

TEACHING DOSSIER

Eric Gordon Epstein

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Item:	Page Number:
Statement of Teaching Philosophy	4
Statement of Commitment to Academic Inclusiveness	8
Syllabus for “Introduction to Philosophy”	10
Syllabus for “Introduction to Business Ethics”	13
Essay Assignment Prompt for “Intro. to Business Ethics”	18
Syllabus for “Critical Thinking”	20
Midterm Exam for “Critical Thinking”	24
Syllabus for “Introduction to Logic”	27
Syllabus for “Introduction to the Philosophy of Language”	31
Syllabus for “Ethics and Feminism in the Lab and Operating Room”	38
Syllabus for “Introduction to Metaphysics”	45
Syllabus for “Knowledge, Justification, and Rationality”	51
Student Email Correspondence	59
Faculty Teaching Evaluations	73
Student Evaluation Summaries	
Cornell University Philosophy Department Note on Student Evaluations	78
“Puzzles & Paradoxes” (Fall 2010)	79
“Religion and Reason” (Spring 2011)	80
“Introduction to Philosophy” (Fall 2011)	81
“Ethics” (Spring 2012)	82
“Defining the Undefinable, Expressing the Inexpressible” (Fall 2013)	83
“Logic for Philosophy” (Fall 2014)	85
“Foundations of Mathematics” (Spring 2015)	86
“History of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict” (Fall 2015)	87
“Introduction to Philosophy and Critical Thinking” (Spring 2016)	88
“Marx, Nietzsche, Freud” (Fall 2016)	89
“Minds and Machines” (Spring 2017)	94
“Critical Thinking” (Fall 2017)	96
“Introduction to Business Ethics” Section 001 (Fall 2017)	98
“Introduction to Business Ethics” Section 002 (Fall 2017)	101

Full Student Evaluations

Cornell University Philosophy Department Note on Student Evaluations	104
Student Evaluations for “Puzzles & Paradoxes” (Fall 2010)	105
Student Evaluations for “Religion and Reason” (Spring 2011)	125
Student Evaluations for “Introduction to Philosophy” (Fall 2011)	140
Student Evaluations for “Ethics” (Spring 2012)	153
Student Evaluations for “Defining the Undefinable” (Fall 2013)	164
Student Evaluations for “Logic for Philosophy” (Fall 2014)	200
Student Evaluations for “Foundations of Mathematics” (Spring 2015)	217
Student Evaluations for “History of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict” (Fall 2015)	230
Student Evaluations for “Intro. to Philosophy and Critical Thinking” (Spring 2016)	253
Student Evaluations for “Marx, Nietzsche, Freud” (Fall 2016)	274
Student Evaluations for “Minds and Machines” (Spring 2017)	332
Student Evaluations for “Critical Thinking” (Fall 2017)	346
Student Evaluations for “Introduction to Business Ethics” Section 001 (Fall 2017)	350
Student Evaluations for “Introduction to Business Ethics” Section 002 (Fall 2017)	354

STATEMENT OF TEACHING PHILOSOPHY

Dr. Eric G. Epstein

When I was an angsty middle schooler, my father used to talk with me over long walks, trying to stimulate my interest in school and the life of the mind. We quickly found ourselves debating the relationship between the mind and the body, and the meaning of Gödel's incompleteness theorem. Later on, long walks with my father were replaced by long walks with a philosophy graduate student from a nearby university, and then in college I had the great fortune to spend my third year at Oxford, taking part in their tutorial system. My tutor and I spent hours in his office, debating about philosophy of language and writing examples on his whiteboard.

My experiences learning philosophy gave me a deep love for the subject, one that inspired me to pursue it as a career. As a teacher, one of my main goals is to cultivate the same feelings of wonder and fascination in my students. A main way that I try to achieve this is by bringing into the classroom some of the same enthusiasm, one-on-one dynamics, individual attention, and exploratory freedom that kindled my own passion.

For example, no matter what kind of class I am teaching, I always leave time in my lectures to respond personally to my students' questions, and allow them to interact verbally in real time. This kind of active participation helps them learn better, even when time limits and class sizes do not afford everyone the chance to speak. Of course, discussion has its dangers, which I have developed ways to manage. In my classes on the philosophy of religion and the history of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, debates had a tendency to spiral quickly out of control. In these situations, I found it effective to impose a gentle pause on the discussion, restating the question we were originally trying to answer. Then I would have the entire class work carefully together to reconstruct the debate, checking that we had accurately recalled everyone's positions. Indeed, in the reviews, one student wrote that I "tried to get every opinion heard".

Showing how the discussion got derailed helped the students learn to restrain the impulse to let loose their unfiltered, knee-jerk reactions. And getting to clarify their positions helped them feel that the class cared what they had really wanted to say. My students responded positively to this, describing me as "very attentive". Moreover, my debate-reconstruction activity also demonstrated that articulating one's views on a complex issue can take more than one attempt, showing the importance of listening sympathetically. Overall, the students left with the feeling that I "guided class discussions very well".

In addition to discussion, learning how to write and think critically can be effective in cultivating a love of philosophy, as well as a goal in itself. Students feel the most passionate when they are given the chance to develop their own honest reflections on the course materials, and to communicate in their own voices. Leading two Freshman Writing Seminars (FWSs) taught me ways to facilitate this kind of learning. FWSs are writing-intensive courses that help incoming freshmen develop their skills in composing college-level papers. Each seminar has 17 students who write 6-9 papers over the course of the term, of roughly 5 pages each. While commenting on paper drafts for the seminars "Defining the Undefinable" and "Marx, Nietzsche, Freud," I practiced thinking hard about what my students were trying to say, striving to give the advice that would best help them say it convincingly. I developed a method of giving a small number of written comments, quickly identifying a paper's two or three greatest virtues and most significant problems. This, I found, avoids overwhelming the students with minutiae, encourages them to be proud of their strengths, and focuses their efforts on addressing the areas most in need of improvement.

In the course reviews, I was delighted to see that my students responded positively to my efforts. The following are a few highlights: "Eric," they wrote, "was good at advising us in developing our arguments". And, "the written comments on papers were definitely helpful and

STATEMENT OF TEACHING PHILOSOPHY

Dr. Eric G. Epstein

after fixing my essay based on Eric's comments, I saw that my second drafts on papers improved dramatically; Eric's comments...make one aware of the problems in [one's] essays". And finally, "I could always directly link a [written] comment [from the instructor] to something specific I wrote rather than it being a general critique of my writing style or paper".

My writing seminars also taught me the value of giving students agency in selecting the course materials, which I continue to do as a lead instructor, as department curricula permit. In both seminars, once we had covered the canonical texts I presented the class with a choice of several options for further study. I had prepared these in advance, based on student interests and on connections with the material we had already seen. In both seminars, the students expressed gratitude for a course that respected their interests, and for showing them how philosophy can be relevant to things they care about. See, for example, the evaluation summary page for "Defining the Undefinable".

Letting students choose what they study can also be a good way to diversify the syllabus, something I believe to be extremely important and to which I am deeply committed. In Spring 2016 I participated Cornell's Prison Education Program (CPEP), teaching a seminar on philosophy and critical thinking at Cayuga Correctional Facility. Building on my students' interest in critical race theory, I added a unit on the philosophy of race, setting W.E.B. Dubois and Kwame Anthony Appiah shoulder to shoulder with Hume and Descartes. The students were thrilled to see how the methods of thought we were learning could be usefully applied to issues that affected them. One of them wrote that he valued "the teacher's willingness to show how the course is relevant to my other studies." Indeed, several who had initially struggled went on to earn top grades, writing sophisticated final papers about whether race exists.

In my many years as an instructor, I've been lucky to teach a wide variety of subjects, from writing-intensive classes like FWSs to courses on technical material, especially formal logic. In technical classes, too, I have drawn on my own experiences to instill a love of the subject. Just as my father drew me into logic with questions about the meaning of Gödel's incompleteness theorem, when I present technical material for the first time I start by saying something about the deeper meaning and motivations. Students find it easier to grasp technical details when they can position these details in the context of a broader, comprehensible project; and they are more motivated to slog through a difficult proof if they believe there is a profound insight that it will help them understand.

In technical courses, especially, attending carefully to students is critical for keeping them motivated. If a student asks me a question that is ill-formed, I try to figure out what they may be thinking and then ask them about that. Often this helps the student restate their original question. Just as importantly, it shows them that I care about what they are thinking, not just what the right answer is. Indeed, in my reviews, one student appreciated that "Eric is very quick and understands any difficulty you may be having".

Similarly, when a student comes to office hours with a problem, I typically start by going over the definitions that the problem is testing, helping them internalize any with which they may be struggling. When they turn again to the problem, the student no longer feels flooded with unfamiliar concepts. In many cases, the confidence that comes from digesting the right definitions is enough to get the student unstuck. To these practices especially, my students have responded enthusiastically. One student wrote, "He was willing to go above and beyond to make sure...that I understood the material. Also, he was very good at breaking concepts down to a step-by-step system that was easier to understand." Another noticed that I "always made time to help students outside of office hours and took a great degree of personal responsibility in helping us figure out

STATEMENT OF TEACHING PHILOSOPHY

Dr. Eric G. Epstein

the material. Is always patient and kind—which is particularly helpful in a quantitative course where it’s easy to feel dumb or intimidated”.

Another practice I find useful in technical classes is making learning a collaborative activity. For example, while I am reluctant to solve students’ homework problems for them, I will give them a similar, easier problem—one that emphasizes key concepts or facts—and work through it together on the whiteboard, just like my Oxford tutor did with me. Or, even better, I’ll have them work through the problem together in small groups. This enables the students to learn from one another, as well as from me, and helps dispel the feelings of isolation and rivalry that can interfere with learning a technical subject.

As an instructor, I strive always to have a finger on the pulse of my class. Indeed, in one review, a student liked that I “consistently asked for feedback & was open to discussing what we wanted / needed clarified”. More recently, as a lead instructor for “Business Ethics” at Pennsylvania State University, at several points in the class I distributed note cards asking for feedback and suggestions for the course. When many students asked for more pictures and videos to be integrated into my in-class presentations, I obliged. Seeing videos of impoverished sweatshop workers and factory-farmed animals helped my students internalize the moral implications of business practices in a way that readings by themselves could not. The students expressed appreciation for these videos in the reviews, and one student noted that I “adapted very well to needs of the students throughout this class” and “was very responsive” to what the students “wanted or needed”. Another wrote that “it really helps when the professor is open to...feedback...from students and really applies their ideas! I told my friends about him and because of his endless care, they are all interested in applying for the course!”

Making an effort to be attentive to my students has helped me improve my pedagogy in other significant ways. For example, when I began teaching, students occasionally found my presentations disorganized: this shows up in a few of my early reviews. After some reflection and conversations with colleagues, I concluded that I had been giving too much time to student discussion, and imposing too little structure on the discussion that occurred. As I struggled to corral a meandering conversation and further elaborate students’ comments, the session led in no particular direction and we occasionally ran out of time for some important topics. In more recent years, I have fixed this problem by preparing a firmer plan for each class, with the ideas I will present being ordered in a way that closely reflects the connections between them. I put this plan on the board at the beginning of class, and while I take care to intersperse my presentation with many moments to pause for discussion, I choose these moments very carefully. So far this approach has been successful in conveying a more organized understanding of the material, and in giving my students a clearer sense of the structure of the session. For example, I was pleased when one of my students from “Introduction to Philosophy and Critical Thinking” wrote that my lectures were “very organized and taught in a way that was understandable”. Likewise, a student from “History of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict” liked how I “helped in connecting the events and topics”; and yet another appreciated that I “always had a plan coming into section”.

In addition to information from students, pedagogical research also informs my teaching practices. In Summer 2013 I took Writing 7100, a seminar that focuses on pedagogy for writing-based classes. In that class, I learned that assigning low-stakes writing, graded only based on completion, is an excellent way to stimulate students’ creativity. And I learned about the importance of assigning drafts that build up to a final, polished essay, rather than simply requesting the final product all at once. When teaching my first FWS, I implemented both of these strategies, with successful results. In the reviews, one student wrote: “By requiring prewriting and a draft,

STATEMENT OF TEACHING PHILOSOPHY

Dr. Eric G. Epstein

students were forced to take the smaller steps to writing a complete paper....I believe that this course has shown me how to work up to a full and final paper”.

I was likewise exposed to much helpful pedagogical theory in the 2015-2016 academic year, when I was a Graduate Teaching Fellow at Cornell’s Center for Teaching Excellence. There I learned about the importance and effectiveness of active learning, and became familiar with a number of different classroom activities that encourage such learning. I implemented these activities in my last FWS, “Marx, Nietzsche, Freud”, and more recently as lead instructor in “Business Ethics”. For example, I frequently used part of the class time to have students write a paragraph in which they explain some of the most important passages from the readings, and submit their paragraphs on Blackboard. Not only did this greatly increase student engagement with the material and make for better-informed discussion, it also produced materials that students used for their papers. My students “liked how the essays were based on the articles we reviewed during class.”

While much of my teaching takes place in an ordinary college classroom setting, I am also very interested in participating in programs and activities that will enhance your institution in other ways. For example, I am eager to bring my experience from the Prison Education Program to bear by teaching again at a local prison, or by finding another way to use philosophy to aid disadvantaged communities, such as developing a program that gives students extra help in writing college papers. Likewise, given my life-changing experiences in studying at Oxford, I am very enthusiastic about playing a facilitating role in study abroad programs. I also enjoy supervising undergraduate groups and clubs. Before graduating from Cornell University, I served as the Club Advisor for the Cornell Effective Altruism Club.

In addition to participating in programs, I am also very dedicated to mentoring and advising individual students. I find myself naturally falling into this role, since my students consistently find me “incredibly approachable”, and “very willing to meet outside of section”. When I meet with students, I try hard to encourage them to continue their education in philosophy, recommending articles and classes that seem relevant to their interests. Indeed, I try especially hard to do this with students whose gender or ethnicity is underrepresented in the field. And when my students come to me requesting letters of recommendation, I am always thrilled to hear that they are applying for jobs or graduate degrees, and happy agree to write them as positive a letter as I honestly can. Last year I carefully crafted a letter for one of my top students from “History of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict”, and was delighted to learn that she was accepted at Columbia University Law School. I am confident that she will succeed and grateful to have been part of the process.

I find teaching very rewarding. Whether it is a student at Cornell University or an inmate at Cayuga Correctional Facility, and whether we are studying Plato’s definition of justice, modal logic, or the 1948 Arab-Israeli War, it is a privilege to contribute to another person’s intellectual growth. And it is my pleasure to share with my students, in whatever ways most benefit them, the richness of my own experiences.

DIVERSITY STATEMENT

In several ways, my own personal background puts me in a position to contribute to academic inclusiveness. As someone from a family of mixed ethnicities, I can understand the situations of people who struggle to reconcile elements of their own identities and beliefs that may conflict with each other, or with their surroundings in the United States. Moreover, I have a significant extracurricular interest in ethnic tensions. For example, in Fall 2015 I led two sections of the course “History of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict” in Cornell University’s Near Eastern Studies department. My strong interest in such conflicts positions me to understand and help moderate ethnic and ideological tensions as they might arise in the university.

I believe that students’ learning can be affected by their physical conditions, both internal and external, and I am committed to assisting community members who suffer from physical impairments or disabilities. As someone with moderate hemophilia, I myself must from time to time spend a month on crutches or in a wheelchair. Thus, I always stay aware of the accessibility services that are available in my surroundings, as well as the best routes to take across campus in an imperfectly mobile condition. Having a teacher who is familiar with this information can make a difference for students who need it. Similarly, because I have experience in overcoming some of the psychological burdens that come with having a physical impairment, I am naturally in a position to make friendly suggestions and connect my students, colleagues, or other community members with appropriate mental health services.

In addition to drawing on my own background in attempting to make my general academic environment more inclusive, I also make a conscious effort to understand and address the diversity issues that specifically affect the field of Philosophy. One such problem is the disproportionate lack of confidence that women and people of color often experience when engaging in philosophical discussion. In part this is because many of the actions that are a normal part of healthy intellectual debate—such as overtly disagreeing with an interlocutor, or asking a second follow-up question in response to an evasive answer—involve breaking social norms to which members of these groups have been (and, unfortunately, often still are) subject. I am committed to staying aware of these norms, and paying close attention to the influences they might be exerting on my colleagues and students. For example, if I can tell that my interlocutor may have an objection that for these reasons she is uncomfortable raising, I will pause and ask whether she or he might have more to say.

Another problem, faced in particular by women and people in the LGBT community, has to do with the examples and philosophical thought experiments that come up in papers and talks. In these settings, it is unfortunately still quite common for female characters to occur only in the context of having some romantic connection with a male character. I understand that for many people this tendency contributes to a feeling of alienation and distracts from the philosophical content under discussion. In my writing and presentations, I strive to avoid this phenomenon, e.g., by using gender-neutral names in my examples. While ‘Christopher’ is gender-committal, ‘Chris’ could also be short for ‘Christina’, making it a better choice. I find that even small matters like this can help to make people feel more included.

Philosophy is also plagued by implicit biases against females, Blacks, Latinos, and people in the LGBT community. As an instructor and colleague, I am committed to exposing and correcting for such biases as they occur in intellectual discussions. While there is continuing scholarly debate about how one can best recognize and overcome one’s own implicit biases, I am committed to learning more about how this can be done, and to doing what I can in the meantime. In my view, an important way to combat such implicit biases is to encourage more members of these groups to join philosophy—and then to talk philosophy with them, debate their scholarly

DIVERSITY STATEMENT

work, attend their talks—thereby challenging head-on the tired image of the philosopher as the bearded white male.

I also understand that many people feel alienated by the absence of female, Black, and Latino philosophers from course syllabi. While such philosophers have made many valuable contributions, often these have not become part of the canon in the way they have deserved. Likewise, many people are concerned about a neglect in philosophy courses of issues that are of urgent concern in society, especially for members of historically oppressed groups. Accordingly, when planning a course, I strive to include works produced by members of these groups, and to connect traditional debates to important social issues. For example, my syllabus for “Knowledge, Justification, and Rationality” includes a unit on the relationships between knowledge and oppression that examines works from important feminists such as Nancy Daukas and Elizabeth Fricker. Part of “Introduction to the Philosophy of Language” discusses elements from the Indian philosophical tradition, and another part uses works by Luvell Anderson, Rae Langton, and Lynne Tyrell to investigate how hate speech and pornographic speech communicate nefarious presuppositions. In “Introduction to Meta-Ethics” it has been my pleasure to draw work from Cornell University powerhouses Julia Markovits and Kate Manne, concerning the connections between our internal feelings of motivation and what we have reason to do. In these cases and others, I have benefited from the help of my colleagues. I am not afraid to ask other philosophers for advice as to how to make my syllabi more inclusive, and intend to do this with every course I would teach as a faculty member.

Most generally, as a faculty member I would endeavor to stay updated on issues relating to the campus culture and social climate. And I would make myself aware of resources that could serve the needs of my students. One thing that I would be particularly interested in doing as a faculty member is consulting with various campus advocacy organizations to improve the effectiveness of the philosophy department in serving the needs of the students they represent.

In addition to increasing the inclusiveness of philosophy on campus, I am also interested in outreach programs that bring philosophy to other communities. For example, in Spring 2016 I served as an instructor in Cornell University’s Prison Education Program. I taught a course in a local prison, Cayuga Correctional Facility. I believe strongly in the importance of this kind of work, and would enthusiastically continue to pursue it as a faculty member at your institution.

PHILOSOPHY: CHALLENGING THE ORTHODOXY

INSTRUCTOR INFORMATION

Name: Eric G. Epstein

Office:

Office Hours:

Email: ege3@cornell.edu

COURSE DESCRIPTION

For as long as people have had established beliefs about the world, philosophers have called those beliefs into question. This course will consider some important challenges to the foundational beliefs of our society, and examine a range of responses. We will begin by asking whether there could be a benevolent God, given that there is so much evil in the world. Some philosophers claim that evil arises from humans exercising their free will. But this raises the question: do we even have free will? Indeed, if we could be wrong about free will, maybe we are wrong about our other basic beliefs too. We will consider whether we really know *anything* that we think we know, and whether knowledge is something objective and universal, or whether there are certain things that can only be known from certain perspectives, depending on such things as one's gender and position in society. Having turned to issues of justice and inequality, we will ask whether those who live in a brutal society can be excused for failing to know right from wrong. We will finish by studying the work of anthropologists who deny that there are any moral absolutes and exploring a few responses.

LEARNING OUTCOMES

By the end of the course, your papers should indicate that you can:

- (1) Find the argument of a text and restate it clearly in your own words.
- (2) Clearly explain viewpoints that are not your own.
- (3) Think critically about difficult ideas.
- (4) Demonstrate a grasp of the concepts and arguments discussed in the course.
- (5) Write clear, persuasive papers that employ methods of critical thinking.

COURSE MATERIALS

Required textbooks:

Free Will: A Contemporary Introduction, Kane (Kane)

The course packet, available on Blackboard and at the campus store (PACK)

EVALUATION

The course grade will be based on:

10 Quizzes (2% each)	20%
Mid-Term Exam	20%
3 Short Papers (16.66% each)	50%
Weekly Discussion Postings	10%

PHILOSOPHY: CHALLENGING THE ORTHODOXY

LATE WORK

If you are expecting to need more time to complete an assignment, get in touch with me at least 48 hours in advance. Unexcused lateness will affect your paper grade by 5% per day past the deadline. Except under extreme circumstances (e.g., medical event requiring hospitalization or a death in the family), no extensions will be granted past the due date of the next paper. If you are having a genuine emergency such as a broken bone or death in the family, let me know as soon as possible and I will accommodate.

GUIDELINES FOR WRITTEN WORK

- Word-process all written work.
- Use standard font (such as Times New Roman), in 12 point.
- Double space, using 1-inch margins. Do not put excessive spaces between paragraphs.
- Number your pages.
- At the top of the first page include your name, assignment number, date, the course number, and my name.
- Whenever there is a choice between multiple essay questions on the prompt, **you must indicate which question you are answering on the first page** of your essay.
- Proofread and spellcheck before bringing any drafts to class.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

You are responsible for following the Code of Academic Integrity, available through the college's website at ... Plagiarism is sufficient grounds for an F in the course.

PORTABLE ELECTRONIC DEVICES

Laptops, iPads, cellphones, etc. may be used in class. However, if you choose to use them, **please sit in the back of the class** so as not to distract other students.

ABSENCES FROM CLASS

If you are absent from class for any reason, you are responsible for finding out from other students what was covered and assigned, and for obtaining copies of any materials distributed in class.

If you find yourself having mental or emotional problems during the semester, contact me and I will connect you with appropriate psychological health resources. I care about your well-being and will do my best to connect you with campus resources that can help. If you need to be absent from class, please notify me as early as possible and provide relevant documentation after the fact (e.g., doctor's note). Given appropriate documentation, we can set up an alternative day for you to take the quiz.

I will readily accommodate religious observance dates, but please give me at least two days advanced notice of any such accommodation you might need.

PHILOSOPHY: CHALLENGING THE ORTHODOXY

CALENDAR:

Date:	Assignments:	Reading:	Topics:
<i>Week 1</i>		(PACK) Mackie, "Evil and Omnipotence" (PACK) Plantinga, "The Free Will Defense"	<i>Introduction, The Problem of Evil</i>
<i>Week 2</i>		(PACK) Rowe, "The Evidential Argument from Evil" (PACK) McCord-Adams, "Horrendous Evils and the Goodness of God"	<i>Seemingly Pointless Evils</i>
<i>Week 3</i>	First paper assigned	(Kane) Ch.1	<i>Introduction to Free Will</i>
<i>Week 4</i>		(Kane) Ch.2, 9	<i>Compatibilism</i>
<i>Week 5</i>		(Kane) Ch.3	<i>Incompatibilism</i>
<i>Week 6</i>	First paper due	(Kane) Ch.4, 5	<i>Libertarianism About Free Will</i>
<i>Week 7</i>		(PACK) Libet, "Do We Have Free Will?" (PACK) Nahmias, "When Consciousness Matters"	<i>Science and Free Will</i>
<i>Week 8</i>		(PACK) Descartes, "Meditations I and II" (PACK) Stroud, "The Problem of the External World", p.7-12	Midterm <i>External World Skepticism</i>
<i>Week 9</i> NO CLASS			FALL BREAK
<i>Week 10</i>	Second paper assigned	(PACK) Moore, "Proof of the External World" (PACK) Russell, <i>Problems of Philosophy</i> , Ch.2	<i>Moore and Russell on Skepticism</i>
<i>Week 11</i>		(PACK) Soames, "Moore on Skepticism, Perception, and Knowledge"	<i>Critiques of Moore on Skepticism</i>
<i>Week 12</i>	Second paper due	(PACK) Anderson, "Feminist Epistemology and Philosophy of Science", Intro & Sections 1 and 2	<i>Situated Epistemology</i>
<i>Week 13</i> NO CLASS			THANKSGIVING BREAK
<i>Week 14</i>	Third paper assigned	(PACK) Haraway, "Situated Knowledges: The Question of Science in Feminism" (PACK) Addelson, "The Man of Professional Wisdom"	<i>Situated Epistemology & Gendered Cognitive Styles</i>
<i>Week 15</i>		(PACK) Ginet, "The Epistemic Requirements for Moral Responsibility" (PACK) Rosen, "Culpability and Ignorance"	<i>Ethical Relativism</i>
<i>Week 16</i>	Third paper due	(PACK) Herskovits, "Cultural Relativism and Cultural Values" (PACK) Benedict, "In Defense of Ethical Relativism"	<i>More on Ethical Relativism</i>

PHIL 106 - INTRODUCTION TO BUSINESS ETHICS

MWF - 11:15am - 12:05pm, Willard Building room 067

TR - 12:05pm - 1:20pm, Willard Building room 151

INSTRUCTOR INFORMATION

Dr. Eric Epstein

Office: Sparks Building, Room 230

Office Hours: Mondays 3:30 - 4:30 and by appointment

Email: ege3@cornell.edu

COURSE DESCRIPTION

Does the use of cheap labor disrespect humanity or benefit people in need of employment? What do CEO's owe their investors? What about their communities? What happens when these responsibilities conflict? These are just some of the questions that students will think critically about in this course. Reading assignments will be drawn from a variety of sources, from philosophical journals to *The New York Times*, and class work will include both essays and in-class activities. Coursework will be designed to teach students the fundamentals of philosophical writing: understanding writing that describes and argues for the views of others; thinking critically about and arguing for one's own views; and explaining one's own reasoning and the reasoning of others clearly in writing.

COURSE OBJECTIVES

By the end of this class, you should be able to:

- Read and understand critical and argumentative writing.
- Write clearly and concisely.
- Apply ethical reasoning to cases.
- Accurately reconstruct and explain the arguments of others in writing, even if you don't agree with their conclusions.
- Explain your own reasoning in writing so that other people can understand it, even if they don't agree with your conclusions.

REQUIREMENTS

- Attendance at > 85% of classes (> 33 for MWF section (41 total), > 24 for TR section (28 total))
- Readings finished **before class**. For each week:
 - Reading 1 for that week is due on: Mon. (MWF) / Tues. (TR)
 - Reading 2 for that week is due on: Wed. (MWF) / Thurs. (TR)
 - Reading 3 (if any) for that week is due on: Fri. (MWF) / Thurs. (TR)
 - Reading 4 (if any) for that week is due on: Fri. (MWF) / Thurs. (TR)
- 4 essays, of varying length, turned in on time
- 4 homework assignments, designed to help you write your essays

READINGS

Ethical Theory and Business, seventh edition (ETB); ISBN: 0-13-111632-0

Ethics at Work: Basic Readings in Business Ethics (EW); ISBN: 0-19-513942-9

Other readings will be posted online through the course website (CW).

Please make sure you get the books as soon as possible (for online orders, you may want to request expedited shipping).

GRADING

Your course grade will be based on:

Attendance & Participation	10%
Four Homework Assignments (5% each)	20%
Four Essays	
Essay 1	15%
Essay 2	15%
Essay 3	20%
Essay 4	20%

Each category above is worth that number of points, for a total possible numerical score of 100 points. (E.g., Essay 4 is worth 20 points.) I will obtain your final letter grade for the course from your numerical score using the chart below.

All numerical grades and letter grades will correspond in the following way:*

Earned Percent of Available Points:	5-point Assignment	15-point Assignment	20-point Assignment	Letter Grade:
96-100%	4.8 - 5	14.4 - 15	19.2 - 20	A+
93-95%	4.65 - 4.75	13.95 - 14.25	18.6 - 19	A
90-92%	4.5 - 4.6	13.5 - 13.8	18 - 18.4	A-
87-89%	4.35 - 4.45	13.05 - 13.35	17.4 - 17.8	B+
84-86%	4.2 - 4.3	12.6 - 12.9	16.8 - 17.2	B
81-83%	4.05 - 4.15	12.15 - 12.45	16.2 - 16.6	B-
78-80%	3.9 - 4	11.7 - 12	15.6 - 16	C+
75-77%	3.75 - 3.85	11.25 - 11.55	15 - 15.4	C
72-74%	3.6 - 3.7	10.8 - 11.1	14.4 - 14.8	C-
69-71%	3.45 - 3.55	10.35 - 10.65	13.8 - 14.2	D+
66-68%	3.3 - 3.4	9.9 - 10.2	13.2 - 13.6	D
63-65%	3.15 - 3.25	9.45 - 9.75	12.6 - 13	D-
62% and below	≤ 3.1	≤ 9.3	≤ 12.4	F

* Fractions of a percent will be rounded up. So, a score of 14.30 (between 95 and 96%) on a 15-point assignment will be rounded up to 14.4 (96%), or A+.

GUIDELINES FOR WRITTEN WORK

- Submit electronic copies of all homework and essays. If you wish to turn in a hard copy, staple or paperclip your pages together.
- Use normal (1") margins and double space your work.
- At the top of the first page include the following, single-spaced:
 - your name,
 - date,
 - the course number,
 - the assignment type & number (e.g., Essay 3)
- Use APA-style citations, both in-text and in a **separate Works Cited page**.
- Submit work on the course website. **Take a screenshot and save it** in case something goes wrong.
 - If the website doesn't work, email your work to me at ege3@cornell.edu. Once it sends, **take a screenshot** and save it.

OTHER POLICIES

Plagiarism: Every student in this course is expected to abide by the Penn State University Academic Code of Integrity. Any work submitted for academic credit must be the student's own work. I have provided a link to the university's Essential Guide to Academic Integrity on the course website, and I encourage you to look it over if you haven't done so already. If you are ever unsure about whether what you are doing counts as plagiarism, just come talk to me or send me an email before you turn your assignment in, and we can make sure you are producing your own work—not somebody else's. There is no penalty at all for talking to me about whether your paper counts as plagiarism before you hand it in!

Deadlines: Make sure to plan out your schedule so that you can finish your work on time. However, if the deadline is approaching and your time-budgeting isn't working out, don't panic! If you let me know that you need an extension at least three days before the paper due date, we will probably be able to work something out. Outside of extensions, all work needs to be turned in on time. Late work will receive a mark-down of half of a letter grade for every day it is late.

Electronics: Some readings for this course are online. I find it easier to look at and take notes on hard copies of readings, so I like to print out my readings. However, I will not assume that all of you are the same way. I will allow the use of laptops/tablets for the purpose of looking at readings in class, if you prefer not to print them out. I am trusting you to be adults and choose this method only if you can avoid being distracted by the internet.

STATEMENT ON COURSE CONTENT

Part of learning ethics is thinking hard about examples of abuse, exploitation, harassment, corruption, neglect, and even well-intended behavior that ends up having harmful consequences. Because of this, some of the material we will study in this class will be disturbing, heartbreakingly sad, or both. I will do my best to notify you in advance when such material looms on our agenda. Still, if you are (like me) a sensitive reader, then before opening any of our course material it is a good idea to remind yourself that you may be affected by what you are about to read.

INTRODUCTION TO BUSINESS ETHICS

CALENDAR:

Date: NOTES	Assignments:	Reading:	Topics:
<i>Week 1</i> : Aug.21-27		1. Brewer, The Wal-Mart Way (CW) 2. Maitland, The Great Non-Debate...(EW, 49-66)	Introduction: Business Ethics Moral Theories and Business Cases
<i>Week 2:</i> Aug.28-Sept.3	Essay 1 assigned HW1: Intro paragraph for E1	1. Lyutse, Nike's Suppliers in Vietnam (CW) 2. Utilitarian Theories (ETB, 17-22)	
<i>Week 3:</i> Sept.4-Sept.10 NO CLASS SEPT.4 - LABOR DAY	HW1 due	1. Kantian Ethics (ETB, 22-27) 2. Arnold & Bowie, Sweatshops...(CW) - !!!SAD!!! 3. Feminist Ethics and Care Ethics (ETB, 33-35)	NO CLASS SEPT. 4 - LABOR DAY
<i>Week 4:</i> Sept.11-Sept.17	Essay 1 due	1. Virtue Ethics (ETB, 31-32) 2. Friedman, The Social Responsibility... (CW) 3. Lucas, The Responsibilities... (EW, 15-29)	Frameworks for Moral Obligation in Business
<i>Week 5:</i> Sept.18-Sept.24 NO CLASS SEPT.20,21,22	Essay 2 assigned	1. Hoffman, The Ford Pinto (CW)	NO CLASS SEPT.20, 21, 22
<i>Week 6:</i> Sept.25-Oct.1 NO CLASS SEPT.29	HW2: 1 body paragraph for E2	1. Freeman, A Stakeholder Theory...(ETB, 55-64) 2. Hakim,Kessler,&Ewing; As Volkswagen...(CW / NYT)	NO CLASS SEPT.29
<i>Week 7:</i> Oct.2-Oct.8 NO CLASS OCT.4,5,6	HW 2 due	1. NYT Editorial Board, Beyond...(CW / NYT) 2. Hasnas, Two Normative Theories...(ETB, 65-74)	NO CLASS OCT.4, 5, 6
<i>Week 8:</i> Oct.9-Oct.15	Essay 2 due	1. Crisp, A Defense of Philosophical...(EW, 1-14) 2. Hoffman, Business and Env...(EW, 166-179)	Businesses and the Surrounding World
<i>Week 9:</i> Oct.16-Oct.22	Essay 3 assigned HW3:Draft of E3	1. Williams, Indian Beer...(CW / NYT) 2. Gee, Animal-Rights...(CW / WSJ) 3. Gee and Bunge, Tyson Fires...(CW / WSJ)	
<i>Week 10:</i> Oct.23-Oct.29		1. Carr, Is Business Bluffing Ethical? (ETB, 443-447) 2. Carson, Second Thoughts...(ETB, 448-453)	Honesty in Business
<i>Week 11:</i> Oct.30-Nov.5	HW3 due	1. Walsh, Don't Let...(CW / Huff) 2. Phillips, The Inconclusive Case...(EW, 129-149)	Advertising
<i>Week 12:</i> Nov.6-Nov.12 LATE DROP DEADLINE: NOV.10	Essay 3 due	1. Bishop, Is Self-Identity...(ETB, 417-427) 2. Anker,Kappel,&Sandoe; The Liberating Power... (CW)	
<i>Week 13:</i> Nov.13-Nov.19	Essay 4 assigned HW4:Draft of E4	1. Epstein, Can A "Dumb...(ETB, 361-369) 2. Sher, Diversity (ETB, 331-338) 3. Nagel, A Defense (ETB, 339-342) 4. Moore, Corporate Culpability...(ETB, 99-109)	Diversity in Business
<i>Week 14:</i> Nov.20-Nov.26 THANKSGIVING BREAK			THANKSGIVING BREAK

INTRODUCTION TO BUSINESS ETHICS

Week 15: Nov.27-Dec.3	HW4 due	1. Belkin, How Can We...(ETB, 136-146) 2. McCoy, The Parable of the Sadhu (CW) 3. Boisjoly, et al.; Roger Boisjoly...(ETB, 123-136) 4. Davis, Some Paradoxes...(EW, 85-99 / ETB, 297-305)	Individuals in Business
Week 16: Dec.4-Dec.10		1. Green, When Is "Everyone's...(EW, 67-84) 2. Ciulla, Trust and the Future of Leadership (CW)	LAST DAY OF CLASS: Dec.8
Week 17: Dec.11-Dec.17 EXAM WEEK	Essay 4 due		EXAM WEEK

WORKS CITED

1. Anker, Kappel, & Sandoe . "The Liberating Power of Commercial Marketing." (CW)
2. Belkin, "How Can We Save the Next Victim?" (ETB, 136-146)
3. Bishop, "Is Self-Identity Image Advertising Ethical?" (ETB, 417-427)
4. Boisjoly, Curtis, & Mellican . "Roger Boisjoly and the *Challenger* Disaster: The Ethical Dimensions," (ETB, 123-136)
5. Carr, "Is Business Bluffing Ethical?" (ETB, 443-447)
6. Carson, "Second Thoughts About Bluffing." (ETB, 448-453)
7. Ciulla, "Trust and the Future of Leadership." (CW)
8. Crisp, "A Defense of Philosophical Business Ethics." (EW, 1-14)
9. Davis, "Some Paradoxes of Whistleblowing." (EW, 85-99 (also in ETB, 297-305))
10. Epstein, "Can A 'Dumb Ass Woman' Achieve Equality in the Workplace?" (ETB, 361- 369)
11. Freeman, "A Stakeholder Theory of the Modern Corporation." (ETB, 55-64)
12. Friedman, "The Social Responsibility of Business is to Increase its Profits." (CW)
13. Gee & Bunge, "Tyson Fires Two Meatpacking Workers After Video's Release." (CW (WSJ))
14. Gee, "Animal-Rights Group Says Video Shows Abused Pigs at Hormel Supplier." (CW (WSJ))
15. Green, "When Is 'Everyone's Doing It' a Moral Justification?" (EW, 67-84)
16. Hakim, Kessler, & Ewing . "As Volkswagen Pushed to Be No.1, Ambitions Fueled a Scandal." (CW (NYT))
17. Hasnas, "Two Normative Theories of Business Ethics: A Critique." (ETB, 65-74)
18. Hoffman, "Business and Environmental Ethics." (EW, 166-179)
19. Hoffman, "The Ford Pinto." (CW)
20. Lucas, "The Responsibilities of a Businessman." (EW, 15-29)
21. Lyutse. "Nike's Suppliers in Vietnam."
22. McCoy, "The Parable of the Sadhu." (CW)
23. Moore, "Corporate Culpability under the Federal Sentencing Guidelines." (ETB, 99- 109)
24. Nagel, "A Defense of Affirmative Action." (ETB, 339- 342)
25. NYT Editorial Board, "Beyond the Emissions Test." (CW (NYT))
26. Phillips, "The Inconclusive Case Against Manipulative Advertising." (EW, 129-149)
27. Sher, "Diversity." (ETB, 331-338)
28. Walsh, "Don't Let Its New Policy Fool You. Morgan Stanley Is a Huge Coal Bank." (CW (Huff))
29. Williams, "Indian Beer Bill Stalls, Industry Money Flows." (CW (NYT))

ESSAY 2 (2-5 pages double spaced)
due Monday, Oct. 16, by 11:59pm, on
Canvas

HW 2
due Monday, Oct. 2, by 11:59pm
Turn in a draft Essay 2 on Canvas.

ASSIGNMENT PROMPT:

Background:

Friedman (1970) argues that the only responsibility a business has is to increase its profits, within the limits of the law. Friedman's claims and arguments have been widely discussed. Dunn & Burton (2006) offer a variety of substantive criticisms, and Hoffman (2005) describes a highly relevant case study. Also, while he does not address Friedman directly, Lucas (1998) lays out a conception of businesses' responsibilities that can be usefully contrasted with Friedman's.

In about two pages (plus an extra page for the Works Cited list), do the following:

1. Write an intro paragraph in which you describe what you are going to do in your paper.
 - a. Give a brief (1-2 sentences each) overview of:
 - i. The views you are going to discuss.
 - ii. The main conclusions you will draw about these views.
 1. That is, your answer to question 4(c) below.
 - iii. The main reasons that will support your conclusions.Your intro paragraph should make it clear what order things will happen in the paper.
2. Present Friedman's (1970) view.
 - a. State Friedman's main claims.
 - b. Briefly, but **carefully**, describe the reasons Friedman gives as to why he accepts these claims.
 - i. Use appropriate in-text citations and be sure to put (Friedman 1970) on the works cited page.
3. Present the perspective of at least one author(s) who disagrees with Friedman.
 - a. You can use any of the folks we read for this class, including but not limited to: (Lucas 1998), (Dunn & Burton 2006), (Dowie 1977), Hoffman's (2005) discussion of (Dowie 1977). All are available on Canvas in the folders under "Modules". **Outside sources are not allowed** for this assignment.
 - b. Articulate the main claims of the author you are discussing.
 - c. Briefly, but **carefully**, describe the reasons s/he gives as to why s/he accepts these claims.
 - i. Use appropriate in-text citations, and be sure to put your author in the works cited page.
4. Compare and contrast Friedman with the other author(s) you discuss, and **draw a conclusion based on thorough engagement with both sides**.
 - a. Exactly what claims do this author and Friedman disagree about? Explain.
 - b. For each author you discuss, look at their reasons that support their position. Explain how the opposite side would respond to those reasons.
 - c. Who is right, Friedman, or the opposite side?
 - i. Is one of them completely right and the other completely wrong? Or is each of them right about certain things and wrong about other things? Explain why, in detail.

Other Requirements:

1. Submit your essay on the Canvas page for this course, as a .doc, .docx, or .pdf file. a. If you have trouble submitting your essay, email the essay to me at ege3@cornell.edu and **take a time-stamped screenshot**. This proves that you turned in your essay on time.
2. At the top of your paper, single spaced, write **your name, the date, and ‘Essay 2’**. No need for a title.
3. For this paper, you are **not allowed to use outside sources**. Just stick to the materials provided in class and on Canvas; it’s all you need.
4. Include proper APA-style citations, both in-text and in your Works Cited list.
 - a. To learn how to generally do APA-style citations (in-text and in the WC list), see this website: <https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/560/02/>
 - b. You can use the Works Cited list I provide below. But **remove any authors you’re not going to discuss!**

The point of this assignment:

When people disagree, you can’t make a rational judgment about who is right until you have understood both sides and gotten to the bottom of what they disagree about. The point of this assignment is to get two or more authors who disagree to really talk to each other, and then make up your own mind based on that conversation.

