

Guy Schuh: Teaching Dossier

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Teaching Statement	Pg. 2
II. Taught Course Syllabi	Pg. 3
III. Draft Course Syllabi	Pg. 10
IV. Sample Assignments	Pg. 22
V. Sample Handouts	Pg. 25
VI. Course Evaluations	Pg. 30
VII. Teaching Evaluations	Pg. 33

Teaching Statement

My pedagogy is centered around the art of philosophical conversation. We learn best when we take it upon ourselves to communicate our views to those who don't already agree with us; open-mindedly entertain the views of those we don't agree with; and justify our views to others and respond to their concerns and objections. Mastering these skills not only makes us excellent philosophical conversationalists, but good and well-rounded thinkers. An important part of my pedagogy is training students to practice these skills with the absent authors of the philosophical texts that they read for class.

As a prerequisite to simulating a philosophical conversation with the absent author of a philosophical text, students need to develop good reading habits. To this end, I hold them accountable for their reading. I either assign reading response questions that students have to answer before the class we'll discuss a reading or assign them a reading quiz. Once students have developed good reading habits, I train them in both asking probing questions about a reading and also answering those questions on behalf of the author. An excellent assignment for developing this skill is having students teach a class on the day's reading. Students are required to compose a handout outlining the sections of the reading they'll focus on; explain those sections to the class—in effect, walk the class through their handout; field any questions about or objections to the reading that other students may have; and then present their own set of questions on the reading to the class for discussion. I'm sure to first model the presentation and the accompanying handout to students before they begin their own presentations. I also require that students workshop their presentations with me outside of class. This allows me to remedy any serious misunderstandings and also point students towards the more philosophical rich parts of a reading. As a result of this preparation, I've had some excellent student presentations on some difficult topics.

An important part of philosophical conversation is the giving of, and responding to, objections. I find that providing objections comes easily to students, but thinking charitably about how an author would respond to their objection is more difficult. I therefore put a lot of emphasis on coming up with responses to an objection on behalf of an author. I also find that this exercise significantly increases students understanding of a position and what sorts of commitments it entails. One of my favorite assignments for sharpening this skill is to give students the task of writing out an objection to any of the readings we've done for a given unit. I then reserve an entire class for the presentation, and discussion, of these objections where, after each student has presented and explained their objection to the class, we think together about how the author could best respond to it. I also do a competitive group version of the same assignment. I break students into groups and assign each group the responsibility of coming up with an objection to a reading. Then, after each group has presented its own objection, I have students vote on which objection they find to be the most compelling. Finally, I have students repeat the process for a response to that objection. I find that putting a competitive spin on the assignment really helps engage and motivate students.

Finally, I myself strive to model good philosophical conversation for the class. I encourage frequent student questions and objections, and I take them very seriously; for example, when I get a student objection, I take the time to first explain it to the class, and then I present what I believe would be the author's response. I also encourage students to talk with me about unresolved questions after class and during office hours. For example, one student disagreed with Aristotle's claim that maintaining a friendship requires an equal return of benefits from the other friend. After we discussed how Aristotle would try to respond to her criticism, she expanded her objection into a term paper

Taught Course Syllabi

Comparative Western/Chinese Ethics: The Ethics of Lying

We will investigate the morality of lying and truthfulness using a comparative approach. The first section will cover the history of Western thinking about lying and truthfulness; the second section will cover Classical and Modern Chinese thinking about lying and truthfulness. The purpose of this comparison will be to reveal what may be our (merely) local and questionable ideas about the morality of honesty as well as to discover what the two traditions have in common. The third section will discuss the value of the truth—is knowing or telling the truth something that’s valuable just by itself? We will conclude with a discussion of “Post-Truth” in contemporary politics. We will try to analyze what sort of attitude towards or views about the value of truth “Post-Truth” involves.

Students will (i) complete complete daily reading quizzes; (ii) complete various in-class group assignments; (iii) write three short papers; (iv) write a final paper.

Tools for the Moral Assessment of Lying

Week 1: Sissela Bok, *Lying*, Introduction, Chapters 1-2; David Ross, “The Nature of Morally Good Action;” Julia Annas, *Intelligent Virtue*, Chapters 2 and 7

Western Treatments of Lying and Truthfulness

Week 2: Sophocles’ *Philoctetes*; Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, Book 2, chapters 6-7, Book 4, chapter 7, Book 7, chapters 1-2, 9

Week 3: Plato, *Republic* 327a-331d, 368c-369d, 380c-383c, 412b-417b; Bok, *Lying*, Chapter XII; Augustine, *Lying* 1-3, 6, 12-14; *Against Lying*, Introduction, chapters 7-10, 15-21

Week 4: 10/1: Kant, *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*, selections; “On a Supposed Right to Lie from Altruistic Motives;” Bok, *Lying*, Chapter 3; Krzysztof Kieślowski, *Dekalog Eight*

Week 5: Mill, *Utilitarianism*, Chapter 2; Bok, *Lying*, Chapter IV; Rosalind Hursthouse, *On Virtue Ethics*, pgs. 25-39, 44-8, 63-87

Eastern Treatments of Lying and Truthfulness

Week 6: Kongzi (Confucius), *Analects*, selections

Week 7: Mozi, selections; “Robber Zhi”; Mengzi (Mencius), selections

Week 8: Mengzi, selections; Han Fei Tzu, selections

Week 9: Wang Xiaofang, *The Civil Servant's Notebook*, “Number Two Department, Department Head, Yang Hengda,” “Chief of the Municipal Finance Bureau, Chen Shi;” Susan Blum, *Lies That Bind: Chinese Truth, Other Truths*, Chapters 1-3, 5-6, 8-9

The Value of Truth

Week 10: Plato, *Republic* 357a-d, 382a-c; *Sophist* 227d-230e; *Philebus* 20b-22b; Robert Nozick, selections on the Experience Machine

Week 11: Hans W. Geissendörfer, *The Wild Duck* (film adaptation of Ibsen's play); Thanksgiving Break

Week 12: Nietzsche, selections; Bernard Williams, *Truth and Truthfulness*, Chapters 1 and 3

Week 13: Williams, *Truth and Truthfulness*, Chapter 5; Harry Frankfurt, "On Bullshit"

Week 14: Lee McIntyre, *Post-Truth*, Chapters 1-3, 6-7; "Stop Blaming Postmodernism for Post-Truth"

Week 15: Final Paper Due

Introduction to Philosophy

We will examine three issues through the reading of classic philosophical texts. We will first examine the nature of philosophy itself. Does it have a unique task or goal? If so, what is it? Is it distinguishable from science? If so, how? Second, we will examine the relationship between philosophy and religion. Is it philosophy's job to assess religious belief? Or do philosophy and religion constitute mutually distinct spheres? Third, we will see what philosophy has to say about why we should be moral.

