drafts a week out: I will not be able to get to them at the end of a semester. Aim to have your plans ready in a few weeks and ask about what you are working on at the start of class.

We will dedicate some time in the remaining classes to talking about paper progression and discussing expected steps in more detail. Bring questions to class! If you have a question, it is likely another of your peers has a similar question. This is also helpful because you may discover a peer is working on a similar topic to you, which will enable you to help one another. **Peer review is always encouraged!** Always feel free to ask questions but at the end of the day this is *your* paper more than a prompt. **Have fun!**

Sample Assignment: Group Project Pitch (Env. & Extremes)

For this course, you are free to do whatever you want for your final project. I will, however, be vetting them to approve them and make sure the amount of work required is roughly commiserate. I am also requiring that you work together in some way. The first step in this process is the *pitch*. In 1 or 2 pages, tell me (1) who you are working with, (2) what the project will be, and (3) how you will work together.

For requirement (1): I would prefer you work in pairs or trios. Groups of 4 will be allowed if the work is clearly and fairly divided as per (3); I would prefer groups of 4 divide into two pairs if possible otherwise. I will insist you work in a group: I think it is an important skill to develop.

For requirement (2): This is very broad and I am happy to guide you along a great range of types of projects. If you just wish to co-author an academic-style paper, great! But you can do a number of other things, too. For some example types:

- An alternative written assignment: try to publish in magazine or pop journal.
- A written artistic assignment: write a dialogue, play, or screenplay.
- A visual artistic assignment: a comic, a model, a photograph collection; there should be a compliment written element explaining the work though.
- A video assignment: a video essay, a performance piece, or an experimental piece.

Here are some more concrete ideas (you are free to pitch these but make it your own!):

- A Socratic dialogue that explores the themes of the first unit.
- A short tragic play about an environmentalist that fails in their endeavor.
- A short dark comedy screenplay about people in the face of environmental catastrophe.
- A sculpture of a few feet tall made out of trash symbolizing the reuse movement.
- A 5-minute silent film about the last survivor of a community devastated by a disaster.

For requirement (3): Just some idea of how you plan to hold one another accountable is what is needed here. I want you all to work together and wish for it to be a fruitful exercise; it is up to you all to work out the details of the “contract” though. This will prevent issues from occurring later on. Additionally, do not *merely* try to work with the person you get along best with or something like that. Consider each other’s schedules: if you never see somebody, they might not be the best person to work with given your conflicting schedules. Be practical about this! It is more important that you agree on *medium* and *substance* than on mere social agreement. Work to each other’s strengths, do not try to simply force different interests together.

This will be graded on completion. Your group only has to submit one pitch *though* I am fine with everyone submitting their own for the sake of accountability per (3). I will provide feedback to adjust the scope of the projects so that they are all roughly the same amount of effort. I will also provide some guidance on how to start.

Additional Course Descriptions

Political Philosophy: Distributive Justice

What economic inequalities, if any, are justified? This is the fundamental question of distributive justice, one of the core questions of political philosophy. In this course on that topic, we will begin with short readings by John Rawls, Robert Nozick, and G. A. Cohen for a range of contemporary views on redistribution and the value of equality. We will then, in the second unit, narrow our questions to matters such as property rights, the social contract, and the modern administrative state, with readings from both historical and contemporary sources. The final unit will extend to major contemporary topics such as duties to the distant poor, international justice, and globalization.

Philosophy of International Law and Relations

This course will look at the philosophical underpinnings of important concepts in international law and the theory of international relations. We will read figures such as broad as Ernst Gellner, Woodrow Wilson, and Samir Amin. The first unit of the course will critically evaluate major historical ideas that continue to influence international law, such as the origins of the nation-state and the self-determination of peoples. The second unit of the course will analyze important institutional changes of the 20th and 21st century, such as the creation of international organizations and the establishment of documents such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The third and last unit will look at difficult problems and associated philosophical tensions, most notably human migration and contemporary theories of secession.

Professional and Practical Ethics: Doctors, Lawyers, Journalists, and More

Everyone is responsible in some ways, but some people in society are responsible in unique ways. Lawyers should keep the secrets, however vile, of their clients and zealously defend them, nonetheless. Doctors hold lives in their hands and mistakes can be deadly. Journalists can destroy lives if they are not careful in their pursuit of truth. This course explores these special professional responsibilities across various sectors and tries to navigate the ethical tensions faced by professions. We will discuss topics such as accountability, licensing and boards, duties and responsibilities, and the idea of professionalism itself.

Philosophy Through Dialogue: Plato, Beckett, Kubrick and More

This interdisciplinary course explores various philosophical topics through various forms of dialogue such as classic prose, plays, and screenplays. We will read some classics such as Plato's "Euthyphro" and "Crito", some plays such as Voltaire's "Candide," John Paul Sartre's "No Exit," and Samuel Beckett's "Waiting for Godot." Students will also watch films (and read the corresponding screenplays for) such as "Citizen Kane," "Starship Troopers," and "Sorry to Bother You." Students will be expected to produce some creative writing as part of a short portfolio for this course, consisting of short pieces in response to various prompts.