Works Cited:

1. Dowie, M. (1977, September / October). “Pinto Madness.” *Mother Jones*, San Francisco, CA.
2. Dunn, C.P. & Burton, B.K. (2006). Friedman’s “The Social Responsibility of Business is to Increase its Profits”: A Critique for the Classroom. *Proceedings of the 17th Annual Meeting of the International Association for Business and Society*, 17, pp.292-295.¹
3. Friedman, M. (1970, September 13). “The Social Responsibility of Business is to Increase its Profits.” *New York Times Magazine*, New York, NY.
4. W. M. Hoffman. (2005). “Case study—the Ford Pinto.” In Gini, A. & Marcoux, A.M., *Case Studies in Business Ethics*, 5th Ed. (pp.222–229). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
5. Lucas, J.R. (1998). The Responsibilities of a Businessman. In C.C. & C.R. (Eds.), *Business Ethics: Perspectives on the Practice of Theory* (pp.59-77). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

¹ For (Dunn & Burton 2006), the pages are not numbered. So you can just use what page it is in the .pdf window: p.1, p.2, etc.

PHIL 010 - CRITICAL THINKING

MWF, 2:30pm - 3:20pm
Willard Building room 251

INSTRUCTOR INFORMATION

Dr. Eric Epstein
Office: Sparks Building Room 230
Office Hours: Mondays 3:30pm - 4:30pm and by appointment
Email: ege3@cornell.edu

COURSE DESCRIPTION

The ability to think rationally is one of the things that distinguishes humans from other animals. In this course, we will examine what rational thinking really is, looking at a variety of different methods of reasoning that fall under that heading—and some that do not! E.g., we will identify the different kinds of rhetoric and logical fallacies that you might encounter in politics and the media, and learn to distinguish them from rational argumentation. We will also apply our critical thinking tools to a variety of particular subjects, from everyday decisions such as whether or not to buy a car, to stranger ideas, such as mystical experiences, extra-sensory perception, astrology, and the existence of aliens.

LEARNING OUTCOMES

By the end of the course, your work should indicate that you can:

- (1) Distinguish between claims and arguments for them.
- (2) Distinguish different kinds of arguments.
- (3) Read a text and determine what kind of reasoning it contains.
- (4) Identify common fallacies and rhetorical devices.
- (5) Think critically about difficult ideas.

COURSE MATERIALS

Required textbooks:
Critical Thinking, Moore and Parker, Mayfield Pub. (CT)
How to Think About Weird Things, Schick (WEIRD)

GRADES

Your course grade will be based on:

15 Homework Assignments ¹ (2% each)	30%
4 Quizzes (5% each)	20%
Mid-Term Exam	15%
Final Exam	25%
Class Participation	10%

¹ To ensure that your graded homework can be returned in a timely manner, I will randomly select a few of the questions and grade only those. But you should **answer all the questions!** You don't know which ones I will grade, and you can use the practice! I know you are busy, so I have tried to keep the homework assignments short.

CRITICAL THINKING

Each category above is worth that number of points, for a total possible numerical score of 100 points. (E.g., the Mid-Term Exam is worth 15 points.) I will obtain your final letter grade for the course from your numerical score using the chart below.

Earned Percent of Available Points:	Quiz	Mid-Term Exam	Final Exam	Letter Grade:
96-100%	4.8 - 5	14.4 - 15	24 - 25	A+
93-95%	4.65 - 4.75	13.95 - 14.25	23.25 - 23.75	A
90-92%	4.5 - 4.6	13.5 - 13.8	22.5 - 23	A-
87-89%	4.35 - 4.45	13.05 - 13.35	21.75 - 22.25	B+
84-86%	4.2 - 4.3	12.6 - 12.9	21 - 21.5	B
81-83%	4.05 - 4.15	12.15 - 12.45	20.25 - 20.75	B-
78-80%	3.9 - 4	11.7 - 12	19.5 - 20	C+
75-77%	3.75 - 3.85	11.25 - 11.55	18.75 - 19.25	C
72-74%	3.6 - 3.7	10.8 - 11.1	18 - 18.5	C-
69-71%	3.45 - 3.55	10.35 - 10.65	17.25 - 17.75	D+
66-68%	3.3 - 3.4	9.9 - 10.2	16.5 - 17	D
63-65%	3.15 - 3.25	9.45 - 9.75	15.75 - 16.25	D-
62% and below	≤ 3.1	≤ 9.3	≤ 15.5	F

* Fractions of a percent will be rounded up. So, a score of 14.30 (between 95 and 96%) on a 15-point assignment will be rounded up to 14.4 (96%), or A+.

LATE WORK

Each week's **homework is due at the beginning of class on Monday** of the following week. If you let me know that you need an extension at least **three days** before the due date, we will probably be able to work something out. Outside of extensions, all work needs to be turned in on time. Late work will receive a mark-down of half of a letter grade for every day it is late.

GUIDELINES FOR WRITTEN WORK

- **Submit all your work online;** hard copies are optional. (Pages must be stapled!)
- At the top of the first page include:
 - your name, the assignment number, date, and the course number.
- For each question you answer, write the question number next to it.

ABSENCES FROM CLASS

If you are absent from class, you must be proactive and ask other students what was covered and assigned, and obtain copies of any materials distributed in class. Notify me by email of the reason for your absence; if it is excused, I will mark it as such. Since we will do a lot of in-class activities, **unexcused absence from 6 or more classes will affect your participation grade.**

If you encounter emotional difficulties during the semester, contact me and I will connect you with appropriate psychological health resources. I am not qualified to act as your therapist, but I care about your well-being and will do my best to help you. Absences due to illness—either physical or psychological—are excused. To guarantee that your absence will be excused, please notify me of the absence as early as possible and provide a doctor's note if applicable.

I will readily accommodate religious observance dates, but please give me at least two days advanced notice of any such accommodation you might need.

OTHER POLICIES

Plagiarism: Every student in this course is expected to abide by the Pennsylvania State University Academic Code of Integrity. Any work submitted for academic credit must be the student's own work. I have provided a link to the university's Essential Guide to Academic Integrity on the course website, and I encourage you to look it over if you haven't done so already. If you are ever unsure about whether what you are doing counts as plagiarism, just come talk to me or send me an email before you turn your assignment in, and we can make sure you are producing your own work—not somebody else's. There is no penalty at all for talking to me about whether your paper counts as plagiarism before you hand it in!

Electronics: Some readings for this course are online. I find it easier to look at and take notes on hard copies of readings, so I like to print out my readings. However, I will not assume that all of you are the same way. I will allow the use of laptops/tablets for the purpose of looking at readings in class, if you prefer not to print them out. I am trusting you to be adults and choose this method only if you can avoid being distracted by the internet.

STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

I am available to discuss appropriate academic accommodations that may be required for students with disabilities. Requests for academic accommodations are to be made during the first three weeks of the semester, except in unusual circumstances, so that arrangements can be made. Students are encouraged to register with Student Disability Services to verify their eligibility for appropriate accommodations.

CRITICAL THINKING

CALENDAR:

Date: NOTES	Assignments:	Reading:	Topics:
<i>Week 1:</i> Aug.21-27	HW1: (CT) Exercises 1-1, 1-7 (p.15), 1-13.	(CT) p.1-26 (WEIRD) Ch.1	Introduction: Critical Thinking
<i>Week 2:</i> Aug.28-Sept.3	HW1 due HW2: (CT) Exercise 2-11	(CT) p.37-57 (WEIRD) Ch.2	Inductive and Deductive Arguments Quiz 1
<i>Week 3:</i> Sept.4-Sept.10 NO CLASS SEPT.4 - LABOR DAY	HW 2 due WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 6 HW3: (WEIRD) Study Questions p.30, #1	(CT) p.69-93	NO CLASS SEPT. 4 - LABOR DAY Sources of Uncertainty in Thought
<i>Week 4:</i> Sept.11-Sept.17	HW3 due HW4: (WEIRD) Disc. Quest. p.91, #1, write one P.	(CT) p.104-136 (WEIRD) Ch.4	Distinguishing the Credibility of Information Sources
<i>Week 5:</i> Sept.18-Sept.24 NO CLASS SEPT.20,21,22	HW4 due HW5: (CT) Exercises 5-6, 5-10	(CT) p.146-171	Rhetoric Part I NO CLASS SEPT.20, 22 Quiz 2
<i>Week 6:</i> Sept.25-Oct.1 NO CLASS SEPT.29	HW 5 due HW6: (CT) Exercises 6-7, 6-8 # 1-10	(CT) p.184-202 (WEIRD) Ch.5	Rhetoric Part II NO CLASS SEPT.29
<i>Week 7:</i> Oct.2-Oct.8 NO CLASS OCT.4,5,6	HW6 due HW7: Midterm review questions	(CT) p.210-230	Rhetoric Part III NO CLASS OCT.4, 6
<i>Week 8:</i> Oct.9-Oct.15	HW 7 due HW 8: (CT) Exercise 8-1	(CT) p.253-284	MIDTERM Categorical Logic
<i>Week 9:</i> Oct.16-Oct.22	HW 8 due HW 9: (CT) Exercise 9-2 #1-10	(CT) p.295-341	Truth-Functional Logic
<i>Week 10:</i> Oct.23-Oct.29	HW 9 due HW 10: (CT) Exercises 9-14, 9-15	(CT) p.295-341	Truth-Functional Logic Quiz 3
<i>Week 11:</i> Oct.30-Nov.5	HW10 due HW11: (CT) Exercises 10-2, 10-3	(CT) p.349-383	Thinking Critically about Inductive Reasoning
<i>Week 12:</i> Nov.6-Nov.12 LATE DROP DEADLINE: NOV.10	HW11 due HW12: (CT) Exercise 11-16 #1-3	(CT) p.389-438 (WEIRD) Ch.6	Causal Explanation
<i>Week 13:</i> Nov.13-Nov.19	HW12 due HW13: (WEIRD) Eval. These Claims p.289 #1-4	(WEIRD) Ch.7	Case Studies in the Extraordinary Quiz 4
<i>Week 14:</i> Nov.20-Nov.26 THANKSGIVING BREAK			THANKSGIVING BREAK
<i>Week 15:</i> Nov.27-Dec.3	HW13 due HW14: (WEIRD) Study Questions p.316 #1-5	(CT) p.439-471 (WEIRD) Ch.8	Moral, Legal, and Aesthetic Reasoning
<i>Week 16:</i> Dec.4-Dec.10	HW14 due HW15: Final Exam study questions		LAST DAY OF CLASS: Dec.8
<i>Week 17:</i> Dec.11-Dec.17 EXAM WEEK	HW15 due - turn in at final exam		FINAL EXAM

MIDTERM EXAM
PHIL 10: Critical Thinking
Section 2: MWF 2:30pm-3:20pm

NAME: _____

ID: _____

Exam Information:

1. WRITE YOUR NAME AND ID on the top of your exam.
2. You have the entire class period to complete the exam. When you are finished, you may leave.
3. Do not look at any books or other materials during the exam.
4. If you need extra paper, ask me and I will give you some.
5. Leave a reasonable distance between yourself and your fellow students.
6. This exam is worth 15% of your course grade. A perfect score on the exam is 15 points.

Directions:

In 1-5 sentences, answer all of the following questions. Length isn't important, as long as you answer fully and correctly.

Worth 1 point each:

1. Define the following (you can define them in terms of each other):
 - a. Argument

 - b. Premise

 - c. Conclusion

2. What is it for an argument to be
 - a. Valid?

 - b. Sound?

MIDTERM EXAM
PHIL 10: Critical Thinking
Section 2: MWF 2:30pm-3:20pm

3. Explain the difference between groupthink and appeal to popularity.
4. Define rationalization and give an example.
5. Supply a universal principle (a statement that says that something holds without exception) that turns the following into a valid deductive argument.
 - a. Jamal donates money to charity, so he is a man of good character.

HINT: It will probably help you to write out the argument with numbered premises followed by a conclusion. But, full credit if you just write a universal principle that does the job.

Worth 2 points each:

6. What is innuendo? (Remember: innuendo is not always sexual! Don't get too excited.)
7.
 - a. In this class, what is an issue?
 - b. How do you figure out what issue a speaker or writer is addressing?
8. What's the difference between a normative claim and a non-normative claim (sometimes called a *descriptive* claim)?

MIDTERM EXAM
PHIL 10: Critical Thinking
Section 2: MWF 2:30pm-3:20pm

9. What is the difference between outrage and the fallacy *argument from outrage*?
10. Propaganda is a really effective way to persuade people. So, why should we bother to learn how to argue, or how to understand arguments? Or, should we really?
- (Here I will accept many different answers, as long as you give some reasons for them.)

INTRODUCTION TO LOGIC

Instructor: Eric G. Epstein

Email: ege3@cornell.edu

Time:

Place:

Website: <http://www.eric-epstein.wixsite.com/eric-epstein>

Course Description:

What makes one claim “follow” from others? Logic aims to address this question and others concerning the rich patterns of inference and reasoning that emerge upon further study. Formal Logic approaches these questions using some mathematical techniques that we will meet and begin to master in this course. In particular, we will study a powerful artificial language called **First-Order Logic** (FOL) that will allow us to precisely formulate the concepts of proof, truth and valid inference. FOL has been of immense foundational importance to mathematics, philosophy, computer science, linguistics and artificial intelligence, and so through FOL we will be encountering ideas of interest to all of these disciplines. Our study of FOL will focus on using it to represent and evaluate the inferences we normally express in ordinary English and other natural languages. Throughout the course we will rely heavily on the interactive computer software included with the textbook to solidify the understanding of logic that can be achieved by studying FOL.

Textbook:

The text/software package *Language, Proof and Logic* by Jon Barwise & John Etchemendy:

Barwise, J. & Etchemendy, J. (2003). *Language, Proof, and Logic*. New edn., Stanford, California: CSLI Publications. URL <http://www-csli.stanford.edu/LPL/>

- The text has a webpage that is likely to be useful throughout the course:
- The textbook is available at ...
- Beware: this textbook cannot be purchased used. The software requires a license that can only be used for one person and cannot be transferred. We will be using the software extensively.
- If you do not have regular access to a computer that you can run the software on, please contact me immediately and we will consider various options. You can run the software directly from the CD so you can use it on a computer without installing anything; e.g. in campus labs.
- In order to be successful in this course, you will have to do the assigned reading and play with the software until you feel comfortable using it.

INTRODUCTION TO LOGIC

Grading:

- 40%: 2 Exams (Midterm: 15%, Final 25%)
- 55%: 12 Short, Weekly Homework Assignments, due the first class of each week
- 5%: Attendance & Participation
- We will do in-class group exercises. I will call on students to present their group's solution. If you aren't here when I call your name, you lose participation points. Except under special circumstances, such as a death in the family or a religious observance date, absences are unexcused. To get an absence excused, you are required to contact me in advance of the absence, except in the case of a true emergency such as a death in the family.

Schedule:

Date:	Homework Exercises:	Reading:	Topics:
<i>Week 1</i> Class 1: Class 2:	HW1: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4	None 1.1-1.4	<i>Introduction</i> Introduction Atomic Sentences & Tarski's World
<i>Week 2</i> Class 3: Class 4:	HW 1 Due HW2: 2.1, 2.2, 2.6, 2.8, 2.20	2.1, 2.2 2.3-2.5	<i>The Concepts of Logic</i> Logical Consequence, Proof Proof, Fitch
<i>Week 3</i> Class 5: Class 6:	HW 2 Due HW3: 3.6, 3.9, 3.23, 4.2, 4.7	3.1-3.7 4.1	<i>Boolean Logic</i> Boolean Connectives: &, v, ~ Tautologies, Logical Truths
<i>Week 4</i> Class 7: Class 8:	HW 3 Due HW4: 4.22, 4.23, 5.5, 5.8, 5.10	4.2-4.4 5.1-5.2	<i>Boolean Logic & Proofs</i> Consequence & Equivalence Informal Boolean Proofs
<i>Week 5</i> Class 9: Class 10:	HW 4 Due HW5: 5.17, 5.20, 6.1, 6.2, 6.6	5.3-5.4 6.1-6.2	<i>Boolean Proofs</i> Indirect Proof Conjunction, Disjunction
<i>Week 6</i> Class 11: Class 12:	HW 5 Due HW6: 6.7, 6.22, 6.26, 7.12, 7.13	6.3-6.5 7.1-7.3, 7.5	<i>More Proofs & Conditionals</i> Negation, Subproofs Conditionals
<i>Week 7</i> Class 13: Class 14:	HW 6 Due HW7: 8.17, practice midterm	8.1, 8.2, 8.4	<i>Logic of Conditionals</i> Conditional Proofs Review of Ch.'s 1-8
<i>Week 8</i> Class 15: Class 16:	HW 7 Due HW8: 9.5, 9.6, 9.9, 9.16, 9.17	9.1-9.3	<i>Midterm, Quantification</i> Midterm Basics of Quantification

INTRODUCTION TO LOGIC

<i>Week 9</i> NO CLASS			<i>Fall Break</i>
<i>Week 10</i> Class 17: Class 18:		9.3, 9.4 9.5, 9.6	<i>Intro to Quantification</i> Basics of Quantification Translation
<i>Week 11</i> Class 19: Class 20:	HW 8 Due HW9: 10.9, 10.14, 10.18, 11.8, 11.9	10.1-10.4 11.1-11.3	<i>Logic of Quantification</i> Taut, Cons, Equiv Multiple, Mixed Quantifiers
<i>Week 12</i> Class 21: Class 22:	HW 9 Due HW10: 11.17, 11.24, 11.39, 12.4, 12.5	11.4, 11.5, 11.8 12.1, 12.2	<i>Translation, Proofs</i> More translation Steps, Existential Instantiation
<i>Week 13</i> NO CLASS			<i>Thanksgiving Break</i>
<i>Week 14</i> Class 23: Class 24:		12.3 12.4	<i>Quantifiers in Proofs</i> General Proofs Mixed Proofs
<i>Week 15</i> Class 25: Class 26:	HW 10 Due HW11: 12.8, 12.9, 12.11, 12.16, 12.23	13.1 13.2	<i>Formal Proofs</i> Universal Rules Existential Rules
<i>Week 16</i> Class 27: Class 28:	HW 11 Due HW12: Practice Final	13.3 13.5	<i>Formal Proofs, Review</i> Strategy & Tactics Review
<i>Week 17</i> NO CLASS	HW 12 Due		<i>Final Exam</i> Final Exam

Homework:

Homework assignments are given out the first class of each week and due by the beginning of the first class of the following week. Many exercises will be submitted electronically. This means that you must submit these exercises before class. Each assignment is worth 100 points and consists of 5 problems, each worth 20 points. Partial credit is given. A rough break down of the grading scale is given below.

Homework Grading Scale:

A	100-95	0-1 minor errors,
A-	94-90	1-2 minor errors
B+	89-85	3-4 minor errors
B	84-80	5-6 minor errors or 1 major error
C+	79-75	6-7 minor errors or 1 major & 1-2 major errors
C	74-70	8-9 minor errors or 1 major & 3-4 minor errors

INTRODUCTION TO LOGIC

D	69-60	10-11 minor errors or 2 major errors
F	59-0	12-13 minor errors or 3 major errors

There is clearly a bit of art to classifying mistakes as major or minor, and even to counting mistakes for that matter. If you disagree with or are confused about the grade on your assignments, you are welcome to discuss them with me during office hours.

Late Homework Policy:

- With a note from the Dean, you can turn in homework late without being penalized.
- 1-3 Days Late: 10 point penalty (i.e. one letter grade)
- 4-6 Days Late: 20 point penalty (i.e. two letter grades)
- And so on, with 10 points every 3 days.

Academic Integrity:

In this course we will strictly adhere to the University Policy on Academic Integrity. If you are not familiar with it, view it at: ... Any violation of this policy will be reported immediately to the University. Violations will, at the very least, result in an F on the assignment in question, but are also likely to lead to an F in the class, suspension and other penalties.

Exams:

If you need to miss an exam, you will need a Dean's note to make it up.

INTRODUCTION TO THE PHILOSOPHY OF LANGUAGE

Instructor Information:

Eric Epstein

Email: ege3@cornell.edu

Office:

Office Hours:

Course Description:

Humans have a remarkable ability to create and use symbolic objects like money, maps and pictures. But what is it that makes something a symbol? How can an object signify something 'beyond' itself? Or, in terminology we'll grow to love and hate: how can an object have a meaning? In this class, we will focus on thinking about human language as a symbol system. While there are many kinds of symbols, words and sentences are perhaps the most characteristic, impressive and intricate examples. Accordingly, studying the symbolic nature of language provides a good testing ground for attempts to answer our questions about symbols. Although these questions are of intrinsic interest to many, when directed at language and thought, they have been argued to have a special relevance to both traditional philosophical topics (skepticism, logic, intentionality, moral values, the mind, the existence of God and many others) and various logical puzzles. This approach to traditional philosophical problems has become particularly predominant in philosophical work from the last century. In this course, you will read the most important works in this tradition and acquire the skills and background necessary to understand it. This skill-set and background will be drawn from work in logic, linguistics, computer science and philosophy. There are no pre-requisites but students with a background in logic or semantics will have an easier time with the material.

Required Texts and Course Resources:

All course texts are contained in the course packet, available from the campus store. I will also make them available on Blackboard.

Reading Advice: It is more important to have a basic grasp of the overall point of a reading than to understand any particular detail. Accordingly, I advise you to do each of the readings once quickly in a single sitting and then return to the details you missed. If, on a second reading, you can't sort out some specific detail, write down what you don't understand and bring it to class for discussion. Do your best to raise your question at a point in the class where that detail is relevant to what's being discussed. It is much more likely that you will get a satisfying answer if you ask your question at the appropriate time. In all the readings, it will be helpful to ask yourself 'what is the problem or issue at stake here?' and then 'what solutions or positions is the author arguing for here?'

Evaluation:

- **50%: 2 Critical Essays, 3000 Word Limit Each (~ 6 pages).** Topics will be provided on Blackboard. You must submit an electronic copy to Turnitin via Blackboard, a plagiarism detection service. Essays are not accepted through email or on paper.
 - Essay 1: due Sunday 3/20. Essay 2: due Friday 5/20.
- **25%: 11 Pop Quizzes.** Throughout the semester there will be 11 short pop quizzes given in lecture. Your lowest will be dropped. These will be very basic comprehension quizzes with short answer questions. Sometimes they will be given at the beginning of lecture, in

INTRODUCTION TO THE PHILOSOPHY OF LANGUAGE

which case they will cover the readings for that meeting. Sometimes they will be towards the end of class, in which case they will cover the contents of that meeting. It is therefore essential to your success in this class that you do the readings, attend lecture and ask questions when you do not understand the material. Except in cases of documented and valid emergencies, you will not be able to make up missed quizzes. If you have a problem making class regularly and on time, drop this course.

- **15%: Discussion Postings.** Every week (Monday-Sunday), you must post twice on the Blackboard discussion forum for that week. Only posts containing questions about the reading or lecture, or answering such questions will count. Posts must also ask questions not directly addressed in the readings or lecture, and responses must be substantive attempts to answer your classmates' responses. Each week is graded on a 0-2 scale: 0 for no post, or no qualifying post, 1 for a single qualifying post or two borderline posts and 2 for two qualifying posts. You can also get 2 credits for bringing a qualifying question to office hours.
- **10%: 4 Journal Entries.** Throughout the semester you will be required to write 4 journal entries on Blackboard. These will be brief (400 word max) explorations of important ideas, personal interests and readings.
 - Journal 1: due Thursday 2/11. Journal 2: due Thursday 3/03. Journal 3: due Tuesday 4/19. Journal 4: due Thursday 5/10.

Website

There is a Blackboard site for this course, at

It is used for announcements, readings, lecture slides, paper topics, journals, the syllabus and a discussion forum.

Guidelines for Submission of Written Work:

- Word-process all written work.
- Use standard font, in 12 point.
- Double space, using 1-inch margins.
- Number your pages.
- Staple or paper-clip your pages together.
- At the top of the first page include your name, assignment number, date, the course number, and my name. If there was a choice between multiple essay questions on the prompt, indicate which question you are writing about.
- Proofread and spellcheck before bringing any drafts to class.

Papers: Grading Policy and Late Work

Your grades on your papers will depend on:

- intelligibility of the argumentative structure in the paper
- clarity of language
- accurate presentation of others' views and comprehension of the material
- persuasiveness
- readability

INTRODUCTION TO THE PHILOSOPHY OF LANGUAGE

In order to pass this course, you must complete all of the assignments before the university-designated end-date of the course. If you are expecting to need more time to complete an assignment, get in touch with me at least 48 hours in advance. I am lenient in granting extensions to students who ask 48 hours or more in advance. Still, to keep you from falling behind, no extensions will be granted past the due date of the next paper. Of course, I will relax my policy on extensions to accommodate any genuine emergency, such as a medical event that requires hospitalization or death in the family. (Debate Club tournaments, Dance Troupe performances, and the like are not genuine emergencies. To get extensions for these things you must ask in advance.)

Academic Integrity:

You are responsible for following the Code of Academic Integrity, available through the college's website at ... Plagiarism with clear intent is sufficient grounds for an F in the course.

Screens

If you want to use your laptop, tablet or smartphone during class, you must sit in the back two rows. This is a courtesy to your neighbors who can easily be distracted by your screen.

Absences from Class:

Attendance is not graded in this class. But if you are absent from class, you are responsible for finding out from other students what was covered and assigned, and for obtaining copies of any materials distributed in class.

If you encounter mental or emotional problems during the semester, contact me and I will connect you with appropriate health resources. I care about your well-being and will do my best to help you. Absences due to illness—either physical or psychological—are excused. To guarantee that your absence will be excused, please notify me of your absence as early as possible and bring a note from an appropriate medical professional.

Religious Observance Dates:

I will readily accommodate religious holidays, but give me at least two days advanced notice of any such accommodation that you might need.

Students with Disabilities:

I am available to discuss appropriate academic accommodations that may be required for students with disabilities. Requests for academic accommodations are to be made during the first three weeks of the semester, except in unusual circumstances, so that arrangements can be made. Students are encouraged to register with Student Disability Services to verify their eligibility for appropriate accommodations.

INTRODUCTION TO THE PHILOSOPHY OF LANGUAGE

Calendar:

Required readings are listed in **boldface**.

Week:	Notes:	Readings:	Topics
Week 1: Tu Th			<i>Introduction</i> What is the Philosophy of Language?
Week 2: Tu Th		(Ayer 1952), p.33-45 , p.102-13 , (Lycan 2008), p.98-105 (Quine 1951), (Russell 2007), (Lycan 2008), p.105-8	<i>Verificationism</i> Verificationism Quine on Analyticity
Week 3: Tu Th	Journal 1	(Welby 1896a), (Welby 1896b), (Chandler 2007), p.14-38 (Frege 1948), (Barwise & Etchemendy 2003), §§1.1-1.3, 2.1-2.2, 3.1-3.3], §§7.1-7.2, 9.1-9.4	<i>Approaches</i> Welby, Peirce, & Saussure Fregean Semantics & Formal Logic
Week 4: Tu Th	No class	FEBRUARY BREAK Fregean Semantics Continued: (Frege 1956), (Frege 1963)	<i>Frege</i> Fregean Semantics Continued
Week 5: Tu Th		(Russell 1919), (Lycan 2008), Ch.2 (Kripke 1972), selected passages , (Lycan 2008), Ch.3	<i>Names</i> Russell's Theory of Descriptions Are Names Descriptions?
Week 6: Tu Th	Journal 2	(Lycan 2008), Ch.4 , (Kripke 1972), p.106-144 (Varma 1925), (Siderits 1986)	<i>Names & Reference</i> Names Reference in the Indian Tradition
Week 7: Tu Th		(Quine 1990), Ch.3 , (Miller 2007), §§4.6-4.10 (Kripke 1982), p.1-22 , p.22-55	<i>Meaning Skepticism</i> Quine's Indeterminacy Thesis Rule-Following Paradox
Week 8: Tu Th	Essay 1	(Millikan 1990), (Kripke 1982) p.68-98 (Pinker 1994), p.83-125 , Ch.8	<i>Solutions? Linguistics</i> Solutions to RFP Linguistics, Grammar, & Recursion
Week 9: Tu Th		(Grice 1957), (Lycan 2008), Ch.7 (Bloom 2000), p.1-23 , p.25-53]	<i>Intention, Acquisition</i> Meaning & Intention Learning Meanings

INTRODUCTION TO THE PHILOSOPHY OF LANGUAGE

Week 10:		SPRING BREAK	
Week 11: Tu Th	Journal 3	(Partee 1996) (Stalnaker 1976), (Lycan 2008), Ch.10	<i>Linguistic Semantics</i> Partee & Montague Possible Worlds Semantics
Week 12: Tu Th		(Grice 1975) (Searle 1998), Ch.6, (Austin 1979)	<i>Pragmatics, Speech Acts</i> Implicature Austin & Searle
Week 13: Tu Th		(Lewis 1975) (Lewis 1975)	<i>Lewis on Meaning</i> Meaning & Convention Meaning & Convention
Week 14: Tu Th	Journal 4	(Millikan 2005), Ch. 1, Ch. 3 (Millikan 2005), Ch. 8, Ch. 9	<i>Millikan</i> Convention & Meaning Speech Acts & Representation
Week 15: Tu Th		(Anderson, Haslanger, & Langton 2012) (Langton & West 1999), (Saul 2006)	<i>Meaning & Society</i> Race, Gender, & Language Pornography & Subordination
Week 16: Tu	Essay 2	(Tirrell 2012)	<i>Language & Race</i> Hate Speech & Genocide

INTRODUCTION TO THE PHILOSOPHY OF LANGUAGE

References

1. Anderson, L, Haslanger, S & Langton, R (2012). 'Language and Race.' In DG Fara & G Russell (eds.), *Routledge Companion to the Philosophy of Language*, 753–767. New York: Routledge.
2. Austin, JL (1979). 'Performative Utterances.' In JO Urmson & GJ Warnock (eds.), *Philosophical Papers*, 3rd edn., 233–252. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Transcript of a talk given in 1956.
3. Ayer, AJ (1952). *Language, Truth and Logic*. 2nd edn. New York: Dover Publications.
4. Barwise, J & Etchemendy, J (2003). *Language, Proof, and Logic*. New edn. Stanford, California: CSLI Publications. URL <http://www-csli.stanford.edu/LPL/>.
5. Bloom, P (2000). *How Children Learn the Meanings of Words*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
6. Chandler, D (2007). *Semiotics: the basics*. 2nd edn. New York: Routledge.
7. Frege, G (1892). 'Begriff und Gegenstand.' *Vierteljahrsschrift für wissenschaftliche Philosophie*, 16: 192–205. References to reprint (Frege 1997).
8. Frege, G (1892). 'Über Sinn und Bedeutung.' *Zeitschrift für Philosophie und philosophische Kritik*, C: 25–50. References to reprint: (Frege 1948).
9. Frege, G (1918). 'Der Gedanke.' *Beiträge zur Philosophie des deutschen Idealismus*, I: 58–77.
10. Frege, G (1923). 'Logische Untersuchungen.' *Beiträge zur Philosophie des deutschen Idealismus*, 3: 36–51. References to (Frege 1963).
11. Frege, G (1948). 'On Sense and Reference.' *The Philosophical Review*, 57(3): 209–230. Originally published as (Frege 1892).
12. Frege, G (1956). 'The Thought.' *Mind, New Series*, 65(259): 289–311. Originally published as (Frege 1918). Translated by P.T. Geach. Reprinted in Martinich [23].
13. Frege, G (1963). 'Compound Thoughts.' *Mind*, 72(285): 1–17. Translation of Frege [10]., URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2251920>.
14. Frege, G (1997). 'On Concept and Object.' In M Beaney (ed.), *The Frege Reader*, 181–193. New York: Blackwell Publishers. Originally published as Frege [7].
15. Grice, HP (1957). 'Meaning.' *Philosophical Review*, 66: 377–388. Reprinted in (Martinich 2006).
16. Grice, HP (1975). 'Logic and Conversation.' In P Cole & J Morgan (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*, 64–75. New York: Academic Press.
17. Kripke, S (1972). *Naming and Necessity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
18. Kripke, SA (1982). *Wittgenstein on Rules and Private Language*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press. Selections reprinted in Martinich [23].
19. Langton, R & West, C (1999). 'Scorekeeping in a pornographic language game.' *Australasian Journal of Philosophy*, 77(3): 303–319. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00048409912349061>.
20. Lewis, DK (1975). 'Languages and Language.' In K Gunderson (ed.), *Language, Mind, and Knowledge. Minnesota Studies in the Philosophy of Science, Vol. 7*, 3–35. Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press. Page references to reprint (Lewis 1983).
21. Lewis, DK (1983). 'Languages and Language.' In *Philosophical Papers*, vol. 1, chap. 11, 163–188. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Oxford University Press.
22. Lycan, WG (2008). *Philosophy of Language: A Contemporary Introduction*. 2nd edn. New York: Routledge.

INTRODUCTION TO THE PHILOSOPHY OF LANGUAGE

23. Martinich, A (ed.) (2006). *The Philosophy of Language*. 5th edn. New York: Oxford University Press.
24. Miller, A (2007). *Philosophy of Language*. 2nd edn. Ithaca, NY: McGill-Queen's University Press.
25. Millikan, RG (1990). 'Truth Rules, Hoverflies, and the Kripke-Wittgenstein Paradox.' *The Philosophical Review*, 99(3):323–353. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2185347>.
26. Millikan, RG (2005). *Language: A Biological Model*. New York: Oxford University Press.
27. Partee, BH (1996). 'The Development of Formal Semantics in Linguistic Theory.' In S Lappin (ed.), *The Handbook of Contemporary Semantic Theory*, 11–38. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
28. Pinker, S (1994). *The Language Instinct*. New York: William Morrow and Company.
29. Quine, WV (1951). 'Two Dogmas of Empiricism.' *The Philosophical Review*, 60: 20–43. Reprinted in (Martinich 2006).
30. Quine, WVO (1990). *Pursuit of Truth*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
31. Russell, B (1919). 'Descriptions.' In *Introduction to Mathematical Philosophy*, 167–180. London: George Allen and Unwin Publishers Ltd. Reprinted in (Martinich 2006).
32. Russell, G (2007). 'The Analytic/Synthetic Distinction.' *Philosophy Compass*, 2(5): 712–729. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-9991.2007.00093.x>.
33. Saul, J (2006). 'Pornography, Speech Acts and Context.' *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, 106: 229–248. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4545459>.
34. Searle, JR (1998). *Mind, Language, and Society*. New York: Basic Books.
35. Siderits, M (1986). 'The Sense-Reference Distinction in Indian Philosophy of Language.' *Synthese*, 69(1): 81–106. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20116332>.
36. Stalnaker, R (1976). 'Propositions.' In AF Mackay & DD Merrill (eds.), *Issues in the Philosophy of Language*, 79–91. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press.
37. Tirrell, L (2012). 'Genocidal Language Games.' In I Maitra & MK McGowan (eds.), *Speech and Harm: Controversies Over Free Speech*, 174–221. New York: Oxford University Press.
38. Varma, S (1925). 'Analysis of Meaning in the Indian Philosophy of Language.' *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, (1): 21–35. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25220633>.
39. Welby, V (1896). 'Sense, Meaning and Interpretation I.' *Mind*, 5(17): 24–37. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2247630>.
40. Welby, V (1896). 'Sense, Meaning and Interpretation II.' *Mind*, 5(18): pp. 186–202. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2247581>.

ETHICS AND FEMINISM IN THE LAB AND OPERATING ROOM

INSTRUCTOR INFORMATION

Dr. Eric Epstein

Office:

Office Hours:

Email:

COURSE DESCRIPTION

In this intermediate-level course, we will study a variety of ethical questions and dilemmas that arise in clinical and research settings, with special attention to feminist scholarly work on the effects of social inequality, both gender-related and otherwise. Topics will include abortion, assisted reproduction, organ transplantation, resource allocation, research on human subjects, end-of-life issues, disability, and mental health.

COURSE MATERIALS

All course materials will be made available on Blackboard.

EVALUTION

The course grade will be based on three papers:

First Paper	25% of your final grade
Second Paper	35% of your final grade
Third Paper	40% of your final grade

LATE WORK

If you are expecting to need more time to complete an assignment, get in touch with me at least 48 hours in advance. Unexcused lateness for an assignment will affect its grade by 5% per day past the deadline. Except under extreme circumstances, no extensions on papers will be granted past the due date of the next paper. That said, if you are having a genuine emergency such as a broken bone or death in the family, let me know as soon as possible and I will do everything possible to accommodate.

GUIDELINES FOR WRITTEN WORK

- Word-process all written work.
- Use standard font (such as Times New Roman), in 12 point.
- Double space, using 1-inch margins. Do not put excessive spaces between paragraphs.
- Number your pages.
- At the top of the first page include your name, assignment number, date, the course number, and my name.
- Whenever there is a choice between multiple essay questions on the prompt, **you must indicate which question you are answering on the first page** of your essay.
- Proofread and spellcheck any written work before submitting it.

ETHICS AND FEMINISM IN THE LAB AND OPERATING ROOM

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

You are responsible for following the Code of Academic Integrity, available through the college's website at ... Plagiarism is sufficient grounds for an F in the course.

PORTABLE ELECTRONIC DEVICES

Laptops, iPads, cellphones, etc. may be used in class. However, if you choose to use them, **please sit in the back of the class** so as not to distract other students.

ABSENCES FROM CLASS

If you are absent from class for any reason, you are responsible for finding out what was covered and assigned, and for obtaining copies of any materials distributed in class.

If you find yourself having mental or emotional problems during the semester, contact me and I will connect you with appropriate psychological health resources. I care about your well-being and will do my best to connect you with campus resources that can help. If you need to be absent from class, please notify me as early as possible and provide relevant documentation after the fact (e.g., doctor's note).

I will readily accommodate religious observance dates, but please give me at least two days advanced notice of any such accommodation you might need.

ETHICS AND FEMINISM IN THE LAB AND OPERATING ROOM

CALENDAR:

Date:	Assignments:	Reading:	Topics:
<i>Week 1</i>		Kuhse & Singer, "What is Bioethics? A Historical Introduction" Little, "Why a Feminist Approach to Bioethics?" Sherwin, "Whither Bioethics?"	<i>Introduction</i>
<i>Week 2</i>		Sherwin, "A Relational Approach to Autonomy in Health Care" Ho, "Choosing Death" Goering, "Post-Natal Reproductive Autonomy"	<i>Autonomy</i>
<i>Week 3</i>	First paper assigned	Thomson, "A Defense of Abortion" Warren, "Abortion" Steinbock, "Mother-Fetus Conflict"	<i>Abortion</i>
<i>Week 4</i>		den Hartogh, "The Slippery Slope Argument" Purdy, "Assisted Reproduction, Prenatal Testing, and Sex Selection"	<i>Assisted Reproduction</i>
<i>Week 5</i>		Donchin, "Toward a Gender-Sensitive Assisted Reproduction Policy" Parks, "Rethinking Radical Politics in the Context of Assisted Reproductive Technology"	
<i>Week 6</i>	First paper due	Munson, "Organ Transplantation" Richards, "A World of Transferable Parts" McLeod, "For Dignity or Money"	<i>Organ Transplantation</i>
<i>Week 7</i>		Harris, "Deciding Between Patients" Wikler & Marchand, "Society's Allocation of Resources for Health" Daniels, "Is There a Right to Health Care?"	<i>Resource Allocation</i>
<i>Week 8</i>		Younger, "The Definition of Death" Brock, "Medical Decisions at the End of Life" Dworkin, "Physician-Assisted Death: the State of the Debate"	<i>The End of Life</i>
<i>Week 9</i>		McMahan, "Death, Brain Death, and Persistent Vegetative State" Capron, "Advanced Directives"	
<i>Week 10</i>	Second paper assigned	Luna & Macklin, "Research Involving Human Beings" Macklin, "Ethical Challenges in HIV Microbicide Research" Karlavish, "Research on Cognitively Impaired Adults"	<i>Research on Human Subjects</i>
<i>Week 11</i>		London, "Clinical Equipoise" Luna, "Research in Developing Countries"	
<i>Week 12</i>	Second paper due	Tremain, "Stemming the Tide of Normalization" Ghai, "Disabled Women: An Excluded Agenda of Indian Feminism"	<i>Disability</i>
<i>Week 13</i>		Ho, "Trusting Experts and Epistemic Humility in Disability" Wong, "At Home with Down Syndrome and Gender"	
<i>Week 14</i>	Third paper assigned	Cosgrove, "DSM, Big Pharma, and Clinical Practice Guidelines" Gould, "Why Histrionic Personality Disorder Should Not Be in the DSM" Morgan, "Foucault, Ugly Ducklings, and Techgnoswans"	<i>Mental Health</i>
<i>Week 15</i>		Bluhm, "Gender Differences and Depression" Hoffman & Hansen, "Is Prozac a Feminist Drug?"	
<i>Week 16</i>	Third paper due	Sherwin & Stockdale, "Whither Bioethics Now?"	<i>Conclusion</i>

ETHICS AND FEMINISM IN THE LAB AND OPERATING ROOM

Course Units:

INTRODUCTION

Kuhse & Singer, "What is Bioethics? A Historical Introduction"
Little, "Why a Feminist Approach to Bioethics?"
Sherwin, "Whither Bioethics?"

UNIT 1: Autonomy

Sherwin, "A Relational Approach to Autonomy in Health Care"
Ho, "Choosing Death"
Goering, "Post-Natal Reproductive Autonomy"

UNIT 2: Abortion

Thomson, "A Defense of Abortion"
Warren, "Abortion"
Steinbock, "Mother-Fetus Conflict"

UNIT 3: Assisted Reproduction

Purdy, "Assisted Reproduction, Prenatal Testing, and Sex Selection"
Donchin, "Toward a Gender-Sensitive Assisted Reproduction Policy"
Parks, "Rethinking Radical Politics in the Context of Assisted Reproductive Technology"
Den Hartogh, "The Slippery Slope Argument"

UNIT 4: Organ Transplantation

Munson, "Organ Transplantation"
Richards, "A World of Transferable Parts"
McLeod, "For Dignity or Money"

UNIT 5: Resource Allocation

Harris, "Deciding Between Patients"
Wikler & Marchand, "Society's Allocation of Resources for Health"
Daniels, "Is There a Right to Health Care?"