Students will (i) complete 5 out of 11 weekly reading response papers; (ii) complete in-class writing assignments; (iii) complete three review exams; (iv) write a final critical paper.

Section 1: What is Philosophy?

Week 1: Introduction; Selections from the Pre-Socratics

Week 2: Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, Book 1, Chapters 1-2

Week 3: Plato, *Laches*; Xenophon, *Memorabilia*, Book 1, Chapter 1, paragraphs 11-16; Plato, *Apology*, selections

Week 4: Bertrand Russell, "The Value of Philosophy;" Heidegger, "What is Metaphysics?," selections

Week 5: First Exam / Section Overview

Section 2: Is it Philosophy's Job to Pass Judgment on Religious Belief?

Week 6: Plato, *Euthyphro*

Week 7: Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, Question 1, articles 1-2, 5-6, 8

Week 8: Hume, *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion*; Introduction and Parts 10-11.

Week 9: Genesis 17: 1-22; 21: 1-7; 22: 1-19 (Abraham, Sarah, and Isaac); Kierkegaard, *Fear and Trembling*, Preamble from the Heart

Week 10: Second Exam / Section Over-View

Section 3: Why Should We be Moral?

Week 11: Epicurus, *Letter to Menoecus*; *The Principle Doctrines*, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, 15, 17, 21, 27-40

Week 12: Plato, *Gorgias*, selections

Week 13: Kant, *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*, selections

Week 14: Bernard Gert, "Why should I be moral?," selections

Week 15: Susan Wolf, "Moral Saints;" Coen Brothers, "A Serious Man"

Week 16: Third Exam and Section Overview; Final Critical Paper Due

Medieval Philosophy

We will examine several issues in Medieval Philosophy (see reading schedule for topics). We will be especially concerned to see how Christian thinkers responded to difficulties or challenges to Christianity that stem from the Ancient philosophical tradition that preceded Christianity.

Students will (i) complete an in-class presentation with an accompanying handout; (ii) write a short paper; (iii) write a final long paper.

Christianity and Ancient Natural Theology

Week 1: Select readings from Plato, Aristotle, and Epicurus; Cicero, *Nature of the Gods*, Book 1

Week 2: Cicero, *Nature of the Gods*, Books 2-3

Week 3: Augustine, *Confessions*, Book 7; *City of God*, Books 6-7

Week 4: Augustine, *City of God*, Books 8-10

Week 5: Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*. Pt. 1, Q's 5 and 6; Q. 19

Could God Create the World?

Week 6: Aristotle *Metaphysics* XII.6-10; Al-Ghazali, *The Incoherence of the Philosophers*, Problem 1, pgs. 13-32

Week 7: Feb. 20. Al-Ghazali, *The Incoherence of the Philosophers*, Problem 1, pgs. 32-53; Maimonides, *The Guide of the Perplexed*, book 2, chapters 13-1

Week 8: Feb. 27. Maimonides, *Guide*, book 2, chapters 16-19; Aquinas, *Summa*, Q. 46

Week 9: Augustine *Confessions*, Book 11; *City of God*, Book 11, chapters 4-6

Grace and Original Sin

Week 10: Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, II.1-2, 4; III.6-9; IV.1

Week 11: Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, I.5; IV.3; VII.1-6; IX.8; Plato, *Protagoras*, 353a-357e

Week 12: Paul, Letter to the Romans; Augustine, *On Nature and Grace*, chapters 1-50

Week 13: Augustine, *On Nature and Grace*, chapters 50-84; Augustine, *City of God*, Books 2, 5

Week 14: April 10. Augustine, *City of God*, Books 13-14, 19; Aquinas, *Summa*, Pt. 1, Q's 109, 114

Are God's Attributes Consistent?

Week 15: Justice and Omnipotence: Anselm, *Prologion*, 1.7; Aquinas, *Summa*, Pt. 1, Q. 25

Week 16: Justice and Mercy: Aquinas, *Summa*, Pt. 1, Q. 21; Final Paper Due

Ancient Philosophy

We will examine two important issues in the tradition of Ancient Philosophy. First: what is the nature of philosophy (*philosophia*)? Does philosophy have a unique subject or goal? What is it? We will examine different answers to this question throughout the Ancient philosophical tradition. Second: what, if anything, is the connection between being a good person and living a good life? This was a topic of great interest in Ancient ethical thought. We will examine several different ways of conceiving the connection (or lack of connection) between the two.

Students will (i) complete an in-class presentation with an accompanying handout; (ii) complete one of two short papers; (iii) write a final long paper.

Section 1: What is Philosophy?

Week 1: Introduction; Selections from the Pre-Socratics

Week 2: Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, Book 1, Chapters 1-2

Week 3: Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, Book 1, Chapters 3-4; *Physics*, Book 2, Chapter 3

Week 4: Xenophon, *Memorabilia*, Book 1, Chapters 1-2

Week 5: Plato, *Apology* (pgs. 22-39)

Week 6: Plato, *Apology* (rest)

Week 7: Plato, *Rival Lovers*; *Phaedo* (pg. 134-end).

Week 8: Finish *Phaedo*; Section Overview; First Short Paper

Section 2: Morality and the Good Life

Week 9: Epicurus, *Letter to Menoeceus*; *The Principle Doctrines*

Week 10: Thucydides, "Melian Dialogue"

Week 11: Plato, *Gorgias*, pgs. 1-5, 21-50 (Socrates and Polus)

Week 12: Plato, *Gorgias*, pgs. 51-113 (Socrates and Callicles)

Week 13: Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, Book 1, Chapters 1-6

Week 14: Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, Book 1, Chapters 7-10, 13; Second Short Paper

Week 15: Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, Book 10, chapters 6-8; Section Overview; Final Paper Due

History of Ancient Philosophy

We will approach the tradition of Ancient Philosophy primarily through two of its greatest philosophers, **Plato** and **Aristotle**. We will study some of their writings in order to become acquainted with two important issues within Ancient Philosophy: **the nature of Socratic (or Platonic) investigation** and **the problem of virtue**.

Students will (i) deliver two written questions about two different readings, which they will present to the class; (ii) complete in-classroom writing assignments; (iii) write four one-page papers; and (iv) write a final four-page paper.

Socratic/Platonic Investigation

Week 1: Introduction / Plato: *Apology* 17a-28b

Week 2: *Apology* 28b-35e

Week 3: *Apology* 35e-end

Week 4: Plato, *Euthyphro* 2a-6e

Week 5: *Euthyphro* 6e-11e

Week 6: *Euthyphro* 11e-end

The Problem of Virtue

Week 7: Plato, *Meno* 70a-79e

Week 8: *Meno* 79e-95a

Week 9: *Meno* 95a-end

Week 10: Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*; Bk. 1, chaps. 1-5

Week 11: *Nicomachean Ethics*; Bk. 1, chaps. 6-12

Week 12: *Nicomachean Ethics*; Bk. 1, chap. 13-Bk. 2, chap. 4

Week 13: *Nicomachean Ethics*; Bk. 2, chaps. 5-7

Week 14: *Nicomachean Ethics*; Bk. 2 chaps. 8-9 / Review

History of Ancient Philosophy

We will approach the tradition of Ancient Philosophy through the problem of “selfishness” or “self-love.” Can human beings care more about others than they do about themselves, or is it a necessary part of our nature to care most of all about our own good? We will approach this problem through the writings of three ancient thinkers: Plato, Aristotle and Thucydides.