Selected Courses Preparable

These are roughly ordered in order of the difficulty of topics, corresponding to the kinds of courses I imagine more as advanced lectures or seminars going down to courses I imagine as more introductory-style lectures. I have marked courses as likely be seminars, advanced lectures, standard lectures, or introductory lectures, roughly corresponding to tiers of difficulty or tiers of required student effort/involvement.

Courses within specialty or of special interest which could be prepared fairly easily.

- Variations on Legal Philosophy (seminar or advanced lecture)
- Variations within Political Philosophy (seminar or advanced lecture)

Courses within areas of competence or areas adjacent to my main interests.

- Topics in Politics, Philosophy, and Economics (seminar or advanced lecture)
- Readings in the History of Ethics (seminar or advanced lecture)
- Philosophy of Technology (advanced lecture or standard lecture)
- Early Modern Philosophy (advanced lecture or standard lecture)

Courses preparable with sufficient notice.

- Topics in (or History of) Analytic Philosophy (advanced or standard lecture)
- Philosophy of Sexuality and Gender (advanced or standard lecture)
- Philosophy of Religion (advanced or standard lecture)
- Just War Theory and International Law (advanced or standard lecture)
- Ancient Greek Philosophy (advanced or standard lecture)
- Introductory Symbolic Logic (standard lecture or introductory lecture)

Curveball ideas I have played around with; could design and propose if desired.

- Philosophy & the History of U.S. Elections (standard or introductory lecture)
- Philosophy & the Modern Album (standard or introductory lecture)

Standard Course Inserts and Policies

Readings

All readings will be uploaded to Canvas and/or linked directly. You are expected to keep up with the readings even if we do not have an in-person class for whatever reason; I will let the class know if we end up having to skip discussing a reading.

Technology

I *recommend* you print the readings and take manual, handwritten notes whenever possible: this increases class participation, minimizes distraction, and increases retention. That being said, appropriate devices may be used instead. However, *I reserve the right to ban any student from using their devices or to institute a general ban if device access is being abused.*

(Those using devices, especially those of you who know you will at times be distracted, should sit further back as to not distract those behind you. But also: just put the laptops away! Before I ask!)

Cell phones should be put away (in your bag ideally); let me know before class if you are monitoring your phone for something important (no need to be specific; I hope students would not lie about this stuff).

Attendance

Regular attendance is always expected. In my introductory courses, attendance will be taken and will be directly factored into the grade. In my upper-level courses, participation will be monitored and requires, for good marks, regular attendance. You are growing professionals and you will be treated as such.

Please contact me if you are going to miss class so that I may mark you as excused for that day.

Illness

Please do not come to class if you are not feeling well. Feel free to come by during office hours to catch up on something you missed when you are feeling better or just email me any questions. Illness does not affect attendance, but you must contact me to be excused, otherwise it will. I am not psychic; communication is key!

I reserve the right to ask you to leave class if I have reason to think you are not well. Do not risk getting your peers sick.

Integrity

You are expected to adhere to the standards detailed in the Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct. Academic misconduct is defined as any activity that tends to undermine the academic integrity of the institution. Violations include: cheating, fabrication, plagiarism, interference, violation of course rules, and facilitating academic dishonesty.

To be as clear as possible about this: submitting a paper written by any large language model is grounds for immediately failing this course. While you may use writing assisting tools such as Grammarly, you should not use any tools to generate writing you submit as your own. Ideas should be your own or those discussed in class.

When you submit an assignment with your name on it, you are signifying that the work contained therein is yours, unless otherwise cited or referenced. Any ideas or materials taken from another source, even if just a conversation with a peer, should be fully and explicitly acknowledged.

I recommend utilizing your peers to assist in your writing: *peer review is always strongly encouraged*. Using ideas from your peers is allowed as long as such is properly acknowledged in the paper (preferably as footnotes). We will discuss this more when the papers are formally assigned.

All suspected violations of the Code will be reported to the appropriate authority and handled according to college or university policies. Sanctions for academic misconduct may include a failing grade on the assignment, a reduction in your final course grade, and even a failing grade in the course.

Supplement: Sample Slides from CTY Presentation on Socrates

The following are sample slides from a “lightning lecture” I designed, the goal of which being to explain the death of Socrates (as told in 4 of the Platonic dialogues) in about 30 minutes. It was a fun exercise and a good example of the kind of pedagogical and public-facing work I would like to do more of in the future.

Note: some of the formatting is a bit off due to importing from Google Slides.



The Trial and Death of Socrates
The Story of the Four Dialogues

Joshua Paschal
Indiana University Philosophy

1

Part 1: On the Life and Times of Socrates



Alcibiades Being Taught by Socrates
François André Vincent, 1776

4

In short: “*Is the pious being loved by the gods because it is pious, or is it pious because it is being loved by the gods?*”

13

Part 3: The Story of Plato’s “Apology”



Socrates standing before seated group of men; figure of Justice stands behind
L.P. Boitard, 1750

16

Outline for Today



This is a lot, so bear with me!