UNIT 6: The End of Life

Younger, "The Definition of Death"
Brock, "Medical Decisions at the End of Life"
Dworkin, "Physician-Assisted Death: the State of the Debate"
McMahan, "Death, Brain Death, and Persistent Vegetative State"
Capron, "Advanced Directives"

UNIT 7: Research on Human Subjects

Luna & Macklin, "Research Involving Human Beings"
Macklin, "Ethical Challenges in HIV Microbicide Research"
Karlavish, "Research on Cognitively Impaired Adults"
London, "Clinical Equipoise: Foundational Requirement or Fundamental Error?"
Luna, "Research in Developing Countries"

ETHICS AND FEMINISM IN THE LAB AND OPERATING ROOM

UNIT 8: Disability

Tremain, "Stemming the Tide of Normalization"

Ghai, "Disabled Women: An Excluded Agenda of Indian Feminism"

Ho, "Trusting Experts and Epistemic Humility in Disability"

Wong, "At Home with Down Syndrome and Gender"

UNIT 9: Mental Health

Cosgrove, "DSM, Big Pharma, and Clinical Practice Guidelines"

Gould, "Why Histrionic Personality Disorder Should Not Be in the DSM"

Morgan, "Foucault, Ugly Ducklings, and Technoswans"

Bluhm, "Gender Differences and Depression"

Hoffman & Hansen, "Is Prozac a Feminist Drug?"

CONCLUSION

Sherwin & Stockdale, "Whither Bioethics Now?"

WORKS CITED:

1. Bluhm, R. (2011) "Gender Differences and Depression: Explanations from Feminist Ethics." *International Journal of Feminist Approaches to Bioethics*, 4(1), pp.69-88.
2. Brock, Dan W. (2009) "Medical Decisions at the End of Life." In Singer, P. and Kuhse, H. (Eds) (2009) *A Companion to Bioethics: Second Edition*, Oxford, Blackwell.
3. Capron, A.M. (2009) "Advanced Directives". In Singer, P. and Kuhse, H. (Eds) (2009) *A Companion to Bioethics: Second Edition*, Oxford, Blackwell.
4. Cosgrove, L. (2011) "DSM, Big Pharma, and Clinical Practice Guidelines." *International Journal of Feminist Approaches to Bioethics*, 4(1), pp.11-25.
5. den Hartogh, G. (2009) "The Slippery Slope Argument". In Singer, P. and Kuhse, H. (Eds) (2009) *A Companion to Bioethics: Second Edition*, Oxford, Blackwell.
6. Daniels, N. (2009) "Is There a Right to Health Care, and, If So, What Does It Encompass?" In Singer, P. and Kuhse, H. (Eds) (2009) *A Companion to Bioethics: Second Edition*, Oxford, Blackwell.
7. Donchin, A. (2009) "Toward a Gender-Sensitive Assisted Reproduction Policy." *Bioethics*, 23(1), pp.28-38.
8. Dworkin, G. (2009) "Physician-Assisted Death: the State of the Debate." In Steinbock, B. (Ed) (2009) *The Oxford Handbook of Bioethics*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
9. Ghai, "Disabled Women: An Excluded Agenda of Indian Feminism"
10. Goering, S. (2009) "Postnatal Reproductive Autonomy: Promoting Relational Autonomy and Self-Trust in New Parents." *Bioethics*, 23(1), pp.9-19.
11. Gould, C.S. (2011) "Why Histrionic Personality Disorder Should Not Be in the DSM." *International Journal of Feminist Approaches to Bioethics*, 4(1), pp.26-40.
12. Harris, J. (2009) "Deciding Between Patients." In Singer, P. and Kuhse, H. (Eds) (2009) *A Companion to Bioethics: Second Edition*, Oxford, Blackwell.

ETHICS AND FEMINISM IN THE LAB AND OPERATING ROOM

13. Ho, A. (2011) "Trusting Experts and Epistemic Humility in Disability." *International Journal of Feminist Approaches to Bioethics*, 4(2), pp.102-123.
14. Ho, A. (2014) "Choosing Death: Autonomy and Ableism." In Veltman, A. & Piper, M. (2014) *Autonomy, Oppression, and Gender*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
15. Hoffman, G.A., & Hansen, J.L. (2011) "Is Prozac a Feminist Drug?" *International Journal of Feminist Approaches to Bioethics*, 4(1), pp.89-120.
16. Karlawish, J. (2009) "Research on Cognitively Impaired Adults." In Steinbock, B. (Ed) (2009) *The Oxford Handbook of Bioethics*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
17. Kuhse H. & Singer, P. (2009) "What is Bioethics? A Historical Introduction." In Singer, P. and Kuhse, H. (Eds) (2009) *A Companion to Bioethics: Second Edition*, Oxford, Blackwell.
18. Little, "Why a Feminist Approach to Bioethics?"
19. London, A.J. (2009) "Clinical Equipoise: Foundational Requirement or Fundamental Error?" In Steinbock, B. (Ed) (2009) *The Oxford Handbook of Bioethics*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
20. Luna, F. & Macklin, R. (2009) "Research Involving Human Beings." In Singer, P. and Kuhse, H. (Eds) (2009) *A Companion to Bioethics: Second Edition*, Oxford, Blackwell.
21. Luna, F. (2009) "Research in Developing Countries." In Steinbock, B. (Ed) (2009) *The Oxford Handbook of Bioethics*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
22. Macklin, "Ethical Challenges in HIV Microbicide Research"
23. McLeod, C. (2009) "For Dignity or Money: Feminists on the Commodification of Women's Reproductive Labour." In Steinbock, B. (Ed) (2009) *The Oxford Handbook of Bioethics*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
24. McMahan, J. (2009) "Death, Brain Death, and Persistent Vegetative State." In Singer, P. and Kuhse, H. (Eds) (2009) *A Companion to Bioethics: Second Edition*, Oxford, Blackwell.
25. Morgan, K.P. (2011) "Foucault, Ugly Ducklings, and Technoswans: Analyzing Fat Hatred, Weight-Loss Surgery, and Compulsory Biomedicalized Aesthetics in America." *International Journal of Feminist Approaches to Bioethics*, 4(1), pp.188-220.
26. Munson, R. "Organ Transplantation." In Steinbock, B. (Ed) (2009) *The Oxford Handbook of Bioethics*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
27. Parks, J. (2009) "Rethinking Radical Politics in the Context of Assisted Reproductive Technology." *Bioethics*, 23(1), pp.20-27.
28. Purdy, L.M. (2009) "Assisted Reproduction, Prenatal Testing, and Sex Selection." In Singer, P. and Kuhse, H. (Eds) (2009) *A Companion to Bioethics: Second Edition*, Oxford, Blackwell.
29. Richards, J.R. (2009) "A World of Transferable Parts." In Singer, P. and Kuhse, H. (Eds) *A Companion to Bioethics: Second Edition*, Oxford, Blackwell.
30. Sherwin, S. (2008) "Whither Bioethics? How Feminism Can Help Reorient Bioethics." *International Journal of Feminist Approaches to Bioethics*, 1(1), pp.7-27.
31. Sherwin, S. & Stockdale, K. (2017) "Whither Bioethics Now?" *International Journal of Feminist Approaches to Bioethics*, 10(1), pp.7-29.
32. Steinbock, B. (2009) "Mother-Fetus Conflict." In Singer, P. and Kuhse, H. (Eds) (2009) *A Companion to Bioethics: Second Edition*, Oxford, Blackwell.
33. Thomson, J.J. (1971) "A Defense of Abortion." *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 1(1), pp.47-66.

ETHICS AND FEMINISM IN THE LAB AND OPERATING ROOM

34. Tremain, S. (2006) "Stemming the Tide of Normalisation: An Expanded Feminist Analysis of the Ethics and Social Impact of Embryonic Stem Cell Research." *Bioethical Inquiry*, 3, pp.33-42.
35. Warren, M.A. (2009) "Abortion." In Singer, P. and Kuhse, H. (Eds) (2009) *A Companion to Bioethics: Second Edition*, Oxford, Blackwell.
36. Wikler, D. & Marchand, S. (2009) "Society's Allocation of Resources for Health." In Singer, P. and Kuhse, H. (Eds) (2009) *A Companion to Bioethics: Second Edition*, Oxford, Blackwell.
37. Wong, S.I. (2002) "At Home with Down Syndrome and Gender." *Hypatia*, 17(3), pp.89-117.
38. Younger, S.J. (2009) "The Definition of Death." In Steinbock, B. (Ed) (2009) *The Oxford Handbook of Bioethics*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

INTRODUCTION TO METAPHYSICS

INSTRUCTOR INFORMATION

Dr. Eric Epstein
Office: TBD
Office Hours: TBD and by appointment
Email: ege3@cornell.edu

COURSE DESCRIPTION¹

In this course, we will start by examining some classic metaphysical questions: Are there other possible worlds? Does the past exist? Are you identical with your childhood self? What are selves, in the first place—do they really exist or are they just convenient fictions? After seeing how prominent scholars have used the methods of philosophy in wrestling with these questions, we will then turn to metaphysical questions that are of pressing concern in society. For example, what are genders? Are they biological or socially constructed? If constructed, could we construct them differently? And, does race really exist, or is the idea of race a conceptual mistake?

COURSE OBJECTIVES

By the end of this class, you should be able to:

- Understand some of the fundamental questions, ideas, and arguments in contemporary metaphysics in the English-speaking tradition.
- Read and understand critical and argumentative writing.
- Write clearly and concisely.
- Explain your own reasoning in writing so that other people can understand it, even if they don't agree with your conclusions.
- Accurately reconstruct and explain the arguments of others in writing, even if you don't agree with their conclusions.

REQUIREMENTS

- Attendance at > 85% of classes (> 33 for MWF section (41 total), > 24 for TR section (28 total))
- All readings will be posted online through the course website. Readings must be finished **before class**. For each week:
 - Reading 1 for that week is due on: Mon. (MWF) / Tues. (TR)
 - Reading 2 for that week is due on: Wed. (MWF) / Thurs. (TR)
 - Reading 3 (if any) for that week is due on: Fri. (MWF) / Thurs. (TR)
 - Reading 4 (if any) for that week is due on: Fri. (MWF) / Thurs. (TR), etc.
- 3 essays, of varying length, turned in on time
- 3 homework assignments, designed to help you write your essays

GRADING

Your course grade will be based on:

Attendance & Participation	10%
Three Homework Assignments (10% each)	30%
Three Essays	
Essay 1	20%
Essay 2	20%
Essay 3	20%

Each category above is worth that number of points, for a total possible numerical score of 100 points. (E.g., Essay 4 is worth 20 points.) I will obtain your final letter grade for the course from your numerical score using the chart below.

¹ Parts of this course are closely modeled after parts of the “Knowledge and Reality” tutorial that I took with Prof. Gabriel Uzquiano at Pembroke College, Oxford University, in Michaelmas Term, Fall 2007. I have received Prof. Uzquiano’s generous permission to incorporate his materials into this course.

INTRODUCTION TO METAPHYSICS

All numerical grades and letter grades will correspond in the following way:*

Earned Percent of Available Points:	10-point Assignment	20-point Assignment	Letter Grade:
96-100%	9.6 - 10	19.2 - 20	A+
93-95%	9.3-9.5	18.6 - 19	A
90-92%	9.0-9.2	18 - 18.4	A-
87-89%	8.7-8.9	17.4 - 17.8	B+
84-86%	8.4-8.6	16.8 - 17.2	B
81-83%	8.1-8.3	16.2 - 16.6	B-
78-80%	7.8-8	15.6 - 16	C+
75-77%	7.5-7.7	15 - 15.4	C
72-74%	7.2-7.4	14.4 - 14.8	C-
69-71%	6.9-7.1	13.8 - 14.2	D+
66-68%	6.6-6.8	13.2 - 13.6	D
63-65%	6.3-6.5	12.6 - 13	D-
62% and below	≤ 6.2	≤ 12.4	F

* Fractions of a percent will be rounded up. So, a score of 19.1 (between 95 and 96%) on a 20-point assignment will be rounded up to 19.2 (96%), or A+.

GUIDELINES FOR WRITTEN WORK

- Submit electronic copies of all homework and essays. If you wish to turn in a hard copy, staple or paperclip your pages together.
- Use Times New Roman font, size 12.
- Use normal (1") margins and double space your work.
- At the top of the first page include the following, **single-spaced**:
 - your name,
 - date,
 - the course number,
 - the assignment type & number (e.g., Essay 3)
- Use APA-style citations, both in-text and in a **separate Works Cited page**.
- Submit work on the course website. **Take a screenshot and save it** in case something goes wrong.
 - If the website doesn't work, email your work to me at ege3@cornell.edu. Once it sends, **take a screenshot** and save it.

OTHER POLICIES

Plagiarism: Every student is expected to abide by the University's Academic Code of Integrity. Any work you submit must be your own work. On the course website, I have provided links to some websites where you can learn how to do proper citations and avoid plagiarism. I encourage you to look these websites over. If you are ever unsure whether what you are doing counts as plagiarism, come talk to me or send me an email before you turn your assignment in, and we can make sure you are producing your own work—not somebody else's. There is no penalty at all for talking to me about whether your paper counts as plagiarism before you hand it in!

Deadlines: Make sure to plan out your schedule so that you can finish your work on time. But, if you find yourself running out of time, don't panic! Let me know that you need an extension at least three days before the paper due date, and we will probably be able to work something out. Outside of extensions, all work must be turned in on time. Late work will receive a mark-down of half of a letter grade for every day it is late.

Electronics: Some readings for this course are online. I find it easier to look at and take notes on hard copies of readings, so I like to print out my readings. However, I will not assume that all of you are the same way. I will allow the use of laptops/tablets for the purpose of looking at readings in class, if you prefer not to print them out. I am trusting you to be adults and choose this method only if you can avoid being distracted by the internet.

INTRODUCTION TO METAPHYSICS

Calendar:

Required readings are listed in **red**.

Date: NOTES	Assignments:	Readings:	Topics
Week 1 :		1. Quine (1953), "Reference and Modality" 2. Chisholm (1967), "Identity Through Possible Worlds..." 3. Lewis (1973)b, <i>Counterfactuals</i> , Ch.4 part 1, especially §§1-3 and 6-9. 4. Adams (1974), "Theories of Actuality" 5. Plantinga (1974), <i>The Nature of Necessity</i> , Ch.1-2	Modality
Week 2:	Essay 1 assigned HW1: E1 Draft	1. Stalnaker (1976), "Possible Worlds" 2. Kripke (1980), <i>Naming and Necessity</i> , Preface and Lecture I, pp.34-53, 76-78 3. Armstrong (1986), "The Nature of Possibility" 4. Lewis (1986), <i>On the Plurality of Worlds</i> , pp.202-205 5. Rosen (1990), "Modal Fictionalism"	
Week 3:		1. Fine (1994), "Essence and Modality" 2. Wiggins (2001), <i>Sameness and Substance Renewed</i> . Ch.4 3. Sider (2002), "The Ersatz Pluriverse" 4. Lowe (2002), <i>A Survey of Metaphysics</i> Ch.5-7	
Week 4:	HW 1 due	1. Collins, J. Hall, E. and Paul, L. A. (eds.) (2004) <i>Causation and Counterfactuals</i> , "Introduction" 2. Mackie, J. L. (1965) "Causes and Conditions" 3. Lewis (1973) "Causation"	Causation
Week 5:	Essay 1 Due	1. Kim, J. (1973) "Causes and Counterfactuals" 2. Cartwright, H. (1979) "Causal Laws and Effective Strategies" 3. Davidson, D. (1993) "Causal Relations"	
Week 6:		1. Lewis (2000) "Causation as Influence" 2. Field, H. (2003) "Causation in a Physical World"	
Week 7:		1. McTaggart, J. M. E. (1908) "The Unreality of Time" 2. Dummett, M. (1960) "A Defense of McTaggart's Proof of the Unreality of Time" 3. Lowe (1987) "The Indexical Fallacy in McTaggart's Proof of the Unreality of Time"	Time
Week 8:	Essay 2 assigned HW2: E2 Draft	1. Williams, D. C. (1951) "The Myth of Passage" 2. Le Poidevin, R. and D. H. Mellor (1987) "Time, Change, and the 'Indexical Fallacy'" 3. Prior, A. (1968) "Changes in Events and changes in things"	
Week 9		1. Crisp, T. (2003) "Presentism" 2. Rea, M. (2003) "Four Dimensionalism" 3. Sider (2001) <i>Four Dimensionalism</i> , Ch.2	
Week 10:	HW2 Due	1. Sider, <i>Four Dimensionalism</i> , Ch. 1 & 4 2. Thomson, J. J. (1983) "Parthood and identity across time" 3. Johnston, M. (1987) "Is There a Problem about Persistence?"	Persistence

INTRODUCTION TO METAPHYSICS

Week 11:	Essay 2 Due	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lewis <i>On the Plurality of Worlds</i>, pp.202-205 2. Quine, W. V. O. (1963) "Identity, Ostension, and Hypostasis" 3. van Inwagen, P. (1990)a "Four-Dimensional Objects" 4. Zimmerman, D. (1998) "Temporary Intrinsics and Presentism" 	
Week 12:		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Snowdon (2014), selections. 2. van Inwagen (1990)b <i>Material Beings</i>, selections 3. Olson, E. (2003), "An Argument for Animalism" 4. Johnston (2007) "Human Beings" 5. Shoemaker, S. (2011), "On What We Are" 	What are we?
Week 13:		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lewis (1976) "Survival and Identity" 2. Hume (1978) <i>Treatise of Human Nature</i>, p.252 3. Quinton, A. (1962) "The Soul" 4. Campbell, S. (2006) "The Conception of a Person as a Series of Mental Events" 	
Week 14:	Essay 3 assigned HW3: E3 Draft	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Russell, B. (1918 / 1985) "The Philosophy of Logical Atomism", p.50 2. Wittgenstein, L. (1922) <i>Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus</i>, 5.631 3. Unger, P. (1979) "I Do Not Exist" 	
Week 15:		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Haslanger, S. (2012) <i>Resisting Reality</i>, selections 2. Mills, Charles, 2014, "Notes from the Resistance: Some Comments on Sally Haslanger's <i>Resisting Reality</i>" 3. Jones, Karen (2014) "Intersectionality and ameliorative analyses of race and gender" 4. Mikkola, M. (2016). "Feminist Perspectives on Sex and Gender" 	Ontology of Gender and Race
Week 16:	HW 3 due	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dubois, W.E.B. (1897) "The Conservation of Races" 2. Appiah, K.A. (1985) "The Uncompleted Argument: DuBois and the Illusion of Race" 3. Taylor, P., 2000, "Appiah's Uncompleted Argument: DuBois and the Reality of Race" 4. Mallon, R., 2004, "Passing, Traveling and Reality: Social Constructionism and the Metaphysics of Race" 5. James, Michael, "Race" 	
Week 17:	Essay 3 Due		

SAMPLE ESSAY TOPICS:

1. Does the mere possibility that Hillary Clinton could have won the 2016 U.S. Presidential Election entail that there exists a possible world in which Clinton wins the election?
2. What exactly is it for one event to cause another?
3. Is time real? Does it involve change?
4. Do material objects have temporal parts?
5. What are people?
6. What are genders and where do they come from?
7. Do races exist? If so, what are they?

INTRODUCTION TO METAPHYSICS

WORKS CITED

1. Adams, R. (1974) "Theories of Actuality" *Noûs* 8: 211-231.
2. Appiah, K.A. (1985) "The Uncompleted Argument: DuBois and the Illusion of Race," in *Overcoming Racism and Sexism*, L. Bell and D. Blumenfeld (eds.), Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
3. Armstrong, D. M. (1986) "The Nature of Possibility" *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 16. Reprinted in Kim, J. and Sosa, E.(eds).
4. Armstrong, D. M. (1989) *A Combinatorial Theory of Possibility*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; selections reprinted in Crane, T. and Farkas, K. (eds).
5. Campbell, S. (2006) "The Conception of a Person as a Series of Mental Events", *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 73: 339-358.
6. Cartwright, H. (1979) "Causal Laws and Effective Strategies" *Noûs* 13: 419-437.
7. Chisholm, R. (1967) "Identity through Possible Worlds: Some Questions" *Noûs* 1: 1-8. Reprinted in Loux, M. (ed.) (1976) *The Possible and The Actual*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press and in Kim J. and Sosa E. (eds).
8. Collins, J. Hall, E. and Paul, L. A. (eds.) (2004) *Causation and Counterfactuals*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
9. Crisp, T. "Presentism" in Loux, M. and Zimmerman, D. (eds) (2003) *The Oxford Handbook of Metaphysics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
10. Davidson, D. (1993) "Causal Relations" *Journal of Philosophy* 64: 691-703. Reprinted in Sosa, E. and Tooley, M. (eds.)
11. Dowe, P. (2000) *Physical Causation* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
12. Dubois, W.E.B. (1897/1970) "The Conservation of Races". In Foner, P.S. (ed), *W.E.B. Dubois Speaks: Speeches and Addresses, 1890-1919*. New York: Pathfinder Press.
13. Dummett, M. (1960) "A Defense of McTaggart's Proof of the Unreality of Time" *Philosophical Review* 69: 497-504.
14. Field, H. (2003) "Causation in a Physical World" in Loux, M. and Zimmerman, D. (eds.) (2003) *Oxford Handbook of Metaphysics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 435-460.
15. Fine, K. (1994) "Essence and Modality" *Philosophical Perspectives* 8: 1-16.
16. Haslanger, S. (2012) *Resisting Reality: Social Construction and Social Critique*, New York: Oxford University Press.
17. Hume, D., 1778, *Treatise of Human Nature*, Oxford: Clarendon Press (original work 1739); partly reprinted in Perry 1975.
18. James, Michael, "Race", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Spring 2017 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2017/entries/race/>>.
19. Johnston, M.
 - (1987) "Is There a Problem about Persistence?" *Aristotelian Society Supplementary Volume*. 61: 107-135.
 - (2007) "Human Beings" Revisited: My Body is not an Animal', in D. Zimmerman (ed.), *Oxford Studies in Metaphysics*, 3, Oxford University Press.
20. Jones, Karen (2014) "Intersectionality and ameliorative analyses of race and gender", *Philosophical Studies*, 171(1): 99-107.
21. Kim, J. (1973) "Causes and Counterfactuals" *Journal of Philosophy* 70: 570-572. Reprinted in Sosa, E. and Tooley, M. (eds.)
22. Kripke, S. (1980) *Naming and Necessity*. London: Blackwell
23. Le Poidevin, R. and D. H. Mellor (1987) "Time, Change, and the 'Indexical Fallacy'" *Mind* 96: 534-538.
24. Lewis, D.
 - (1973)a "Causation" *Journal of Philosophy*. 70: 556-567. Reprinted in Collins, J. Hall, E. and Paul, L. A. (eds.)
 - (1973)b *Counterfactuals*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. Chapter 4, Part 1. Reprinted in Loux, M. (ed.). Or, Chapter 1 of Lewis, D. (1986) *On the Plurality of Worlds*, London: Blackwell.
 - (1976) "Survival and Identity", in A. Rorty (ed.), *The Identities of Persons*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press; reprinted in his *Philosophical Papers* vol. I, New York: Oxford University Press, 1983.
 - (1986) *On the Plurality of Worlds*, London: Blackwell Chapter 4, initial sections are reprinted as "Counterparts or Double Lives?" in Kim J. and Sosa E. (eds). PP.202-2-5 reprinted in Crane, T. and Farkas, K. (eds), 552-559.
 - (2000) "Causation as Influence" *Journal of Philosophy*. 97: 182-197. Reprinted in Lewis, D. (1986) *Philosophical Papers* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
25. Loux, M.J.
 - (1976) (ed.) *The Possible and The Actual*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
 - (1998) *Metaphysics: A Contemporary Introduction*. London: Routledge.
 - (2001) (ed.) *Metaphysics: Contemporary Readings*. London: Routledge.
26. Loux, M.J. and Zimmerman, D. (eds.) (2003) *Oxford Handbook of Metaphysics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
27. Lowe, E. J.

INTRODUCTION TO METAPHYSICS

- (1987) “The Indexical Fallacy in McTaggart’s Proof of the Unreality of Time” *Mind* 96: 62-70.
- (2002) *A Survey of Metaphysics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, Chapters 5-7.
- 28. Mackie, J. L. (1965) “Causes and Conditions” *American Philosophical Quarterly* 2: 245-255, 261-264. Extracts reprinted in Sosa, E. and Tooley, M. (eds.)
- 29. Mallon, R., 2004, “Passing, Traveling and Reality: Social Constructionism and the Metaphysics of Race,” *Noûs*, 38 (4): 644–673.
- 30. McTaggart, J. M. E. (1908) “The Unreality of Time” *Mind* 17: 457-74. Or, alternatively, Chapter 33 of his *The Nature of Existence* (“The Unreality of Time”) reprinted in Le Poidevin, R. and MacBeath, M. (eds) (1993) *The Philosophy of Time* Oxford: Oxford University Press, and in Crane, T. and Farkas, K. (eds.)
- 31. Mikkola, M. (2016). “Feminist Perspectives on Sex and Gender”, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Spring 2016 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2016/entries/feminism-gender/>>.
- 32. Mills, Charles, 2014, “Notes from the Resistance: Some Comments on Sally Haslanger’s *Resisting Reality*”, *Philosophical Studies*, 171(1): 85–97.
- 33. Olson, E. (2003), “An Argument for Animalism”, in Martin, R. and J. Barresi (eds.), 2003, *Personal Identity*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- 34. Plantinga, A. (1974) *The Nature of Necessity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Chapters 1 and 2. Reprinted in Kim, J. and Sosa, E. (eds).
- 35. Prior, A. “Changes in Events and changes in things” in his (1968) *Papers on Time and Tense*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Reprinted in Le Poidevin, R. and MacBeath, M. (eds) and in Crane, T. and Farkas, K. (eds.)
- 36. Quine, W. V. “Reference and Modality” in his *From a Logical Point of View* (Harvard University Press, 1953). (Or, alternatively, his (1943) “Notes on Existence and Necessity” *Journal of Philosophy* 40: 113-127.)
- 37. Quine, W. V. O. (1963) “Identity, Ostension, and Hypostasis” in his *From a Logical Point of View* (2nd. ed, revised) Evanston: Harper & Row: 65-79.
- 38. Quinton, A. (1962) “The Soul”, *Journal of Philosophy*, 59: 393–403, and reprinted in Perry (ed.), (1975) *Personal Identity*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- 39. Rea, M. “Four Dimensionalism” in Loux, M. and Zimmerman, D. (eds) (2003) *The Oxford Handbook of Metaphysics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 40. Rosen, G. (1990) “Modal Fictionalism” *Mind* 99: 327-354.
- 41. Russell, B. (1918) “The Philosophy of Logical Atomism”. *Monist*, 28: 495–527 and 29: 32–63, 190–222, 345–380; reprinted in R. Marsh (ed.), *Logic and Knowledge* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1956), and in D. Pears, ed., *The Philosophy of Logical Atomism* (La Salle, IL: Open Court, 1985) [page numbers from the latter].
- 42. Snowdon, P. (2014) *Persons, Animals, Ourselves*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 43. Shoemaker, S. (2011), “On What We Are”, in *The Oxford Handbook of the Self*, S. Gallagher (ed.), Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 44. Sider, T.
 - (2001) *Four Dimensionalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
 - (2002) “The Ersatz Pluriverse” *Journal of Philosophy*: 279-315. Preprint available: <http://fas-philosophy.rutgers.edu/sider/>
- 45. Sosa, E. and Tooley, M. (1993) *Causation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 46. Stalnaker, R. (1976) “Possible Worlds” *Noûs* 10: 65-75. Reprinted in Loux, M. (ed.) (1976) *The Possible and The Actual*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- 47. Taylor, P., 2000, “Appiah’s Uncompleted Argument: DuBois and the Reality of Race,” *Social Theory and Practice*, 26 (1): 103–128.
- 48. Thomson, J. J. (1983) “Parthood and identity across time” *Journal of Philosophy* 80: 201-20. Reprinted in Kim, J. and Sosa, E. (eds)
- 49. Unger, P. (1979) “I Do Not Exist” in *Perception and Identity*, G. F. MacDonald (ed.), London: Macmillan, and reprinted in Rea (1997).
- 50. van Inwagen, P.
 - (1990)a “Four-Dimensional Objects” *Noûs* 24: 245-255.
 - (1990)b *Material Beings*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- 51. van Inwagen, P. and Zimmerman, D. (ed.) (1998) *Metaphysics: The Big Questions*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- 52. Wiggins, D. (2001) *Sameness and Substance Renewed*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 53. Williams, D. C. (1951) “The Myth of Passage” *Journal of Philosophy* 48: 457-72.
- 54. Wittgenstein, L. (1922) *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, London: Routledge
- 55. Zimmerman, D. (1998) “Temporary Intrinsic and Presentism” in van Inwagen, P. and Zimmerman, D. (eds) (1998) *Metaphysics: The Big Questions*. Cambridge: Blackwell: 206-19.

KNOWLEDGE, JUSTIFICATION, AND RATIONALITY¹

Instructor Information:

Eric Epstein
ege3@cornell.edu
Office Hours:

General Description:

One of philosophy's most important jobs is to give us clear, useful terms for articulating the problems we face. Accordingly, this course uses classic questions like "Do we really know what we think we know?" to sharpen our understanding of the notions of knowledge, belief, justification, and rationality. At the end of the semester, we will then apply this new, clearer understanding to matters of pressing concern in society, such as: how do discrimination and bias affect people's reasoning? And how can being oppressed affect what one is able to know, and what others are capable of knowing about one?

Evaluation:

Two short papers: 85%

First paper (5-7 pages)	40% of your final grade
Second paper (7-12 pages)	40%

You may choose any two out of the five essay topics, one of which is associated with each unit.

Participation: 15%

The participation grade is based on your attendance and classroom participation, or, if you are shy, questions for discussion that you send me in lieu of participating vocally in class.

Course Materials:

Course packet, available from the campus store.

Guidelines for Submission of Written Work:

- Word-process all written work.
- Use standard font, in 12 point.
- Double space, using 1-inch margins.
- Number your pages.
- Staple or paper-clip your pages together.
- At the top of the first page include your name, assignment number, date, essay title, the course number, and my name. I'll show you how I want all this information laid out.
- Proofread and spellcheck before bringing any drafts to class.

¹ Parts of this course are modeled closely after the tutorial, "Knowledge and Reality" taught by Gabriel Uzquiano at Pembroke College, Oxford University, Michaelmas Term 2007. I have obtained Prof. Uzquiano's permission.

Grading Policy and Late Work:

Your final grade will depend on:

- The quality of your papers, with respect to:
 - intelligibility of the argumentative structure
 - clarity of language
 - accurate presentation of others' views
 - persuasiveness
 - readability
- Trends of improvement in your papers
- Attendance and active participation in class

Failure to turn in work by the end of the course (i.e., the last day of the semester as specified on the official calendar) results in failure in the course, unless you have arranged with my explicit agreement to take the course as "Incomplete".

If you are expecting to need more time to complete an assignment, please get in touch with me at least 48 hours in advance. No extensions will be granted past the due date of the next paper. Of course, I can accommodate in the event of a genuine emergency.

Academic Integrity:

You are responsible for following the University's Code of Academic Integrity, available at... For the record: plagiarism is sufficient grounds for an F in the course. Since you're new to college and may not be familiar with what is expected, I will spend some time in class discussing what plagiarism is and is not. However, do not use this discussion as an excuse not to study the Code of Academic Integrity on your own!

Absences from Class:

If you are absent from class for any reason, you are responsible for finding out from other students what was covered and assigned, and for obtaining copies of any materials distributed in class. Also, you are responsible for notifying me of the reason for your absence, if it is an excused absence. Having too many unexcused absences will affect your grade.

Whether or not they cause you to miss class, if you find yourself having mental or emotional problems during the semester, contact me and I will connect you with psychological health resources at Cornell. I'm not qualified to act as your therapist, but I care about your well-being and will do my best to help you. Absences due to illness—either physical or psychological—are excused. Please notify me as early as possible of any such absence.

Religious Observance Dates:

I will readily accommodate religious holidays and disabilities, but please give me at least two days advanced notice of any such accommodation you might need.

Students with Disabilities:

In compliance with the university policy and equal access laws, I am available to discuss appropriate academic accommodations that may be required for students with disabilities. Requests for academic accommodations are to be made during the first three weeks of the semester, except in unusual circumstances, so that arrangements can be made. Students are encouraged to register with Student Disability Services to verify their eligibility for appropriate accommodations.

Essay Questions:

Could one dispense with the concept of knowledge and replace it with justified belief?

Does skepticism rest on a mistake?

Are we in a position to justify our inductive inferences? Should we be?

What is reliabilism? What is the most serious objection to it?

Are there certain kinds of injustice that are distinctively epistemic?

Course Calendar:

Required readings are written in **boldface**. Everything else is optional.

UNIT 1: SKEPTICISM (WEEKS 1-3)

Readings:

1. **Descartes, R. (1641) *Meditations on First Philosophy. Meditation I***
2. DeRose, K. (1995) "Solving the Skeptical Problem"
3. DeRose, K. (1999) "Introduction" in DeRose, K. and Warfield, T. (eds) *Skepticism: A Contemporary Reader*.
4. **Klein, P. (2005) "Scepticism."**
5. Lewis, D. (1996) "Elusive Knowledge"
6. Moore, G. E. (1946) "Proof of an External World"
7. Putnam, H. (1981) "Brains in a Vat"
8. Stroud, B. (1984) *The Significance of Philosophical Skepticism*. Ch. 1 & 2, p.1-82.

UNIT 2: KNOWLEDGE & BELIEF (WEEKS 4-6)

WEEK 4: FIRST PAPER ASSIGNED

Readings:

1. Ayer, "Knowing as having the right to be sure," Chapter 1.
2. **Gettier, E. (1963) "Is Justified True Belief Knowledge?"**
3. Goldman, Alvin I. (1967) "A Causal Theory of Knowing"
4. Lehrer, K. and Paxson, T. D. (1969) "Knowledge: undefeated justified true belief"
5. Shope, R. (2005) "Conditions and Analyses of Knowing", Ch. 1
6. Williamson, T. (2000) *Knowledge and its Limits*, Ch. 1.

UNIT 3: INDUCTION (WEEKS 7-10)

WEEK 8: FIRST PAPER DUE

Readings:

1. Armstrong, D. (1983) *What Is a Law of Nature*, p.52-59
2. Deutsch, D. (1997) *The Fabric of Reality*, Ch. 7
3. **Hume, D. (1739 – 40) *A Treatise of Human Nature*, Book 1, Part III, esp. §§6 & 11 – 14**
4. **Hume, D. (1748) *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding*, Ch. 4 & 5.**
5. Foster, J. (1983) "Induction, Explanation and Natural Necessity"
6. **Goodman, N. (1955) *Fact, Fiction and Forecast*, p.72-83**

7. Papineau, D. (1993) *Philosophical Naturalism*. Ch. 5
8. **Popper, K. (1972) *Objective Knowledge*. Ch. 1,**
9. **Reichenbach, H. “The Pragmatic Justification of Induction”**
10. **Russell, B. (1912) *The Problems of Philosophy***
11. Strawson, P. F. (1952) *Introduction to Logical Theory*, Ch. 9 part 2.

UNIT 4: INFERENTIALISM (WEEKS 11-13)

WEEK 11: SECOND PAPER ASSIGNED

Readings:

1. **Goldman, Alvin I. (1979) “What is Justified Belief?”**
2. **Foley, Richard. (1985) “What’s Wrong with Reliabilism?”**
3. **Sosa, Earnest. (1991) “Reliabilism and Intellectual Virtue.”**
4. **Steup, Matthias. (1999) “A Defense of Internalism.”**

UNIT 5: KNOWLEDGE & INJUSTICE (WEEKS 13-16)

WEEK 16: SECOND PAPER DUE

Readings:

1. **Fricker, Elizabeth (1994) “Against Gullibility.”**
2. **Fricker, Elizabeth (2006). “Second-Hand Knowledge.”**
3. **Fricker, Miranda. (2007) *Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing*, Ch. 1-3**
4. **Moody-Adams, Michelle. (1994) “Culture, Responsibility, and Affected Ignorance.”**
5. **Daukas, Nancy. (2006) “Epistemic Trust and Social Location.”**

Works Cited:

1. Armstrong, D. (1983) *What Is a Law of Nature?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
2. Ayer, A. J. “Knowing as having the right to be sure,” Chapter 1. Reprinted in Bernecker, S. and Dretske, F. (eds.). *Knowledge: Readings in Contemporary Epistemology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
3. Daukas, Nancy. (2006) “Epistemic Trust and Social Location.” *Episteme*, Vol. 3, Issue 1-2, p.109-124.

4. Descartes, R. (1641) *Meditations on First Philosophy*. Meditation I in vol. 2 of *The Philosophical Writings of Descartes*, ed. and trans. by J. Cottingham, R. Stoothoff and D. Murdoch, *Cambridge Texts in the History of Philosophy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984-5.
5. DeRose, K. (1995) "Solving the Skeptical Problem" *The Philosophical Review*, Vol. 104, p.1-52.
6. DeRose, K. (1999) "Introduction" in DeRose, K. and Warfield, T. (eds) *Skepticism: A Contemporary Reader*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
7. Deutsch, D. (1997) *The Fabric of Reality*. London: Penguin.
8. Foley, Richard. (1985) "What's Wrong with Reliabilism?" *The Monist*, Vol. 68.
9. Foster, J. (1983) "Induction, Explanation and Natural Necessity", *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, Vol. 83, p. 87-101. Reprinted in Huemer, M. (ed.)
10. Fricker, Elizabeth (1994) "Against Gullibility." In Maitlal, B. and Chakrabarti, A. (1994) *Knowing from Words: Western and Indian Philosophical Analysis of Understanding and Testimony*. Springer Science + Business Media, Dordrecht.
11. Fricker, Elizabeth (2006). "Second-Hand Knowledge." *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, Vol. 73, No. 3.
12. Fricker, Miranda. (2007) *Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
13. Gettier, E. (1963) "Is Justified True Belief Knowledge?", *Analysis* 23, pp.121-123. Reprinted as Chapter 8 of Huemer, M. (ed.); and reprinted as Chapter 2 of Bernecker, S. and Dretske, F. (eds.).
14. Goldman, Alvin I. (1967) "A Causal Theory of Knowing" *The Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. 64, No. 12, p. 357-372. Reprinted in Bernecker, S. and Dretske, F. (eds.).
15. Goldman, Alvin I. (1979) "What is Justified Belief?" in Pappas, George S. (ed.), *Justification and Knowledge*. London: D. Reidel Publishing Company.
16. Goodman, N. (1955) *Fact, Fiction and Forecast*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. p.72 – 83 reprinted in Bernecker S. and Dretske F. (eds) and in Huemer, M. (ed.)
17. Hume, D. (1739 – 40) *A Treatise of Human Nature*. ed. by D. F. Norton and M. J. Norton, *Oxford Philosophical Texts*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
18. Hume, D. (1748) *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding*. ed. by T. L. Beauchamp, *Oxford Philosophical Texts*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

19. Klein, P. (2005) "Scepticism." In Moser, P. (ed.) (1987) *A Priori Knowledge*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
20. Lehrer, K. and Paxson, T. D. (1969) "Knowledge: undefeated justified true belief" *Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. 66, pp. 225-237.
21. Lewis, D. (1996) "Elusive Knowledge" *Australasian Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. 74, p.549-67. Reprinted in Lewis D. (1999) *Papers in Metaphysics and Epistemology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
22. Lipton, Peter. (1998) "The Epistemology of Testimony." *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science*, Vol. 29, p.1–31.
23. Lyons, Jack, 'Testimony, Induction and Folk Psychology', *Australasian Journal of Philosophy*, 75, no. 2 (1997), 163–77.
24. Moody-Adams, Michelle. (1994) "Culture, Responsibility, and Affected Ignorance." *Ethics*, Vol. 104, No. 2, p.291-309.
25. Moore, G. E. (1946) "Proof of an External World" *Proceedings of the British Academy*, Vol. 25. Reprinted in Huemer, M. (ed.) (2002) *Epistemology: Contemporary Readings*. New York: Routledge. Chapter 8, pp. 602-605
26. Moser, P. (ed.) (1987) *A Priori Knowledge*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
27. Papineau, D. (1993) *Philosophical Naturalism*. Oxford: Blackwell.
28. Popper, K. (1972) *Objective Knowledge*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
29. Putnam, H. (1981) "Brains in a Vat" in Putnam, H. (1981) *Truth, Reason and History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Reprinted in Huemer, M. (ed.) (2002) *Epistemology: Contemporary Readings*. New York: Routledge. Chapter 8, pp. 524-538.
30. Reichenbach, H. "The Pragmatic Justification of Induction" in Reichenbach, H. (1938) *Experience and Prediction: An Analysis of the Foundation and the Structure of Knowledge*. Chicago: Chicago University Press. Selections reprinted in Bernecker S. and Dretske, F. (eds.)
31. Russell, B. (1912) *The Problems of Philosophy*, London: Williams and Norgate.
32. Shope, R. (2005) "Conditions and Analyses of Knowing" in Moser, P. K. (ed.).
33. Sosa, Earnest. (1991) "Reliabilism and Intellectual Virtue." In *Knowledge in Perspective: Selected Essays in Epistemology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
34. Steup, Matthias. (1999) "A Defense of Internalism." In Pojman, Louis P. (ed.), *The Theory of Knowledge: Classical and Contemporary Readings*, 2nd edn. London: Wadsworth.

35. Strawson, P. F. (1952) *Introduction to Logical Theory*, New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
36. Stroud, B. (1984) *The Significance of Philosophical Skepticism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
37. Williamson, T. (2000) *Knowledge and its Limits*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

STUDENT CORRESPONDENCE

Dr. Eric G. Epstein

In the following pages, I have included some email correspondence between myself and students in various classes I have taught. This correspondence exemplifies the kind of relationship I try to cultivate with my students: I strive to make myself approachable, to make time to discuss their questions and concerns, to be sensitive to special needs they may have, to inspire their interest in the course subject matter, and, above all, to help them succeed in their further pursuits.