Students will (i) complete daily in-class quizzes; (ii) write in-class writing assignments; (iii) write four one-page papers on an upcoming reading; and (iv) write a final four-page paper.

Week 1: Introduction / Plato: *Hipparchus* beginning-228b

Week 2: *Hipparchus* 228b-end

Week 3: Plato, *Alcibiades I* 113d-118b

Week 4: Thucydides: *Melian Dialogue*

Week 5: Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* Bk. 9, chap. 8; Bk. 1 chaps. 1-4

Week 6: *Nicomachean Ethics* Bk. 1 chaps. 5-11

Week 7: *Nicomachean Ethics* Bk. 1 chap. 12-Bk. 2 chap. 4

Week 8: *Nicomachean Ethics* Bk. 3 chaps. 6-9

Week 9: *Nicomachean Ethics* Bk. 8 chaps. 1-6

Week 10: *Nicomachean Ethics* Bk. 8 chap. 7-11

Week 11: *Nicomachean Ethics* Bk. 12-Bk. 9 chap. 1

Week 12: *Nicomachean Ethics* Bk. 9 chap. 2-7

Week 13: *Nicomachean Ethics* Bk. 9 chap. 8-12

Week 14: *Nicomachean Ethics* Bk. 10 chaps. 6-8 / Review

Draft Course Syllabi

Classical Chinese Philosophy (Draft)

We'll study Classical Chinese Philosophy—the foundational period in Chinese philosophy. We'll begin in the Spring and Autumn period with the rise of Confucianism (circa 550 BC) and end with the rise of legalism right before the emergence of the Qin dynasty (circa 220 BC).

Students will (i) complete daily reading quizzes; (ii) complete in-class group assignments; (iii) give a class presentation with an accompanying handout; (iv) write two short papers; and (v) write a final paper.

Schedule

Week 1 (Introduction): Van Norden, *Introduction to Chinese Philosophy* ["Introduction"], Chapter 1; Slingerland, *Analects* ["Analects"], xvi-xx "Pre-Confucian Background"; "The History of Chinese Philosophy Podcast," ["Podcast"] Part 1: chinachannel.org/2017/11/01/chp-1/; Sunzi, *The Art of War*, chapter 1

Week 2 (Confucius): *Introduction*, Chapter 2; *Analects*, xx-xxv "The Age of Confucius"; Van Norden, Ivanhoe, *Readings in Classical Chinese Philosophy* ["Readings"], pgs. 3-30 with supplements from *Analects*; podcast, part 2: chinachannel.org/2017/11/09/chp-2/

Week 3 (Confucius): *Introduction*, Chapter 3; *Readings*, pgs. 31-54 with supplements from *Analects*

Week 4 (Mozi): Mengzi (Mencius), *Mengzi*, 3b9; Podcast Part 4 0:00-10:30: chinachannel.org/2017/11/23/hundred-schools-thought/; *Introduction*, Chapter 4; *Readings*, pgs. 59-104; "On the Necessity of Standards;"

Week 5 (Mozi and later Mohism): *Readings*, pg. 105-111; "Anti-Fatalism III; "Anti-Confucianism;" "Keng Chu;" "Esteem for Righteousness;" "Kung Meng;" "Lu's Question;" "Kung Shu"

Week 6 (Yang Zhu and egoism): Mengzi, *Mengzi*, 3b9; Podcast," Part 4 10:30-18:30 chinachannel.org/2017/11/23/hundred-schools-thought/; *Introduction*, Chapter 5; "Robber Zhi;" "The Old Fisherman;" selections from *Analects*

Week 7 (Mengzi and Early Confucianism): "The Great Learning;" "The Doctrine of the Mean;" Podcast Part 4 18:30-31:32; *Introduction*, Chapter 6; *Readings*, 115-37 with supplements from *Mengzi*

Week 8 (Mengzi): *Readings*, pgs. 137-159 with supplements from *Mengzi*

Week 9 (School of Names): *Introduction*, Chapter 7; "On The White Horse"; selection from Mohist Canon

Week 10 (Laozi): Podcast, Part 6: chinachannel.org/2017/12/07/follow-the-dao/; *Introduction*, Chapter 8; *Analects* 13.4, 14.39, 18.6-7; *Mengzi* 3A4; *Readings*, Chapter 4

Week 11 (Zhuangzi): *Introduction*, Chapter 9; *Readings*, Chapter 5

Week 12 (Xunzi): Podcast Part 4 18:30-31:32; *Introduction*, Chapter 10; *Readings*, Chapter 6; “On Honor and Disgrace;” “Contra Twelve Philosophers;” “The Teachings of the Ru”

Week 13: (Legalism): *Introduction*, Chapter 11; Podcast, Part 5: chinachannel.org/2017/11/30/follow-the-law/; *The Book of Lord Shang*, Chapter 1, paragraph 1; chapter 2, paragraph 5; chapter 3, paragraphs 8,9,14; chapter 4, paragraphs 17, 18; chapter 5, paragraphs 25-6; *Readings*, pgs. 311-351

Week 14 (Han Feizi): *Readings*, pgs. 351-359; “Ten Villainies,” “Eight Faults;” Course Review

Eudaimonism in Ancient Philosophy (Draft)

Let “Eudaimonism” be the view that either (a) one’s own *eudaimonia* (“blessedness,” “prospering”) is the ultimate aim of one’s action or (b) one should do whatever is most conducive to one’s own *eudaimonia*. In this class we will attempt to answer the following questions:

- a) Did Ancient Philosophers accept Eudaimonism?
- b) If so, did they offer a defense or justification of Eudaimonism?

We will pay particular attention to three subjects that were popularly understood in ways that imply the rejection of Eudaimonism: virtue and nobility (*to kalon*); friendship; and weakness of will or *akrasia*. The philosophers we will investigate will include Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Epicurus, the Stoics, and, as a representative of early Christianity, Augustine.