2

Part 2: The Story of Plato’s “Euthyphro”



Socrates with Students and Diotima
Franz Caucig (Franc Kavčič), 1810

9

So, while on his way to face the charges of corrupting the youth and impiety, Socrates annoys a prosecutor not unlike Meletus.



14

The Accusations Against Socrates & His Replies

- Being a dishonest sophist no better than any other rhetorician
- Being an atheist and failing to worship the gods of Athens
- Turning the youth of Athens away from the gods
- Conspiring with the enemies of Athens during the reign of the Thirty Tyrants
- Socrates never charges and educates out *o*philosophia
- The youth are interested in him for that reason: they wish to *dear*n that is why the Athenian people seek to prosecute him
- Socrates fought against Sparta and risked his own life defying the order of one of the Tyrants (Leon)

18

Part 4: The Story of Plato's "Crito"



The Death of Socrates
Jacques-Philip-Joseph de Saint-Quentin, c. 1738

24

Part 5: The Story of Plato's "Phaedo"



A morte de Sócrates
José Maria de Medeiros, 1878

29

"I do not expect any benefit from drinking the poison a little later, except to become ridiculous in my own eyes for clinging to life... So do as I ask and do not refuse me."

34

Conclusion: Why Remember Socrates?



The School of Athens
Raphael, 1511

39

Crito & Socrates

Crito

- (1) Our reputations will suffer!
- (2) It would be unjust for you to die: it would allow you to be harmed by your enemy and hurt your friends. (See: Polemarchus in R. I.)

Socrates

- (1) That has little to do with justice.
- (2) No: I am a citizen of Athens and Athens has sentenced me to die. To not accept this verdict would be to betray the law.

Crito yields; the moment is quite tense given Socrates is due to die rather soon.

But the tension is unresolved: what makes the law of Athens? And is there an obligation of justice to follow the law? Socrates does not try to answer here.

26

- Nothing comes from its opposite; life cannot come from death.
- We only have knowledge of the forms *because* our souls are eternal: we come from and thus return to there.

32

The Cockerel

"Crito, we own a cockerel to Asclepius; make this offering to him and do not forget."

- Asclepius: the God of Medicine
- A young rooster: a sacrifice for cures to illness

Socrates has asked his friend for a cure to his illness, but what illness?

Socrates ~~dis~~feis his illness: he wishes for Crito to give to the gods in honor of his death.

This is either mockery of the Greek religion or a genuine gesture (contrary to why he was sentenced to death!). It remains unclear, as Socrates as a character often is.

38

Two Interpretations of the Legacy of Socrates

Socrates the Wise

Plato's goal: to remember Socrates as the wisest of the Athenians.

Socrates as the father of philosophy.

"All of Western philosophy is but a footnote to Plato." (A. Whitehead)

Socrates is better than all other philosophers (then and now): he took no coin and taught only out of the love of wisdom.

Socrates the Fool

Despite being so important to the history of philosophy, Plato's Socrates was *wrong*.

Socrates's death symbolizes the foolishness of the old philosophy that we must reject- the rejection of our senses and the belief of something more. "We must overcome even the Greeks." (Nietzsche)

40

Supplement: Syllabus Design Workshop Notes

(*Note: these are the notes I wrote out while talking to fellow graduate students about my approach to course design; I have left them completely unedited from that conversation.)

Syllabus/Collins GASP Workshop Notes (14 Sept 2023)

Pitching the Course

- What is the angle?
 - What makes the class unique or special
 - Norms of discipline? Deviations? Why?
 - Interdisciplinarity! (Especially important for Collins)
 - Why is it interesting (focus on the *questions* not so much *answers*)
- Why should a student take the course?
 - One thing to know why you want to teach it, but what is the *message*?
 - Pedagogical reflection: why should students listen to you at all?
 - Core lessons: example, self-reflection is something I constantly hammer into students as what I want more than anything
 - Touchstones: when something is unclear, what should they go back to? The basics of any course (and, assumedly, things worth knowing!)

Outlining the Course

- Focus on the basics first
 - Firstly, what units? Think of the broadest of questions first.
 - Secondly, cornerstone readings? What readings *must* be in the course?
- Think some about core assignments
 - Essays v. exams?
 - Pedagogically serve difference purposes
 - Essays: writing is a skill; focus on developing that skill
 - Exam: knowledge and retention; better for recall
 - Most classes have an element of both, think about weight/importance

Seek Insight

- Surrounded by many peers, use their expertise!
 - Check-in with people who have taught similar courses
 - Seek out readings! Do not assume you know everything
 - Diversify!
 - Perspectives on difficult questions
 - Identities and how those inform the questions
 - Mediums, such as podcasts, instead of just readings
- Flesh it all out, make a reading schedule. Add in policies and a description...
- You have a syllabus! Okay, now check-in once your class has started.
 - It is okay to adjust, especially a new course!
 - Be honest about why readings have been assigned, make it clear “Okay, *this* is the core takeaway for today...”