Law School Update

2 messages

Savanna Klinek <savannaklinek@gmail.com>
To: Eric Epstein <ege3@cornell.edu>

Tue, May 2, 2017 at 3:10 PM

Hi Eric,

I hope you are doing well! It was good running into you today; I had been planning on emailing you an update as to my plans for the future. I was lucky enough to be accepted to Columbia Law School and I just submitted my deposit yesterday, so I will be attending in the fall. I just wanted to thank you again for writing my letter of recommendation, as I appreciate you taking the time to recommend me and I'm sure your letter played a significant role in my acceptance.

Thanks again,
Savanna

Eric Epstein <ege3@cornell.edu>
To: Savanna Klinek <savannaklinek@gmail.com>

Tue, May 2, 2017 at 8:16 PM

Hi Savanna,

Thank you for sharing this lovely news. I was happy to help; you worked hard and you deserve to go to a good school. Best of luck at Columbia and stay in touch.

Best wishes,

Eric

[Quoted text hidden]

Essay 3- Colin Moran

6 messages

Colin Starbuck Moran <csm5417@psu.edu>
To: ege3@cornell.edu

Fri, Nov 17, 2017 at 9:44 PM

Dr. Epstein,

For my essay on I chose to dive into the topic of the Ogala people. I spent time researching, calling government offices in Pine Ridge/South Dakota, and coming up with a strong solution to their problem. Upon my research I discovered that alcohol distribution licenses in Whiteclay were revoked this year, making any argument involving the stores in Whiteclay useless. I wrote my paper on legalizing alcohol in within the reservation but I am worried I did not include enough about the beer stores in Nebraska. I have attached my paper below (and it is submitted), I was hoping you could give it a look and tell me what you think. If I veered to far off topic, I was wondering if you could give me a small extension to reorganize.

I hope you have a relaxing fall break!

Best,
Colin Moran

 **Colin Moran Essay 3.pdf**
51K

Eric Epstein <ege3@cornell.edu>
To: Colin Starbuck Moran <csm5417@psu.edu>

Fri, Nov 17, 2017 at 10:10 PM

Hi Colin,

See below. Most important messages in bold.

First of all, let me just say that this is the kind of message every teacher dreams of receiving! **It's really awesome that you did all that research and thought hard and sincerely about this problem.** That's how problems actually get solved in the real world. I'm sure it is meaningful to the people you spoke to at Pine Ridge to know that someone is thinking about their problem and cares enough to call.

re: revoked this year-- Right. Actually, it even said that in one of the videos we saw. But I kept the topic because I thought that the situation that existed prior to the closure raised interesting questions about business and what its role in society ought to be.

That said, **don't worry about not talking about the beer stores.** Your paper is pretty awesome as it is; it's clearly written, thoughtful, and develops an original proposal. Re: my criticisms, **for purposes of this assignment, you've done more than enough.** There are a few run-on sentences and grammatical errors, but this is easy to fix--try reading it out loud--and the problem is not bad enough to affect your grade. If you want my advice on how to turn it into an even more rigorous piece that you could submit to a journal, let me know.

In light of this work, as well as your excellent participation in class, please let me know if you'd ever like a recommendation letter for anything. It'd be my pleasure to write for you.

The main thing now is **not to let this get to your head!** Keep working hard! Safe travels and have a good break.

Dr. Epstein

[Quoted text hidden]

Eric Epstein <ege3@cornell.edu>

Fri, Nov 17, 2017 at 10:14 PM

To: Colin Starbuck Moran <csm5417@psu.edu>

I guess another criticism would be: when you talk about objections to your proposal, develop each objection in more detail, in its own paragraph, and then respond to it in more detail, using concrete data. Thinking it over again, the paper's biggest weakness is that it runs through the objections and your responses pretty quickly. That's ok for a 5-6 page paper, but for a more rigorous piece you'd have to devote more space to methodically doing the back-and-forth.

If you want to make those changes, you can have until the 24th. But that's just the difference between A and A+.

Dr. Epstein

[Quoted text hidden]

Eric Epstein <ege3@cornell.edu>

Fri, Nov 17, 2017 at 10:15 PM

To: Colin Starbuck Moran <csm5417@psu.edu>

(Just let me know what you plan to do.)

[Quoted text hidden]

Colin Moran <colinstarbuckmoran@gmail.com>

Sat, Nov 18, 2017 at 4:01 PM

To: Eric Epstein <ege3@cornell.edu>

Hi Dr. Epstein!

Thank you very much for your kind words! I will add more insight to the objections and fix up my grammatical errors before the 24th. Would you like me to email my revised copy or submit it online?

I would also like to thank you for your class this year. This has been by far my favorite course i've taken at Penn state. I think the material is extremely interesting and I really enjoy discussing such morally-complicated concepts.

Have a great holiday!

-Colin

[Quoted text hidden]

Eric Epstein <ege3@cornell.edu>

Sat, Nov 18, 2017 at 5:36 PM

To: Colin Moran <colinstarbuckmoran@gmail.com>

See below.

Hi Dr. Epstein!

Thank you very much for your kind words! I will add more insight to the objections and fix up my grammatical errors before the 24th. Would you like me to email my revised copy or submit it online?

The final submission should be on canvas. If you want further comments before the 24th, email me a draft.

I would also like to thank you for your class this year. This has been by far my favorite course i've taken at Penn state. I think the material is extremely interesting and I really enjoy discussing such morally-complicated concepts.

So glad to hear you are enjoying the class!

Have a great holiday!

Likewise.

[Quoted text hidden]

Curious PHIL 10 student2 messages

SEONGTAEK KANG <sqk5830@psu.edu>
To: ege3@cornell.edu

Wed, Aug 30, 2017 at 6:20 PM

Dear Dr. Epstein,

I am currently enrolled in your PHIL 10 at 2:30 and am thoroughly interested in the topic of philosophy. As I am unable to attend your office hours due to class right after, I was wondering if I could ask a couple of questions. First, I was wondering what branch of philosophy you are most experienced in or studied.

Secondly, although, I am interested in the field of philosophy and wish to continue my study in this field, I feel that I am not the strongest writer. Can one succeed in this field without being the best writer or is the majority of the workload writing. Thank You.

-Dylan Seongtaek Kang

Eric Epstein <ege3@cornell.edu>
To: SEONGTAEK KANG <sqk5830@psu.edu>

Wed, Aug 30, 2017 at 10:18 PM

Hi Seongtaek,

I am so delighted to hear that you're interested in exploring philosophy more! See below for some answers to your questions.

re: me

As far as experience goes, I have taught many different philosophy classes, from "Logic for Philosophy" and "Philosophy of Language" to "Ethical Theory" and "Marx, Nietzsche, Freud". But my areas of specialization are in the philosophies of mind, language, and logic. Most of my research has to do with the Liar Paradox (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Liar_paradox). I have also written about intentionality (<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Intentionality>). If you ever want to chat about that stuff, come to my office hour on Mondays or make an appointment! We can also talk about what kinds of philosophy classes you might be interested in or might be most useful to you. (You can also ask Christopher Moore at c.moore@psu.edu.)

re: writing

Philosophy has some technical areas that are more like mathematics, but most work in philosophy does involve writing. Still, taking philosophy classes, including our class, is a great way to become a better writer. There is no such thing as a bad writer, just an inexperienced one!

Also, you don't have to be a literary person to be good at philosophical writing. Writing simply is a virtue, as long as you can make it clear what you are trying to say.

Let me know if you have any more questions!

Best wishes,

Religious observance dates

25 messages

Eric Epstein <ege3@cornell.edu>

Wed, Aug 30, 2017 at 9:27 PM

To: ahk5153@psu.edu, alf5618@psu.edu, bkk5210@psu.edu, cah5974@psu.edu, cxc5676@psu.edu, djc80@psu.edu, dpr5177@psu.edu, efm5142@psu.edu, ikc5035@psu.edu, jtc5474@psu.edu, jus392@psu.edu, ktk5135@psu.edu, kva5283@psu.edu, lmh5761@psu.edu, lqb5351@psu.edu, lxs5503@psu.edu, mmc5634@psu.edu, mmj5256@psu.edu, nmy5054@psu.edu, rgk5064@psu.edu, rjm6038@psu.edu, sim5727@psu.edu, sqk5830@psu.edu, tmm6047@psu.edu, vjd5081@psu.edu, zak5124@psu.edu, zjx5011@psu.edu, BRANDON FRANK TAYLOR <bft5037@psu.edu>, Brandon Kiehl <bck5148@psu.edu>, "Karam J. Salameh" <kjs5795@psu.edu>, Zhixin He <zzh37@psu.edu>, aqa5495@psu.edu, aya128@psu.edu, bmh5632@psu.edu, brv5037@psu.edu, cdm5508@psu.edu, cfz5034@psu.edu, csm5417@psu.edu, din5193@psu.edu, djn5193@psu.edu, gqm5163@psu.edu, ihk5013@psu.edu, ise5012@psu.edu, jdp5635@psu.edu, kza5200@psu.edu, ljm5313@psu.edu, lts5115@psu.edu, mga5087@psu.edu, mhb5161@psu.edu, mma244@psu.edu, mma5504@psu.edu, moa5435@psu.edu, mxh5580@psu.edu, mxm6070@psu.edu, nqp5170@psu.edu, pnl5034@psu.edu, pwg5144@psu.edu, rcr5189@psu.edu, saa5741@psu.edu, sba5165@psu.edu, sel5392@psu.edu, sws6021@psu.edu, tul29@psu.edu, whz5000@psu.edu, Rosario Bevevino <rxb987@psu.edu>, aaa302@psu.edu, ajr6093@psu.edu, akp5390@psu.edu, anb5717@psu.edu, bq5047@psu.edu, clc5887@psu.edu, eag5455@psu.edu, ecg5174@psu.edu, eof5061@psu.edu, gpc5107@psu.edu, hlh5137@psu.edu, hme5069@psu.edu, jqa5406@psu.edu, jvz5368@psu.edu, kdl5220@psu.edu, kmb6781@psu.edu, kqf5251@psu.edu, mer5709@psu.edu, mjd5791@psu.edu, mqq5499@psu.edu, msg5396@psu.edu, mta5162@psu.edu, mxt5325@psu.edu, mzh5706@psu.edu, ngs5080@psu.edu, nms5585@psu.edu, rvy5082@psu.edu, sjc5824@psu.edu, skp5381@psu.edu, tfk5116@psu.edu, twt5155@psu.edu, vkr5046@psu.edu, yog5111@psu.edu, Morgan Soster <mms6256@psu.edu>, Rachel Stiller <rss5344@psu.edu>

Hi all,

If you're getting this message, then my records say that you are in one of my sections of PHIL 106 (Business Ethics) or PHIL 010 (Critical Thinking).

I wanted to remind any students who need to miss class tomorrow or Friday to observe Eid al-Adha that you should email me ASAP and let me know. This will make it easier to count the absence as excused, as it should be counted.

The same goes for all other religious observance dates-- it is excused, but do try to let me know in advance!

Best wishes,

Dr. Eric Epstein

Mail Delivery Subsystem <MAILER-DAEMON@limerock03.mail.cornell.edu>

Wed, Aug 30, 2017 at 9:27 PM

To: ege3@cornell.edu

The original message was received at Wed, 30 Aug 2017 21:27:49 -0400 from sf-e2013-09.exchange.cornell.edu [10.22.40.56]

----- The following addresses had permanent fatal errors -----
< din5193@psu.edu >

The same goes for all other religious observance dates-- it is excused, but do try to let me know in advance!

Best wishes,

Dr. Eric Epstein

Mshari Alajmi <msharialajmi@gmail.com>
To: Eric Epstein <ege3@cornell.edu>

Wed, Aug 30, 2017 at 9:35 PM

Dear Dr. Epstein,

That is really nice of you and thoughtful to send us this email before we even have to ask. With your permission, I'd like to miss class for Eid El-Adha celebrations.

Have a good night,
Mshari

[Quoted text hidden]

Mohammad Alrumaihi <mohammadalrumaihi@gmail.com>
To: Eric Epstein <ege3@cornell.edu>

Wed, Aug 30, 2017 at 9:43 PM

I highly appreciate your understanding. I will not attend tomorrow's class.

Thanks
Mohammed
[Quoted text hidden]

Eric Epstein <ege3@cornell.edu>
To: Mshari Alajmi <msharialajmi@gmail.com>

Wed, Aug 30, 2017 at 10:02 PM

Hello Mshari,

Thank you so much for your kind words! Still, I can't take too much credit; a student asked me about it earlier today.

Your absence will be excused. Good night and Eid Mubarak!

Eric
[Quoted text hidden]

Eric Epstein <ege3@cornell.edu>
To: Mohammad Alrumaihi <mohammadalrumaihi@gmail.com>

Wed, Aug 30, 2017 at 10:02 PM

You are very welcome. Eid Mubarak!

Eric
[Quoted text hidden]

Mohammad Alrumaihi <mohammadalrumaihi@gmail.com>
To: Eric Epstein <ege3@cornell.edu>

Wed, Aug 30, 2017 at 10:04 PM

Thank you!

[Quoted text hidden]

ZHIXIN HE <zzh37@psu.edu>
To: Eric Epstein <ege3@cornell.edu>

Wed, Aug 30, 2017 at 10:52 PM

Dear Dr. Eric Epstein,
Because of my schedule conflict, I have dropped your phil10 last week. For your connivence, could you remove me from your email list? By the way, even though I dropped your class, I have learned a lot and I really appreciate what you taught us.
Thank you so much!
Sincerely, Zhixin He
[Quoted text hidden]
Zhixin he

MUHANNAD OMAR A ALABDULLATEEF <moa5435@psu.edu>
To: Eric Epstein <ege3@cornell.edu>

Wed, Aug 30, 2017 at 11:19 PM

Hello,

Thank you for the email and understanding. I will miss tomorrow's class.

Thank you

On Wed, Aug 30, 2017 09:27 PM, **Eric Epstein**< ege3@cornell.edu > wrote:
[Quoted text hidden]

Jieru Zeng <gtsangky@gmail.com>
To: Eric Epstein <ege3@cornell.edu>

Wed, Aug 30, 2017 at 11:45 PM

Hi, Dr. Epstein,
I am Jieru Zeng from the PHIL106, and I go by Grace as well. I will miss the class on Friday because the class conflicts with my road test. I am very sorry about being absent, but that test is very important to me.

Thank you!
Grace
[Quoted text hidden]

Adnan AbuAlsaud <adnan.z.abualsaud@gmail.com>
To: Eric Epstein <ege3@cornell.edu>

Thu, Aug 31, 2017 at 7:50 AM

Dear Dr. Epstein,

Happy Eid al-adha. I will be out of town today and tomorrow to visit family.
I was going to email you anyway, but replying to this email makes it easier.

Regards
Adnan AbuAlSaud
[Quoted text hidden]

Eric Epstein <ege3@cornell.edu>
To: Adnan AbuAlsaud <adnan.z.abualsaud@gmail.com>

Thu, Aug 31, 2017 at 8:55 AM

Thanks for letting me know. Your absence is excused. Eid Mubarak!

Eric

[Quoted text hidden]

Eric Epstein <ege3@cornell.edu>

Thu, Aug 31, 2017 at 8:55 AM

To: MUHANNAD OMAR A ALABDULLATEEF <moa5435@psu.edu>

Thanks for letting me know. Your absence is excused. Eid Mubarak!

Eric

[Quoted text hidden]

Khalid AlMusharraf <kalmusharraf@gmail.com>

Thu, Aug 31, 2017 at 10:42 AM

To: Eric Epstein <ege3@cornell.edu>

Hello Professor,

I'm sending this email to let you know that I will skip the class today due to Eid AlAdha.

I hope you have a good one.

Thank you,
Khalid

[Quoted text hidden]

MOSTAFA MOHAMMED M ALBORI <mma5504@psu.edu>

Thu, Aug 31, 2017 at 12:09 PM

To: Eric Epstein <ege3@cornell.edu>

Greeting dr. Epstein, I just saw the email , i would not be able to attend the class today.

Thank you and happy Eid to you

[Quoted text hidden]

Eric Epstein <ege3@cornell.edu>

Thu, Aug 31, 2017 at 1:37 PM

To: Khalid AlMusharraf <kalmusharraf@gmail.com>

Thanks for letting me know. Your absence is excused. Eid Mubarak!

Eric

[Quoted text hidden]

Eric Epstein <ege3@cornell.edu>

Thu, Aug 31, 2017 at 1:37 PM

To: MOSTAFA MOHAMMED M ALBORI <mma5504@psu.edu>

Thanks for letting me know. Your absence is excused. Eid Mubarak!

Eric

[Quoted text hidden]

Khalid AlMusharraf <kalmusharraf@gmail.com>

Thu, Aug 31, 2017 at 4:30 PM

To: Eric Epstein <ege3@cornell.edu>

Thank you professor, Eid Mubarak :)

[Quoted text hidden]

Essay 3

2 messages

COLE MICHAEL LEETY <cml6080@psu.edu>
To: ege3@cornell.edu

Tue, Nov 28, 2017 at 6:35 PM

Dr. Epstein,

I submitted Essay 3, and I just wanted to say thank you. I've really been enjoying your class, and its unlike any other class i've taken. Thank you for being understanding of the circumstances that I have dealt with this semester.\

Best,

Cole Leety

Eric Epstein <ege3@cornell.edu>
To: COLE MICHAEL LEETY <cml6080@psu.edu>

Tue, Nov 28, 2017 at 7:10 PM

Hi Cole,

How nice to hear! And, it's my job to make an effort to accommodate your needs! Happy to do it. Looking forward to seeing your Essay 3.

Dr. Epstein
[Quoted text hidden]

Kaitlyn Amaro (PHIL 10, Section 002: Crit Think (21781--UP---P-PHIL-----10-----002-)) just sent you a message in Canvas.

1 message

Kaitlyn Amaro <notifications@instructure.com> Fri, Dec 15, 2017 at 4:47 PM
Reply-To: Kaitlyn Amaro via Canvas Notifications <reply+f62e42338e0a1d01294727c947be5284eec3737f-1050~340239590@notifications.canvaslms.com>
To: exe51@psu.edu

Missing Assignment Make-up

Hi Professor Epstein,

Attached are the 2 homework assignments and quiz (with explanations for my answers) that I was missing this semester. I want to thank you again for giving me the opportunity to make up these assignments and for being such a great professor throughout this course. Although I'm a business major, I'm definitely more excited about minoring in Philosophy. I want to thank you for being such an influential part of my journey so far and for reminding me why I love it so much.

Thanks again for a great semester!

Best,
Kaitlyn Amaro



Kaitlyn Amaro
kva5283@psu.edu

You can reply to this message in Canvas by replying directly to this email. If you need to include an attachment, please log in to Canvas and reply through the Inbox.

Attached Files:

- Phil HW 10,12 & Quiz2.docx - 108 KB [\[download\]](#)



Muhamad Hakimi Bin Daud (PHIL 106, Section 002: Intro Bus Ethics (21781--UP---P-PHIL----106-----002-)) just sent you a message in Canvas.

1 message

Muhamad Hakimi Bin Daud <notifications@instructure.com>

Wed, Dec 13, 2017 at 10:06 AM

Reply-To: Muhamad Hakimi Bin Daud via Canvas Notifications

<reply+0feb8582f8be0a9bc18eb5bff036ca1b6409af54-1050~339249821@notifications.canvaslms.com>

To: exe51@psu.edu

PHIL 106 - Thank you

Hello professor,

I hope you're doing well. I just wanted to say thank you for this semester for I have learned a lot. Before this, I have never really pondered on conflicting ethical decisions in my life. Now, whenever I buy a new shirt, I always look at the tag and wondered if the stuff I'm buying, is me subconsciously supporting sweatshops, further declining the degraded work conditions there.

Again, I just wanted to express my sincere gratitude that you've done for us in class. I might not have been a very active participant, but I sometimes just lack the confidence to.

Lastly, happy holidays!

Thank you,

Muhamad Hakimi



Muhamad Hakimi Bin Daud
mxh5580@psu.edu

You can reply to this message in Canvas by replying directly to this email. If you need to include an attachment, please log in to Canvas and reply through the Inbox.



met one of your former students

Vivek Mathew <vcmathew@gmail.com>
To: Eric Epstein <ege3@cornell.edu>

Fri, Jul 6, 2018 at 1:01 PM

from CPEP. Michael Dixon specifically mentioned how you were very kind, how he was having trouble seeing the point of philosophy and you had specifically brought in a couple of pieces on the philosophy of race (one of which was Appiah's, I'm not remembering the others). Anyway, he spoke about you so highly, I wanted you to know!

Hope you are well. Are you in State College these days or back here?

- Vivek

FACULTY EVALUATIONS

Eric G. Epstein

PHIL 2300 - Puzzles and Paradoxes (Matti Eklund) Fall 2010

Since I taught a discussion section at the same time that Eric was teaching his, I was, unfortunately, unable to evaluate his teaching personally. But judging from everything I have seen, Eric did a terrific job. He always had good things to say when we discussed the course and the material. His way of dealing with students' written work was conscientious and helpful. As far as I could tell from his interaction with students, he had good rapport with them.

Eric did give a guest lecture in the course, on epistemicism about vagueness. I liked that Eric wanted to volunteer when I gave TAs the opportunity, and I should stress that generally he did well. However, his lecturing skills could do with improvement (as is only natural). He was not sufficiently sensitive to what the appropriate level of difficulty might be; nor was he sufficiently sensitive to issues regarding what aspects of the material he was presenting could, for the students' benefit, be especially highlighted.

Especially toward the end of the course, Eric often asked questions in lecture. I thought his questions were good and useful; often his questions forced me to pause on important matters, making it easier for the students to follow.

PHIL 2530 - Religion & Reason (Scott MacDonald) Spring 2011

Eric TA-ed for me in Religion & Reason this term. He led a weekly discussion section of about 20 students, held regular office hours, and helped with the grading for the course (5 short essays, 1 paper, and a take home final essay). He did a great job. He was conscientious, reliable, and prompt with grading. His comments on students' assignments were careful, generous, and pedagogically astute. I also asked Eric to guest lecture one day when I was traveling. He took on the assignment eagerly and, by all reports, successfully. I visited one of Eric's discussion sections. The topic that week — whether the world must have had a beginning (the so-called Kalam cosmological argument) — involved some tricky issues about infinity. The students were a bit confused about some of the fundamental points in play and consequently were tempted in the discussion to press a variety of vague and unhelpful ideas. Eric made a valiant (which is not to say entirely successful) effort to corral the discussion and keep it on track. Despite the mild chaos, however, the overall effect was terrific precisely because of Eric's energy and enthusiasm and the honest, careful attention he gave to each student who spoke up. The students clearly respond to and appreciate Eric's efforts. He has some natural pedagogical talents which, when sharpened by a bit more experience, will make him a very effective and popular teacher.

PHIL 1100 - Introduction to Philosophy (Nico Silins) Fall 2011

Eric Epstein did excellent work as a TA, I was very happy to have his help, and benefitted greatly from his questions and suggestions about how to cover the material. Eric's enthusiasm and willingness to help students outside of classroom was warmly appreciated by them, in one case getting him a score of "5!!". I am by no means especially organized myself, but I would encourage Eric to be a bit more efficient about administrative details, such as those concerning who grades what when.

PHIL 2410 – Ethics (Nick Sturgeon) Spring 2012

A lot of the TA work for this course consisted in commenting on, and grading, three student papers, one in two drafts. Eric was very good at this: his comments on papers were generous, he struck an appropriate balance between criticism and encouragement, his grades were fair, and everything was done on time. (This was true of his grading on the final exam, too.) He was also helpful in talking with students as they wrote their papers: they gave him a good score on this on the end-of-semester evaluations, and several shared the sentiment of the student who wrote, "He helped me through the assignments, and I wouldn't be where I am without him." Several also commented on Eric's kindness to them when they came to him with questions. His students—in quite a small section—were less generous about Eric as a section leader. They appreciated the often lively discussion, which I observed myself when I visited a section meeting: it was clear that students felt comfortable joining in, and Eric was nicely responsive to student questions and remarks. But several, including ones who praised him in other respects, complained that he did not present material in an organized manner and that he was too often unclear. (I saw one instance of this when I visited his section, in that he initially left out a crucial detail of an example that students had been assigned to discuss.) It is interesting that several of the students volunteered in their written comments that he needed to be more confident: they apparently took him to understand the material, as I am quite sure that in general he did, but to be unsure of his own understanding in a way that distracted students.

PHIL 3320 – Logic for Philosophy (Ted Sider) Fall 2014

Eric was a superb TA. The workload was heavy (weekly homework assignments, two exams, lots of office hours) but he did his duties promptly and perfectly. I don't know how I would have managed without him. He was particularly supportive of and helpful to the many students who needed extra help with the course. He also taught one meeting of the lecture. This didn't go so well, but I think it was a valuable experience nevertheless. Afterward we discussed it in detail, and I think he learned a number of things to do differently next time. (I should also add that the topic for that lecture was especially pedagogically challenging.)

PHIL 3300 – Foundations of Mathematics (Ted Sider) Spring 2015

Eric was again a superb TA. The workload was heavy (weekly homework assignments, two exams, lots of office hours) but he did his duties promptly and perfectly. I don't know how I would have managed without him. He was particularly supportive of and helpful to the many students who needed extra help with the course. He also taught one meeting of the lecture, which went much better than a similar event last semester.

PHIL 3710 – Philosophy of Language (William Starr) Spring 2016

Eric did an excellent job TAing for Philosophy of Language. He was a regular, engaged participant in class and completed all of his grading on time. He did not teach a section, but did moderate a discussion board online and maintain office hours. He was meticulous and thorough on the discussion board, showing generosity to the students but also steering them away from common mistakes. Eric taught two classes while I was away at conferences, and several students told me that he did well.

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

Student Evaluation Summaries

A Note on Student Evaluations

“Puzzles & Paradoxes” (Fall 2010)

“Religion and Reason” (Spring 2011)

“Introduction to Philosophy” (Fall 2011)

“Ethics” (Spring 2012)

“Defining the Undefinable, Expressing the Inexpressible” (Fall 2013)

“Logic for Philosophy” (Fall 2014)

“Foundations of Mathematics” (Spring 2015)

“History of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict” (Fall 2015)

“Introduction to Philosophy and Critical Thinking” (Spring 2016)

“Marx, Nietzsche, Freud” (Fall 2016)

“Minds and Machines” (Spring 2017)

“Critical Thinking” (Fall 2017)

“Introduction to Business Ethics: Section 001” (Fall 2017)

“Introduction to Business Ethics: Section 002” (Fall 2017)



Cornell University
Sage School of Philosophy

Julia Markovits
Associate Professor
235 Goldwin Smith Hall
Ithaca, NY 14853-3201
t. (607) 255-3687
f. (607) 255-8177
markovits@cornell.edu

A Note on Student Evaluations

Unfortunately, the teaching assistant evaluation forms in use by the Cornell Department of Philosophy before Fall 2015 have the following flaw: they ask students to rate their graduate TAs on a scale of 1 to 5 across a number of categories (where 1 is the lowest and 5 the highest score) and then define the score of 3 as “neutral/not applicable.” This means that many of the 3-scores TAs received likely indicate not that the student evaluator felt her TA was mediocre in the relevant respect, but rather that she felt the category in question did not apply. (For example, maybe the question asked the student to evaluate her TA’s grading, but the TA was not the one grading her work; or maybe the question asked the student to evaluate the TA’s section performance, but the section was optional and the student did not attend.) As a result, these forms (and the mean scores calculated on the basis of them) likely undersell students’ actual evaluations of their TA’s teaching.

Of course, it is impossible to tell with certainty which 3-scores were intended to give mediocre evaluations and which were intended to indicate that the question was not applicable. To help offset the misleading effect of the flawed evaluation forms, some of Cornell’s job candidates may choose to provide two sets of average scores with their teaching evaluations: one that includes all of the 3-scores and one that includes none of them. The “real” score likely lies somewhere in between.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Julia Markovits".

Julia Markovits
Associate Professor of Philosophy
Placement Director

STUDENT EVALUATION SUMMARIES

Note: “Not applicable” was not listed as a numerical response category. For accuracy, responses for which students circled a number but wrote in “not applicable” or the like were not counted. For full information about student answers, the official university documents are available upon request.

Puzzles and Paradoxes, Fall 2010:

Question:	Average Score (low 1, high 5):
1. The teaching assistant was well prepared.	4.06
2. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner.	4.00
3. The teaching assistant’s discussions were stimulating and held my interest.	3.89
4. The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material.	4.11
5. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner.	3.56
6. The teaching assistant’s grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted.	3.94
7. The teaching assistant’s comments on written work were thorough and instructive.	3.83
8. The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section.	4.35
9. The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate.	3.94
10. The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable.	3.67
11. Overall, this section met my expectations.	4.11

Highlights from Written Answers:

“Eric is really nice and approachable, I wouldn’t be afraid to ask him for help.”

“[Eric had] patience to explain difficult concepts thoroughly.”

“Eric...did a great job...to encourage my interest.”

“I enjoyed his enthusiasm about every topic.”

“It was engaging...really interesting discussions”

“He seemed to want to learn from us”

“Eric was very good at helping us prepare for exams, and he did a good job of explaining the material.”

“He spent a lot of time answering our questions and having discussions rather than lecturing us.”

“Helpful through email”

“Makes sure we understand what he’s talking about”

“Always willing to help and take the time to explain things thoroughly”

“He was well-versed in all of the source material”

STUDENT EVALUATION SUMMARIES

Religion and Reason, Spring 2011:

Question:	Average Score (low 1, high 5):
1. The teaching assistant was well prepared.	4.12
2. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner.	3.82
3. The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest.	4.14
4. The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material.	4
5. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner.	3.35
6. The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted.	2.39
7. The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive.	3.42
8. The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section.	4.5
9. The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate.	4.71
10. The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable.	3.79
11. Overall, this section met my expectations.	3.64

Highlights from Written Answers:

"Eric facilitated a generous amount of discussion, and it was not uncommon for the whole section to be passionately engaged in a topic."

"Eric was incredibly approachable and was always open to talk with. I have no doubt that he'll make a very inviting and enjoyable professor."

"Eric is very enthusiastic and asks the right questions to stimulate discussion. He makes class fun and has a good sense of humor."

"Clearly laid out arguments."

"Eric was very involved and responsive to students. Also very attentive to students and did a great job getting everyone involved."

"The material was presented in a manner that facilitated interesting discussion."

"Enjoyable, lively discussions, very on point with the lectures. I gained a lot from this section. The TA was excellent."

"I never came anywhere near falling asleep in section which is more than I can say for 99% of my courses here."

Introduction to Philosophy, Fall 2011:

Question:	Average Score (low 1, high 5):
1. The teaching assistant was well prepared.	4.75
2. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner.	4.67
3. The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest.	4.42
4. The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material.	4.17
5. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner.	4.08
6. The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted.	4.25
7. The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive.	4.33
8. The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section.	4.67
9. The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate.	4.50
10. The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable.	4.17
11. Overall, this section met my expectations.	4.33

Highlights from Written Answers:

"The T.A. elicited conversational interest, engaging all by dispersing speaking opportunities equitably, always making the core content of concern clear....He conducted conversation well, highlighting all details of course materials very clearly."

"The T.A. was always prepared, gave very helpful and clear instructions on what we wanted, and led an interesting discussion."

"Eric was very friendly and seemed like he legitimately wanted us to learn philosophy. He tried and succeeded in engaging with the students."

"He was always quick to meet outside of class."

"We discussed readings in detail that we normally would not have discussed in class."

"He tried to answer everybody's questions."

STUDENT EVALUATION SUMMARIES

Ethics, Spring 2012:

Question:	Average Score (low 1, high 5):
1. The teaching assistant was well prepared.	3.50
2. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner.	2.80
3. The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest.	3.20
4. The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material.	3.00
5. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner.	2.40
6. The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted.	4.10
7. The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive.	3.90
8. The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section.	4.30
9. The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate.	3.90
10. The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable.	3.60
11. Overall, this section met my expectations.	3.20

Highlights from Written Answers:

"He addressed individual points made by students, was open to new ideas/approaches."

"Well prepared and seemed knowledgeable."

"TA is well prepared and encourages questions....He is very willing to answer questions and to take advice from students as to how the class discussion should proceed."

"Made sure to explain the difficult ideas!"

"We discussed valuable material that was going to be on quizzes and papers."

"Eric was very kind and very approachable in case you needed help. He helped me through many assignments, and I wouldn't be where I am without him!"

"Allowed everyone to propose ideas and got the class talking."

Defining the Undefinable, Expressing the Inexpressible, (First Year Writing Seminar) Fall 2013:¹**A. Numerical Questions:***Question:**Average Score:*

- | | |
|--|------|
| 1. The most important reason I chose this seminar. | 1.56 |
| 1) I liked the course description. | |
| 2) I thought it would be challenging. | |
| 3) My advisor recommended it. | |
| 4) It was offered at a time I had open. | |
| 5) I could not get into one of my top preferences. | |

For the following questions: (1 = an appropriate amount, 2 = too much, 3 = too little, 4 = far too much, 5 = far too little)

- | | |
|---|------|
| 2. How much reading did you do? | 1.25 |
| 3. How much out-of-class writing did you do? | 1.25 |
| 4. How much time was spent learning about writing? | 3.00 |
| 5. How much time was devoted to learning how to revise your essays? | 1.88 |

How much do you agree with the following statements? (1 = very strongly, 2 = strongly, 3 = somewhat, 4 = a little, 5 = not at all)

In class, in conferences, or in paper comments, the teacher emphasized

- | | |
|--|------|
| 6. Choosing the words that best express ideas. | 2.75 |
| 7. writing grammatically correct sentences. | 2.81 |
| 8. structuring sentences carefully. | 2.75 |
| 9. providing appropriate documentation for sources. | 1.80 |
| 10. developing a strong argument. | 1.25 |
| 11. writing well-focused, coherent paragraphs. | 1.88 |
| 12. making transitions from one paragraph to the next. | 3.19 |
| 13. focusing an essay on a significant problem, hypothesis, thesis, argument, or idea. | 1.56 |
| 14. supporting claims with pertinent, substantive evidence. | 1.75 |
| 15. incorporating and analyzing source material and quotations. | 2.25 |
| 16. editing essays to eliminate flaws of grammar, word choice, spelling, and format. | 2.56 |
| 17. revising essays to enhance interest, clarity, and persuasiveness. | 1.81 |
| 18. writing in a style appropriate for a particular purpose. | 2.63 |
| 19. writing in a style appropriate for a particular audience. | 3.13 |

In this seminar,

- | | |
|--|------|
| 20. reading and writing assignments formed an understandable progression. | 2.25 |
| 21. the level of difficulty of the readings seemed appropriate. | 2.25 |
| 22. I learned to read with care in the discipline of the seminar. | 2.13 |
| 23. informal/preparatory writing assignments helped me understand the readings and write an essay. | 1.63 |

¹ Since this course was a Freshman Writing Seminar taught through the Cornell Knight Institute for Writing in the Disciplines, it has a different questionnaire.

STUDENT EVALUATION SUMMARIES

24. I had opportunities to confer privately with the teacher.	1.19
25. the teacher was well-prepared.	1.63
26. the teacher directed discussions well.	2.13
27. the teacher treated my writing with respect.	1.56
28. the teacher graded my papers fairly.	1.63
29. the teacher returned our papers within a reasonable length of time.	1.31
30. comments on each returned paper helped me improve the next assignment.	1.75
31. I felt intellectually stimulated.	1.94
32. I became a more confident writer.	2.19
33. I became a more skillful writer.	2.40

B. Highlights from written responses:

Comments on Student Writing:

“I learned how to argue in a paper because the essay prompts required us to do so and Eric was good at advising us in developing our arguments.”

The written comments “pointed out flaws in an argument and pushed you in the right direction to try and fix it.”

“My writing has definitely improved as I have learned to analyze and argue for/against various [claims].”

“The written comments on papers were definitely helpful and after fixing my essay based on Eric’s comments, I saw that my second drafts on papers improved dramatically; Eric’s comments just make one aware of the problems in [one’s] essays.”

“I could always directly link a [written] comment [from the instructor] to something specific I wrote rather than it being a general critique of my writing style or paper.”

“By requiring prewriting and a draft, students were forced to take the smaller steps to writing a complete paper....I believe that this course has shown me how to work up to a full and final paper.”

“The thought processes required me to think in a very logical way and be clear in my writing....good emphasis on the importance of being clear.”

In Class:

“Eric was clear in helping students simplify complex arguments. Another strength was the constant reminder that students are always welcome to stop by office hours or speak to the instructor.”

“Class discussions of the assigned texts [were] excellent—the handouts prepared for each session were helpful.”

“The discussion of the texts [was] extremely useful because many of them were quite difficult to understand at first, but became fairly clear with discussion.”

“The class discussions were very useful, often giving me insight into a part of the reading I did not analyze enough or for generating counterarguments on a claim which I had not thought of.”

“This was a very enlightening course....The handouts were crystal-clear, and elucidated any confusion from the readings.”

“I enjoyed getting to pick what we wanted to talk about later in the course.”

STUDENT EVALUATION SUMMARIES

Logic for Philosophy, Fall 2014:

Question:	Average Score (low 1, high 5):
1. The teaching assistant was well prepared.	4.86
2. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner.	4.86
3. The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest.	4.86
4. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner.	4.86
5. The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted.	4.64
6. The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive.	4.70
7. The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of office hours.	5.00
8. The amount of discussion that occurred in office hours was adequate.	5.00
9. The student discussion that occurred in office hours was valuable.	5.00
10. Overall, the office hours met my expectations.	4.86

Highlights from Written Answers:

"Very helpful and knowledgeable."

"Always helpful, patient."

"Patient, polite, knowledgeable, professional."

"He was willing to go above and beyond to make sure he got my homework and that I understood the material. Also he was very good at breaking concepts down to a step-by-step system that was easier to understand."

"Very personable, easy to understand, always willing to help."

"T.A. always made time to help students outside of office hours and took a great degree of personal responsibility in helping us figure out the material. Is always patient and kind—which is particularly helpful in a quantitative course where it's easy to feel dumb or intimidated."

"I think T.A. went over and beyond expectations."

"He well responds to my email, well prepared."

"He was a good grader."

Foundations of Mathematics, Spring 2015:

Question:	Average Score (low 1, high 5):
1. The teaching assistant was well prepared.	4.73
2. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner.	4.4
3. The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest.	4.33
4. The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material.	4.33
5. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner.	4.22
6. The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted.	4.36
7. The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive.	4.27
8. The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section.	4.64
9. The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate.	4.64
10. The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable.	4.37
11. Overall, this section met my expectations.	4.45

Highlights from Written Answers:

"Very responsive over email."

"Eric is patient and thorough."

Eric "[takes] the time to think about a problem before attempting to answer it."

"Available outside of class."

"Eric really knows his stuff."

"Eric is very quick and understands any difficulty you may be having."

"He was very approachable and friendly."

"Eric was very available to discuss the material and assignments. His contributions in class were often illuminating."

History of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict, Fall 2015:

Question:	Average Score (low 1, high 5):
1. I attended TA sessions: (5 = regularly; 1 = never)	4.84
2. I met with my TA individually: (5 = more than 5 times, 1 = never)	1.72
3. The TA was knowledgeable about the course material.	4.05
4. The discussion sections were well-organized.	3.82
5. The sections effectively reviewed materials covered in lecture.	4.23
6. The sections helped me to gain new insight into the subject matter.	4.14
7. The TA did a good job of attempting to stimulate student discussion.	4.20
8. The TA was able to explain effectively difficult concepts.	4.02
9. The TA was available for individual consultation with students.	4.53
10. Overall, how would you rate the TA? (5 = excellent; 1 = poor)	4.09

Highlights from Written Answers:

“The TA was extremely knowledgeable and well-versed in the subject matter.”

“[TA had the] ability to notice when arguments are missing links”

“He conveyed a lot of passion and enthusiasm for the material.”

“He seemed to have a genuine passion for the material and wanted to stimulate discussion.”

“Guided class discussions very well.”

“Tried to get every opinion heard.”

“Always had a plan coming into section”

“Helped in connecting the events and topics”

“TA tries his best to help and gave very good insight”

“He consistently asked for feedback & was open to discussing what we wanted / needed clarified.”

“He was...very friendly...and was willing to go over whatever we wanted.”

“Cared about students’ success in the course”

“Very willing to meet outside of section.”

“[I learned] how to think objectively & critically about the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.”

“[I learned] more than one could ever hope to learn about this conflict.”

Philosophy 101: Introduction to Philosophy and Critical Thinking, Spring 2016²

Question:	Average Score:
1. How well did the instructor organize the presentation of the material? (1 = very disorganized...5 = well organized)	4.2
2. How willing was the instructor to give help to students requesting it? (1 = very unwilling...5 = very willing)	4.8
3. How well did the course meet its stated objectives? (1 = poorly...5 = very well)	4.4
4. How did the workload compare with other courses carrying equal credit? (1 = much less...5 = required much more)	3.5
5. How did the teaching skills of the instructor compare with other college instructors you've had? (1 = very unfavorably...5 = very favorably)	4.2
6. The value of this course as a part of my general education, compared with other courses, has been: 1 = very low...5 = very high	3.89
7. My overall opinion of this course is: 1 = very low...5 = very high	4.3

Highlights from Written Answers:

"[I have gained] a deeper insight into various contours of thought."

"[I valued] the teacher's willingness to show how the course is relevant to my other studies."

"[I've gained] the ability to understand a valid argument from a sound argument."

"Very good instructor...instructor cares about the students."

"[I valued] the challenging back-and-forth dialogue. I gained] the ability to express an argument logically and to view an argument from both sides. I appreciate the dedication and the helpfulness of the CPEP instructors."

"The class was very well planned and instructed. I gained much understanding of philosophy. Great class, enjoyed it an the instructors very much."

"The instructor and the TA are like peas and carrots. Separately, they're good, but put them together they're amazing."