Students will (i) write three short papers; (ii) complete an in-class presentation; (iii) write a final paper

Popular Background

Week 1: Introduction; selections from Homer, Sophocles, Menander, Demosthenes, Isocrates, Thucydides, and Aristotle’s *Rhetoric*

Socrates

Week 2: Xenophon, *Memorabilia*, selections on virtue, nobility, and friendship; Aristotle, selections on Socrates; Plato, *Apology*, selections; *Crito*, selections

Plato

Week 3: (Eudaimonism:) Selections from Plato’s *Meno*, *Euthydemus*, *Symposium*, *Republic*, and *Philebus*

Week 4: (Friendship:) Plato’s *Lysis*; **(Akrasia:)** Plato, *Protagoras*, selections

Week 5: (Virtue and Nobility:) *Alcibiades I*; Plato, *Gorgias*, selections

Week 6: (Virtue and Nobility:) Plato, *Republic*, book 1; Plato, *Symposium*, Socrates’ Speech

Aristotle

Week 7: (Eudaimonism:) Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, Book 1; *Eudemian Ethics*, Book 1, selections

Week 8: (Virtue and Nobility:) *Nicomachean Ethics*, Book 2, chapters 1-4; Book 3, chapters 6-9; Book 4, chapter 1; Book 9, chapter 8

Week 9: (Virtue and Nobility:) Book 4, chapter 3; Book 5, chapters 3, 5-6; Book 8, chapter 13-Book 9, chapter 1; Book 10, chapters 6-7

Week 10: (Akrasia:) Book 7, Chapters 1-10

Week 11: (Friendship:) Book 8, chapters 1-8; Book 9, chapters 4-7, 9-12

Epicurus

Week 12: Epicurus, *Letter to Menoeceus*; *Principle Doctrines*, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, 15, 17, 21, 27-40; Cicero, *On Moral Ends*, Books 1-2

The Stoics

Week 13: Selected Stoic fragments; Cicero, *On Moral Ends*, Books 3-4

Augustine

Week: 14: Augustine, *City of God*, Book 5, chapter 12-20; Book 13, chapter 21; Book 14, chapters 11-15, 7-28; Book 19

Week 15: Review

Philosophy of Friendship (Draft)

In this class, we will explore friendship and its ethical dimensions. We will be guided by three questions:

- a) What is friendship?
- b) Is friendship an important part of a good life?
- c) Is friendship an important part of a moral life?

We will explore these questions through a historical survey of works on friendship. We will begin with Classical treatments and then move on to Medieval, Modern and Contemporary ones. We will pay special attention to Aristotle's discussion of friendship in the *Nicomachean Ethics*, which is still considered the classic work on friendship, and Alexander Nehamas' recent *On Friendship*, which directly challenges those views.

Students will (i) write three short papers; (ii) give an in-class presentation (iii) write a final paper on a topic arranged with the instructor.

Week 1: Introduction; Plato, *Lysis*

Week 2: Confucius, *Analects*, selections on friendship

Week 3: Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*: Book VIII

Week 4: Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*: Books IX

Week 5: Thomas Aquinas, "Questions on Love and Charity"

Week 6: Montaigne, "Of Friendship;" Francis Bacon, "Of Friendship"

Week 7: Kant, "Lecture on Friendship;" Kierkegaard, "You Shall Love Your Neighbor"

Week 8: Elizabeth Telfer, "Friendship "

Week 9: C. S. Lewis, "Friendship—The Least Necessary Love"

Week 10: Lawrence Blum, "Friendship as a moral phenomenon"

Week 11: Alexander, Nehamas. *On Friendship*, Chapters 1-2; Philosophy Bytes Interview:

<https://philosophybytes.com/2008/10/alexander-nehama.html>

Week 12: Alexander Nehamas, *On Friendship*, Chapters 3-4

Week 13: Alexander Nehamas, *On Friendship*, Chapters 5-6

Week 14: Course Review

Ethics As Introduction to Philosophy (Draft)

We will study Ethics, one branch of philosophy, as an introduction to the discipline. We will study several major Philosophical traditions through different Ethical topics. The traditions include the Ancient Greek ethical tradition, the Medieval tradition, the Classical Chinese tradition, and the contemporary Western tradition. The topics will include, “Why Should We Be Moral?,” “Does God Decide Morality?,” “Is God Responsible for the Evil in the World?.” We will then conclude by discussing an Applied Ethics subject: “The Ethics of Lying.” This will be a fitting conclusion for our course insofar as it draws on some of the themes and thinkers we will have discussed earlier, such as Plato’s “noble lie” and Augustine’s views about God and morality.

Students will (i) complete daily reading response assignments; (ii) write five 1-page papers; and (iii) write a final 4-5 page paper.

Schedule

Week 1: Introduction; Xenophon, *Memorabilia*, Book 1, Chapter 1, paragraphs 11-16;
Plato, *Apology*; Podcast: <https://historyofphilosophy.net/plato-socrates>

Why Should We Be Moral?

Week 2: Plato, *Republic*, Books 1-2;
Podcast: <https://historyofphilosophy.net/plato-republic-soul-political-philosophy>

Week 3: Plato, *Republic*, Books 3-4

Week 4: Kant, selections from the *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*;
Bernard Gert, “Why Should I Be Moral?”;
Podcast: <https://www.bbc.co.uk/radio/play/b0952z13>

Week 5: Confucius, *Analects*, selections; *Introduction to Chinese Philosophy*, Chapter 1;
Podcast: chinachannel.org/2017/11/09/chp-2/

Does God Decide Morality?

Week 6: Plato, *Euthyphro*; Augustine, *City of God*, Books 14, 19;
Podcast: <https://historyofphilosophy.net/augustine-city-of-god>

Week 7: Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, First Part, Questions 19, 21, First Part of the Second Part, Question 91; Podcast: historyofphilosophy.net/natural-law

Week 8: Mozi, *Mozi*, selections; *Introduction to Chinese Philosophy*, Chapter 4;
Podcast: chinachannel.org/2017/11/23/hundred-schools-thought/ (0:00-10:30)

Is God Responsible for the Evil in the World?

Week 9: Plato, *Republic* 379a-383c; Augustine, *Confessions*, Book 7;
On the Free Choice of the Will, Book 1;
Podcast: <https://historyofphilosophy.net/augustine-confessions>

Week 10: Dostoevsky, *The Brothers Karamazov*, “Rebellion” and “The Grand Inquisitor”

Week 11: John Perry, *Dialogue on Good, Evil, and the Existence of God*

The Ethics of Lying

Week 12: Plato, *Republic* 327a-331d, 368c-369d, 380c-383c, 412b-417b;
Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, Book 2, chapters 6-7, Book 4, chapter 7;
Augustine, selections from “Lying” and “Against Lying;”
Kant, “On A Supposed Right to Lie from Altruistic Motives”

Week 13: Sissela Bok, *Lying*, Chapters 1-3, 6-7, 12; Rosiland Hursthouse, *On Virtue Ethics*,
Chapters 2-3 (on moral dilemmas).

Week 14: Confucius, *Analects* and Mengzi, *Mengzi*, selections on “trustworthiness” (*xin* 信);
Podcast: chinachannel.org/2017/11/23/hundred-schools-thought/ (10:30-18:30)

Week 15: Review

Introduction to Ethics (Intro/Mid-Level)

In this course we will examine the philosophical study of morality. We will divide the philosophical study of morality into two parts. The first part is **practical**—it inquires whether we should be moral or to what extent being moral (or acting in a moral way) is choiceworthy for us. The second part is **theoretical**—it inquires into the nature of morality and related phenomena.

Student will (i) write weekly one-page reading responses; (ii) complete in-class writing assignments; and (iii) write a four-page final paper.

The Practical Question: Should I be moral?

Week 1: Antiphon, selections; Plato, *Protagoras*, 316b-334c

Week 2: Plato, *Gorgias*, 466a-481b

Week 3: Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, Book 1, chapters 1-5, 7-10

Week 4: Butler, Preface, Sermons I-III

Week 5: Kant, *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*, Preface and Section I

Week 6: Williams, *Ethics and the Limits of Philosophy*, Chapters 1-2

Week 7: Foot, *Natural Goodness*, Chapter 7

The Theoretical Question: What is the nature of morality?

Week 8: Plato, *Republic*, Books I and II

Week 9: Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, Book 2, Chapters 1-9; Book 3 Chapters 6-8; *Rhetoric* Book 1, Chapter 9

Week 10: Kant, *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*, Section II

Week 11: Mill, *Utilitarianism*

Week 12: Nietzsche, *Genealogy of Morality*

Week 13: Williams, *Ethics and the Limits of Philosophy*, Chapters 5 and 10

Week 14: Course Review

Philosophy and Religion (Mid/Upper-Level)

In this course, we will examine the relationship between philosophy and religion. Is it philosophy's job to examine, and potentially challenge, religious belief? Or do philosophy and religion constitute mutually distinct spheres?

Students will (i) write eight one-page papers; (ii) deliver two written questions about two different readings, which they will present to the class; (iii) write a final paper on a topic arranged with the instructor.

Week 1: Plato, *Euthyphro*, *Apology* 20c-23b

Week 2: Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, Book 8, chapter 7; Book 10, chapter 8; *Metaphysics*, Book 1, chapter 2; Book 12, chapters 7-9

Week 3: Cicero, *On the Nature of the Gods*

Week 4: Maimonides, *Guide to the Perplexed*, Introduction to the first part; Part 2, chapters 23-31

Week 5: Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, Part 1, Question 1, Articles 1-8; Part 2, Second Part, Question 6

Week 6: Spinoza, *Theological-Political Treatise*, Preface, Chapters 12-15

Week 7: Hume, "The Natural History of Religion"

Week 8: Hume, *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion*

Week 9: Kant, *Religion Within the Bounds of Reason Alone*, Prefaces and Books 1-2

Week 10: Kant, *Religion Within the Bounds of Reason Alone*, Books 3-4

Week 11: Kierkegaard, *Fear and Trembling*, through Problema I

Week 12: Kierkegaard, *Fear and Trembling*, rest

Week 13: MacIntyre, "Philosophy Recalled to its Task"

Week 14: Course Review

Nietzsche (Mid/Upper-Level)

In this course, we will attempt to understand Nietzsche's account of philosophy and morality. We will begin with two early works, "On the Uses and Disadvantages of History for Life" and "Human All Too Human" where he sets out some basic ideas of his thought. We will then see how he develops these ideas in two later works.

Students will (i) write eight one-page papers; (ii) deliver two written questions about two different readings, which they will present to the class; (iii) write a final paper on a topic arranged with the instructor.

Week 1: Nietzsche, "On the Uses and Disadvantages of History for Life"

Week 2: *Human All Too Human*, Preface, Part 1

Week 3: *Human All Too Human*, Parts 2, 3

Week 4: *Human All Too Human*, Parts 4, 5

Week 5: *Human All Too Human*, Parts 6, 7

Week 6: *Human All Too Human*, Parts 8, 9, Epilogue

Week 7: *Beyond Good and Evil*, Preface, Parts 1, 2

Week 8: *Beyond Good and Evil*, Parts 3, 4, 5

Week 9: *Beyond Good and Evil*, Parts 6, 7

Week 10: *Beyond Good and Evil*, Parts 8, 9

Week 11: *Genealogy of Morality*, Preface, I

Week 12: *Genealogy of Morality*, II

Week 13: *Genealogy of Morality*, III

Week 14: Course Review

Phenomenology (Mid/Upper-Level)

This course will serve as an introduction to Phenomenology. We will begin by reading through Heidegger's excellent introduction to Phenomenology in his lecture course, *History of the Concept of Time*. We will then transition to Husserl's influential *Logical Investigations*. In the work, Husserl, in contrast to the reigning "Psychologism" of his time, undertakes six "investigations" to found an a priori study of logic and epistemology. These investigations laid the foundation for what would come to be the discipline of Phenomenology. At the end of the class, we'll read Husserl's lectures "The Idea of Phenomenology" to get a sense for his understanding of this discipline.

Students will (i) write eight one-page papers; (ii) deliver two written questions about two different readings, which they will present to the class; (iii) write a final paper on a topic arranged with the instructor.

Week 1: Heidegger, *History of the Concept of Time*, Preliminary Part, Chapter 1

Week 2: Heidegger, *History of the Concept of Time*, Preliminary Part, Chapter 2

Week 3: Heidegger, *History of the Concept of Time*, Preliminary Part, Chapter 3

Week 4: Husserl, *Logical Investigations*, Prolegomena, Chapters 7-8;

Week 5: Husserl, *Logical Investigations*, Prolegomena, Chapters 10-11

Week 6: Husserl, *Logical Investigations*, Investigation 1, chapters 1, 3-4

Week 7: Husserl, *Logical Investigations*, Investigation 5, chapters 1-3

Week 8: Husserl, *Logical Investigations*, Investigation 5, chapters 3-6

Week 9: Husserl, *Logical Investigations*, Investigation 6, chapters 1-3

Week 10: Husserl, *Logical Investigations*, Investigation 6, chapters 4-6

Week 11: Husserl, *The Idea of Phenomenology*, Lectures 1-2

Week 12: Husserl, *The Idea of Phenomenology*, Lectures 3-4

Week 13: Husserl, *The Idea of Phenomenology*, Lecture 5, Addenda 1-3, and "The Train of Thought of These Lectures"

Week 14: Course Review

Aristotle and Eudaimonism (Upper Level)

Let “Eudaimonism” be the view that either (a) one’s own *eudaimonia* (“blessedness,” “prospering”) is the ultimate aim of one’s action or (b) one should do whatever is most conducive to one’s own *eudaimonia*. In this class we will attempt to answer the following questions:

- c) Did Aristotle accept Eudaimonism?
- d) If he does, does he offer a *defense* of Eudaimonism?