"The lectures – very organized and taught in a way that was understandable. I gained a better understanding of the way we evaluate information and/or arguments every day. Both instructors are excellent. They complemented each other in teaching styles and their desire to help others in pursuit of higher education is commendable."

² Since this course was run through the Cornell Prison Education Program under the auspices of Cayuga Community College, it has a different questionnaire.

GERST 1170: Marx, Nietzsche, Freud (First Year Writing Seminar) Fall 2016³**Student Performance:**

Please rate (1 = poor, 5 = excellent):	Average Score:
1. your own preparation for class	3.33
2. the quality of your participation in the discussions	3.2
3. the quality of other students' participation	3.67
4. your efforts to improve your writing	3.67

Instructor Performance:

Please rate (1 = poor, 5 = excellent):	Average Score:
5. planning and organization	4.47
6. appropriateness of reading assignments in terms of length, difficulty, relevance	4.4
7. knowledge of the material	4.87
8. clarity in presenting the material	4.4
9. effectiveness in stimulating and directing discussion	4.2
10. enthusiasm for the subject	4.87
11. effectiveness in helping you to recognize main ideas and grasp abstract concepts	4.47
12. effectiveness in helping you develop coherent and complex arguments	4.4
13. tolerance of differing opinions	4.8
14. responsiveness to students' questions and comments	4.8
15. use of examples from texts (literature, film, style manual, etc.) to illustrate points	4.13
16. helpfulness through comments on written work	4.53
17. helpfulness during individual conferences	4.73
18. overall teaching performance	4.77

Highlights from Written Responses (First Questionnaire):

19. *Elaborate on any of the above (5-18) and/or provide additional comments on the instructor's performance.*

"Epstein was very knowledgeable [about] the subjects and set up class in a way that successfully helped students develop ideas."

"He knows that he is talking about even though the material is not his focus. He prepares well for class."

"He is really smart and loves the subject, so is a good teacher."

"Eric's enthusiasm was great, we were the ones who didn't talk (#9)."

"He was very passionate about philosophy and genuinely wanted to help us learn."

"The instructor is very effective in stimulating and directing discussion."

"Individual conferences were extremely helpful - need to do more of them."

³ Since this course was a Freshman Writing Seminar taught through the Cornell Knight Institute for Writing in the Disciplines, it has a different questionnaire.

STUDENT EVALUATION SUMMARIES

20. *What aspects of the course did you find the most valuable and helpful; the least valuable and helpful? (Do you have suggestions for improvement?)*

“The feedback was the most valuable.”

“Discussions were most valuable and helpful.”

“Nothing in particular for improvement - very nice class!”

“The most valuable & helpful were the in-class discussions.”

“The ideas that we learnt about; Marx, Nietzsche, Freud, and how they relate to reality.”

“Most valuable: unpacking of thinkers’ ideas, organizing arguments, first assignment. Least valuable: *Dora [A Case of Hysteria]*.”

“Analysis of complicated language. @Marx @Nietzsche”

21. *Which reading (viewing) assignments did you consider the most valuable; least valuable? Why?*

“The intro reading with all three philosophers was a great baseline....all readings were useful.”

“The first essay assignment...allowed us to practice comparing the views of different writers.”

“I thought all reading assignments were valuable.”

“They were all valuable except *A Case of Hysteria*—it didn’t seem too relevant to the philosophical style of the class.”

22. *How well were the reading and writing assignments integrated in the course? To what extent did the writing assignments usefully supplement the reading and class discussion?*

“They were integrated well; every class we had small readings and assignments to do based on the readings.”

The “writing assignments [were] great to deepen my understanding of the reading.”

“They were integrated well because they related well to our discussions.”

“The reading and writing assignments were well integrated into the course. We spent ample time [on writing] without losing view of the big 3 [Marx, Nietzsche, and Freud].”

23. *Do you think your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing that should have been stressed more heavily?*

“Yes [improved], because of guiding the reader.”

“Yes, my ability to use text to support my claims has improved.”

“Yes! I learnt signaling.”

“It has improved in terms of philosophical writing and structure, but not from an English standpoint.”

STUDENT EVALUATION SUMMARIES

“Yes - improvement through the revision process.”

“This course helped me improve my skills in structuring and organizing an academic paper and in developing a logical and coherent argument.”

“The course promoted improvement through small improvements [steps].”

“A little bit. Literary quality should have been stressed more.”

24. To what extent did this course improve your intellectual and critical abilities? How would you evaluate the intellectual challenge of the course?

“[Abilities—] close reading. [Challenge—] very good!”

“This course is extremely intellectually challenging, it forces students to think critically.”

“It improved my critical thinking abilities about philosophical claims, and opened my mind to a new kind of thinking and writing.”

“It was highly intellectual.”

“This course improved my intellectual and critical abilities. It was intellectually challenging.”

“Improved [my] critical reading / writing skills. Reasonably challenging, but manageable.”

“This course challenged me to think critically and evaluate the arguments of philosophers. The course was an appropriate level of difficulty.”

“I found it very intellectually challenging but it helped me improve my ability to unpack tough material.”

25. Would you recommend this course to a friend? Why or why not?

“Yes, because very interesting and challenging.”

“Yes, because I feel that I learned valuable things.”

“Yes! I like the write - edit - portfolio procedure.”

“Yes! It was so interesting and eye-opening.”

“Yes, it is interesting and useful for self-development.”

“Yes, but only if Eric was teaching it.”

“YES - very intellectually stimulating.”

“Yes, I found the workload appropriate and the material interesting.”

“Yes, Eric is awesome.”

“Yes. Eric is a great instructor.”

STUDENT EVALUATION SUMMARIES

26. *Additional comments or suggestions:*

“(63)”

“Nice job, I really enjoyed the philosophy bent of this class.”

“I ♥ GERST 1170!!”

“I appreciate tremendously the continuous effort that the teacher made to improve the course and engage the students.”

Highlights from Written Responses (Second Questionnaire):

1. What are your overall impressions of the course?

“The class was very eye-opening to the field of philosophy and writing about philosophy, and the discussion were very intellectually stimulating. Our discussions and small writing assignments served as good inspiration and preparations for the essays.”

“I enjoyed the course material and the in-class discussion, and felt that the work load was reasonable and useful.”

“I’m pretty impressed by the intellectual stimulation from the class.”

“I enjoyed [the course] a lot, especially the investigations into these philosophers/thinkers that allowed for an interesting dialogue and comparison of their ideas. Although the exercises certainly helped with the final essays, they were initially overwhelming to complete. After they were reduced, however, the workload was manageable.”

“I really enjoyed this class. This goes through challenging reading and made us write about it. I really like Eric and his teaching.”

2. Do you believe your writing has improved?

“My writing in philosophy has improved because the class taught me to state directly what I was going to talk about in the essay as well as to use first person narration when needed. Clarity of writing and relevance of questions was stressed, and I think those are the most important points.”

“I definitely think my writing has improved. The course helped me learn how to effectively structure and organize a paper and how to incorporate personal arguments while analyzing an author’s work.”

“Yes,” my writing has improved. “The course...highlighted the importance of structure and clarity, especially since writing in philosophy can easily be misinterpreted.”

“I think my writing has improved as far as the process, I learned to make outlines and several drafts of my writing.”

“I am better at being clear and fully explaining quotations, and have begun using more adequate textual evidence.”

STUDENT EVALUATION SUMMARIES

3. *Were written comments on papers helpful?*

“Written comments on papers were extremely helpful because they helped me see my writing from the perspective of the reader. This shared where I needed to clarify or elaborate on points I otherwise would have found obvious.”

Written comments were “very” helpful, and addressed “both general and focused” issues. They “helped pinpoint weaknesses and understand how to best organize papers.”

“Eric Epstein leaves very helpful comments on a sentence-to-sentence, paragraph-to-paragraph level. He can suggest edits to help incorporate quotes or make overall flow better.”

“My writing has improved in terms of expressing an idea and providing substantial evidence to support it. The conferences provided the most helpful and personalized feedback.”

Written comments on papers were “very helpful. The teacher had expertise in writing these types of essays. I had good comments that improved the structure, flow, and clarity of the papers.”

“The written comments and one-on-one meetings were extremely helpful in identifying how to improve my writing.”

“Yes,” the written comments were helpful. “There were comments on small defects / flaws and larger, more general problems, that helped with essay revision.”

4. *How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? Of writing?*

Class discussions of the assigned texts, and of writing, were “both...very helpful.” They “brought up conclusions that might be tough to discern alone.”

“Class discussions helped my understanding of readings. I could see other people’s interpretations and views on the authors. The discussions helped fuel my writing too.”

Class discussions of the assigned texts and of writing were “very useful; they prepared me well for the essays and were really interesting.”

Class discussions were “quite useful, as they helped me unpack the material and improve my essays.”

5. *After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?*

My weaknesses as a writer include “blending in my opinion and the author’s opinion. They should be better separated.”

After taking this course, my greatest strengths as a writer are “presenting and defending an idea, [and] expressing my opinion based on information in a text.”

After taking this class, my greatest weakness as a writer is “to locate the most useful passage in the essay.”

After taking this course, “I believe my greatest strength is writing a strong introduction with a clear thesis. However, I still need to work on maintaining clarity throughout.”

PHIL 2621: Minds and Machines (Spring 2017)**Notes on the class:**

1. As I was a teaching assistant for this class, here I include only the questions that pertained to teaching assistants (#21 - 31).
2. I was one of two TAs for this class, and many questions pertain to both TA's.
3. In this class, there were no discussion sections, but TA's
 - supervised an online discussion board,
 - held office hours,
 - graded papers according to the lead instructor's rubric,
 - gave two guest lectures,
 - commented on drafts of student papers.

Numerical Questions:

These questions were answered in the following format:

- 1) Strongly Disagree
- 2) Disagree
- 3) Neutral
- 4) Agree
- 5) Strongly Agree

Question	Mean	StdDevP	Count	1	2	3	4	5
21. The teaching assistant/s was/were well prepared.	3.85	.90	20	1	0	4	11	4
22. The teaching assistant/s reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner.	3.79	1.05	19	1	1	4	8	5
23. The teaching assistants' discussions were stimulating and held my interest.	3.72	.98	18	1	0	6	7	4
24. The teaching assistant/s reviewed a sufficient amount of course material.	3.82	1.04	17	1	0	5	6	5
25. The teaching assistant/s reviewed course material in an organized manner.	3.82	1.04	17	1	0	5	6	5
26. The teaching assistants' grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted.	3.57	1.32	28	4	1	6	9	8
27. The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive.	3.61	1.28	31	4	2	4	13	8
28. The teaching assistant/s was/were responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section.	3.95	1.07	20	1	1	3	8	7
29. If you had a TA draft meeting for Essay 1 or 2, how useful was it?	4.10	.99	20	1	0	3	8	8
30. How useful were the discussion postings for engaging with your classmates?	3.12	1.19	41	4	9	12	10	6
31. How useful were the discussion postings for engaging with the class material?	2.55	.67	38	4	9	25		

Highlights From Short Answer Questions:

What aspects of the teaching assistant/s' performance in the section did you like?

“I liked that they held essay review sessions.”

“They were very approachable and accommodating if meeting times didn't work out.”

“Really helpful comments.”

“The TA is very helpful, and helps me understand the concepts better, since he always listens to my opinion, and gives specific responses to me.”

“Their efforts to break the concepts down into understandable terms.”

“Was able to run the classes and involved in discussion.”

What changes in the teaching assistant/s' conduct of section would you recommend?

“None”

“I think it would be a good idea to have discussions.”

“I really would have liked to have a TA meeting on the second essay but the limited days the office hours were available conflicted with a large project's due dates in another class and the office hours for it so I had no chance to do so. I think more spread out office hours for the essays would be much better.”

“More open to essay grading. ‘Rubric’ was harsh and many points were missed despite them being there.”

Other comments/suggestions? Please be specific as to which TA.

“I think TA Epstein's comments and questions in lecture were often elucidating and intriguing.”

“Eric is a nice guy. Though I did come to office hours once and he wasn't there. Helpful overall.”

“If essay draft sessions were longer, that would be good. Mr. Epstein was really clear and insightful. Mr. Paskell was also insightful.”

“I went to Matt's TA meeting for essay 1 and Eric's for essay 2. Both are very helpful and did a great job clarifying my confusions and presenting the material!”

STUDENT EVALUATION SUMMARIES

PHIL 010: Critical Thinking (Pennsylvania State University)*Multiple Choice Questions:*

Out of 7 points, 0 = lowest rating, 7 = highest rating, N/A offered as an option.

	Question:	% giving lowest rating	% giving highest rating	Mean Score:
A1.	Are you taking this course as an elective?	No: 4	Yes: 8	
A2.	What grade do you expect to earn in this course?	< A: 16.7%	A: 83.3%	
A3.	Rate the overall quality of this course.	0%	53%	6.10
A4.	Rate the overall quality of the instructor.	0%	57%	6.13
B1.	Rate the clarity of the instructor's presentations.	0%	50%	6.03
B2.	Rate the effectiveness of the examples used to clarify difficult concepts.	0%	59%	6.24
B3.	Rate the clarity of the instructor's explanations.	0%	47%	5.97
B4.	Rate the instructor's skill in using visual as well as verbal communication.	0%	53%	6.30
B5.	Rate the instructor's skill in relating course material to real life situations.	0%	53%	6.20
B6.	Rate the clarity of the examples used.	0%	50%	6.20
B8. ⁴	Rate the effectiveness of the instructor's definitions of terms, concepts, and principles.	0%	50%	6.17
B9.	Rate the effectiveness of the instructor's explanations of why certain processes, techniques, or formulas were used.	1%	59%	6.21
B10.	Rate the instructor's skill in handling students' questions and comments.	0%	60%	6.33
B11.	Rate the instructor's pacing of lectures and presentations to allow for note taking.	0%	67%	6.37
B12.	Rate the effectiveness of the instructor as a classroom leader.	0%	43%	5.97
B13.	Rate the effectiveness of the instructor as a speaker.	0%	47%	5.83
B14.	Rate the instructor's skill in organizing classroom activities.	1%	50%	6.07
B15.	Rate the instructor's skill in using a variety of teaching methods.	0%	47%	6.07
–	Rate this course in terms of how much you learned in it.	7%	33%	5.52

*Open-Ended Items***Open 1: What helped you learn in this course?**

Homework really forced me to learn the material when I wanted to be lazy and not read.

the setup of the course was very easy for me to understand and the professor made it very flexible for me.

The groupwork that we did in class gave us the opportunity to discuss the topics together and get as many perspectives as possible.

Videos & pictures in class. Class discussions

The instructor was very forgiving and always there to help the students. Tried to learn everyone's name, making a great learning environment

⁴ Here for ease of reference I follow the numbering on Pennsylvania State University's official evaluation forms, which skips from B6 to B8.

STUDENT EVALUATION SUMMARIES

Dr. Epstein's use of a planner that was attached to the syllabus, which included the lesson plan, assignments, and other important information, helped me learn, because I was able to use it to organize the class better.

Clarity of examples and in class discussions. Exam packets and discussion board helped.

Lectures related to real life applications.

The study guides and independent work that was given to us was very helpful for my own knowledge. Also, the extra Credit offered was very helpful and the level of understanding from the professor was also helpful.

I thought his homeworks were very helpful and the way he posted study guides was very helpful.

The lectures taught everything that was needed on the exams and quizzes.

The examples that Dr. Epstein used were flawless and really helped me relate the material to everyday situations, which is beneficial for the way that I learn.

Professor Epstein's teaching style helped me learn the most, more than any other factor. He is enthusiastic, informative, and knowledgeable. Could not recommend more highly.

The professor's lectures and the homework assignments.

The instructor used various methods to make sure the students were able to learn the subjects that were being presented, realizing that not everyone learns in the same method. This ranged from pictures, videos, readings to skits. I also felt something that was very effective was the explanation of why this information is important and to what field it pertained to heavily. I felt something that also helped me learn in this class was the relaxed and understanding manner the professor used. The professor also realized that not all students perform well on test/exams and attempted to make other ways for the students to gain points.

The visual images and the information that the instructor wrote on the board helped me learn in this course.

He did a great job answering questions and trying to get the entire class involved. We also did numerous group activities where we paired up and answered questions and brainstormed about topics and definitions.

Professor Epstein posted his lessons online, and I think that helped quite a lot, especially with studying for quizzes/exams.

Dr. Epstein was just such a nice and understanding professor who took lots of time out of his day to ensure we understood the material taught in class. He had many office hours, let students have extensions on work if needed and really created an environment where I was not afraid to approach him.

Videos, class discussions, lectures, and other activities. There was a large variety of teaching methods used in this course.

Clear instructions. And great formatting of tests and study guides were a great help.

The professor was very clear and structured in what was required.

Open 2: What changes would improve your learning?

I would not make any changes

I felt that in some cases the homework did not pertain to the subjects we were learning in the classroom. The rigid format of the homework did not work with the lecture-style he was using. Perhaps choosing different questions in certain cases or making his own questions could have worked better.

I think it would have been more helpful to get explanations that were more clear. Sometimes I felt the class material was explained too quickly and there were awkward moments where we were expected to smoothly answer a question.

To improve this course I would add more real life visual image examples that would relate to the topics more. Some topics were boring and dense and if they had been spiced up relating them to entertaining examples it would have been better.

More application to real life examples like the news or maybe tv/movies

Dr. Epstein is really understanding in giving students every opportunity to get both a good grade and how to understand the course material, though I feel as if sometimes his explanations of topics do not provide further clarification from the textbook.

Nothing. Was a great, clear, fun class.

Better handwriting on the chalkboard from the professors end.

I would maybe have some more videos that related the concepts learned to real life situations.

Additional Readings.

Make lectures more dynamic. Encourage debates and maybe devote a few class periods to interesting topics for debate.

Nothing, great class!

Maybe some more exposure to information outside the textbook, but still thoroughly enjoyed the class and learned a lot.

I think the format of the quizzes should be multiple choice, true and false along with short answer. Maybe even have weekly summarizations of the class lectures.

STUDENT EVALUATION SUMMARIES

PHIL 106, Sec. 001: Introduction to Business Ethics (Pennsylvania State University)

Multiple Choice Questions:

Out of 7 points, 0 = lowest rating, 7 = highest rating, N/A offered as an option.

	Question:	% giving lowest rating	% giving highest rating	Mean Score:
A1.	Are you taking this course as an elective?	No: 5	Yes: 20	
A2.	What grade do you expect to earn in this course?	< A: 14.8%	A: 85.2%	
A3.	Rate the overall quality of this course.	0%	29%	5.68
A4.	Rate the overall quality of the instructor.	0%	35%	6.06
B1.	Rate the clarity of the instructor's presentations.	0%	39%	5.87
B2.	Rate the effectiveness of the examples used to clarify difficult concepts.	0%	52%	6.26
B3.	Rate the clarity of the instructor's explanations.	0%	32%	5.81
B4.	Rate the instructor's skill in using visual as well as verbal communication.	0%	42%	5.90
B5.	Rate the instructor's skill in relating course material to real life situations.	0%	61%	6.42
B6.	Rate the clarity of the examples used.	0%	32%	6.06
B8. ⁵	Rate the effectiveness of the instructor's definitions of terms, concepts, and principles.	0%	42%	5.94
B9.	Rate the effectiveness of the instructor's explanations of why certain processes, techniques, or formulas were used.	0%	31%	5.97
B10.	Rate the instructor's skill in handling students' questions and comments.	0%	58%	6.35
B11.	Rate the instructor's pacing of lectures and presentations to allow for note taking.	0%	45%	6.16
B12.	Rate the effectiveness of the instructor as a classroom leader.	0%	45%	5.94
B13.	Rate the effectiveness of the instructor as a speaker.	0%	45%	6.03
B14.	Rate the instructor's skill in organizing classroom activities.	0%	40%	6.03
B15.	Rate the instructor's skill in using a variety of teaching methods.	0%	40%	5.67
—	Rate this course in terms of how much you learned in it.	0%	33%	5.80

Open-Ended Items

Open 1: What helped you learn in this course?

Being able to read the articles again in class on canvas when we are discussing them in order to be able to pull specific examples.

Different types of media other than reading articles really reinforced the material being taught at hand. I enjoyed the various clips and podcasts on the ethical dilemmas we discussed in class.

As this was Dr. Epstein's first course teaching here I think he did very well and improved over the course of the semester. Discussing the articles in class, no pressure of the exams, given decent amount of times to work on essays

⁵ Here for ease of reference I follow the numbering on Pennsylvania State University's official evaluation forms, which skips from B6 to B8.

STUDENT EVALUATION SUMMARIES

Breaking down the readings and explaining the main points to better understand the concepts.
Professor Epstein adapted very well to needs of the students throughout this class. He was very responsive to what the students wanted or needed.
Looking through the provided articles and book readings, as well as re-reading old notes from class
Examples, videos on top of the readings
I like how the teacher used real life examples to explain a point that he was making. It helped clarify. Also that he wrote all his points out on the board.
Videos, and visual aids. Lectures from the professor were well organized and used examples from readings.
When we watched videos and read an article similar to the video.
Class notes posted [online]
Going to office hours
Dr. Epstein had notes online which made it easy to find the important points and write essays about. Also, he was very welcoming when we asked questions.
class discussions
The online material that are always posted in Canvas, and Dr. Eric's general way of thinking. Dr. Epstein has a great sense of logic that helped me to apply in other areas of life: such as, always consider the opposition's perspective and analyze it in a fair manner.
His passion for philosophy and excitement for teaching it to us every day helped engage students and get us into the subject matter as well.
Leniency on deadlines allowed us to work hard on our assignments and not worry as much. Great professor all around.
Going through the articles and material in class in detail helped me learn a lot. Some of the articles in philosophy are difficult to understand the author's opinions, but Dr. Epstein went through each one thoroughly. This gave me good points to use in the essays we were assigned. I liked how the essays were based on the articles we reviewed during class.
The course relies on the reading a lot. so reading in advance of the class is helping me to engage in the in-class discussions.
The professor cares about the students' understanding more than anything! He understands what the students go through and makes changes to deadlines just to make sure his students do their best. Also, it really helps when the professor is open to the feedback and the ideas from students and really apply their ideas! I told my friends about him and because of his endless care, they are all interested in applying for the course!! Also his passion is another story :) I can't describe the debates.

Open 2: What changes would improve your learning?

Having a more clear grading system on how the essays are graded rather than just how to write a philosophy paper.
Engaging the students more and have more debates that allow the students to exchange ideas
I might be able to understand the reading materials better if you could offer some reading questions to guide me when reading the materials. I like the group discussion occurs at the beginning of the semester, but we lost it later in the semester. You could set up worksheet of questions on topics that answered by the group together. And those should have points. being here does not equal to participation in class.
Maybe do one less essay since extensions were given so often. This would reduce extensions and give students more time to do each one. Also, do other small assignments for points instead of just 4 essays.
I would change how we read numerous articles about various ethical concepts and dilemmas in business, but did not use them all when we were to write our essays.
It would be more helpful to go into specific detail about four or five subjects and then used the knowledge we learned from them in four or five essays.
I would clarify the course a little bit. Professor Epstein was extremely knowledgeable and passionate about all of the topics in class. This was awesome, but he could not effectively transfer all of this knowledge to us, due to some of the complexity of the class.
Explanation of articles, some were difficult but for the most part you explained them.
More of the students talking.
Having more discussions and maybe Socratic seminars would be good for this course. Talking about the readings with a mix of visuals and Dr. Epstein's explanations would be better for me, only because that is the type of the learner I am. I learned the most when I was involved with the topic. I rated the course at a 5 for that reason.
Maybe do more group work (not necessary but may help or mix up classes)
Maybe just a few more class debates. We had some but I think if we had even 2 or 3 more the class would have really been able to get engaged with the material
More diverse and interactive activities in class.
Some quizzes to solidify information learned.
The professor listens to his students and cares for them, I believe he will know what to improve more than anyone else :)
More practice with the difference between an english paper and a philosophy paper.

STUDENT EVALUATION SUMMARIES

I thought overall the class went well and was taught very well

More clarity on how essays will be graded. Also maybe having a recap of each section to make sure each topic is nailed down for everyone.

The only change would be to help write papers better. Dr. Epstein did give feedback if we asked him, which was very helpful. I think if we learned to write about our arguments better, that would improve my learning.

Other activities, other than just talking about the readings.

STUDENT EVALUATION SUMMARIES

PHIL 106, Sec. 002: Introduction to Business Ethics (Pennsylvania State University)

Multiple Choice Questions:

Out of 7 points, 0 = lowest rating, 7 = highest rating, N/A offered as an option.

	Question:	% giving lowest rating	% giving highest rating	Mean Score:
A1.	Are you taking this course as an elective?	No: 8	Yes: 6	
A2.	What grade do you expect to earn in this course?	< A: 0%	A: 100%	
A3.	Rate the overall quality of this course.	0%	67%	6.24
A4.	Rate the overall quality of the instructor.	0%	86%	6.57
B1.	Rate the clarity of the instructor's presentations.	0%	76%	6.43
B2.	Rate the effectiveness of the examples used to clarify difficult concepts.	0%	67%	6.43
B3.	Rate the clarity of the instructor's explanations.	0%	67%	6.43
B4.	Rate the instructor's skill in using visual as well as verbal communication.	0%	71%	6.57
B5.	Rate the instructor's skill in relating course material to real life situations.	0%	75%	6.75
B6.	Rate the clarity of the examples used.	0%	81%	6.67
B8. ⁶	Rate the effectiveness of the instructor's definitions of terms, concepts, and principles.	0%	71%	6.48
B9.	Rate the effectiveness of the instructor's explanations of why certain processes, techniques, or formulas were used.	0%	71%	6.29
B10.	Rate the instructor's skill in handling students' questions and comments.	0%	71%	6.57
B11.	Rate the instructor's pacing of lectures and presentations to allow for note taking.	0%	86%	6.67
B12.	Rate the effectiveness of the instructor as a classroom leader.	5%	62%	6.14
B13.	Rate the effectiveness of the instructor as a speaker.	0%	67%	6.38
B14.	Rate the instructor's skill in organizing classroom activities.	5%	67%	6.33
B15.	Rate the instructor's skill in using a variety of teaching methods.	0%	62%	6.19
—	Rate this course in terms of how much you learned in it.	5%	52%	6.19

Open-Ended Items

Open 1: What helped you learn in this course?

The lectures coupled with the examples such as YouTube videos, readings, etc.

Organized material.

His down to earth personality and interest in the subject and our willingness to learn it.

One-on-one essay review and editing.

I learned how to make claims and arguments that are related to business ethics. In addition, his explanations and readings.

Readings, interactions with professor

⁶ Here for ease of reference I follow the numbering on Pennsylvania State University's official evaluation forms, which skips from B6 to B8.

STUDENT EVALUATION SUMMARIES

.Class discussions and homework assignments related to the essays.

The professor's feedback on assignments was very helpful. He also had very informative lectures that were well put together.

Dr. Epstein is very enthusiastic and always willing to help the students.

EVERYTHING. HE IS SO GOOD AT TEACHING

All of Eric's examples.

Open 2: What changes would improve your learning?

Maybe add more interactive learning in groups to further engage the students.

Provide more relevant examples Have students write a paragraph every month or so about how one specific topic that interests them in class and how it pertains to life today.

Maybe include the rubrics used for grading the essays.

Just because I care too much about the environment, I think it is better to ask the students to bring the readings with them instead of passing out printed copies. Personally, I prefer reading on my Ipad or laptop.

Not much.

Dr. Eric Epstein is the best professor in Penn State. He is simply amazing and always helps us if we had any questions. I went to his office hours and he was so helpful with his feedbacks regarding my essay. If I had the chance to take the course again, I would definitely do it if Professor Eric is teaching it.

Providing up to date essays.

More videos.

Less in-class reading.

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

Full Student Evaluations

A Note on Student Evaluations

“Puzzles & Paradoxes” (Fall 2010)

“Religion and Reason” (Spring 2011)

“Introduction to Philosophy” (Fall 2011)

“Ethics” (Spring 2012)

“Defining the Undefinable, Expressing the Inexpressible” (Fall 2013)

“Logic for Philosophy” (Fall 2014)

“Foundations of Mathematics” (Spring 2015)

“History of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict” (Fall 2015)

“Introduction to Philosophy and Critical Thinking” (Spring 2016)

“Marx, Nietzsche, Freud” (Fall 2016)

“Minds and Machines” (Spring 2017)

“Critical Thinking” (Fall 2017)

“Introduction to Business Ethics: Section 001” (Fall 2017)

“Introduction to Business Ethics: Section 002” (Fall 2017)



Cornell University
Sage School of Philosophy

Julia Markovits
Associate Professor
235 Goldwin Smith Hall
Ithaca, NY 14853-3201
t. (607) 255-3687
f. (607) 255-8177
markovits@cornell.edu

A Note on Student Evaluations

Unfortunately, the teaching assistant evaluation forms in use by the Cornell Department of Philosophy before Fall 2015 have the following flaw: they ask students to rate their graduate TAs on a scale of 1 to 5 across a number of categories (where 1 is the lowest and 5 the highest score) and then define the score of 3 as “neutral/not applicable.” This means that many of the 3-scores TAs received likely indicate not that the student evaluator felt her TA was mediocre in the relevant respect, but rather that she felt the category in question did not apply. (For example, maybe the question asked the student to evaluate her TA’s grading, but the TA was not the one grading her work; or maybe the question asked the student to evaluate the TA’s section performance, but the section was optional and the student did not attend.) As a result, these forms (and the mean scores calculated on the basis of them) likely undersell students’ actual evaluations of their TA’s teaching.

Of course, it is impossible to tell with certainty which 3-scores were intended to give mediocre evaluations and which were intended to indicate that the question was not applicable. To help offset the misleading effect of the flawed evaluation forms, some of Cornell’s job candidates may choose to provide two sets of average scores with their teaching evaluations: one that includes all of the 3-scores and one that includes none of them. The “real” score likely lies somewhere in between.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Julia Markovits".

Julia Markovits
Associate Professor of Philosophy
Placement Director

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

PUZZLES & PARADOXES

Fall 2010

Principal Instructor: Matti Eklund

Teaching Assistant: Eric Epstein

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY SECTION EVALUATION

Course Number: PHIL 2300

Term & year: Fall 2010

Section Leader's Name: Eric Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25% - 50%

☒ 50% - 75%

☐ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral/Not Applicable

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------|
| 1. | The teaching assistant was well prepared. | <u>3</u> |
| 2. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner | <u>2</u> |
| 3. | The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest | <u>4</u> |
| 4. | The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material | <u>4</u> |
| 5. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner | <u>3</u> |
| 6. | The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted | <u>4</u> |
| 7. | The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive | <u>4</u> |
| 8. | The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section | <u>-</u> |
| 9. | The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate | <u>3</u> |
| 10. | The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable | <u>3</u> |
| 11. | Overall, this section met my expectations | <u>4</u> |

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

Eric is really nice and approachable, I wouldn't be afraid to ask him for help

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

He also seems rather unorganized in his thought process at times, though he's gotten much better.

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

People aren't afraid to give their own opinions.

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

Math and science people dominated most conversations and made conversations hard to follow

**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
SECTION EVALUATION**

Course Number: PHIL2300

Term & year: FA10

Section Leader's Name: Eric Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25% - 50%

☐ 50% - 75%

☒ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral/Not Applicable

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------|
| 1. | The teaching assistant was well prepared. | <u>5</u> |
| 2. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner | <u>4</u> |
| 3. | The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest | <u>4</u> |
| 4. | The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material | <u>3</u> |
| 5. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner | <u>3</u> |
| 6. | The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted | <u>4</u> |
| 7. | The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive | <u>5</u> |
| 8. | The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section | <u>5</u> |
| 9. | The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate | <u>3</u> |
| 10. | The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable | <u>4</u> |
| 11. | Overall, this section met my expectations | <u>4</u> |

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

When discussion was in force, there was a flow among the students who contributed to class section. Also, it was a good opportunity for test reviews.

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

The organization seemed a bit ad hoc at times - I hope future sections begin w/ a few bullet points about what should be covered that day.

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

Patience to explain difficult concepts thoroughly.

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

I'd recommend not to get lost/swept up in the flow of discussion for him itself... remain in charge of the discussion.

**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
SECTION EVALUATION**

Course Number: 2306

Term & year: FA10

Section Leader's Name: ERIC EPSTEIN

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25% - 50%

☒ 50% - 75%

☐ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral/Not Applicable

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------|
| 1. | The teaching assistant was well prepared. | <u>4</u> |
| 2. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner | <u>4</u> |
| 3. | The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest | <u>4</u> |
| 4. | The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material | <u>4</u> |
| 5. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner | <u>4</u> |
| 6. | The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted | <u>5</u> |
| 7. | The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive | <u>4</u> |
| 8. | The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section | <u>4</u> |
| 9. | The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate | <u>4</u> |
| 10. | The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable | <u>4</u> |
| 11. | Overall, this section met my expectations | <u>4</u> |

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

RELAX ENVIRONMENT

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

NONE

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

THE TA IS RELAX BUT PASSIONATE

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

NONE

**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
SECTION EVALUATION**

Course Number: Phil 2300

Term & year: FALL 2010

Section Leader's Name: Eric Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25% - 50%

☐ 50% - 75%

☒ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral/Not Applicable

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------|
| 1. | The teaching assistant was well prepared. | <u>5</u> |
| 2. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner | <u>5</u> |
| 3. | The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest | <u>4</u> |
| 4. | The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material | <u>5</u> |
| 5. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner | <u>5</u> |
| 6. | The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted | <u>5</u> |
| 7. | The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive | <u>5</u> |
| 8. | The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section | <u>5</u> |
| 9. | The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate | <u>4</u> |
| 10. | The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable | <u>3</u> |
| 11. | Overall, this section met my expectations | <u>5</u> |

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

I enjoyed coming to section, because Eric In my opinion did a great job both presenter and teacher to encourage my interest

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

No I much of a weakness, I would love however having more review sessions

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

Open Personality and willingness to help

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

Just to be less nervous, ^{maybe} cause it's his first class that he teaches he really is doing a great job. I hope you'll let him know

**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
SECTION EVALUATION**

Course Number: PHIL 2300

Term & year: Fall 2010

Section Leader's Name: Eric Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25% - 50%

☐ 50% - 75%

☒ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral/Not Applicable

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------|
| 1. | The teaching assistant was well prepared. | <u>5</u> |
| 2. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner | <u>4</u> |
| 3. | The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest | <u>5</u> |
| 4. | The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material | <u>5</u> |
| 5. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner | <u>4</u> |
| 6. | The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted | <u>4</u> |
| 7. | The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive | <u>4</u> |
| 8. | The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section | <u>5</u> |
| 9. | The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate | <u>5</u> |
| 10. | The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable | <u>4</u> |
| 11. | Overall, this section met my expectations | <u>5</u> |

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

There were new, interesting ideas presented during discussions

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

Some subject matters were confusing and difficult to clarify

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

I enjoyed his enthusiasm about every topic

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

None, I was generally satisfied about the section

**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
SECTION EVALUATION**

Course Number: 2300

Term & year: F/2010

Section Leader's Name: Eric Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25% - 50%

☐ 50% - 75%

☒ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral/Not Applicable

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------|
| 1. | The teaching assistant was well prepared. | <u>5</u> |
| 2. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner | <u>5</u> |
| 3. | The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest | <u>5</u> |
| 4. | The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material | <u>5</u> |
| 5. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner | <u>5</u> |
| 6. | The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted | <u>4</u> |
| 7. | The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive | <u>4</u> |
| 8. | The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section | <u>5</u> |
| 9. | The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate | <u>5</u> |
| 10. | The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable | <u>3</u> |
| 11. | Overall, this section met my expectations | <u>5</u> |

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

good chance to review what lecture only reviewed

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

wish more

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

very helpful, tried to answer any & all questions

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

SECTION EVALUATION

Course Number: 2300

Term & year: F 10

Section Leader's Name: Eric Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25% - 50%

☐ 50% - 75%

☒ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral/Not Applicable

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------|
| 1. | The teaching assistant was well prepared. | <u>5</u> |
| 2. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner | <u>5</u> |
| 3. | The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest | <u>4</u> |
| 4. | The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material | <u>5</u> |
| 5. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner | <u>5</u> |
| 6. | The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted | <u>5</u> |
| 7. | The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive | <u>5</u> |
| 8. | The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section | <u>5</u> |
| 9. | The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate | <u>4</u> |
| 10. | The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable | <u>5</u> |
| 11. | Overall, this section met my expectations | <u>5</u> |

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

Usually good discussion of material that was not covered in class.

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

Attending did not help prepare for exams much since discussions were usually much further in depth and slightly off the topic from lecture

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

Good promotion of discussion

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

would have preferred a more structural section

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

SECTION EVALUATION

Course Number: 2300

Term & year: Fall 2010

Section Leader's Name: Eric Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25% - 50%

☐ 50% - 75%

☒ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral/Not Applicable

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------|
| 1. | The teaching assistant was well prepared. | <u>4</u> |
| 2. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner | <u>3</u> |
| 3. | The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest | <u>4</u> |
| 4. | The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material | <u>2</u> |
| 5. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner | <u>3</u> |
| 6. | The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted | <u>3</u> |
| 7. | The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive | <u>2</u> |
| 8. | The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section | <u>5</u> |
| 9. | The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate | <u>4</u> |
| 10. | The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable | <u>4</u> |
| 11. | Overall, this section met my expectations | <u>4</u> |

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

discussion of problems + paradoxes brought up in lecture helped us to gain better understanding of the arguments for each solution.

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

it was not always clear what points we were supposed to focus on for each paradox (i.e. what was expected of us on the tests)

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

encouraged + participated in discussion.

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

encourage the discussion / focus of the students to center on the most important arguments for each paradox.

**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
SECTION EVALUATION**

Course Number: Phil 2300

Term & year: F'10

Section Leader's Name: Eric

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25% - 50%

☐ 50% - 75%

☒ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral/Not Applicable

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------|
| 1. | The teaching assistant was well prepared. | <u>4</u> |
| 2. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner | <u>5</u> |
| 3. | The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest | <u>5</u> |
| 4. | The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material | <u>4</u> |
| 5. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner | <u>4</u> |
| 6. | The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted | <u>4</u> |
| 7. | The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive | <u>5</u> |
| 8. | The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section | <u>5</u> |
| 9. | The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate | <u>5</u> |
| 10. | The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable | <u>5</u> |
| 11. | Overall, this section met my expectations | <u>5</u> |

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

It was engaging. Mostly students discussed the paradoxes and problems found in them, making for really interesting discussions

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

Occasionally the discussions would be taken over by a few students but that is to be expected.

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

He seemed to want to learn from us

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

Nothing I can think of

20
1800

100

91

1

100

1

1

1

100

1

100

100

100

**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
SECTION EVALUATION**

Course Number: Phil 2300

Term & year: F10

Section Leader's Name: Eric

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25% - 50%

☐ 50% - 75%

☒ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral/Not Applicable

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------|
| 1. | The teaching assistant was well prepared. | <u>4</u> |
| 2. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner | <u>4</u> |
| 3. | The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest | <u>4</u> |
| 4. | The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material | <u>5</u> |
| 5. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner | <u>3</u> |
| 6. | The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted | <u>4</u> |
| 7. | The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive | <u>4</u> |
| 8. | The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section | <u>5</u> |
| 9. | The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate | <u>4</u> |
| 10. | The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable | <u>4</u> |
| 11. | Overall, this section met my expectations | <u>4</u> |

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

Eric was very good at helping us prepare for exams, and he did a good job of explaining the material.

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

Sometimes Eric talked a little too much rather than allowing the students to run the show.

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

See 12

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

See 13

**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
SECTION EVALUATION**

Course Number: 2300

Term & year: Fall '10

Section Leader's Name: Eric

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25% - 50%

☐ 50% - 75%

☒ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral/Not Applicable

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------|
| 1. | The teaching assistant was well prepared. | <u>4</u> |
| 2. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner | <u>5</u> |
| 3. | The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest | <u>5</u> |
| 4. | The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material | <u>5</u> |
| 5. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner | <u>4</u> |
| 6. | The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted | <u>3</u> |
| 7. | The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive | <u>5</u> |
| 8. | The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section | <u>3</u> |
| 9. | The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate | <u>4</u> |
| 10. | The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable | <u>5</u> |
| 11. | Overall, this section met my expectations | <u>5</u> |

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

Smaller setting makes it easier to have your question answered

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

More material to cover than time to cover it, especially, mid-semester unbalanced focus on some paradoxes over others

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

He spent a lot of time answering our questions and having discussions rather than lecturing us.

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

Less formal logic notation if it isn't going to be on tests

**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
SECTION EVALUATION**

Course Number: 2300

Term & year: Fall 10

Section Leader's Name: Eric Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25% - 50%

☐ 50% - 75%

☒ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral/Not Applicable

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------|
| 1. | The teaching assistant was well prepared. | <u>2</u> |
| 2. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner | <u>2</u> |
| 3. | The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest | <u>2</u> |
| 4. | The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material | <u>3</u> |
| 5. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner | <u>1</u> |
| 6. | The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted | <u>4</u> |
| 7. | The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive | <u>3</u> |
| 8. | The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section | <u>2</u> |
| 9. | The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate | <u>3</u> |
| 10. | The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable | <u>3</u> |
| 11. | Overall, this section met my expectations | <u>2</u> |

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

there were people who asked questions so the topic of conversation was always on what was learned in class

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

Things were not clarified really, just got maybe even more confusing or dull during section

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

He was nice and open to questions

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

Making sure he understands the material so can answer questions

**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
SECTION EVALUATION**

Course Number: 2300

Term & year: FALL

Section Leader's Name: Eric E.