We will pursue these questions through a close reading of sections of the *Nicomachean Ethics* (NE). We will pay particular attention to his treatment of those subjects that were popularly thought by the Ancient Greeks to be counterexamples to Eudaimonism. We will attempt to see whether Aristotle agrees with these popular views, and if he does not, whether he offers justification for his disagreement.

Students will (i) write eight one-page papers; (ii) write a final paper.

Introduction: Aristotle and Eudaimonism

Week 1: Book 1, chapters 1-6

Week 2: Book 1, chapters 7-13

Eudaimonism and Akrasia

Week 3: *Protagoras* 352A-353A; NE Book 7, chapters 1-5

Week 4: Book 7, chapters 6-14

Eudaimonism and Friendship

Week 5: *Rhetoric* Book 2, chapter 4; NE Book 8, chapters 1-4

Week 6: Book 8, chapters 5-8, chapters 13-14; Book 9, chapter 1

Week 7: Book 9, chapters 2-7

Week 8: Book 9, chapters 8-12

Eudaimonism and Virtue

Week 9: *Rhetoric* Book 1, chapters 3 and 9; NE Book 2, chapters 1-4

Week 10: Book 3, chapters 6-9; Book 4, chapter 1

Week 11: Book 9, chapter 8; Book 10, chapters 6-7

Week 12: Book 4, chapter 3; Book 5, chapters 3, 6

Week 13: Book 8, chapter 13-Book 9, chapter 1; Book 5, chapter 5

Week 14: Course Review

Sample Assignments

Reading Response for 10/18

In the reading from last class, Socrates, a philosopher, examines, and challenges, Euthyphro, a self-identified religious expert. Imagine that Socrates encountered an expert in what Aquinas calls “sacred doctrine” (see Question #1, Article #1). Does Aquinas think that Socrates, insofar as he is acting as a philosopher, should examine, and potentially challenge, this expert? Why or why not? **It will help to look at Question #1, Articles #1 and #8.**

General Instructions for Reading Responses:

- In accordance with the limitations spelled out on the syllabus, answer the question(s) asked. If you wish, you **may** sub-divide your reading response into parts. Don’t take up too much space with a heading, however; just do something like, “(Question 2) Aristotle claims that philosophy is the best activity; however, he is mistaken for the following reasons.”
- Your reading response must have a clear **thesis** statement or statements; that is, you must begin by clearly presenting your answer to the question(s). The rest of the reading response, or section, should be an attempt to **justify** and **explain** your thesis. Consider such questions as, “Why should someone agree with what I just claimed?” and “What sorts of objections might someone have that I could answer?”
- You must include some **textual citation**. Quotation is optional, but not necessary. You may paraphrase and put in a parenthetical reference. Since we’re all using the same editions, simply put in the page number, or aphorism number, or other textual reference in parentheses—for example, Aristotle claims that all human beings by nature desire to know (pg. 1).

Paper Guidelines (For Upper-Level)

There are two sorts of papers you can write for the class: (a) exegetical and (b) critical papers.

(a) Exegetical papers are “interpretive.” The idea for one of these papers is that you have some guiding issue or question about the text(s) that you’re trying to work out. To give an example, we saw that Plato, in the *Republic*, presents an early version of the “problem of evil” and offers a solution to it. Augustine also presents a version of the problem of evil in the *Confessions* and offers a solution. So one possible exegetical paper topic would be to compare Augustine and Plato on the problem of evil. Do their views on the problem/solution differ? Are they the same? If they are the same, which one is the better response?

It’s very important to make sure that your paper has a clear structure. So, to continue with the above example, you could start out by (a) laying out the issue you’ll discuss in the paper. In this case, the comparison of Augustine and Plato’s treatments of the problem of evil. Then (b) you could do a section on Plato’s treatment; (c) a section on Augustine’s treatment; and (d) a section on their comparison. Or however you want to organize it. The point is to have a clear, functional organization rather than a running commentary.

(b) Critical papers are, well, critical. The idea is that you’re offering an objection to a position/argument from one of the thinkers we’ve read. If you have space, I highly recommend thinking about how the thinker could best respond to your objection. And if you want, doing a follow-up response after that. As before, clear organization is important. Let’s say that you’re objecting to Augustine’s argument that evil does not exist (all parts of creation are good). You could (a) begin your paper by announcing your intention to object to Augustine’s argument; (b) present Augustine’s argument; (c) offer your objection; (d) discuss how Augustine could try to respond to your objection.

I know the page limits are low. I’ll let you go over if you really feel you need to (within reason of course). I’m also happy to help you figure out or refine your topic. Just stop by office hours.

Critical Assignments and Final Paper (For Intro)

- As part of the participation grade (**10%**), students must complete **3 critical assignments**. Students will write out an objection to a position taken by one of the authors in a given section. These assignments must be at least 1/2 of a page, double-spaced, 12 point times. They are due in hard-copy at the class they are marked due. We will then discuss, in class, how the philosopher you objected to could respond to your objection.

Critical assignments are graded for completion. That being said, I will have these at my side when I do final grades. If your grade is near a cutoff, doing a great job on these could boost you into the next grade bracket.

- Final paper (**10%**). Students will write out an objection to a position taken by one of the authors in a given section **as well as** a response to that objection on behalf of the author. Your job is to do, by yourself, what we have done in class with the critical assignments. Note that you don't have to agree with this response. Give me what you judge to be the author's best available response—even if you think it ultimately falls short. The final paper should be one double-spaced page with 12 point times font. If students need more space, they can use 11 point font, 1.5 spacing, and wide margins. The final reflection paper must **both** be turned in, in hard copy, on the day it is marked due **and** submitted online to Turn It In.

Sample Handouts

Sample Presentation Handout (for Cicero, *The Nature of the Gods*, Chapter 1)

(A) Cicero the Academic

Cicero identifies as an Academic Skeptic

The Academic Skeptics believes that definite knowledge is unobtainable, but they still have a method for exploring philosophical questions:

- (i) Explore the arguments on all sides of a question.
- (ii) Then accept the view that stands out as the most probable.

Note: Cicero identifies “the most important question” not as whether gods exist, but whether they exercise supervision over the world or are, in this respect, inactive (think Aristotle).

(B) Velleius’ Epicurean Account of the Gods

Two Epicurean tenants:

- (i) The world composed of atoms (indivisible particles of matter) and void (empty space).
- (ii) The good for human beings is pleasure and freedom from pain/distress, and the second element is more important than the first.

Argument against a creator god (pg. 11):

- (i) Why did the god remain idle for an expanse of time *before* beginning to create the world?

Avoiding hard work? But nothing hard for a god.

- (ii) What is the motivation for the god to begin creating the world?

To improve the god’s surroundings? But why would the god linger in a worse condition before improving its surroundings?

For the benefit of human beings?

Only for the wise? But very few of those.

For the fools? Why would a god want the gratitude of fools + their lives are miserable lives anyway.

Positive Epicurean Account

“Prolepsis”—basic notion—of gods = “blessed and immortal beings.”