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25% - 50%

☐ 50% - 75%

☒ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral/Not Applicable

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------|
| 1. | The teaching assistant was well prepared. | <u>4</u> |
| 2. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner | <u>4</u> |
| 3. | The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest | <u>3</u> |
| 4. | The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material | <u>3</u> |
| 5. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner | <u>2</u> |
| 6. | The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted | <u>3</u> |
| 7. | The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive | <u>2</u> |
| 8. | The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section | <u>4</u> |
| 9. | The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate | <u>3</u> |
| 10. | The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable | <u>3</u> |
| 11. | Overall, this section met my expectations | <u>3</u> |

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

Free to ask questions

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

Lots of wasted time and unnecessary discussions

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

Nice guy, and helpful through email

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

More organized presentation of material

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

SECTION EVALUATION

Course Number: PHIL 2300

Term & year: Fall 2010

Section Leader's Name: Eric

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25% - 50%

☐ 50% - 75%

☒ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral/Not Applicable

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------|
| 1. | The teaching assistant was well prepared. | <u>4</u> |
| 2. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner | <u>4</u> |
| 3. | The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest | <u>4</u> |
| 4. | The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material | <u>4</u> |
| 5. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner | <u>4</u> |
| 6. | The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted | <u>3</u> |
| 7. | The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive | <u>4</u> |
| 8. | The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section | <u>4</u> |
| 9. | The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate | <u>4</u> |
| 10. | The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable | <u>3</u> |
| 11. | Overall, this section met my expectations | <u>4</u> |

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

Very friendly atmosphere, easy to discuss issues.

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

Eric is sometimes a little "lost" when leading the section, should be a little more firm.

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

Friendly, easy to understand, makes sure we understand what he's talking about

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

Be more sure of himself when in section.

**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
SECTION EVALUATION**

Course Number: 2300

Term & year: Fall 2010

Section Leader's Name: Eric

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25% - 50%

☐ 50% - 75%

☒ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral/Not Applicable

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 1. | The teaching assistant was well prepared. | 4 |
| 2. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner | 4 |
| 3. | The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest | 2 |
| 4. | The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material | 4 |
| 5. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner | 3 |
| 6. | The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted | 3 |
| 7. | The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive | 3 |
| 8. | The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section | 4 |
| 9. | The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate | 4 |
| 10. | The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable | 2 |
| 11. | Overall, this section met my expectations | 3 |

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

Good time to ask and discuss questions.

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

Could be very boring at times.

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

Always willing to help and take the time to explain things thoroughly.

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

None

**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
SECTION EVALUATION**

Course Number: 2300 Term & year: FA 2010 Section Leader's Name: Eriz Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended

☐ 0-25% ☐ 25% - 50% ☐ 50% - 75% ☒ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Neutral/Not Applicable 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------|
| 1. | The teaching assistant was well prepared. | <u>5</u> |
| 2. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner | <u>5</u> |
| 3. | The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest | <u>5</u> |
| 4. | The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material | <u>5</u> |
| 5. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner | <u>5</u> |
| 6. | The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted | <u>5</u> |
| 7. | The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive | <u>3</u> |
| 8. | The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section | <u>5</u> |
| 9. | The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate | <u>5</u> |
| 10. | The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable | <u>5</u> |
| 11. | Overall, this section met my expectations | <u>5</u> |

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

The ability to propose and debate our own ideas

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

Nothing in particular, some of the topics were a bit dry for Friday morning

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

He was well-versed in all of the source material

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

He should speak with more confidence. He knows what he's doing.

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

SECTION EVALUATION

Course Number: 2300

Term & year: Fall 2010

Section Leader's Name: Eric

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25% - 50%

☐ 50% - 75%

☒ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral/Not Applicable

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------|
| 1. | The teaching assistant was well prepared. | <u>4</u> |
| 2. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner | <u>4</u> |
| 3. | The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest | <u>4</u> |
| 4. | The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material | <u>4</u> |
| 5. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner | <u>3</u> |
| 6. | The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted | <u>4</u> |
| 7. | The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive | <u>5</u> |
| 8. | The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section | <u>5</u> |
| 9. | The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate | <u>4</u> |
| 10. | The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable | <u>4</u> |
| 11. | Overall, this section met my expectations | <u>4</u> |

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

Good discussion of material presented during lecture

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

Could be more organized, felt like we jumped around a lot

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

Eager to help and explain

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

Some times explanations were a bit confusing. Understandable since topic were difficult

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

SECTION EVALUATION

Course Number: PHIL 2300

Term & year: F2010

Section Leader's Name: Eric Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25% - 50%

☒ 50% - 75%

☐ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral/Not Applicable

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

1. The teaching assistant was well prepared. 2
2. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner 3
3. The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest 2
4. The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material 4
5. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner 2
6. The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted 4
7. The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive 2
8. The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section 3
9. The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate 3
10. The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable 2
11. Overall, this section met my expectations 3

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

TA seemed unprepared

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

RELIGION & REASON

Spring 2011

Principal Instructor: Scott MacDonald

Teaching Assistant: Eric Epstein

**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
SECTION EVALUATION**

PHIL 2530

Course Number: RELST 2630

Term & year: spring 2011

Section Leader's Name: Eric Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25% - 50%

☐ 50% - 75%

☒ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral/Not Applicable

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------|
| 1. | The teaching assistant was well prepared. | <u>4</u> |
| 2. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner | <u>4</u> |
| 3. | The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest | <u>5</u> |
| 4. | The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material | <u>4</u> |
| 5. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner | <u>2</u> |
| 6. | The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted | <u>5</u> |
| 7. | The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive | <u>2</u> |
| 8. | The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section | <u>5</u> |
| 9. | The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate | <u>5</u> |
| 10. | The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable | <u>5</u> |
| 11. | Overall, this section met my expectations | <u>4</u> |

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

Very stimulating discussion in class, covers arguments well, Eric is ~~very~~ very good at

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

Class was slightly disorganized - Eric is very scatterbrained, prone to going off on tangents. Eric is also not always prepared and slightly disorganized.

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

Eric is very enthusiastic and asks the right questions to stimulate discussion. He makes class fun and has a good sense of humour.

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

more organized and prepared for class

**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
SECTION EVALUATION**

Course Number: 2530

Term & year: Spring

Section Leader's Name: Eric Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25% - 50%

☐ 50% - 75%

☒ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral/Not Applicable

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | |
|-----|---|-----------|
| 1. | The teaching assistant was well prepared. | <u>5</u> |
| 2. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner | <u>4</u> |
| 3. | The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest | <u>5</u> |
| 4. | The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material | <u>3</u> |
| 5. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner | <u>4</u> |
| 6. | The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted | <u>1</u> |
| 7. | The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive | <u>2</u> |
| 8. | The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section | <u>4</u> |
| 9. | The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate | <u>5</u> |
| 10. | The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable | <u>5</u> |
| 11. | Overall, this section met my expectations | <u>11</u> |

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

Eric allowed as much open discussion/debate as possible, even on topics not specifically in the readings & lectures.

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
SECTION EVALUATION**

Course Number: 2530

Term & year: Spring 2011

Section Leader's Name: Eric Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25% - 50%

☐ 50% - 75%

☒ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral/Not Applicable

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------|
| 1. | The teaching assistant was well prepared. | <u>2</u> |
| 2. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner | <u>3</u> |
| 3. | The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest | <u>4</u> |
| 4. | The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material | <u>5</u> |
| 5. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner | <u>3</u> |
| 6. | The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted | <u>1</u> |
| 7. | The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive | <u>2</u> |
| 8. | The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section | <u>5</u> |
| 9. | The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate | <u>5</u> |
| 10. | The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable | <u>5</u> |
| 11. | Overall, this section met my expectations | <u>3</u> |

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

allowed for open discussion, helped students, open to meet

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

Not so prepared sometimes.

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

helped students, allowed for discussion which was great, clearly laid out arguments

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

reading the material that is expected of the students to read. Grade more fair! This isn't Oxford!

**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
SECTION EVALUATION**

Course Number: phil 2570

Term & year: Soph 2013

Section Leader's Name: Erik Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25% - 50%

☐ 50% - 75%

☒ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral/Not Applicable

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------|
| 1. | The teaching assistant was well prepared. | <u>4</u> |
| 2. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner | <u>4</u> |
| 3. | The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest | <u>3</u> |
| 4. | The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material | <u>4</u> |
| 5. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner | <u>4</u> |
| 6. | The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted | <u>1</u> |
| 7. | The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive | <u>2</u> |
| 8. | The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section | <u>5</u> |
| 9. | The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate | <u>4</u> |
| 10. | The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable | <u>4</u> |
| 11. | Overall, this section met my expectations | <u>4</u> |

off the charts adequate!!!

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

TA was very receptive to discussion and encouraged discussion

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

Some proofs were hard to understand

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

See 12

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

Perhaps trying to more clearly explain proofs

**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
SECTION EVALUATION**

Course Number: PHIL 2530

Term & year: Spring 11

Section Leader's Name: E Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended:

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25% - 50%

☐ 50% - 75%

☒ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral/Not Applicable

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------|
| 1. | The teaching assistant was well prepared. | <u>4</u> |
| 2. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner | <u>4</u> |
| 3. | The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest | <u>4</u> |
| 4. | The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material | <u>4</u> |
| 5. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner | <u>4</u> |
| 6. | The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted | <u>2</u> |
| 7. | The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive | <u>3</u> |
| 8. | The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section | <u>5</u> |
| 9. | The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate | <u>5</u> |
| 10. | The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable | <u>2</u> |
| 11. | Overall, this section met my expectations | <u>4</u> |

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

Light hearted attitude. Happy conversation

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

We would digress ALOT!

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

Enthusiasm

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

More control over what we are talking about - Stick to what was read and discussed in class

**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
SECTION EVALUATION**

Course Number: PHIL 2530

Term & year: 2nd, 2011

Section Leader's Name: Eric Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25% - 50%

☐ 50% - 75%

☒ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral/Not Applicable

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------|
| 1. | The teaching assistant was well prepared. | <u>2</u> |
| 2. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner | <u>4</u> |
| 3. | The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest | <u>2</u> |
| 4. | The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material | <u>4</u> |
| 5. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner | <u>2</u> |
| 6. | The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted | <u>2</u> |
| 7. | The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive | <u>4</u> |
| 8. | The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section | <u>4</u> |
| 9. | The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate | <u>4</u> |
| 10. | The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable | <u>2</u> |
| 11. | Overall, this section met my expectations | <u>2</u> |

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

He was very enthusiastic

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

We discussed minute details for too long

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

He was so enthusiastic w/ the material and was very responsive outside of class

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

maybe prepare a little more what to teach

**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
SECTION EVALUATION**

Course Number: 2530

Term & year: _____

ENC
Section Leader's Name: Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25% - 50%

☐ 50% - 75%

☒ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral/Not Applicable

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------|
| 1. | The teaching assistant was well prepared. | <u>4</u> |
| 2. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner | <u>2</u> |
| 3. | The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest | <u>3</u> |
| 4. | The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material | <u>2</u> |
| 5. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner | <u>2</u> |
| 6. | The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted | <u>3</u> |
| 7. | The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive | <u>3</u> |
| 8. | The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section | <u>3</u> |
| 9. | The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate | <u>3</u> |
| 10. | The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable | <u>2</u> |
| 11. | Overall, this section met my expectations | <u>2</u> |

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

digression from discussing the topic.

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

Tend to digress a lot in section, so try to stay focused

**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
SECTION EVALUATION**

Course Number: 2530

Term & year: Spring 11

Section Leader's Name: Eric Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25% - 50%

☐ 50% - 75%

☒ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral/Not Applicable

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------|
| 1. | The teaching assistant was well prepared. | <u>5</u> |
| 2. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner | <u>5</u> |
| 3. | The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest | <u>5</u> |
| 4. | The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material | <u>4</u> |
| 5. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner | <u>3</u> |
| 6. | The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted | <u>3</u> |
| 7. | The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive | <u>4</u> |
| 8. | The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section | <u>4</u> |
| 9. | The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate | <u>4</u> |
| 10. | The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable | <u>4</u> |
| 11. | Overall, this section met my expectations | <u>4</u> |

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

Good people in section

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

Kind of disorganized...

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

disorganized, very hard grader Very easy to approach, enthusiastic

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

better organized, more to easier grading

**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
SECTION EVALUATION**

Course Number: Phil 2530

Term & year: ~~2010~~ 2011 Spring

Section Leader's Name: Eric Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25% - 50%

☐ 50% - 75%

☒ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral/Not Applicable

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | |
|-----|---|-------------------------|
| 1. | The teaching assistant was well prepared. | <u>4.5</u> |
| 2. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner | <u>4.5</u> |
| 3. | The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest | <u>5</u> |
| 4. | The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material | <u>4</u> |
| 5. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner | <u>4</u> |
| 6. | The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted | 4 <u>3.5</u> |
| 7. | The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive | <u>5</u> |
| 8. | The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section | <u>5</u> |
| 9. | The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate | <u>5</u> |
| 10. | The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable | <u>5</u> |
| 11. | Overall, this section met my expectations | <u>5</u> |

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

Eric was very involved & responsive to students. Also very attentive to students and did a great job getting everyone involved.

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

~~Not sure~~ Not sure Eric had much of a background for this. I feel like the grading was a little harsh for a 200-level.

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

Energetic and understanding

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

None really; he was good Thanks!

**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
SECTION EVALUATION**

Course Number: Phil 2530

Term & year: Sp 2011

Section Leader's Name: Eric Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25% - 50%

☐ 50% - 75%

☒ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral/Not Applicable

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------|
| 1. | The teaching assistant was well prepared. | <u>4</u> |
| 2. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner | <u>3</u> |
| 3. | The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest | <u>4</u> |
| 4. | The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material | <u>3</u> |
| 5. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner | <u>3</u> |
| 6. | The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted | <u>3</u> |
| 7. | The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive | <u>4</u> |
| 8. | The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section | <u>5</u> |
| 9. | The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate | <u>5</u> |
| 10. | The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable | <u>4</u> |
| 11. | Overall, this section met my expectations | <u>4</u> |

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
SECTION EVALUATION**

Course Number: REIST 2630

Term & year: Spring 2011

Section Leader's Name: Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25% - 50%

☐ 50% - 75%

☒ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral/Not Applicable

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------|
| 1. | The teaching assistant was well prepared. | <u>5</u> |
| 2. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner | <u>5</u> |
| 3. | The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest | <u>5</u> |
| 4. | The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material | <u>5</u> |
| 5. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner | <u>5</u> |
| 6. | The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted | <u>3</u> |
| 7. | The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive | <u>5</u> |
| 8. | The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section | <u>5</u> |
| 9. | The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate | <u>5</u> |
| 10. | The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable | <u>5</u> |
| 11. | Overall, this section met my expectations | <u>5</u> |

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

Enlightening conversation

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

NA

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

Excited to teach

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

More command

**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
SECTION EVALUATION**

Course Number: Phil 2630

Term & year: SPR 2011

Section Leader's Name: Eric Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25% - 50%

☐ 50% - 75%

☒ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral/Not Applicable

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------|
| 1. | The teaching assistant was well prepared. | <u>5</u> |
| 2. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner | <u>4</u> |
| 3. | The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest | <u>5</u> |
| 4. | The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material | <u>5</u> |
| 5. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner | <u>3</u> |
| 6. | The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted | <u>3</u> |
| 7. | The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive | <u>2</u> |
| 8. | The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section | <u>3</u> |
| 9. | The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate | <u>5</u> |
| 10. | The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable | <u>4</u> |
| 11. | Overall, this section met my expectations | <u>4</u> |

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

The material was presented in a manner that facilitated interesting discussion

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

We sometimes went off on tangents that really had almost nothing to do with the current topic but they were still relevant to the course topic

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

He knows what he's doing as a TA

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
SECTION EVALUATION**

Course Number: Phil 2530

Term & year: Sp 2011

Section Leader's Name: Eric Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25% - 50%

☐ 50% - 75%

☒ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral/Not Applicable

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------|
| 1. | The teaching assistant was well prepared. | <u>5</u> |
| 2. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner | <u>5</u> |
| 3. | The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest | <u>5</u> |
| 4. | The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material | <u>5</u> |
| 5. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner | <u>4</u> |
| 6. | The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted | <u>2</u> |
| 7. | The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive | <u>5</u> |
| 8. | The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section | <u>5</u> |
| 9. | The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate | <u>5</u> |
| 10. | The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable | <u>5</u> |
| 11. | Overall, this section met my expectations | <u>5</u> |

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

Enjoyable, lively discussions very on point with lecture. I gained a lot from this section. The TA was excellent.

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

I think the SAE grades were somewhat harsh. That's really the only weakness I can think of.

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

I think he was really good at working with students' ideas

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

I really thought it was ideal: informative but interesting. I never thought I'd be bored until just now, but I never came anywhere near falling asleep in section which is more than I can say for 99% of my courses here.

**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
SECTION EVALUATION**

Course Number: Phil 2530

Term & year: Spring 11

Section Leader's Name: Eric E

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25% - 50%

☐ 50% - 75%

☒ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral/Not Applicable

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | |
|-----|---|-------|
| 1. | The teaching assistant was well prepared. | 4 |
| 2. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner | 2 |
| 3. | The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest | 3 |
| 4. | The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material | 4 |
| 5. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner | 4 |
| 6. | The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted | 1 !!! |
| 7. | The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive | 3 |
| 8. | The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section | 5 |
| 9. | The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate | 5 |
| 10. | The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable | 1 |
| 11. | Overall, this section met my expectations | 2 |

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

discussion, ~~lots~~ Eric facilitated a generous amount of discussion, and it was not uncommon for the whole section to be passionately engaged in a topic.

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

While discussions were engaging, they also strayed frequently into bizarre tangents. Also, he seemed to lack a commanding hold on the subject matter.

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

Eric was incredibly approachable and was always open to talk with. I have no doubt that he'll make a very inviting and enjoyable professor.

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

Grades were very unfair and ~~not~~ unreasonable for undergraduates with little or no previous experience. Also, provide more structure.

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

INTRODUCTION TO PHILOSOPHY

Fall 2011

Principal Instructor: Nicholas Silins

Teaching Assistant: Eric Epstein

**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
SECTION EVALUATION**

Course Number: Phil. 11

Term & year: 7th

Section Leader's Name: Eric Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25% - 50%

☐ 50% - 75%

☐ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral/Not Applicable

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------|
| 1. | The teaching assistant was well prepared. | <u>5</u> |
| 2. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner | <u>5</u> |
| 3. | The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest | <u>5</u> |
| 4. | The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material | <u>4</u> |
| 5. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner | <u>4</u> |
| 6. | The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted | <u>5</u> |
| 7. | The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive | <u>5</u> |
| 8. | The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section | <u>5</u> |
| 9. | The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate | <u>5</u> |
| 10. | The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable | <u>5</u> |
| 11. | Overall, this section met my expectations | <u>5</u> |

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

The TA elicited conversational interest, engaging all by dispersing speaking opportunities equitably, and always making the core content of course clear.

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

The length was a bit brief...

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

He conducted conversation well, highlighting all details of course material very clearly.

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

Longer reading opportunity.

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

SECTION EVALUATION

Course Number: 1100

Term & year: Fall 2011

Section Leader's Name: Eve Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25% - 50%

☐ 50% - 75%

☒ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral/Not Applicable

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------|
| 1. | The teaching assistant was well prepared. | <u>5</u> |
| 2. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner | <u>5</u> |
| 3. | The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest | <u>5</u> |
| 4. | The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material | <u>5</u> |
| 5. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner | <u>4</u> |
| 6. | The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted | <u>5</u> |
| 7. | The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive | <u>5</u> |
| 8. | The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section | <u>5</u> |
| 9. | The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate | <u>4</u> |
| 10. | The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable | <u>4</u> |
| 11. | Overall, this section met my expectations | <u>5</u> |

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

The major strengths of this section were that the TA was always ~~prepared~~ ^{prepared}, gave very helpful feedback and clear instructions on what to write, and led an interesting discussion.

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

The only real weakness that ~~needed improvement~~ was that there wasn't enough discussion.

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

I liked the format of the discussion and the way he started to cover material.

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

I would just make the class slightly more discussion based.

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

SECTION EVALUATION

Course Number: Phil 1100

Term & year: 2011 Sem 1

Section Leader's Name: Eric Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25% - 50%

☐ 50% - 75%

☒ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral/Not Applicable

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------|
| 1. | The teaching assistant was well prepared. | <u>5</u> |
| 2. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner | <u>4</u> |
| 3. | The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest | <u>4</u> |
| 4. | The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material | <u>5</u> |
| 5. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner | <u>3</u> |
| 6. | The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted | <u>4</u> |
| 7. | The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive | <u>4</u> |
| 8. | The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section | <u>4</u> |
| 9. | The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate | <u>5</u> |
| 10. | The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable | <u>4</u> |
| 11. | Overall, this section met my expectations | <u>4</u> |

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

~~See~~ There was a variety of discussion which was relevant to the lesson.
He was helpful with grading.

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

There was less structure than I would normally like. However,
I believe this reflects the spontaneity of philosophy in general.

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

Eric was very friendly and seemed like he legitimately wanted us to
learn philosophy. He tried and succeeded in engaging with the students.

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

Try to engage each one of the students. If students are quiet,
I would try to help them speak.

**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
SECTION EVALUATION**

Course Number: 1100

Term & year: _____

Section Leader's Name: Eric Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25% - 50%

☐ 50% - 75%

☒ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral/Not Applicable

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | |
|-----|---|-------------|
| 1. | The teaching assistant was well prepared. | <u>5</u> |
| 2. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner | <u>5</u> |
| 3. | The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest | <u>5</u> |
| 4. | The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material | <u>4</u> |
| 5. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner | <u>5</u> |
| 6. | The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted | <u>5</u> |
| 7. | The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive | <u>5</u> |
| 8. | The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section | <u>5 !!</u> |
| 9. | The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate | <u>5</u> |
| 10. | The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable | <u>5</u> |
| 11. | Overall, this section met my expectations | <u>5</u> |

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

TA was flexible in class with new ideas for discussion. He was also flexible and quick to meet outside of class.

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

Sometimes discussions took too much time and we couldn't review enough. I think the discussion should be made longer.

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

He was always enthusiastically caring if we learned and were successful and the class was fun to be in.

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

Change nothing, except for class length.

**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
SECTION EVALUATION**

Course Number: 1100

Term & year: FALL 2011

Section Leader's Name: ERIC EPSTEIN

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25% - 50%

☒ 50% - 75%

☐ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral/Not Applicable

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------|
| 1. | The teaching assistant was well prepared. | <u>5</u> |
| 2. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner | <u>5</u> |
| 3. | The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest | <u>5</u> |
| 4. | The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material | <u>5</u> |
| 5. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner | <u>5</u> |
| 6. | The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted | <u>5</u> |
| 7. | The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive | <u>5</u> |
| 8. | The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section | <u>5</u> |
| 9. | The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate | <u>5</u> |
| 10. | The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable | <u>5</u> |
| 11. | Overall, this section met my expectations | <u>5</u> |

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

Eric clearly instructed the most important topics to be discussed on each week.

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

—

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

Thorough explanation of all the abstract points and ideas

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

—

**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
SECTION EVALUATION**

Course Number: 1100

Term & year: Fall 2011

Section Leader's Name: Eric Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25% - 50%

☐ 50% - 75%

☒ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral/Not Applicable

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------|
| 1. | The teaching assistant was well prepared. | <u>4</u> |
| 2. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner | <u>4</u> |
| 3. | The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest | <u>3</u> |
| 4. | The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material | <u>4</u> |
| 5. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner | <u>4</u> |
| 6. | The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted | <u>3</u> |
| 7. | The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive | <u>3</u> |
| 8. | The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section | <u>4</u> |
| 9. | The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate | <u>4</u> |
| 10. | The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable | <u>4</u> |
| 11. | Overall, this section met my expectations | <u>3</u> |

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

discussed readings in detail that we normally would not have discussed in class

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

didn't discuss what was expected in the papers

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

Ability to initiate a good student discussion

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

individual meetings that could help us better understand the evaluations/not going over time

**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
SECTION EVALUATION**

Course Number: PHIL 1100

Term & year: Fall 2011

Section Leader's Name: Eric Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25% - 50%

☐ 50% - 75%

☒ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral/Not Applicable

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------|
| 1. | The teaching assistant was well prepared. | <u>5</u> |
| 2. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner | <u>4</u> |
| 3. | The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest | <u>5</u> |
| 4. | The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material | <u>4</u> |
| 5. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner | <u>4</u> |
| 6. | The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted | <u>4</u> |
| 7. | The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive | <u>4</u> |
| 8. | The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section | <u>5</u> |
| 9. | The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate | <u>5</u> |
| 10. | The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable | <u>5</u> |
| 11. | Overall, this section met my expectations | <u>5</u> |

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

Good discussion with good viewpoints and participation.

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

—

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

Summarizing viewpoints, facilitating discussion.

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

Write out a summary of viewpoints on the board before beginning discussion to allow reference to content that needs to be learnt/covered.

**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
SECTION EVALUATION**

Course Number: Phil 1100

Term & year: F/2011

Section Leader's Name: Eric Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25% - 50%

☐ 50% - 75%

☒ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral/Not Applicable

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 1. | The teaching assistant was well prepared. | 5 |
| 2. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner | 5 |
| 3. | The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest | 5 |
| 4. | The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material | 4 |
| 5. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner | 4 |
| 6. | The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted | 4 |
| 7. | The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive | 4 |
| 8. | The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section | 4 |
| 9. | The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate | 5 |
| 10. | The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable | 5 |
| 11. | Overall, this section met my expectations | 5 |

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

Good preparation & provoking questions

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

Lost time trying to link ideas/shift topics

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

Help with wording ideas Provoking Questions

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

None

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

SECTION EVALUATION

Course Number: 1100

Term & year: Fall 2011

Section Leader's Name: Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25% - 50%

☐ 50% - 75%

☒ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral/Not Applicable

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------|
| 1. | The teaching assistant was well prepared. | <u>3</u> |
| 2. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner | <u>3</u> |
| 3. | The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest | <u>4</u> |
| 4. | The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material | <u>3</u> |
| 5. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner | <u>4</u> |
| 6. | The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted | <u>4</u> |
| 7. | The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive | <u>3</u> |
| 8. | The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section | <u>4</u> |
| 9. | The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate | <u>3</u> |
| 10. | The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable | <u>3</u> |
| 11. | Overall, this section met my expectations | <u>4</u> |

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

*lots of discussion.
• an effectively run discussion*

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

sometimes people didn't talk as much during discussion

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

*liked how approachable he was
tried to answer everybody's questions
also put his own perspective when discussing as well as giving objective arguments*

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

maybe a little more confidence in his speaking

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

SECTION EVALUATION

Course Number: Phil 1101

Term & year: Fall 2011

Section Leader's Name: Eric Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25% - 50%

☐ 50% - 75%

☒ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral/Not Applicable

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | |
|-----|---|-------------------|
| 1. | The teaching assistant was well prepared. | <u>3</u> |
| 2. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner | <u>5</u> |
| 3. | The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest | <u>4</u> |
| 4. | The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material | <u>4</u> |
| 5. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner | <u>4</u> |
| 6. | The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted | <u>4</u> <u>5</u> |
| 7. | The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive | <u>5</u> |
| 8. | The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section | <u>5</u> |
| 9. | The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate | <u>5</u> |
| 10. | The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable | <u>4</u> |
| 11. | Overall, this section met my expectations | <u>5</u> |

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

Definitely covered most issues w/ any philosophical questions.

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

At times a little hard to keep track of the discussion.

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

I thought he did a job of facilitating debate and involving most people in the section.

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

N/A

**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
SECTION EVALUATION**

Course Number: 1100

Term & year: F'11

Section Leader's Name: Eric Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25% - 50%

☐ 50% - 75%

☒ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral/Not Applicable

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------|
| 1. | The teaching assistant was well prepared. | <u>5</u> |
| 2. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner | <u>5</u> |
| 3. | The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest | <u>4</u> |
| 4. | The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material | <u>4</u> |
| 5. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner | <u>4</u> |
| 6. | The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted | <u>3</u> |
| 7. | The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive | <u>4</u> |
| 8. | The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section | <u>5</u> |
| 9. | The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate | <u>5</u> |
| 10. | The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable | <u>5</u> |
| 11. | Overall, this section met my expectations | <u>4</u> |

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

reviewing material

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

Sometimes, the fundamental ideas of certain philosophical schools of thought were not explained (i.e. we discussed the impacts/consequences re: utilitarianism, but didn't review the definition of it clearly)

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
SECTION EVALUATION**

Course Number: Phi 1100

Term & year: Fall 2011

Section Leader's Name: Eric Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25% - 50%

☐ 50% - 75%

☒ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral/Not Applicable

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------|
| 1. | The teaching assistant was well prepared. | <u>4</u> |
| 2. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner | <u>4</u> |
| 3. | The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest | <u>4</u> |
| 4. | The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material | <u>4</u> |
| 5. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner | <u>4</u> |
| 6. | The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted | <u>4</u> |
| 7. | The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive | <u>5</u> |
| 8. | The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section | <u>5</u> |
| 9. | The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate | <u>5</u> |
| 10. | The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable | <u>5</u> |
| 11. | Overall, this section met my expectations | <u>4</u> |

12. What were the major strengths of this section? Being able to discuss certain arguments

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section? N/A

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like? Seemed to have a genuine interest in the subject matter and engaged students

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend? Just have a more thorough plan, not jump from one idea to the next and build again

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

ETHICS

Spring 2012

Principal Instructor: Nicholas Sturgeon

Teaching Assistant: Eric Epstein

**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
SECTION EVALUATION**

Course Number: 2410

Term & year: Spring 2012

Section Leader's Name: Eric Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25% - 50%

☐ 50% - 75%

☒ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral/Not Applicable

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------|
| 1. | The teaching assistant was well prepared. | <u>4</u> |
| 2. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner | <u>4</u> |
| 3. | The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest | <u>5</u> |
| 4. | The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material | <u>1</u> |
| 5. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner | <u>3</u> |
| 6. | The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted | <u>4</u> |
| 7. | The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive | <u>4</u> |
| 8. | The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section | <u>5</u> |
| 9. | The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate | <u>5</u> |
| 10. | The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable | <u>5</u> |
| 11. | Overall, this section met my expectations | <u>5</u> |

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

Being able to actually discuss and critique the material instead of just going over it; student discussion.

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

Being limited to answering the Discussion Questions asked by the professor.

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

How he addressed individual points made by students, was open to new ideas/approaches.

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

Since lecture covers all the material and the professor is very thorough, discussion sections shouldn't be used to go over/explain the material another time. They should be entirely about discussing the ideas presented in lecture, unless people have questions.

**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
SECTION EVALUATION**

Course Number: 2410

Term & year: SP2012

Section Leader's Name: Eric Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25% - 50%

☐ 50% - 75%

☒ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral/Not Applicable

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | |
|-----|---|------------|
| 1. | The teaching assistant was well prepared. | <u>1</u> |
| 2. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner | <u>1</u> |
| 3. | The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest | <u>1</u> |
| 4. | The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material | <u>2</u> |
| 5. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner | <u>1 2</u> |
| 6. | The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted | <u>1</u> |
| 7. | The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive | <u>2</u> |
| 8. | The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section | <u>3</u> |
| 9. | The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate | <u>4</u> |
| 10. | The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable | <u>3</u> |
| 11. | Overall, this section met my expectations | <u>1</u> |

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

When there was another TA who had to fill in

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

TA (Eric) extremely unorganized & confusing. Didn't seem to have any knowledge that helped to clarify material

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

None

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

Be more prepared: Practice section beforehand. NO CLARITY in sections. TA made it confusing & painful.

**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
SECTION EVALUATION**

Course Number: 2410

Term & year: Spring 2012 Section Leader's Name: Eric Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25% - 50%

☐ 50% - 75%

☒ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral/Not Applicable

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------|
| 1. | The teaching assistant was well prepared. | <u>3</u> |
| 2. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner | <u>3</u> |
| 3. | The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest | <u>4</u> |
| 4. | The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material | <u>3</u> |
| 5. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner | <u>3</u> |
| 6. | The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted | <u>5</u> |
| 7. | The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive | <u>2</u> |
| 8. | The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section | <u>3</u> |
| 9. | The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate | <u>4</u> |
| 10. | The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable | <u>5</u> |
| 11. | Overall, this section met my expectations | <u>4</u> |

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

good student disoussion

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

TA was often confusing and stumbling through arguments

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

His sense of humor

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

A better command of the material and more confidence in his ability

**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
SECTION EVALUATION**

Course Number: 2410

Term & year: Spring 2012 Section Leader's Name: Eric Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25% - 50%

☐ 50% - 75%

☒ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral/Not Applicable

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------|
| 1. | The teaching assistant was well prepared. | <u>3</u> |
| 2. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner | <u>1</u> |
| 3. | The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest | <u>2</u> |
| 4. | The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material | <u>2</u> |
| 5. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner | <u>1</u> |
| 6. | The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted | <u>4</u> |
| 7. | The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive | <u>3</u> |
| 8. | The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section | <u>5</u> |
| 9. | The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate | <u>3</u> |
| 10. | The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable | <u>4</u> |
| 11. | Overall, this section met my expectations | <u>2</u> |

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

Flexibility to spend time on tangents during discussion

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

Did not follow a logical order/pattern. Could do more to review concepts from class. Overall, not incredibly engaging

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

Eric was enthusiastic & genuinely cared that students shared his interest.

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

Try to stick to a more structured plan & ~~keep~~ budget time based on importance of topics to cover. A lot of times we went over the allotted time.

**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
SECTION EVALUATION**

Course Number: PHIL 240

Term & year: SP12

Section Leader's Name: Eric

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25% - 50%

☐ 50% - 75%

☒ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral/Not Applicable

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------|
| 1. | The teaching assistant was well prepared. | <u>4</u> |
| 2. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner | <u>4</u> |
| 3. | The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest | <u>4</u> |
| 4. | The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material | <u>3</u> |
| 5. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner | <u>4</u> |
| 6. | The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted | <u>5</u> |
| 7. | The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive | <u>5</u> |
| 8. | The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section | <u>5</u> |
| 9. | The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate | <u>4</u> |
| 10. | The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable | <u>3</u> |
| 11. | Overall, this section met my expectations | <u>4</u> |

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

Good to have a somewhat interactive component to the course.

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

The physical structure of the room was not at all conducive to discussion. I also feel it would have been better with a few more students and some more open ended questions.

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

well prepared and seemed knowledgeable.

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

Too easily. Should try to move past striking points a bit quicker.

**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
SECTION EVALUATION**

Course Number: Phil 2410 Term & year: SP 12 Section Leader's Name: Eric

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended

☐ 0-25% ☐ 25% - 50% ☐ 50% - 75% ☒ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Neutral/Not Applicable 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------|
| 1. | The teaching assistant was well prepared. | <u>5</u> |
| 2. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner | <u>4</u> |
| 3. | The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest | <u>4</u> |
| 4. | The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material | <u>5</u> |
| 5. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner | <u>4</u> |
| 6. | The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted | <u>4</u> |
| 7. | The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive | <u>5</u> |
| 8. | The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section | <u>5</u> |
| 9. | The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate | <u>4</u> |
| 10. | The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable | <u>4</u> |
| 11. | Overall, this section met my expectations | <u>4</u> |

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

TA is well prepared and encourages questions

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

Class discussions sometimes get carried away and sometimes we stuck on a question for too long.

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

He is very willing to answer questions and to take advice from students as to how the class discussion should proceed

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

He should make ~~more~~ efforts to keep discussion focused on the main point rather than spending a lot of time on peripheral issues that either he or the students brought up.

**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
SECTION EVALUATION**

Course Number: 2140

Term & year: S 2012

Section Leader's Name: Eric

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25% - 50%

☐ 50% - 75%

☒ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral/Not Applicable

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

1.	The teaching assistant was well prepared.	<u>5</u>
2.	The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner	<u>3</u>
3.	The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest	<u>3</u>
4.	The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material	<u>5</u>
5.	The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner	<u>2</u>
6.	The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted	<u>5</u>
7.	The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive	<u>5</u>
8.	The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section	<u>5</u>
9.	The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate	<u>5</u>
10.	The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable	<u>2</u>
11.	Overall, this section met my expectations	<u>4</u>

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

Made sure to explain the difficult ideas! ☺

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

I think a lot of people didn't come prepared,
so sometimes group discussion was hard.

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

The TA was very kind and enthusiastic. He always
seemed genuinely interested in helping.

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
SECTION EVALUATION**

Course Number: 2410

Term & year: 2012
2nd
semester

Section Leader's Name: Eric Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25% - 50%

☐ 50% - 75%

☐ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral/Not Applicable

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------|
| 1. | The teaching assistant was well prepared. | <u>4</u> |
| 2. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner | <u>3</u> |
| 3. | The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest | <u>2</u> |
| 4. | The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material | <u>4</u> |
| 5. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner | <u>2</u> |
| 6. | The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted | <u>5</u> |
| 7. | The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive | <u>5</u> |
| 8. | The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section | <u>5</u> |
| 9. | The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate | <u>2</u> |
| 10. | The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable | <u>3</u> |
| 11. | Overall, this section met my expectations | <u>3</u> |

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

The major strengths were that we discussed valuable material that was going to be on quizzes and papers.

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

there were many instances of dead silence and a lack of fruitful discussion being generated.

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

Eric was very kind and very approachable in case you needed help. He helped me through many assignments, and I wouldn't be where I am without him!

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

Be more confident! And prepare a bit more before class if you can.

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
SECTION EVALUATION

PHIL
Course Number: 2416

Term & year: Sp '12

Section Leader's Name: ERIC EASTMAN

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25% - 50%

☐ 50% - 75%

☒ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral/Not Applicable

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------|
| 1. | The teaching assistant was well prepared. | <u>2</u> |
| 2. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner | <u>2</u> |
| 3. | The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest | <u>4</u> |
| 4. | The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material | <u>3</u> |
| 5. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner | <u>2</u> |
| 6. | The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted | <u>4</u> |
| 7. | The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive | <u>4</u> |
| 8. | The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section | <u>4</u> |
| 9. | The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate | <u>4</u> |
| 10. | The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable | <u>4</u> |
| 11. | Overall, this section met my expectations | <u>2</u> |

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

Student input, depth of discussion

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

Organization, clarity of TA's descriptions, accuracy of TA's descriptions.

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

Willingness to engage on specifics.

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

More organization of topics & subtopics. Needs to explain the relevance of topical discussions to overall shape of the debate; this was VERY rarely made clear.

**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
SECTION EVALUATION**

Course Number: 2410

Term & year: Spring 2012 Section Leader's Name: Eric Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended.

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25% - 50%

☐ 50% - 75%

☒ 75% - 100%

RATING SCALE

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral/Not Applicable

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------|
| 1. | The teaching assistant was well prepared. | <u>4</u> |
| 2. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner | <u>3</u> |
| 3. | The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest | <u>3</u> |
| 4. | The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material | <u>2</u> |
| 5. | The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner | <u>2</u> |
| 6. | The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted | <u>4</u> |
| 7. | The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive | <u>4</u> |
| 8. | The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section | <u>3</u> |
| 9. | The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate | <u>4</u> |
| 10. | The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable | <u>3</u> |
| 11. | Overall, this section met my expectations | <u>3</u> |

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

A lot of discussion.

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

Teacher was confused on occasion, made understanding difficult

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

Allowed everyone to propose ideas and got the class talking

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

More preparation and review

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

DEFINING THE UNDEFINABLE, EXPRESSING THE INEXPRESSIBLE

Fall 2013

Principal Instructor: Eric Epstein



Cornell University
College of Arts and Sciences

John S. Knight Institute for
Writing in the Disciplines
101 McGraw Hall
Ithaca, New York 14853
t. 607-255-4061
f. 607-255-2956
knight_institute@cornell.edu
www.arts.cornell.edu/knight_institute

To: Eric Epstein, Philosophy

From: David Faulkner, Acting Director of First-Year Writing Seminars

Date: 9 January 2014

Re: Course Evaluations, Fall 2013

Enclosed are the student evaluations (written and numerical) from the course you taught in the Fall 2013 semester. We hope that the information they provide will prove useful for you.

Here is some additional information that may interest you as you examine the summaries of the computer-scored responses:

For Fall '13 FWS, the median score for instructors (half of results above/half below) was 1.72.

Ranking (including only questions 2–33):

First quarter:	less than or equal to 1.57
Second quarter:	1.58–1.72
Third quarter:	1.73–1.94
Fourth quarter:	1.95 or greater.

Further information about how to read the summary appears at the bottom of the sheet.

Thank you for your work; please let us know if we can be of help during the coming semester.

PHIL 1111.105

Fa13 -- First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluations

Instructor:

Course: 17244

Philosophical Problems: Defining the Undefinable, Expressing the Inexpressible

Epstein

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33
1	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33
2	4	1	1	3	1	4	3	4	1	1	2	4	1	1	3	3	2	1	3	3	1	3	1	1	2	3	1	1	2	4	1	4	5
3	1	1	1	3	1	3	3	3	*	1	3	3	3	1	1	3	1	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2
4	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
5	1	3	1	3	1	2	2	1	2	1	1	3	2	2	1	2	1	2	2	3	3	2	4	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	3	2	2
6	1	1	1	3	1	2	2	3	1	1	2	4	2	3	2	2	2	3	4	2	4	3	2	1	1	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2
7	1	1	1	3	1	2	3	3	2	1	1	4	1	2	1	2	1	3	3	1	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	2
8	1	1	3	3	1	2	1	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	1	1	2	3	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	3	1	1
9	1	1	1	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	3	2	5	2	4	5	5	5	5	4	5	4	5	4	3	5	4	4	1	3	5	5	5
10	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	2	2	2	1	3	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	2
11	1	1	1	5	3	3	5	5	4	2	4	4	2	2	3	4	2	3	4	2	2	3	2	1	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	4
12	1	1	1	5	4	3	4	2	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	4	1	4	4	3	2	2	2	1	3	3	2	3	1	3	2	3	2
13	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	2	1	2	4	1	1	5	2	2	5	5	3	3	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	3	2	3	2	1
14	4	1	1	3	3	5	5	5	3	1	3	4	2	1	4	4	4	4	5	2	2	3	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2
15	4	1	3	3	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
16	1	2	1	3	1	3	4	3	1	1	2	3	1	1	1	3	2	1	3	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	2
158	1.25	1.25	3.00	1.88	2.75	2.81	2.75	1.80	1.25	1.88	3.19	1.56	1.75	2.25	2.56	1.81	2.63	3.13	2.25	2.25	2.13	1.63	1.19	1.63	2.13	1.58	1.63	1.31	1.75	1.94	2.19	2.40	

mean for questions 2-5: **1.84** mean for questions 6-19: **2.29** mean for questions 20-33: **1.84** overall mean for questions 2-33: **2.04**

The table above provides an overview of responses, and the mean for each question, on the computer-scored section of evaluations for your FWS.

HOW TO READ THE TABLE:

Each question is listed on the top horizontal axis, starting with 1 on the left and running to question 33 on the far right.

The students are listed on the left vertical axis; their responses to each question run horizontally.

The mean for each question appears at the bottom of each column of responses for each question.

What the numbers mean: an "A" answer on the bubble sheet equals 1 on the table above; a "B" equals 2, and so on. (The evaluation questions and possible range of responses are reprinted on the back of this sheet.)

To interpret questions #2-#33, you will need to compare student opinions about what your seminar accomplished with your own goals. You will naturally have stressed some areas more than others. In some instances, a question may not be relevant to your seminar: for example, in a film course, questions about "the readings" may not apply. In general, finding a significant number of "4" and "5" responses when you scan down the column of responses for a question (question 1 aside) may be a cause for concern.

To remember: The purpose of the table is to alert you to possible strengths and weaknesses, not to measure all courses against a single inflexible standard.

We hope you will find the evaluations to be informative. Please contact Katy Gotschalk or Paul Sawyer at the Knight Institute (101 McGraw Hall) if you would like to discuss them.

JOHN S. KNIGHT INSTITUTE FOR WRITING IN THE DISCIPLINES
FWS End-of-Semester Evaluation

1) The most important reason I chose this seminar:

- 1) I liked the course description.
- 2) I thought it would be challenging.
- 3) My advisor recommended it.
- 4) It was offered at a time I had open.
- 5) I could not get into one of my top preferences.

For the following questions:

(1=An appropriate amount, 2=Too much, 3=Too little, 4=Far too much, 5=Far too little)

- 2) How much reading did you do?
- 3) How much out-of-class writing did you do? (First-Year Writing Seminar guidelines suggest a minimum of six essays and a maximum of nine.)
- 4) How much time was spent learning about writing?
- 5) How much time was devoted to learning how to revise your essays? (FWS guidelines suggest that a minimum of three essays go through a process of guided revision.)

How much do you agree with the following statements?

(1=Very strongly, 2=Strongly, 3=Somewhat, 4=A little, 5=Not at all)

In class, in conferences, or in paper comments, the teacher emphasized

- 6) choosing the words that best express ideas.
- 7) writing grammatically correct sentences.
- 8) structuring sentences carefully.
- 9) providing appropriate documentation for sources.
- 10) developing a strong argument.
- 11) writing well-focused, coherent paragraphs.
- 12) making transitions from one paragraph to the next.
- 13) focusing an essay on a significant problem, hypothesis, thesis, argument, or idea
- 14) supporting claims with pertinent, substantive evidence.
- 15) incorporating and analyzing source material and quotations.
- 16) editing essays to eliminate flaws of grammar, word choice, spelling, and format.
- 17) revising essays to enhance interest, clarity, and persuasiveness.
- 18) writing in a style appropriate for a particular purpose.
- 19) writing in a style appropriate for a particular audience.

In this seminar,

- 20) reading and writing assignments formed an understandable progression.
- 21) the level of difficulty of the readings seemed appropriate.
- 22) I learned to read with care in the discipline of the seminar.
- 23) informal/preparatory writing assignments helped me understand the readings and write an essay.
- 24) I had opportunities to confer privately with the teacher.
- 25) the teacher was well-prepared.
- 26) the teacher directed discussions well.
- 27) the teacher treated my writing with respect.
- 28) the teacher graded my papers fairly.
- 29) the teacher returned our papers within a reasonable length of time.
- 30) comments on each returned paper helped me improve the next assignment.
- 31) I felt intellectually stimulated.
- 32) I became a more confident writer.
- 33) I became a more skillful writer.

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Fall 2013

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name ERIC EPSTEIN

Department Philosophy Course Number 17244

Course Title defining the undefinable

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

I thought this class was interesting. I liked being exposed to some of the many aspects of philosophy and getting a chance to think and use my mind/develop my thoughts in a different way. The class was very difficult though and philosophic reading was a bit much.

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

My writing as improved in a certain way. I learned how to argue in a paper because the essay prompt required us to do so and Eric was good at advising us in developing our arguments.

(over)

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

Comments were sure helpful.
They were how I learned what errors
I made in my writing.

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

Class discussions were useful for
most essays. It's how I developed
most of my thoughts as a
~~topic~~ and some of debating these
ideas in class allowed me to make
stronger arguments for my papers.

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

My weakness is keeping all my
thoughts and ideas organized.

My strength is writing clearly.

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Fall 2013

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name Eric Epstein

Department Philosophy Course Number 17244

Course Title Defining the Undefinable, Expressing the Inexpressible

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

Some of the topics chosen were very interesting, stimulated great discussion and were easy to write about because everybody had an opinion on the matter.

Others, however, were not so opinionated, and when Eric didn't have a lesson plan, most of the class was spent with him just trying really hard to stimulate discussion. We also didn't read one of the books he had us buy, and the other we read but discussed for one day, and never had to write about.

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

Perhaps this class emphasized writing very clearly more than my previous experiences with writing, but I never had particularly meaningful edits in terms of writing - more so with refining ideas.

(over)

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

He wrote some trivial comments, but he also gave feedback on our ideas. He didn't look at writing style too much.

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

we didn't discuss writing. The discussion of the texts were extremely useful because ^{many of them} they were quite difficult to ~~understand~~ understand at first, but became fairly clear with discussion.

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

strengths: sentence structure, word choice, ideas

weaknesses: sometimes clarity, especially with 'creative' sentence structure

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Fall 2013

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name Eric Epstein

Department Philosophy Course Number 17244

Course Title Defining the Undefinable

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

It was very interesting.

Eric is very knowledgeable ;
engaging

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

Sure - through multiple essays
I was given valuable feedback
to help myself strengthen
my writing

(over)

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

Yes - Specific, plentiful and helpful

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

of writing - minimal
of texts - very

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

Strength - ? Undefined
Weakness - Time Management
Planning

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Fall 2013

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name Eric Epstein

Department PHILOSOPHY Course Number PHIL 1111

Course Title DEFINING THE UNDEFINABLE

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

This class is very interesting. The subject matter is captivating and very often induces lots of discussion. The writing assignments are fair and well-prompted. Overall great FWS.

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

I do believe this class has improved my writing. The professor (Eric Epstein) provides constructive, insightful comments on all of our assignments.

(over)

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

Extremely so, as per my previous answer.

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

Both the discussions & writing assignments were very useful. The writing assignments especially were very interesting and thought-provoking. The discussions were fun and we've had many interesting discussions.

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

A strength that I've developed is creating technical solutions for abstract problems (although it still needs lots of work)

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Fall 2013

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name Eric Epstein

Department Philosophy Course Number 7248

Course Title Defining the Undefinable

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

I loved the class!

Suggestion for improvement: NO PHILOSOPHY OF MIND!

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

My writing has definitely improved as I have learned to analyze and argue for/against various arguments.

(over)

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not? The written comments ^{on papers} were definitely helpful and after fixing my essay based on Eric's comments, I saw that my second drafts on papers improved dramatically; Eric's comments just makes one aware of the problems in their essays.

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

Hit or miss for me.

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

My greatest strength: Being concise and getting to the point.

My greatest weakness: I'm too slow when trying to gather my thoughts.

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Fall 2013

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name Eric Epstein

Department Philosophy Course Number 17244

Course Title PHIL 1111 : Defining the Undefinable

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

Although philosophy was a difficult topic to fully grasp, Eric was clear in helping students simplify complex arguments. Another strength was the constant reminder that students are always welcome to stop by office hours or speak to ~~see~~ the instructor; ~~perhaps~~ it was easier to approach Eric because he is a PhD student and not a professor. Also, by requiring prewriting and a draft, students were forced to take the smaller steps to writing a complete paper and show how ^{their} ideas formed.

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

Yes, I believe that this course has shown me how to work up to a full and final paper through the enforced steps that came with each essay. Though I did experience ~~a~~ deep critical thinking, I wish there could have been an levels of essay on writing with a book, and also a quick lesson on citation.

(over)

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

Yes; very, very helpful. The comments on drafts were essential to improving the paper — although this could also be because I went to office hours to talk out written comments, it is true that comments in general often clarified and shaped the direction of my essays.

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

Class discussions of the assigned texts was excellent — the handouts prepared for each session were helpful. However, the course lacked discussion of writing itself (ie. citation ~~methods~~ methods, intro/conclusion, etc.)

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

Strengths: Ability to structure and organize ideas efficiently; responsiveness to constructive criticism; use of citation/quotes

Weaknesses: Repetitive tendencies; awkward diction; rambling instead of elaborating sometimes; writing strong conclusions.

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Fall 2013

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name Eric Epstein

Department Philosophy Course Number 17244

Course Title Phil 111: Defining the indeterminate

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

I thoroughly enjoyed the course. The assigned readings were all very stimulating, which made the class discussions as well as the essay writing much more natural and flowing. Their brevity (the readings) was also appreciated. I have no suggestions for improvement.

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

I do believe my writing has improved. I was already concise to begin with, but here, I learned to focus the prompt more, hence allowing these concise statements to be more dense.

EP

(over)

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

Written comments on papers were very helpful! I would say they were what helped me improve the most because I could always ~~be~~ directly link a comment to something specific I wrote rather than it being a general critique of my writing style or paper.

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

The class discussions were very useful, often giving me insight into a part of the reading I did not analyze enough or for generating counter arguments on a claim which I had not thought of.

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

I consider my greatest strength to be brevity and my greatest weakness: disorganization.

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Fall 2013

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name Eric Epstein

Department Philosophy

Course Number 17244

Course Title Phil 1111

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

The course was mostly interesting while also being very helpful in developing my writing skills. The strength of this course was definitely the feedback. The instructor was always willing to help and his feedback always directed me to the weak points within my essays. Writing seminars, more than trying to teach writing skills in the traditional way should focus on creating a learning environment by creating a forum for the student and the instructor to establish a dialogue. This course was very successful in terms of that. The only issue had to do with the material and the overall cohesion of the topics covered. Everything should form a logical progression.

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

Yes, because of the instructor's feedback. I think Eric Epstein did a great job of encouraging me to work on the weak aspects of my writing.

(over)

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

Yes, they were the best part of the course. The instructor used them to guide me to the parts of my writing that were not as strong.

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

They could have been more helpful, although the instructor tried to make sure that everyone had a good understanding of the texts.

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

Writing a well structured paper is probably my greatest strength, while making sure that the sentences and words I used in my writing really got to the core of what I was trying to say.

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Fall 2013

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name Eric Epstein

Department Philosophy Course Number 17244

Course Title Philosophy III- Phil problems- Defining the Undefinable, Representing... etc.

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

The course did little to improve my writing skills and much to fuel my frustrations. The discussions were confused and ^{the} papers... the papers were causes for despair.

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

→ Nope → Appreciation of the written word. Of course, that is more the realm of a typical English class and not a philosophical one, though still. I have come to hate writing.

(over)

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

Yes and no. They helped in developing philosophical arguments, not in improving writing.

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

They were, as mentioned before, confused. So no, they were not useful. ↑
There were none.

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

I resent writing now. That speaks volumes as a weakness.

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Fall 2013

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name Eric Epstein

Department Philosophy Course Number 17244

Course Title Defining the Undefined

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

Great - very stimulating and encouraging of thinking of difficult concepts in a variety of different ways. The summaries of discussions were great in terms of clarifying readings which could have been confusing. Office hours + prof. availability + willingness to help were absolutely GREAT

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

Yes, the thought processes required me to think in a very logical way and be clear in my writing. Seems good to me - good emphasis on the importance of being clear.

(over)

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

Yes very. They were very clear and specific.
Sometimes not all that could be said was
done so in comments but that's what
office hours are for so it was fine.

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

Useful although a lot of people would zone out so
often discussions weren't as fruitful as
could be hoped. Picking on people
instead of waiting for them to volunteer
may be a better way to go.

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

Strength- being clear and organising my
thoughts in a good way + citations

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Fall 2013

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name Eric Epstein

Department Philosophy Course Number 17244

Course Title Defining the Undefinable (PHIL 1111)

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

This class was very interesting. I enjoyed the discussions in class as well as some of the readings. I enjoyed getting to pick what we wanted to talk about later in the course and there'd be more enjoyable if we could cover

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

NO, this class was very interesting and on a cool topic but did not feel like any emphasis was put on improving our actual writing.

(over)

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

yes - his comments helped me know
what needed improvement and where I did
well with the topic Very useful

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

I really enjoyed discussions, ~~write~~ with
such a confusing class, like philosophy, it's
helpful to be able to talk about what we
reading/writing about

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

I'm not sure, this class did
not emphasize writing, just
philosophical ideas.

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Fall 2013

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name Eric Epstein

Department Philosophy Course Number 1111

Course Title Defining the undefinable; expressing the inexpressable

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

This course was very interesting. Eric is a great instructor and really has a firm grasp of the material. He also explains things very clearly & well and makes philosophy fun. Some of the reading is a little too dense, however, and also he didn't focus much on writing, more on material.

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

To some degree yes but I am uncertain as to how much. Most of the class was on philosophical material not writing.

(over)

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

In terms of philosophy, yes they were very helpful. They pointed out flaws in an argument & pushed you in the right direction to try and fix it

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

Very useful for texts ~~atmos~~

There were very few discussions on the actual writing

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

Not sure.

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Fall 2013

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name Eric Epstein

Department Philosophy

Course Number 17244

Course Title ~~Expressing~~ Phil 1212: ~~Expressing~~ the Unaffinable

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

This was a very enlightening course. We read a wide range of works and discussed the meaning between the lines. Often, discussions were tangential to the reading but these discussions were most valuable because they provided a ~~setting~~ real-world reference for understanding a given topic. The handouts were crystal-clear, and elucidated any confusion from the readings. Sometimes discussion was dry so perhaps getting people engaged is an area for improvement.

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

Philosophical writing and literary analysis are extremely different. I had come in with a background in the latter ~~area~~. I later learned that philosophy is precise and the writing has to be presented clearly in a report-like way. This distinction was unclear to me at the beginning of the term.

(over)

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

Extremely. Eric invested a lot of time in to perfecting essays and crystallizing each and every sentence that could be a source of confusion.

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

Very useful when the assigned texts were interesting.
People zone out when the readings are boring (ex: Mrs. Dalloway)

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

Greatest strength: extrapolating and looking at the big picture.
Greatest weakness: precisely understanding each part of every clause of a theory.

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Fall 2013

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name Eric Epstein

Department PHIL Course Number 17244

Course Title PHIL 1111: Defining the Undefinable

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

The course was interesting and required a lot of critical thinking
Strength:- many philosophical problems discussed

Weakness:- I didn't like reading novels; articles and
other people's writings were fine though

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

I feel like my analytical abilities have improved, but
my style and eloquence has not. Given the nature of
philosophy however, content and clear delivery is probably
more important than style.

(over)

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

Yes. They were specific and I knew exactly what to fix and exactly what issues it had in the paper.

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

The assigned readings (other than Mrs Dallaway) were helpful and discussion helped see other people's perspectives.

The writing assignments helped me think individually about the readings and analyze them for myself, building critical thinking skills for myself.

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

Strength - analytical & critical think skills

weakness - eloquence.

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Fall 2013

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name Eric Epstein

Department Philosophy

Course Number 1111

Course Title Philosophy 1111: Defining the Undefinable

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

If you love to read, then you should take this class.
Lots of reading is assigned as pretty abstract material,
and you have to dig deep and analyze and then later
write an essay on it.

I think if this was more geared towards "discussion",
the gap of improvement will lessen.

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

Yeah I think so. It helped me become more
concise.

(over)

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

Yeah, Eric did a great job on that as he would tell you what you did wrong

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

Saw it useful we got off track a lot

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

Strengths: Content and organization

Weaknesses: word vocabulary and length of essay

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Fall 2013

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name Eric Epstein

Department Philosophy Course Number 1111

Course Title Defining the Undefinable

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

This course introduced me to a new way of approaching ideas and texts. The course was mostly reading-based discussions, which helped clarify the material. Sometimes I felt the material in the texts was too hard to understand and write a coherent paper. However, now I am better at finding more evidence in various texts.

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

I think my writing improved regarding the presentation of arguments. Sometimes I felt the traditional structure of good essays was not stressed enough, but that might also be because philosophical essays are different from analytic ones.

(over)

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

Comments were always helpful because they always questioned certain points I made. The criticism helps to move the essay to a stronger level. Additionally, the comments helped clarify certain places that weren't very strong.

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

Class discussions were useful on most topics and helped to develop my thoughts better. Sometimes the discussions strayed from the text, but turned into stimulating debates.

I would have liked if we spent more class time talking about how to develop better writing strategies.

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

I am better at presenting arguments in the text and forming my own arguments. I think my weaknesses include not clarifying everything that I say.

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

LOGIC FOR PHILOSOPHY

Fall 2014

Principal Instructor: Theodore Sider

Teaching Assistant: Eric Epstein

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY SECTION EVALUATION

Course Number 3320 Term & Year FALL 14 TA's Name ERIC EPSTEIN

Please estimate the percentage of office hour sessions you have attended:

☐ 0-25% ☒ 25%-50% ☐ 50%-75% ☐ 75%-100%

RATING SCALE 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Neutral/Not Applicable 4=Agree 5=Strongly Agree	
1. The teaching assistant was well prepared.	5
2. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner.	5
3. The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest.	5
4. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner.	5
5. The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted.	5
6. The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive.	5
7. The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of office hours.	4
8. The amount of discussion that occurred in office hours was adequate.	4
9. The discussion that occurred in office hours was valuable.	5
10. Overall, the office hours met my expectations.	5
	5
	5
	5
	5
	5
	5
	5
	5

12. What were the major strengths of the TA's performance?

VERY HELPFUL AND KNOWLEDGEABLE

13. What were the major weaknesses of the TA's performance?

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of office hours would you recommend?

NONE

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY SECTION EVALUATION

Course Number 2320

Term & Year Fall 2014

TA's Name Eric Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of office hour sessions you have attended:

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25%-50%

☐ 50%-75%

☒ 75%-100%

RATING SCALE 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Neutral/Not Applicable 4=Agree 5=Strongly Agree	
1. The teaching assistant was well prepared.	5
2. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner.	5
3. The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest.	5
4. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner.	5
5. The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted.	5
6. The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive.	5
7. The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of office hours.	5
8. The amount of discussion that occurred in office hours was adequate.	5
9. The discussion that occurred in office hours was valuable.	5
10. Overall, the office hours met my expectations.	5

12. What were the major strengths of the TA's performance?

always helpful, patient (Thank you!!)

13. What were the major weaknesses of the TA's performance?

/

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of office hours would you recommend?

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY SECTION EVALUATION

Course Number 3320

Term & Year Fall 2014

TA's Name Eric Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of office hour sessions you have attended:

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25%-50%

☒ 50%-75%

☐ 75%-100%

RATING SCALE 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Neutral/Not Applicable 4=Agree 5=Strongly Agree	
1. The teaching assistant was well prepared.	5
2. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner.	5
3. The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest.	5
4. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner.	5
5. The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted.	5
6. The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive.	5
7. The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of office hours.	5
8. The amount of discussion that occurred in office hours was adequate.	5
9. The discussion that occurred in office hours was valuable.	5
10. Overall, the office hours met my expectations.	5
	5
	5
	5
	5
	5

12. What were the major strengths of the TA's performance?

Patient, Polite, Knowledgeable Professional

13. What were the major weaknesses of the TA's performance?

None

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of office hours would you recommend?

None

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY SECTION EVALUATION

Course Number 3320

Term & Year Fall '14

TA's Name Eric Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of office hour sessions you have attended:

☐ 0-25%

☒ 25%-50%

☐ 50%-75%

☐ 75%-100%

RATING SCALE		
1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Neutral/Not Applicable 4=Agree 5=Strongly Agree		
1. The teaching assistant was well prepared.	1	5
2. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner.	2	5
3. The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest.	3	5
4. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner.	4	5
5. The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted.	5	5
6. The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive.	6	5
7. The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of office hours.	7	5
8. The amount of discussion that occurred in office hours was adequate.	8	5
9. The discussion that occurred in office hours was valuable.	9	5
10. Overall, the office hours met my expectations.	10	5
		<i>[Signature]</i>
		<i>[Signature]</i>

12. What were the major strengths of the TA's performance?

He was willing to go above & beyond to make sure he got ~~my~~ my homework & that I understood the material. Also he was very good at breaking concepts down to a step-by-step system that was easier to understand.

13. What were the major weaknesses of the TA's performance?

I don't know. Not enough time in office hours to get to everyone?

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of office hours would you recommend?

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY SECTION EVALUATION

Course Number 3320 Term & Year Fall 14 TA's Name Eric Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of office hour sessions you have attended:

☐ 0-25% ☐ 25%-50% ☒ 50%-75% ☐ 75%-100%

RATING SCALE 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Neutral/Not Applicable 4=Agree 5=Strongly Agree	
1. The teaching assistant was well prepared.	5
2. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner.	5
3. The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest.	5
4. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner.	5
5. The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted.	5
6. The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive.	5
7. The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of office hours.	5
8. The amount of discussion that occurred in office hours was adequate.	5
9. The discussion that occurred in office hours was valuable.	5
10. Overall, the office hours met my expectations.	5
	5
	5
	5
	5
	5
	5
	5

12. What were the major strengths of the TA's performance?

Very personable easy to understand always willing to help

13. What were the major weaknesses of the TA's performance?

None we were perfect

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of office hours would you recommend?

Nothing

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY SECTION EVALUATION

Course Number Phil 3820

Term & Year ²⁰¹⁴ Fall

TA's Name Eric Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of office hour sessions you have attended:

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25%-50%

☐ 50%-75%

☒ 75%-100%

RATING SCALE

1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Neutral/Not Applicable 4=Agree 5=Strongly Agree

1. The teaching assistant was well prepared.
2. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner.
3. The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest.
4. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner.
5. The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted.
6. The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive.
7. The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of office hours.
8. The amount of discussion that occurred in office hours was adequate.
9. The discussion that occurred in office hours was valuable.
10. Overall, the office hours met my expectations.

5

5

5

3

5

5

5

3

12. What were the major strengths of the TA's performance?

TA always made time to help students outside of office hours and took a great degree of personal responsibility in helping us figure out the material. Is always patient and kind - which is particularly helpful in a quantitative course where it's easy to feel dumb or intimidated.

13. What were the major weaknesses of the TA's performance?

I think TA went over and beyond expectations, so none.

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of office hours would you recommend?

none.

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY SECTION EVALUATION

Course Number 3320

Term & Year F 14

TA's Name Eric

Please estimate the percentage of office hour sessions you have attended:

☒ 0-25%

☐ 25%-50%

☐ 50%-75%

☐ 75%-100%

RATING SCALE 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Neutral/Not Applicable 4=Agree 5=Strongly Agree	
1. The teaching assistant was well prepared.	5
2. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner.	5
3. The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest.	5
4. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner.	5
5. The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted.	5
6. The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive.	5
7. The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of office hours.	5
8. The amount of discussion that occurred in office hours was adequate.	5
9. The discussion that occurred in office hours was valuable.	5
10. Overall, the office hours met my expectations.	5
	5
	5
	5
	5
	5

12. What were the major strengths of the TA's performance?

He was funny

13. What were the major weaknesses of the TA's performance?

I didn't actually go to any, so no idea

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of office hours would you recommend?

See above

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY SECTION EVALUATION

Course Number 3320 Term & Year F14 TA's Name Eric

Please estimate the percentage of office hour sessions you have attended:

☒ 0-25% ☐ 25%-50% ☐ 50%-75% ☐ 75%-100%

RATING SCALE 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Neutral/Not Applicable 4=Agree 5=Strongly Agree	
1. The teaching assistant was well prepared.	1
2. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner.	1
3. The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest.	1
4. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner.	1
5. The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted.	1
6. The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive.	1
7. The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of office hours.	1
8. The amount of discussion that occurred in office hours was adequate.	1
9. The discussion that occurred in office hours was valuable.	1
10. Overall, the office hours met my expectations.	1
	1
	1
	1
	1
	1
	1
	1

12. What were the major strengths of the TA's performance?

13. What were the major weaknesses of the TA's performance?

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of office hours would you recommend?

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY SECTION EVALUATION

Course Number 3320 Term & Year Fall 2014 TA's Name Eric Espino

Please estimate the percentage of office hour sessions you have attended:

☒ 0-25% ☐ 25%-50% ☐ 50%-75% ☐ 75%-100%

RATING SCALE 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Neutral/Not Applicable 4=Agree 5=Strongly Agree	
1. The teaching assistant was well prepared.	
2. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner.	
3. The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest.	
4. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner.	
5. The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted.	
6. The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive.	
7. The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of office hours.	
8. The amount of discussion that occurred in office hours was adequate.	
9. The discussion that occurred in office hours was valuable.	
10. Overall, the office hours met my expectations.	

12. What were the major strengths of the TA's performance?

13. What were the major weaknesses of the TA's performance?

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of office hours would you recommend?

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY SECTION EVALUATION

Course Number 3320

Term & Year Fall 2014 TA's Name Eric Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of office hour sessions you have attended:

☒ 0-25%

☐ 25%-50%

☐ 50%-75%

☐ 75%-100%

RATING SCALE 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Neutral/Not Applicable 4=Agree 5=Strongly Agree	
1. The teaching assistant was well prepared.	3
2. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner.	3
3. The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest.	3
4. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner.	3
5. The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted.	3
6. The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive.	3
7. The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of office hours.	3
8. The amount of discussion that occurred in office hours was adequate.	3
9. The discussion that occurred in office hours was valuable.	3
10. Overall, the office hours met my expectations.	3

all 3's
↓
haven't been to any office hours

12. What were the major strengths of the TA's performance?

13. What were the major weaknesses of the TA's performance?

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of office hours would you recommend?

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY SECTION EVALUATION

Course Number 3320

Term & Year Fall 2014 TA's Name Eric Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of office hour sessions you have attended:

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25%-50%

☐ 50%-75%

☒ 75%-100%

RATING SCALE 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Neutral/Not Applicable 4=Agree 5=Strongly Agree	
1. The teaching assistant was well prepared.	5
2. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner.	5
3. The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest.	NA
4. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner.	NA
5. The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted.	NA
6. The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive.	5
7. The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of office hours.	5
8. The amount of discussion that occurred in office hours was adequate.	5
9. The discussion that occurred in office hours was valuable.	5
10. Overall, the office hours met my expectations.	NA
	NA
	5

12. What were the major strengths of the TA's performance?

knowledgeable, smart.

13. What were the major weaknesses of the TA's performance?

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of office hours would you recommend?

Don't go to DH.

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY SECTION EVALUATION

Course Number 3710

Term & Year Fall 2014

TA's Name Eric Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of office hour sessions you have attended:

☒ 0-25%

☐ 25%-50%

☐ 50%-75%

☐ 75%-100%

RATING SCALE 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Neutral/Not Applicable 4=Agree 5=Strongly Agree	
1. The teaching assistant was well prepared.	4
2. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner.	4
3. The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest.	3
4. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner.	4
5. The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted.	4
6. The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive.	3
7. The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of office hours.	3
8. The amount of discussion that occurred in office hours was adequate.	4
9. The discussion that occurred in office hours was valuable.	4
10. Overall, the office hours met my expectations.	3
	4
	3
	4

12. What were the major strengths of the TA's performance?

Understanding of the material

13. What were the major weaknesses of the TA's performance?

Grading seems a bit tough

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of office hours would you recommend?

None.

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY SECTION EVALUATION

Course Number 3320

Term & Year 14FA

TA's Name Eric Eptim

Please estimate the percentage of office hour sessions you have attended:

☒ 0-25%

☐ 25%-50%

☐ 50%-75%

☐ 75%-100%

RATING SCALE 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Neutral/Not Applicable 4=Agree 5=Strongly Agree	
1. The teaching assistant was well prepared.	4
2. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner.	4
3. The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest.	4
4. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner.	4
5. The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted.	4
6. The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive.	4
7. The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of office hours.	4
8. The amount of discussion that occurred in office hours was adequate.	4
9. The discussion that occurred in office hours was valuable.	4
10. Overall, the office hours met my expectations.	4
<div style="text-align: right; margin-right: 50px;"> <i>Can't say</i> </div>	

12. What were the major strengths of the TA's performance?

Well I've never been to his OH, but he well responds to my email, well-prepared.

13. What were the major weaknesses of the TA's performance?

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of office hours would you recommend?

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY SECTION EVALUATION

Course Number 3320

Term & Year Fall '14

TA's Name Eric Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of office hour sessions you have attended:

☒ 0-25%

☐ 25%-50%

☐ 50%-75%

☐ 75%-100%

RATING SCALE 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Neutral/Not Applicable 4=Agree 5=Strongly Agree	
1. The teaching assistant was well prepared.	5
2. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner.	5
3. The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest.	5
4. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner.	5
5. The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted.	5
6. The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive.	5
7. The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of office hours.	5
8. The amount of discussion that occurred in office hours was adequate.	5
9. The discussion that occurred in office hours was valuable.	5
10. Overall, the office hours met my expectations.	5
	5
	5
	5
	5
	5

12. What were the major strengths of the TA's performance?

13. What were the major weaknesses of the TA's performance?

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of office hours would you recommend?

don't do them in the philosophy lounge, use your office.

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY SECTION EVALUATION

Course Number 3320

Term & Year Fa 2014

TA's Name Eric Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of office hour sessions you have attended:

☒ 0-25%

☐ 25%-50%

☐ 50%-75%

☐ 75%-100%

RATING SCALE 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Neutral/Not Applicable 4=Agree 5=Strongly Agree	
1. The teaching assistant was well prepared.	3
2. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner.	3
3. The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest.	3
4. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner.	3
5. The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted.	3
6. The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive.	3
7. The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of office hours.	5
8. The amount of discussion that occurred in office hours was adequate.	5
9. The discussion that occurred in office hours was valuable.	3
10. Overall, the office hours met my expectations.	3

12. What were the major strengths of the TA's performance?

Eric is terrific. Please note that OH conflicts with one of my classes so I never was able to go to one.

Each "3" corresponds to a "Not applicable." I have a very high opinion of Eric

13. What were the major weaknesses of the TA's performance?

None

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of office hours would you recommend?

Not applicable

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY SECTION EVALUATION

Course Number 3320 Term & Year Fall 2014 TA's Name Eric Epsstein

Please estimate the percentage of office hour sessions you have attended:

☒ 0-25% ☐ 25%-50% ☐ 50%-75% ☐ 75%-100%

RATING SCALE	
1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Neutral/Not Applicable 4=Agree 5=Strongly Agree	
1. The teaching assistant was well prepared.	4
2. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner.	5
3. The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest.	3
4. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner.	3
5. The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted.	3
6. The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive.	4
7. The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of office hours.	4
8. The amount of discussion that occurred in office hours was adequate.	3
9. The discussion that occurred in office hours was valuable.	3
10. Overall, the office hours met my expectations.	3

12. What were the major strengths of the TA's performance?

He was a good grader

13. What were the major weaknesses of the TA's performance?

NA

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of office hours would you recommend?

NA

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

FOUNDATIONS OF MATHEMATICS

Spring 2015

Principal Instructor: Theodore Sider

Teaching Assistant: Eric Epstein

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY SECTION EVALUATION

Course Number PHIL 3300 Term. & Year Spring 2015 Section Leader's Name Eric

Please estimate the percentage of discussion ^{office hours} ~~section meetings~~ you have attended:

☐ 0-25% ☒ 25%-50% ☐ 50%-75% ☐ 75%-100% n/a

RATING SCALE

1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Neutral/Not Applicable 4=Agree 5=Strongly Agree

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. The teaching assistant was well prepared. | 5 |
| 2. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner. | 5 |
| 3. The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest. | 5 |
| 4. The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material. | 5 |
| 5. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner. | 5 |
| 6. The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted. | 5 |
| 7. The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive. | 5 |
| 8. The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section. | 5 |
| 9. The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate. | 5 |
| 10. The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable. | 5 |
| 11. Overall, this section met my expectations. | |

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

accessible

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

very responsive over email

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY SECTION EVALUATION

Course Number Phil 3300 Term & Year Spring 2015 Section Leader's Name Eric

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended:

☐ 0-25% ☐ 25%-50% ☒ 50%-75% ☐ 75%-100%

RATING SCALE 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Neutral/Not Applicable 4=Agree 5=Strongly Agree	
1. The teaching assistant was well prepared.	5
2. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner.	5
3. The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest.	5
4. The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material.	5
5. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner.	5
6. The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted.	5
7. The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive.	5
8. The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section.	5
9. The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate.	5
10. The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable.	5
11. Overall, this section met my expectations.	5

12. What were the major strengths of this section? N/A

Eric is patient and thorough

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY SECTION EVALUATION

Course Number Phil 3300 Term & Year Spring 2015 Section Leader's Name Eric Dier

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended:

☐ 0-25% ☐ 25%-50% ☐ 50%-75% ☒ 75%-100%

RATING SCALE 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Neutral/Not Applicable 4=Agree 5=Strongly Agree	
1. The teaching assistant was well prepared.	4
2. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner.	3
3. The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest.	3
4. The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material.	3
5. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner.	3
6. The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted.	2
7. The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive.	1
8. The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section.	3
9. The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate.	3
10. The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable.	3
11. Overall, this section met my expectations.	3

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY SECTION EVALUATION

Course Number Phil 3890 Term & Year Spring Section Leader's Name Erin Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended:

☐ 0-25% ☐ 25%-50% ☐ 50%-75% ☒ 75%-100%

N/A

RATING SCALE

1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Neutral/Not Applicable 4=Agree 5=Strongly Agree

1. The teaching assistant was well prepared. 4
2. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner. 5
3. The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest. /
4. The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material. /
5. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner. 4
6. The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted. 5
7. The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive. 5
8. The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section. 5
9. The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate. 5
10. The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable. 5
11. Overall, this section met my expectations.

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

No section

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

No section

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

Taking the time to think about a problem before attempting to answer it

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

Try not to lose data

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY SECTION EVALUATION

Course Number 3300 Term & Year Spring 15 Section Leader's Name Eric Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended:

☐ 0-25% ☐ 25%-50% ☐ 50%-75% ☒ 75%-100%

RATING SCALE	
1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Neutral/Not Applicable 4=Agree 5=Strongly Agree	
1. The teaching assistant was well prepared.	5
2. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner.	NA
3. The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest.	NA
4. The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material.	NA
5. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner.	NA
6. The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted.	4
7. The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive.	4
8. The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section.	5
9. The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate.	4
10. The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable.	3
11. Overall, this section met my expectations.	NA

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

NA

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

NA

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

Available outside of class

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

NA

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY SECTION EVALUATION

Course Number Math 280/phil 3300 Term & Year Spring 2015 Section Leader's Name Eric Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended:

☐ 0-25% ☐ 25%-50% ☐ 50%-75% ☒ 75%-100%

RATING SCALE 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Neutral/Not Applicable 4=Agree 5=Strongly Agree	
1. The teaching assistant was well prepared.	5
2. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner.	4
3. The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest.	5
4. The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material.	5
5. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner.	5
6. The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted.	4
7. The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive.	5
8. The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section.	5
9. The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate.	5
10. The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable.	5
11. Overall, this section met my expectations.	5

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

N/A

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

N/A

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

N/A

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

N/A

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY SECTION EVALUATION

Course Number Phil 3840 Term & Year Spring 2015 Section Leader's Name Eric Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended:

☒ 0-25%

☐ 25%-50%

☐ 50%-75%

☐ 75%-100%

RATING SCALE

1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Neutral/Not Applicable 4=Agree 5=Strongly Agree

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. The teaching assistant was well prepared. | 5 |
| 2. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner. | |
| 3. The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest. | |
| 4. The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material. | |
| 5. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner. | |
| 6. The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted. | |
| 7. The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive. | |
| 8. The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section. | |
| 9. The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate. | |
| 10. The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable. | |
| 11. Overall, this section met my expectations. | ↓ |

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

Everything

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

None

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

All

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

None

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY SECTION EVALUATION

Course Number PHI 3840 Term & Year _____ Section Leader's Name Eric

Please estimate the percentage of discussion ^{lectures} section meetings you have attended:

☐ 0-25% ☐ 25%-50% ☒ 50%-75% ☐ 75%-100%

RATING SCALE 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Neutral/Not Applicable 4=Agree 5=Strongly Agree	
1. The teaching assistant was well prepared.	4
2. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner.	4
3. The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest.	3
4. The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material.	3
5. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner.	3
6. The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted.	4
7. The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive.	4
8. The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section.	4
9. The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate.	4
10. The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable.	2
11. Overall, this section met my expectations.	3

N/A
N/A
N/A

N/A

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY SECTION EVALUATION

Course Number 3360

Term & Year Spring 2015 Section Leader's Name Eric Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended: N/A

☐ Q-25%

☐ 25%-50%

 50%-75%

☐ 75%-100%

RATING SCALE

1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Neutral/Not Applicable 4=Agree 5=Strongly Agree

1. The teaching assistant was well prepared.
2. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner.
3. The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest.
4. The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material.
5. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner.
6. The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted.
7. The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive.
8. The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section.
9. The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate.
10. The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable.
11. Overall, this section met my expectations.

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

Eric really knows his stuff.

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

well, in general the discussion was terrible,
but that's not Oz's fault.

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY SECTION EVALUATION

Course Number 3840 ^{MATH} Term & Year Spring '15 Section Leader's Name Eric Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended:

☐ 0-25% ☐ 25%-50% ☐ 50%-75% ☐ 75%-100% N/A

RATING SCALE	
1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Neutral/Not Applicable 4=Agree 5=Strongly Agree	
1. The teaching assistant was well prepared.	5
2. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner.	5
3. The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest.	5
4. The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material.	5
5. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner.	5
6. The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted.	5
7. The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive.	5
8. The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section.	5
9. The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate.	5
10. The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable.	5
11. Overall, this section met my expectations.	N/A

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

Eric is very quiet and understands
any difficulty you may be having.

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

The class is quite difficult,
so reading was tough.

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

He was very approachable
and friendly.

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

I have no
recommendations.

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY SECTION EVALUATION

Course Number PHIL 3300 Term & Year S'15 Section Leader's Name Eric Fether

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended:

☐ 0-25% ☐ 25%-50% ☐ 50%-75% ☒ 75%-100% w/a

RATING SCALE 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Neutral/Not Applicable 4=Agree 5=Strongly Agree	
1. The teaching assistant was well prepared.	5
2. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner.	3
3. The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest.	3
4. The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material.	3
5. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner.	3
6. The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted.	5
7. The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive.	5
8. The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section.	5
9. The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate.	5
10. The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable.	5
11. Overall, this section met my expectations.	5

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

w/a

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

w/a

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

Eric was very available to discuss the material + assignments. His contributions in class were often illuminating.

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

none.

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY SECTION EVALUATION

Course Number Phil 3300 Term & Year Spring 15 Section Leader's Name Eric Epstein

Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended:

☐ 0-25%

☐ 25%-50%

☐ 50%-75%

☐ 75%-100%

CNA - No section

RATING SCALE

1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Neutral/Not Applicable 4=Agree 5=Strongly Agree

1. The teaching assistant was well prepared. _____	5
2. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner. _____	5
3. The teaching assistant's discussions were stimulating and held my interest. _____	5
4. The teaching assistant reviewed a sufficient amount of course material. _____	5
5. The teaching assistant reviewed course material in an organized manner. _____	4
6. The teaching assistant's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted. _____	3
7. The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive. _____	4
8. The teaching assistant was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section. _____	5
9. The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate. _____	4
10. The student discussion that occurred in the class was valuable. <u>→ in class</u> _____	4
11. Overall, this section met my expectations. _____	5

12. What were the major strengths of this section?

→ Based on discussions / class

13. What were the major weaknesses of this section?

14. What aspects of the teaching assistant's performance in the section did you like?

15. What changes in the teaching assistant's conduct of section would you recommend?

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

HISTORY OF THE ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN CONFLICT

Fall 2015

Principal Instructor: Ross Brann

Teaching Assistant: Eric Epstein

1/7

Department of Near Eastern Studies
Course Evaluation
Teaching Assistants

Professor: Ross Bram TA: Eric Epstein
Course: GNT 3977 Sec 3 Term: Fall 2015
Class: Fr So Jr (S) Grad Other (Circle One) Major/College: Engineering

Expected Course Grade: _____

Please respond to the following statements and questions using a 5-point scale.
Unless otherwise indicated, "5" indicates strong agreement, "1" indicates strong disagreement, and "3" serves as the midpoint.
Circle a number for each relevant question; leave blank if the question is not applicable. Be sure to complete both sides of this form.

Teaching Assistants (Circle a number for each relevant question. 5 = strongly agree, 1 = strongly disagree)

- | | |
|------------------|---|
| 1 2 3 4 <u>5</u> | 1. I attended TA sessions: (5 = regularly; 1 = never) |
| 1 <u>2</u> 3 4 5 | 2. I met with my TA individually: (5 = more than 5 times; 1 = never) |
| 1 2 3 <u>4</u> 5 | 3. The TA was knowledgeable about the course material. |
| 1 2 <u>3</u> 4 5 | 4. The discussion sections were well-organized. |
| 1 2 <u>3</u> 4 5 | 5. The sections effectively reviewed materials covered in lecture. |
| 1 2 <u>3</u> 4 5 | 6. The sections helped me to gain new insight into the subject matter. |
| 1 2 <u>3</u> 4 5 | 7. The TA did a good job of attempting to stimulate student discussion. |
| 1 2 3 <u>4</u> 5 | 8. The TA was able to explain effectively difficult concepts. |
| 1 2 3 4 <u>5</u> | 9. The TA was available for individual consultation with students. |
| 1 2 3 <u>4</u> 5 | 10. Overall, how would you rate the TA? (5 = excellent; 1 = poor) |

Written Comments:

Please note: These comments are reviewed by faculty and teaching assistants, and are used in faculty reviews for renewal and tenure, as well as for job placement of TA's.