A god is inactive

“blessedness” = “untroubled mind and relaxation from all duties.”

“being active” is work and therefore incompatible with blessedness

A god “take pleasure in their own wisdom and virtue”

(C) Cato’s (another Academic Skeptic) Criticisms

Against idle gods:

Human beings are not satisfied with idleness but seek enjoyable pastimes

(Implicitly): there are *enjoyable* activities which are not “work” or “toil” and which are superior to mere idleness. Therefore gods would engage in some such activity *instead of* simply being idle.

What then does a god do?

Possible answer: a god continuously contemplates its own blessedness—i.e., the god continuously contemplates its own condition.

A god’s immortality not consistent with Epicurean physics.

Since we receive no benefits from the gods, no room for religions worship or devotion.

If a god is “best and most outstanding,” then it must show kindness.

Questions / Issues:

What is Christianity’s stance on “the most important question” of whether gods are active in the world or not?

What do you think about Velleius’ argument against a god that creates the world in time? Is this argument a threat to Christianity? Why or why not?

What would Aristotle say about Epicurus’ claim that “being active” is incompatible with blessedness? Or what do you think about it?

What would Plato—in the *Timaeus*—say about the question of why a god would begin creating the world? Does Velleius have a response?

Sample Presentation Handout (for Hesiod +Thales)

(A) Hesiod (Poetic / Mythical Creation Account)

- (i) Initially, coming into Being Out of Nothing (purely spontaneous coming into being): "First of all did Chaos *come to be*." Therefore, no first cause, ultimate source, or explanation for things.
- (ii) Gods Generate Everything Else By Their Actions.
- (iii) Provides no Argument/Evidence. Just reports the genealogy to us.

(Not in the reading, but at the beginning of his poem, he claims he was told the story he reports by the muses, who he also says "know how to lie like they are speaking the "truth" or something to that effect.)

(B) Thales (Philosophical Account)

- (i) Ultimate source/cause (*arche*) of the world is water--the material that everything is made of, that existed before the particular things that are made of it started to exist and that continues to exist after they perish.
- (ii) Also tried to account for astronomical/geological phenomena: Earth stays in its position because it rests on water. Earthquakes occur when the water is turbulent (?). Observed astronomical motions somehow caused by motion of water.
- (iii) He gave arguments/evidence for his position--or so other people feel comfortable speculating that he *had* arguments: we observe that the nourishment / seeds of living things are moist (watery). Another reason we can add: water is a material that we regularly observe changing material states, i.e., it becomes liquid (water), solid (ice), and gaseous (steam).

Note: Your outline should be longer than this, i.e., you should cover a larger portion of the text. I threw this together to give you a model.

Questions / Issues:

~If water, for example, is the cause / source of everything else, what is the cause / source of water? What would Thales say?

~Given the reading, what would we say the goal of philosophy is? What is it after?

~How can we differentiate philosophy from myth, e.g. Hesiod? Which differences are really essential?

Is it essential to philosophy that it provides arguments or evidence?

Is it essential to philosophy that it supposes there's an ultimate cause or explanation for the world?

Is it essential to philosophy that it denies that a god or gods are the causes of everything?

~Why did the philosophers like Thales suppose there was an ultimate cause/source? Did they have any sort of argument for this?

Thucydides' Athenians vs. Socrates

People are by nature self-interested.

/ \

Athenians

Socrates

Therefore, we shouldn't be serious about justice because it's not always good for us.

Therefore, we should be serious about justice because it's (always) good for us

(Good people are wrong/foolish)

(Good people are correct/wise)

Athenian objection to Socrates: Justice does not have divine support. Just actions can have bad consequences for those who are just, and unjust action can have good consequences for those who are unjust.

Socratic response: Yes, but justice may be an intrinsic good, that is, good by itself and not only because of its consequences, like the courage example in the Alcibiades I. Further, the intrinsic good of justice may outweigh the harm of the bad consequences, also as in the courage example.

The question, then, is whether we can accept and defend this response. For example, can we accept that injustice is intrinsically harmful? Can we come to pity those who are not punished for their injustice—since they are unknowingly harming themselves—instead of being indignant at them? Can we say that unjust people do not deserve punishments, since doing injustice is sufficiently harmful just by itself? Likewise, can we accept that just people do not deserve any rewards because justice is a “reward in itself”?

These questions are discussed in Plato's *Gorgias* and *Republic* if you are interested.

Handout 7: Met PH 110 B1—Great Philosophers

Course Theme: What is Philosophy? We will investigate through three general questions:

(1) What is Philosophy Itself?

Explication: (a) What is the task or goal of philosophy? What is it trying to accomplish? What motivates it? (b) What, if anything, distinguishes it from science?

(2) What is the relation between Philosophy and Religion?

Explication: Is it philosophy's job to examine and potentially challenge religious belief? Or are philosophy and religion separate?

(3) What is the relation between Philosophy and Morality?

Explication: (a) Is philosophy supportive of morality? Is it harmful to it? (b) Should it be philosophy's job to support morality?

Let's sum up the answer to (2) we get from Aquinas:

It does not belong to philosophy to examine, and potentially challenge, religious belief. At least when it comes to Christian belief, it is based on faith, which cannot be argued to. Additionally, Christian revelation is (for the Christian) more reliable than the results of human reason. Therefore, any conflict between human reason and Christian revelation is decided in favor of revelation. Perhaps Aquinas thinks philosophers can examine whether any parts of Christian belief can be definitively proven to be false, on the supposition that what is known to be false cannot be taken on faith. But that would be it. Philosophers cannot ask for rational justification for what Christians take on faith.

Course Evaluations

Spring 2018

Evaluation Summary for PHIL 3030 A—"Medieval Philosophy"

	(1 = "poor," 5 = "superior")	1	2	3	4	5	Mean
I would rate the course overall as:		0	0	1	3	3	4.29
I would rate the instructor overall as		0	0	2	1	5	4.38

Evaluation Summary for PHIL 2010 A—"Introduction to Philosophy"

	(1 = "poor," 5 = "superior")	1	2	3	4	5	Mean
I would rate the course overall as:		0	1	5	16	6	3.96
I would rate the instructor overall as		0	0	5	11	12	4.25

Evaluation Summary for PHIL 2010 B—"Introduction to Philosophy"

	(1 = "poor," 5 = "superior")	1	2	3	4	5	Mean
I would rate the course overall as:		0	0	7	8	4	3.84
I would rate the instructor overall as		0	0	5	7	7	4.11

Evaluation Summary for PHIL 2010 H—"Introduction to Philosophy"

	(1 = "poor," 5 = "superior")	1	2	3	4	5	Mean
I would rate the course overall as:		0	3	5	9	7	3.83
I would rate the instructor overall as		1	3	2	5	13	4.08

Evaluation Summary for PHIL 2010 I—"Introduction to Philosophy"

	(1 = "poor," 5 = "superior")	1	2	3	4	5	Mean
I would rate the course overall as:		1	0	7	11	5	3.79
I would rate the instructor overall as		0	1	3	9	11	4.25

Fall 2017

Evaluation Summary for PHIL 3431 A—Ancient Philosophy

	(1 = “poor,” 5 = “superior”)					Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	
I would rate the course overall as:	0	0	1	4	1	4.0
I would rate the instructor overall as	0	0	1	4	1	4.0

Evaluation Summary for PHIL 2010 F—Introduction to Philosophy

	(1 = “poor,” 5 = “superior”)					Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	
I would rate the course overall as:	0	0	9	12	3	3.8
I would rate the instructor overall as	0	0	6	12	7	4.0

Evaluation Summary for PHIL 2010 G—Introduction to Philosophy

	(1 = “poor,” 5 = “superior”)					Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	
I would rate the course overall as:	0	0	10	7	8	3.9
I would rate the instructor overall as	0	0	2	11	12	4.4

Evaluation Summary for PHIL 2010 H—Introduction to Philosophy

	(1 = “poor,” 5 = “superior”)					Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	
I would rate the course overall as:	0	1	8	14	5	3.8
I would rate the instructor overall as	0	0	3	17	8	4.2

Evaluation Summary for PHIL 2010 D—Introduction to Philosophy

	(1 = “poor,” 5 = “superior”)					Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	
I would rate the course overall as:	0	0	9	8	7	3.9
I would rate the instructor overall as	0	1	7	7	9	4.0

Spring 2017

Evaluation Summary for MET PH 101 B1—Basic Problems of Philosophy

	(1 = “poor,” 5 = “superior”)					Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	
I would rate the course overall as:	1	0	1	3	2	3.8
I would rate the instructor overall as	1	0	1	1	3	3.8

Fall 2016

Evaluation Summary for MET PH 110 B1—Great Philosophers

	(1 = “poor,” 5 = “superior”)					Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	
I would rate the course overall as:	0	0	0	1	5	4.8
I would rate the instructor overall as	0	0	0	1	5	4.8

Summer 2014

Evaluation Summary for CAS PH 300 B1, “History of Ancient Philosophy”

	(1 = “poor,” 5 = “superior”)					Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	
I would rate the course overall as:	0	0	1	3	5	4.4
I would rate the instructor overall as	0	0	2	4	3	4.1

Summer 2013

Evaluation Summary for CAS PH 300 B1, “History of Ancient Philosophy”

	(1 = “poor,” 5 = “superior”)					Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	
I would rate the course overall as:	0	0	1	7	2	4.1
I would rate the instructor overall as	0	0	1	5	4	4.3

Full Course Evaluations Available Upon Request

Teaching Evaluations

Complete Unedited Evaluations for PHIL 3030 A Medieval Philosophy (Spring 2018)

“Strong Points”

“I really liked him as a teacher and his personality and style of teaching and use of discussion in the class and his helpfulness.”

“Dr. Schuh was very honest about this being a learning experience for him along with us, and he handled the material well for not having studied it before—he kept the discussions interesting.”

“I really liked how the instructor would explain in detail the content in a way that everyone could understand.”

“Dr Schuh is a perfect “Devil’s advocate” for any side of philosophy. He is excellent at clarifying course material and arguments.”

“He was always prepared.”

“It did not have a difficult load.”

“The great class discussion/evaluation of the texts.”

“Could be Improved”

“Better prepared for the course material; more concrete class teachings more [illegible].”

“Allowing electronic access to course materials in class would save a lot of time and paper, and students may be more incentivized to bring course material to class.”

“I honestly don’t know This is my second course with him, and I would take him again if I was able.”

“It can’t.”

“He was learning with us, so maybe better perpetration going forward.”

“Develop a better understanding of the material.”

Complete Unedited Evaluations for PHIL 2010 D Introduction to Philosophy (Fall 2017)

“Strong Points”

“Dr. Schuh made the material palatable and generally did a good job focusing on the most significant info.”

“Course material was discussed in class.”

“He took the time to make sure we understood each concept.”

“Great conversations in class.”

“The professor was very passionate and introduced a lot of topics to discuss that were interesting.”

“Discussion based learning.”

“Schuh is excellent at promoting though and discussion and clarifying ideas.”

“He was very clear with his study questions and what was going to be on the test.”

“The course was thought provoking and interesting.”

“Very interesting subject matter; openness of classroom environment was attractive; classroom conversations were always great.”

“Some of the readings were very confusing and hard to understand, but you managed to explain it and leave it off the tests if we still didn’t get it.”

“I liked learning about some of the foundations of philosophy.”

“His ability to put the ideas into thoughts that we could easily comprehend.”

“Very cool class—I fell like I learned a lot + enjoyed the learning environment. Thanks for being such a cool professor!”

“Could Be Improved”

“Material needs to be more organized.”

“Be clear on specific assignments.”

“Talk more than just the basic topics.”

“Try to organize the course material better and grade on time.”

“Breaking up lectured with videos/audio.”

“I wouldn’t change anything.”

“More clear explanation of material.”

“Nothing.”

“More [physical?] handouts / note [illegible] / assignments.”

“The tests could be a little confusing.”

“I wish class discussions were [looser?]. Handwriting + spelling need to be a lot better.”

“Try to write clearer.”

“Give back tests quicker (if possible) + utilize folio so we can keep track of our grades!”

“Give the students more of a visual representation w/ slideshows and other.”

“More ways to access materials online.”

“Less reading in class.”

“Maybe some slides to help stress important points?”

“State the points we need to know clearly and please don’t give an essay exam that’s worth 200 — with only one question.”

“Strong Points” Contd.

“Professor did an excellent job getting students to understand material + concepts. The discussions were very engaging.”

“Opinions + Debates.”

“The instructor definitely seemed interested in the material and taught it well.”

“The class discussions were interesting.”

“The way he teaches, there is never a wrong answer. His handouts are very helpful and his lessons easy to understand. He challenges you to always wonder about the topic.”

“I loved the open in-class discussions where tough topics could be elaborated on. Format of tests was great. Enthusiasm and preparedness were refreshing. Study guide helped a lot.”

“I loved the topics we discussed about in class.”

“The instructor did try to help us be prepared for our tests as much as he could. He gave us plenty of study materials, answered any questions, and was always flexible with office hours.”

“Dr. Schuh is very interested in this class and presents the information well. His syllabus is very organized and his office hours really helped.”

“Could be Improved” Contd.

“The instructor could be more flexible in the way assignments are graded.” The attendance policy also needs to be way more flexible. Tardiness happens and people should not be punished for arriving to class a little late.”

“I think better questions in the tests. Also, there needs to be more grades. We hardly have 10 assignments over the whole semester.”

Additional Teaching Evaluations Available Upon Request