1. What did you like best about your TA?
TA tries his best to help and gave very good insight. However, the class in general did not seem very organized and the students were led to believe the exam was on a difficulty level different than it actually was. This was also due to the inconsistent grading standards of the TAs.
2. What suggestions do you have to improve TA sessions?
Sessions are satisfactory but there should be a unified consistent grading scheme between TAs for the whole class. There needs to be more transparency regarding logistical aspects such as how exams and papers are evaluated so as to maintain fairness for all students.
3. In one or two sentences, please describe what you learned in the course.
I learned a lot about the history of the conflict and ~~quarantine~~ was able to practice writing skills. 231

2/7

Department of Near Eastern Studies
Course Evaluation
Teaching Assistants

Professor: PROF ROSS BRANN

TA: ERIC EPSTEIN

Course: ISRAELI-PAL CONFLICT

Term: FALL '15

Class: Fr So (Jr) Sr Grad Other (Circle One)

Major/College: A&S

Expected Course Grade: B+

Please respond to the following statements and questions using a 5-point scale.

Unless otherwise indicated, "5" indicates strong agreement, "1" indicates strong disagreement, and "3" serves as the midpoint. Circle a number for each relevant question; leave blank if the question is not applicable. Be sure to complete both sides of this form.

Teaching Assistants (Circle a number for each relevant question. 5 = strongly agree, 1 = strongly disagree)

- | | |
|-----------|---|
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 1. I attended TA sessions: (5 = regularly; 1 = never) |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 2. I met with my TA individually: (5 = more than 5 times; 1 = never) |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 3. The TA was knowledgeable about the course material. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 4. The discussion sections were well-organized. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 5. The sections effectively reviewed materials covered in lecture. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 6. The sections helped me to gain new insight into the subject matter. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 7. The TA did a good job of attempting to stimulate student discussion. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 8. The TA was able to explain effectively difficult concepts. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 9. The TA was available for individual consultation with students. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 10. Overall, how would you rate the TA? (5 = excellent; 1 = poor) |

Written Comments:

Please note: These comments are reviewed by faculty and teaching assistants, and are used in faculty reviews for renewal and tenure, as well as for job placement of TA's.

1. What did you like best about your TA?

Nice guy

2. What suggestions do you have to improve TA sessions?

Grade with realistic expectations please: we're not PhD students. Also, show some more concern that students did poorly. Our grades are a reflection of you as well.

3. In one or two sentences, please describe what you learned in the course.

In depth understanding of course material; Israeli-Palestinian conflict. More than one could hope to ever learn abt this conflict

3/7

Department of Near Eastern Studies
Course Evaluation
Teaching Assistants

Professor: Ross Brann

TA: Eric Epstein

Course: Israel-Palestine Conflict

Term: Fall 2015

Class: Fr So Jr (Sr) Grad Other (Circle One)

Major/College: Gov / A & S

Expected Course Grade: A

Please respond to the following statements and questions using a 5-point scale. Unless otherwise indicated, "5" indicates strong agreement, "1" indicates strong disagreement, and "3" serves as the midpoint. Circle a number for each relevant question; leave blank if the question is not applicable. Be sure to complete both sides of this form.

Teaching Assistants (Circle a number for each relevant question. 5 = strongly agree, 1 = strongly disagree)

- 1 2 3 4 5 1. I attended TA sessions: (5 = regularly; 1 = never)
 1 2 3 4 5 2. I met with my TA individually: (5 = more than 5 times; 1 = never)
 1 2 3 4 5 3. The TA was knowledgeable about the course material.
 1 2 3 4 5 4. The discussion sections were well-organized.
 1 2 3 4 5 5. The sections effectively reviewed materials covered in lecture.
 1 2 3 4 5 6. The sections helped me to gain new insight into the subject matter.
 1 2 3 4 5 7. The TA did a good job of attempting to stimulate student discussion.
 1 2 3 4 5 8. The TA was able to explain effectively difficult concepts.
 1 2 3 4 5 9. The TA was available for individual consultation with students.
 1 2 3 4 5 10. Overall, how would you rate the TA? (5 = excellent; 1 = poor)

Written Comments:

Please note: These comments are reviewed by faculty and teaching assistants, and are used in faculty reviews for renewal and tenure, as well as for job placement of TA's.

1. What did you like best about your TA? Good explanation of material & preparation
2. What suggestions do you have to improve TA sessions? More discussion, less lecturing; more about what directly covered in lecture
3. In one or two sentences, please describe what you learned in the course. The Israel-Palestine conflict has a complex history and ~~has~~ several dimensions. As time has gone on both sides have hardened their historical grievances making a successful resolution increasingly impossible.

4/7

Department of Near Eastern Studies
Course Evaluation
Teaching Assistants

Professor: Ross Brann
Course: History of Israeli Palestinian Conflict
Class: Fr So Jr Sr Grad Other (Circle One)

TA: Eli Epstein
Term: FALL
Major/College: InfoSci, CALS

Expected Course Grade: B+

Please respond to the following statements and questions using a 5-point scale. Unless otherwise indicated, "5" indicates strong agreement, "1" indicates strong disagreement, and "3" serves as the midpoint. Circle a number for each relevant question; leave blank if the question is not applicable. Be sure to complete both sides of this form.

Teaching Assistants (Circle a number for each relevant question. 5 = strongly agree, 1 = strongly disagree)

- | | |
|--------------------|---|
| 1 2 3 4 <u>5</u> | 1. I attended TA sessions: (5 = regularly; 1 = never) |
| <u>4</u> 1 2 3 4 5 | 2. I met with my TA individually: (5 = more than 5 times; 1 = never) |
| 1 2 3 4 <u>5</u> | 3. The TA was knowledgeable about the course material. |
| 1 2 3 4 <u>5</u> | 4. The discussion sections were well-organized. |
| 1 2 3 4 <u>5</u> | 5. The sections effectively reviewed materials covered in lecture. |
| 1 2 3 4 <u>5</u> | 6. The sections helped me to gain new insight into the subject matter. |
| 1 2 3 4 <u>5</u> | 7. The TA did a good job of attempting to stimulate student discussion. |
| 1 2 3 4 <u>5</u> | 8. The TA was able to explain effectively difficult concepts. |
| 1 2 3 4 <u>5</u> | 9. The TA was available for individual consultation with students. |
| 1 2 3 4 <u>5</u> | 10. Overall, how would you rate the TA? (5 = excellent; 1 = poor) |

Written Comments:

Please note: These comments are reviewed by faculty and teaching assistants, and are used in faculty reviews for renewal and tenure, as well as for job placement of TA's.

1. What did you like best about your TA?

I liked how he seemed to have a genuine passion for the material and wanted to stimulate discussion. He was also very friendly and wanted to help us learn and was willing to go over whatever we wanted.

2. What suggestions do you have to improve TA sessions?

I think it would have been great if we could have gone over general themes and trends from the history rather than reviewing what happened again.

3. In one or two sentences, please describe what you learned in the course.

I learned about the history of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, both what actually happened and how what happened is perceived by both sides in their narrative.

5/7

Department of Near Eastern Studies
Course Evaluation
Teaching Assistants

Professor: Professor Ross Brann

TA: Eric

Course: NES 3697

Term: Fall

Class: Fr ~~So~~ Jr Sr Grad Other (Circle One)

Major/College: IUR

Expected Course Grade: 2018

Please respond to the following statements and questions using a 5-point scale. Unless otherwise indicated, "5" indicates strong agreement, "1" indicates strong disagreement, and "3" serves as the midpoint. Circle a number for each relevant question; leave blank if the question is not applicable. Be sure to complete both sides of this form.

Teaching Assistants (Circle a number for each relevant question. 5 = strongly agree, 1 = strongly disagree)

- | | |
|------------------|---|
| 1 2 3 4 <u>5</u> | 1. I attended TA sessions: (5 = regularly; 1 = never) |
| <u>1</u> 2 3 4 5 | 2. I met with my TA individually: (5 = more than 5 times; 1 = never) |
| 1 2 <u>3</u> 4 5 | 3. The TA was knowledgeable about the course material. |
| 1 2 3 <u>4</u> 5 | 4. The discussion sections were well-organized. |
| 1 2 3 4 <u>5</u> | 5. The sections effectively reviewed materials covered in lecture. |
| 1 2 <u>3</u> 4 5 | 6. The sections helped me to gain new insight into the subject matter. |
| 1 <u>2</u> 3 4 5 | 7. The TA did a good job of attempting to stimulate student discussion. |
| 1 2 3 <u>4</u> 5 | 8. The TA was able to explain effectively difficult concepts. |
| 1 2 <u>3</u> 4 5 | 9. The TA was available for individual consultation with students. |
| 1 2 <u>3</u> 4 5 | 10. Overall, how would you rate the TA? (5 = excellent; 1 = poor) |

Written Comments:

Please note: These comments are reviewed by faculty and teaching assistants, and are used in faculty reviews for renewal and tenure, as well as for job placement of TA's.

1. What did you like best about your TA?
He ~~consistently~~ consistently asked for feedback & was open to discussing what we wanted / needed clarified
2. What suggestions do you have to improve TA sessions?
~~ask~~ Asking us questions that facilitate discussion
3. In one or two sentences, please describe what you learned in the course.
How to think objectively & critically about the Israeli/Palestinian conflict

6/7

Department of Near Eastern Studies
Course Evaluation
Teaching Assistants

Professor: Poss Brown

TA: Eric Egerton

Course: NES 3697

Term: Fall 2015

Class: (Fr) So Jr Sr Grad Other (Circle One)

Major/College: Math & Engineering

Expected Course Grade: A-/B+

Please respond to the following statements and questions using a 5-point scale.

Unless otherwise indicated, "5" indicates strong agreement, "1" indicates strong disagreement, and "3" serves as the midpoint. Circle a number for each relevant question; leave blank if the question is not applicable. Be sure to complete both sides of this form.

Teaching Assistants (Circle a number for each relevant question. 5 = strongly agree, 1 = strongly disagree)

- | | |
|------------------|---|
| 1 2 3 4 <u>5</u> | 1. I attended TA sessions: (5 = regularly; 1 = never) |
| <u>1</u> 2 3 4 5 | 2. I met with my TA individually: (5 = more than 5 times; 1 = never) |
| 1 2 3 4 <u>5</u> | 3. The TA was knowledgeable about the course material. |
| 1 2 3 <u>4</u> 5 | 4. The discussion sections were well-organized. |
| 1 2 3 4 <u>5</u> | 5. The sections effectively reviewed materials covered in lecture. |
| 1 2 3 4 <u>5</u> | 6. The sections helped me to gain new insight into the subject matter. |
| 1 2 3 4 <u>5</u> | 7. The TA did a good job of attempting to stimulate student discussion. |
| 1 2 3 4 <u>5</u> | 8. The TA was able to explain effectively difficult concepts. |
| 1 2 3 4 <u>5</u> | 9. The TA was available for individual consultation with students. |
| 1 2 3 4 <u>5</u> | 10. Overall, how would you rate the TA? (5 = excellent; 1 = poor) |

Written Comments:

Please note: These comments are reviewed by faculty and teaching assistants, and are used in faculty reviews for renewal and tenure, as well as for job placement of TA's.

1. What did you like best about your TA?

The TA was extremely knowledgeable and well-versed in the subject matter. He was also clearly passionate about the subject and the conflict as a whole.

2. What suggestions do you have to improve TA sessions?

Sometimes our discussions felt a bit flat, although this might be due to having a relatively small discussion size. But the material was always covered effectively.

3. In one or two sentences, please describe what you learned in the course.

I learned about the complexities and intricacies about the conflict on a much deeper level. I also learned a lot about how the present conflict has been shaped by the deep history of the region.

7/7

Department of Near Eastern Studies
Course Evaluation
Teaching Assistants

Professor: Prof. Ross Brann TA: Eric Epstein
Course: NES 3697 History of Israeli-Palestinian Conflict Term: Fall 2015
Class: Fr So (Jr) Sr Grad Other (Circle One) Major/College: Near Eastern Studies

Expected Course Grade: _____

Please respond to the following statements and questions using a 5-point scale. Unless otherwise indicated, "5" indicates strong agreement, "1" indicates strong disagreement, and "3" serves as the midpoint. Circle a number for each relevant question; leave blank if the question is not applicable. Be sure to complete both sides of this form.

Teaching Assistants (Circle a number for each relevant question. 5 = strongly agree, 1 = strongly disagree)

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1. I attended TA sessions: (5 = regularly; 1 = never) |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 2. I met with my TA individually: (5 = more than 5 times; 1 = never) |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 3. The TA was knowledgeable about the course material. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4. The discussion sections were well-organized. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5. The sections effectively reviewed materials covered in lecture. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6. The sections helped me to gain new insight into the subject matter. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 7. The TA did a good job of attempting to stimulate student discussion. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 8. The TA was able to explain effectively difficult concepts. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 9. The TA was available for individual consultation with students. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 10. Overall, how would you rate the TA? (5 = excellent; 1 = poor) |

Written Comments:

Please note: These comments are reviewed by faculty and teaching assistants, and are used in faculty reviews for renewal and tenure, as well as for job placement of TA's.

1. What did you like best about your TA?

Effectively reviewed materials
helped in connecting the events and topics

2. What suggestions do you have to improve TA sessions?

~~more~~ maybe we can use the time
more efficiently

3. In one or two sentences, please describe what you learned in the course.

We learned about the history of the
conflict and ~~the~~ how the two peoples
perceived the conflict. Though we never
came to any solution.

4/15

Department of Near Eastern Studies
Course Evaluation
Teaching Assistants

Professor: Ross Brown sec 5 TA: Eric Epstein
Course: NES 3697 IP Conflict Term: Fall 2015
Class: Fr So Jr Sr Grad Other (Circle One) Major/College: Sociology/Arts
Expected Course Grade: B

Please respond to the following statements and questions using a 5-point scale.
Unless otherwise indicated, "5" indicates strong agreement, "1" indicates strong disagreement, and "3" serves as the midpoint.
Circle a number for each relevant question; leave blank if the question is not applicable. Be sure to complete both sides of this form.

Teaching Assistants (Circle a number for each relevant question. 5 = strongly agree, 1 = strongly disagree)

- | | |
|-----------|---|
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 1. I attended TA sessions: (5 = regularly; 1 = never) |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 2. I met with my TA individually: (5 = more than 5 times; 1 = never) |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 3. The TA was knowledgeable about the course material. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 4. The discussion sections were well-organized. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 5. The sections effectively reviewed materials covered in lecture. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 6. The sections helped me to gain new insight into the subject matter. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 7. The TA did a good job of attempting to stimulate student discussion. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 8. The TA was able to explain effectively difficult concepts. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 9. The TA was available for individual consultation with students. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 10. Overall, how would you rate the TA? (5 = excellent; 1 = poor) |

Written Comments:

Please note: These comments are reviewed by faculty and teaching assistants, and are used in faculty reviews for renewal and tenure, as well as for job placement of TA's.

1. What did you like best about your TA?

He was passionate about the material.

2. What suggestions do you have to improve TA sessions?

Clearer descriptions - grading criteria

3. In one or two sentences, please describe what you learned in the course.

The deeper themes of the IP conflict -
A general understanding of facts.

2/15

Department of Near Eastern Studies
Course Evaluation
Teaching Assistants

Professor: Ross Brann

TA: Eric Epstien

Course: NES 3697

Term: Fall 2015

Class: Fr(So) Jr Sr Grad Other (Circle One)

Major/College: FLR

Expected Course Grade: A-

Please respond to the following statements and questions using a 5-point scale. Unless otherwise indicated, "5" indicates strong agreement, "1" indicates strong disagreement, and "3" serves as the midpoint. Circle a number for each relevant question; leave blank if the question is not applicable. Be sure to complete both sides of this form.

Teaching Assistants (Circle a number for each relevant question. 5 = strongly agree, 1 = strongly disagree)

- | | |
|------------------|---|
| 1 2 3 <u>4</u> 5 | 1. I attended TA sessions: (5 = regularly; 1 = never) |
| <u>1</u> 2 3 4 5 | 2. I met with my TA individually: (5 = more than 5 times; 1 = never) |
| 1 2 <u>3</u> 4 5 | 3. The TA was knowledgeable about the course material. |
| 1 <u>2</u> 3 4 5 | 4. The discussion sections were well-organized. |
| 1 2 <u>3</u> 4 5 | 5. The sections effectively reviewed materials covered in lecture. |
| 1 <u>2</u> 3 4 5 | 6. The sections helped me to gain new insight into the subject matter. |
| 1 2 <u>3</u> 4 5 | 7. The TA did a good job of attempting to stimulate student discussion. |
| 1 2 <u>3</u> 4 5 | 8. The TA was able to explain effectively difficult concepts. |
| 1 2 3 <u>4</u> 5 | 9. The TA was available for individual consultation with students. |
| 1 2 <u>3</u> 4 5 | 10. Overall, how would you rate the TA? (5 = excellent; 1 = poor) |

Written Comments:

Please note: These comments are reviewed by faculty and teaching assistants, and are used in faculty reviews for renewal and tenure, as well as for job placement of TA's.

1. What did you like best about your TA?

- He really wanted to relay material to us.

2. What suggestions do you have to improve TA sessions?

I think section could be more structured.

3. In one or two sentences, please describe what you learned in the course.

3/15

Department of Near Eastern Studies
Course Evaluation
Teaching Assistants

Professor: BRANN

TA: ERIC EPSTEIN

Course: _____

Term: FALL 2015

Class: Fr So Jr Sr Grad Other (Circle One)

Major/College: ADS

Expected Course Grade: _____

Please respond to the following statements and questions using a 5-point scale. Unless otherwise indicated, "5" indicates strong agreement, "1" indicates strong disagreement, and "3" serves as the midpoint. Circle a number for each relevant question; leave blank if the question is not applicable. Be sure to complete both sides of this form.

Teaching Assistants (Circle a number for each relevant question. 5 = strongly agree, 1 = strongly disagree)

- | | |
|------------------|---|
| 1 2 3 4 <u>5</u> | 1. I attended TA sessions: (5 = regularly; 1 = never) |
| 1 <u>2</u> 3 4 5 | 2. I met with my TA individually: (5 = more than 5 times; 1 = never) |
| 1 2 3 <u>4</u> 5 | 3. The TA was knowledgeable about the course material. |
| 1 2 <u>3</u> 4 5 | 4. The discussion sections were well-organized. |
| 1 2 3 4 <u>5</u> | 5. The sections effectively reviewed materials covered in lecture. |
| 1 2 3 4 <u>5</u> | 6. The sections helped me to gain new insight into the subject matter. |
| 1 2 3 4 <u>5</u> | 7. The TA did a good job of attempting to stimulate student discussion. |
| 1 2 3 4 <u>5</u> | 8. The TA was able to explain effectively difficult concepts. |
| 1 2 3 4 <u>5</u> | 9. The TA was available for individual consultation with students. |
| 1 2 3 4 <u>5</u> | 10. Overall, how would you rate the TA? (5 = excellent; 1 = poor) |

Written Comments:

Please note: These comments are reviewed by faculty and teaching assistants, and are used in faculty reviews for renewal and tenure, as well as for job placement of TA's.

1. What did you like best about your TA?

2. What suggestions do you have to improve TA sessions?

3. In one or two sentences, please describe what you learned in the course.

4/15

Department of Near Eastern Studies
Course Evaluation
Teaching Assistants

Professor: Brann TA: Epstein
Course: Israel-Palestine Term: Fall 2015
Class: Fr So Jr Sr Grad Other (Circle One) Major/College: ILR
Expected Course Grade: B-

Please respond to the following statements and questions using a 5-point scale.
Unless otherwise indicated, "5" indicates strong agreement, "1" indicates strong disagreement, and "3" serves as the midpoint.
Circle a number for each relevant question; leave blank if the question is not applicable. Be sure to complete both sides of this form.

Teaching Assistants (Circle a number for each relevant question. 5 = strongly agree, 1 = strongly disagree)

- | | |
|------------------|---|
| 1 2 3 4 <u>5</u> | 1. I attended TA sessions: (5 = regularly; 1 = never) |
| <u>1</u> 2 3 4 5 | 2. I met with my TA individually: (5 = more than 5 times; 1 = never) |
| 1 2 3 <u>4</u> 5 | 3. The TA was knowledgeable about the course material. |
| 1 2 3 <u>4</u> 5 | 4. The discussion sections were well-organized. |
| 1 2 <u>4</u> 3 5 | 5. The sections effectively reviewed materials covered in lecture. |
| 1 2 3 <u>4</u> 5 | 6. The sections helped me to gain new insight into the subject matter. |
| 1 2 3 <u>4</u> 5 | 7. The TA did a good job of attempting to stimulate student discussion. |
| 1 2 <u>3</u> 4 5 | 8. The TA was able to explain effectively difficult concepts. |
| 1 2 3 4 <u>5</u> | 9. The TA was available for individual consultation with students. |
| 1 2 3 <u>4</u> 5 | 10. Overall, how would you rate the TA? (5 = excellent; 1 = poor) |

Written Comments:

Please note: These comments are reviewed by faculty and teaching assistants, and are used in faculty reviews for renewal and tenure, as well as for job placement of TA's.

1. What did you like best about your TA?

Tried to get everyone's opinion heard.

2. What suggestions do you have to improve TA sessions?

Be a little more flexible w/ the flow of discussion.

3. In one or two sentences, please describe what you learned in the course.

Historical context for the current situations in the region.

5/15

Department of Near Eastern Studies
Course Evaluation
Teaching Assistants

Professor: Prof. Brunn

TA: Eric Epstein

Course: I-P Conflict

Term: FA '15

Class: Fr So Jr Sr Grad Other (Circle One)

Major/College: Art & Sciences

Expected Course Grade: Not a C (ur)

Please respond to the following statements and questions using a 5-point scale. Unless otherwise indicated, "5" indicates strong agreement, "1" indicates strong disagreement, and "3" serves as the midpoint. Circle a number for each relevant question; leave blank if the question is not applicable. Be sure to complete both sides of this form.

Teaching Assistants (Circle a number for each relevant question. 5 = strongly agree, 1 = strongly disagree)

- | | |
|-----------|---|
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 1. I attended TA sessions: (5 = regularly; 1 = never) |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 2. I met with my TA individually: (5 = more than 5 times; 1 = never) |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 3. The TA was knowledgeable about the course material. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 4. The discussion sections were well-organized. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 5. The sections effectively reviewed materials covered in lecture. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 6. The sections helped me to gain new insight into the subject matter. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 7. The TA did a good job of attempting to stimulate student discussion. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 8. The TA was able to explain effectively difficult concepts. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 9. The TA was available for individual consultation with students. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 10. Overall, how would you rate the TA? (5 = excellent; 1 = poor) |

Written Comments:

Please note: These comments are reviewed by faculty and teaching assistants, and are used in faculty reviews for renewal and tenure, as well as for job placement of TA's.

1. What did you like best about your TA?

Guided class discuss very well

2. What suggestions do you have to improve TA sessions?

Prof Brunn should tell TA's what to cover for each section so section is sure to hit on the

3. In one or two sentences, please describe what you learned in the course. Most important

In depth knowledge of conflict issues.
ability to analyze and debate
conflict critically

6/15

Department of Near Eastern Studies
Course Evaluation
Teaching Assistants

Professor: Brann

TA: Eric Epstein

Course: 3697

Term: Fall 2015

Class: Fr (So) Jr Sr Grad Other (Circle One)

Major/College: ? / A&S

Expected Course Grade: _____

Please respond to the following statements and questions using a 5-point scale.

Unless otherwise indicated, "5" indicates strong agreement, "1" indicates strong disagreement, and "3" serves as the midpoint. Circle a number for each relevant question; leave blank if the question is not applicable. Be sure to complete both sides of this form.

Teaching Assistants (Circle a number for each relevant question. 5 = strongly agree, 1 = strongly disagree)

- | | |
|-------------|---|
| 1 2 3 4 (5) | 1. I attended TA sessions: (5 = regularly; 1 = never) |
| 1 2 (3) 4 5 | 2. I met with my TA individually: (5 = more than 5 times; 1 = never) |
| 1 2 3 (4) 5 | 3. The TA was knowledgeable about the course material. |
| 1 2 (3) 4 5 | 4. The discussion sections were well-organized. |
| 1 2 (3) 4 5 | 5. The sections effectively reviewed materials covered in lecture. |
| 1 2 (3) 4 5 | 6. The sections helped me to gain new insight into the subject matter. |
| 1 2 (3) 4 5 | 7. The TA did a good job of attempting to stimulate student discussion. |
| 1 2 (3) 4 5 | 8. The TA was able to explain effectively difficult concepts. |
| 1 2 3 4 (5) | 9. The TA was available for individual consultation with students. |
| 1 2 (3) 4 5 | 10. Overall, how would you rate the TA? (5 = excellent; 1 = poor) |

Written Comments:

Please note: These comments are reviewed by faculty and teaching assistants, and are used in faculty reviews for renewal and tenure, as well as for job placement of TA's.

1. What did you like best about your TA?

Eric = O.G.

2. What suggestions do you have to improve TA sessions?

Interpretive dance.

3. In one or two sentences, please describe what you learned in the course.

What does it matter how many lovers you have if none of them gives you the universe?

7/15

Department of Near Eastern Studies
Course Evaluation
Teaching Assistants

Professor: Ross Beann

TA: Eric Eyalon

Course: NES 3697

Term: Fall 2015

Class: Fr So **Jr** Sr Grad Other (Circle One)

Major/College: Arts and Science
Chemistry
Philosophy

Expected Course Grade: A-

Please respond to the following statements and questions using a 5-point scale. Unless otherwise indicated, "5" indicates strong agreement, "1" indicates strong disagreement, and "3" serves as the midpoint. Circle a number for each relevant question; leave blank if the question is not applicable. Be sure to complete both sides of this form.

Teaching Assistants (Circle a number for each relevant question. 5 = strongly agree, 1 = strongly disagree)

- | | |
|------------------|---|
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 1. I attended TA sessions: (5 = regularly; 1 = never) |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 2. I met with my TA individually: (5 = more than 5 times; 1 = never) |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 3. The TA was knowledgeable about the course material. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 4. The discussion sections were well-organized. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 5. The sections effectively reviewed materials covered in lecture. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 6. The sections helped me to gain new insight into the subject matter. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 7. The TA did a good job of attempting to stimulate student discussion. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 8. The TA was able to explain effectively difficult concepts. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 9. The TA was available for individual consultation with students. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 10. Overall, how would you rate the TA? (5 = excellent; 1 = poor) |

Written Comments:

Please note: These comments are reviewed by faculty and teaching assistants, and are used in faculty reviews for renewal and tenure, as well as for job placement of TA's.

1. What did you like best about your TA?

Eric was an excellent TA.

2. What suggestions do you have to improve TA sessions?

3. In one or two sentences, please describe what you learned in the course.

8/15

Department of Near Eastern Studies
Course Evaluation
Teaching Assistants

Professor: Bram

TA: Eric Epstein

Course: NBS 3697

Term: Fall 2015

Class: Fr So Jr Sr Grad Other (Circle One)

Major/College: NBS / A&S

Expected Course Grade: B+

Please respond to the following statements and questions using a 5-point scale. Unless otherwise indicated, "5" indicates strong agreement, "1" indicates strong disagreement, and "3" serves as the midpoint. Circle a number for each relevant question; leave blank if the question is not applicable. Be sure to complete both sides of this form.

Teaching Assistants (Circle a number for each relevant question. 5 = strongly agree, 1 = strongly disagree)

- 1 2 3 4 5 1. I attended TA sessions: (5 = regularly; 1 = never)
1 2 3 4 5 2. I met with my TA individually: (5 = more than 5 times; 1 = never)
1 2 3 4 5 3. The TA was knowledgeable about the course material.
1 2 3 4 5 4. The discussion sections were well-organized.
1 2 3 4 5 5. The sections effectively reviewed materials covered in lecture.
1 2 3 4 5 6. The sections helped me to gain new insight into the subject matter.
1 2 3 4 5 7. The TA did a good job of attempting to stimulate student discussion.
1 2 3 4 5 8. The TA was able to explain effectively difficult concepts.
1 2 3 4 5 9. The TA was available for individual consultation with students.
1 2 3 4 10. Overall, how would you rate the TA? (5 = excellent; 1 = poor)

Written Comments:

Please note: These comments are reviewed by faculty and teaching assistants, and are used in faculty reviews for renewal and tenure, as well as for job placement of TA's.

1. What did you like best about your TA?

He conveyed a lot of passion + enthusiasm for the material and did a good job of mediating discussion.

2. What suggestions do you have to improve TA sessions?

Try to have TAs more associated with the NBS department.

3. In one or two sentences, please describe what you learned in the course.

I learned about the different perspectives + motivations of the conflict.

9/15

Department of Near Eastern Studies
Course Evaluation
Teaching Assistants

Professor: Ross Brann TA: Eric Epstein
Course: NES 3697 Term: Fall 2015
Class: Fr So Jr Sr Grad Other (Circle One) Major/College: History / Arts
Expected Course Grade: A- / B+

Please respond to the following statements and questions using a 5-point scale.
Unless otherwise indicated, "5" indicates strong agreement, "1" indicates strong disagreement, and "3" serves as the midpoint.
Circle a number for each relevant question; leave blank if the question is not applicable. Be sure to complete both sides of this form.

Teaching Assistants (Circle a number for each relevant question. 5 = strongly agree, 1 = strongly disagree)

- | | |
|------------------|---|
| 1 2 3 4 <u>5</u> | 1. I attended TA sessions: (5 = regularly; 1 = never) |
| <u>1</u> 2 3 4 5 | 2. I met with my TA individually: (5 = more than 5 times; 1 = never) |
| 1 2 3 <u>4</u> 5 | 3. The TA was knowledgeable about the course material. |
| 1 2 <u>3</u> 4 5 | 4. The discussion sections were well-organized. |
| 1 2 <u>3</u> 4 5 | 5. The sections effectively reviewed materials covered in lecture. |
| 1 2 <u>3</u> 4 5 | 6. The sections helped me to gain new insight into the subject matter. |
| 1 2 <u>3</u> 4 5 | 7. The TA did a good job of attempting to stimulate student discussion. |
| 1 2 3 <u>4</u> 5 | 8. The TA was able to explain effectively difficult concepts. |
| 1 2 3 4 <u>5</u> | 9. The TA was available for individual consultation with students. |
| 1 2 3 <u>4</u> 5 | 10. Overall, how would you rate the TA? (5 = excellent; 1 = poor) |

Written Comments:

Please note: These comments are reviewed by faculty and teaching assistants, and are used in faculty reviews for renewal and tenure, as well as for job placement of TA's.

1. What did you like best about your TA?

He did a decent job synthesizing material

2. What suggestions do you have to improve TA sessions?

Be more accepting of all viewpoints, and don't be afraid of a little conflict in the class. That's when people are at their learning edge. We need to challenge each other in order to learn and grow.

3. In one or two sentences, please describe what you learned in the course.

If ~~when~~ someone asks you ~~what~~ if you're pro-Israel or Pro-Palestine, they don't fucking get it.

10/15

Department of Near Eastern Studies
Course Evaluation
Teaching Assistants

Professor: Dr. Ross Brown

TA: Eric Epstein

Course: Israeli/Palestinian Conflict

Term: Fall 2015

Class: Fr So Jr **(Sr)** Grad Other (Circle One)

Major/College: NES / Arts

Expected Course Grade: _____

Please respond to the following statements and questions using a 5-point scale.

Unless otherwise indicated, "5" indicates strong agreement, "1" indicates strong disagreement, and "3" serves as the midpoint. Circle a number for each relevant question; leave blank if the question is not applicable. Be sure to complete both sides of this form.

Teaching Assistants (Circle a number for each relevant question. 5 = strongly agree, 1 = strongly disagree)

- 1 2 3 4 **(5)** 1. I attended TA sessions: (5 = regularly; 1 = never)
(1) 2 3 4 5 2. I met with my TA individually: (5 = more than 5 times; 1 = never)
1 2 3 4 **(5)** 3. The TA was knowledgeable about the course material.
1 2 3 4 **(5)** 4. The discussion sections were well-organized.
1 2 3 4 **(5)** 5. The sections effectively reviewed materials covered in lecture.
1 2 3 4 **(5)** 6. The sections helped me to gain new insight into the subject matter.
1 2 3 4 **(5)** 7. The TA did a good job of attempting to stimulate student discussion.
1 2 3 4 **(5)** 8. The TA was able to explain effectively difficult concepts.
1 2 3 4 **(5)** 9. The TA was available for individual consultation with students.
1 2 3 4 **(5)** 10. Overall, how would you rate the TA? (5 = excellent; 1 = poor)

Written Comments:

Please note: These comments are reviewed by faculty and teaching assistants, and are used in faculty reviews for renewal and tenure, as well as for job placement of TA's.

1. What did you like best about your TA?

I liked that he was very knowledgeable about the subject matter and always had a plan coming into section

2. What suggestions do you have to improve TA sessions?

3. In one or two sentences, please describe what you learned in the course.

I learned about the history and politics of the conflict

11/15

Department of Near Eastern Studies
Course Evaluation
Teaching Assistants

Professor: Ross Brann
Course: NES 3697
Class: Fr So Jr Sr Grad Other (Circle One)

TA: Eric Epstein
Term: Fall
Major/College: Spanish + Govt

Expected Course Grade: _____

Please respond to the following statements and questions using a 5-point scale. Unless otherwise indicated, "5" indicates strong agreement, "1" indicates strong disagreement, and "3" serves as the midpoint. Circle a number for each relevant question; leave blank if the question is not applicable. Be sure to complete both sides of this form.

Teaching Assistants (Circle a number for each relevant question. 5 = strongly agree, 1 = strongly disagree)

- | | |
|------------------|---|
| 1 2 3 4 <u>5</u> | 1. I attended TA sessions: (5 = regularly; 1 = never) |
| <u>1</u> 2 3 4 5 | 2. I met with my TA individually: (5 = more than 5 times; 1 = never) |
| 1 2 3 <u>4</u> 5 | 3. The TA was knowledgeable about the course material. |
| 1 2 3 <u>4</u> 5 | 4. The discussion sections were well-organized. |
| 1 2 3 <u>4</u> 5 | 5. The sections effectively reviewed materials covered in lecture. |
| 1 2 3 <u>4</u> 5 | 6. The sections helped me to gain new insight into the subject matter. |
| 1 2 3 <u>4</u> 5 | 7. The TA did a good job of attempting to stimulate student discussion. |
| 1 2 3 <u>4</u> 5 | 8. The TA was able to explain effectively difficult concepts. |
| 1 2 3 <u>4</u> 5 | 9. The TA was available for individual consultation with students. |
| 1 2 3 <u>4</u> 5 | 10. Overall, how would you rate the TA? (5 = excellent; 1 = poor) |

Written Comments:

Please note: These comments are reviewed by faculty and teaching assistants, and are used in faculty reviews for renewal and tenure, as well as for job placement of TA's.

1. What did you like best about your TA?

really willing to touch on all questions we had, wanted us to succeed which is a nice feeling

2. What suggestions do you have to improve TA sessions?

highlight what we're doing at the beginning of the section

3. In one or two sentences, please describe what you learned in the course.

I learned the complexities of the IP conflict.

12/15

Department of Near Eastern Studies
Course Evaluation
Teaching Assistants

Professor: Professor Brann TA: Eric Epstein
Course: NES 3697 IP Conflict Term: Fall 2015
Class: Fr So Jr **Sr** Grad Other (Circle One) Major/College: English / AdS
Expected Course Grade: B-

Please respond to the following statements and questions using a 5-point scale.
Unless otherwise indicated, "5" indicates strong agreement, "1" indicates strong disagreement, and "3" serves as the midpoint.
Circle a number for each relevant question; leave blank if the question is not applicable. Be sure to complete both sides of this form.

Teaching Assistants (Circle a number for each relevant question. 5 = strongly agree, 1 = strongly disagree)

- | | |
|------------------|---|
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 1. I attended TA sessions: (5 = regularly; 1 = never) |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 2. I met with my TA individually: (5 = more than 5 times; 1 = never) |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 3. The TA was knowledgeable about the course material. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 4. The discussion sections were well-organized. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 5. The sections effectively reviewed materials covered in lecture. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 6. The sections helped me to gain new insight into the subject matter. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 7. The TA did a good job of attempting to stimulate student discussion. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 8. The TA was able to explain effectively difficult concepts. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 9. The TA was available for individual consultation with students. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 10. Overall, how would you rate the TA? (5 = excellent; 1 = poor) |

Written Comments:

Please note: These comments are reviewed by faculty and teaching assistants, and are used in faculty reviews for renewal and tenure, as well as for job placement of TA's.

1. What did you like best about your TA?

His friendliness and willingness to be approached with questions.

2. What suggestions do you have to improve TA sessions?

Clearer concepts + better preparation for the quiz.

Guided discussions, but not structured to align with the essays + quiz.

3. In one or two sentences, please describe what you learned in the course.

Everyone is a victim.

13/15

Department of Near Eastern Studies
Course Evaluation
Teaching Assistants

Professor: Ross Brann

TA: Eric Epstein

Course: NES 3697

Term: Fall 2015

Class: Fr So Jr Sr Grad Other (Circle One)

Major/College: Arts

Expected Course Grade: A

Please respond to the following statements and questions using a 5-point scale. Unless otherwise indicated, "5" indicates strong agreement, "1" indicates strong disagreement, and "3" serves as the midpoint. Circle a number for each relevant question; leave blank if the question is not applicable. Be sure to complete both sides of this form.

Teaching Assistants (Circle a number for each relevant question. 5 = strongly agree, 1 = strongly disagree)

- | | |
|------------------|---|
| 1 2 3 4 <u>5</u> | 1. I attended TA sessions: (5 = regularly; 1 = never) |
| <u>1</u> 2 3 4 5 | 2. I met with my TA individually: (5 = more than 5 times; 1 = never) |
| 1 2 3 <u>4</u> 5 | 3. The TA was knowledgeable about the course material. |
| 1 2 3 <u>4</u> 5 | 4. The discussion sections were well-organized. |
| 1 2 3 4 <u>5</u> | 5. The sections effectively reviewed materials covered in lecture. |
| 1 2 3 <u>4</u> 5 | 6. The sections helped me to gain new insight into the subject matter. |
| 1 2 3 4 <u>5</u> | 7. The TA did a good job of attempting to stimulate student discussion. |
| 1 2 3 <u>4</u> 5 | 8. The TA was able to explain effectively difficult concepts. |
| 1 2 <u>3</u> 4 5 | 9. The TA was available for individual consultation with students. |
| 1 2 3 <u>4</u> 5 | 10. Overall, how would you rate the TA? (5 = excellent; 1 = poor) |

Written Comments:

Please note: These comments are reviewed by faculty and teaching assistants, and are used in faculty reviews for renewal and tenure, as well as for job placement of TA's.

1. What did you like best about your TA?

He's very nice + flexible w/ discussions

2. What suggestions do you have to improve TA sessions?

3. In one or two sentences, please describe what you learned in the course.

Department of Near Eastern Studies
Course Evaluation
Teaching Assistants

14/15

Professor: Ross Brann
Course: 3697 Pal-Israeli Conflict
Class: Fr So Jr Sr Grad Other (Circle One)

TA: Eric Epstein
Term: Fall 2015
Major/College: RAM, Human Ec.

Expected Course Grade: A-

Please respond to the following statements and questions using a 5-point scale. Unless otherwise indicated, "5" indicates strong agreement, "1" indicates strong disagreement, and "3" serves as the midpoint. Circle a number for each relevant question; leave blank if the question is not applicable. Be sure to complete both sides of this form.

Teaching Assistants (Circle a number for each relevant question. 5 = strongly agree, 1 = strongly disagree)

- | | |
|-----------|---|
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 1. I attended TA sessions: (5 = regularly; 1 = never) |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 2. I met with my TA individually: (5 = more than 5 times; 1 = never) |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 3. The TA was knowledgeable about the course material. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 4. The discussion sections were well-organized. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 5. The sections effectively reviewed materials covered in lecture. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 6. The sections helped me to gain new insight into the subject matter. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 7. The TA did a good job of attempting to stimulate student discussion. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 8. The TA was able to explain effectively difficult concepts. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 9. The TA was available for individual consultation with students. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 10. Overall, how would you rate the TA? (5 = excellent; 1 = poor) |

Written Comments:

Please note: These comments are reviewed by faculty and teaching assistants, and are used in faculty reviews for renewal and tenure, as well as for job placement of TA's.

1. What did you like best about your TA?

Very willing to meet outside of section. Very knowledgeable on course material & cared about student's success in course & understanding of material

2. What suggestions do you have to improve TA sessions?

more section debating

3. In one or two sentences, please describe what you learned in the course.

- Early history of Zionism & history of region
- Better understanding of important events & documents

Department of Near Eastern Studies
Course Evaluation
Teaching Assistants

15/15

Professor: Koss Brown

TA: Bil Epton

Course: NES 3697

Term: FA 2015

Class: Fr So Jr **(Sr)** Grad Other (Circle One)

Major/College: Computer Science / A&S

Expected Course Grade: B ?

Please respond to the following statements and questions using a 5-point scale. Unless otherwise indicated, "5" indicates strong agreement, "1" indicates strong disagreement, and "3" serves as the midpoint. Circle a number for each relevant question; leave blank if the question is not applicable. Be sure to complete both sides of this form.

Teaching Assistants (Circle a number for each relevant question. 5 = strongly agree, 1 = strongly disagree)

- 1 2 3 4 **5** 1. I attended TA sessions: (5 = regularly; 1 = never)
- 1** 2 3 4 5 2. I met with my TA individually: (5 = more than 5 times; 1 = never)
- 1 2 3 4 **5** 3. The TA was knowledgeable about the course material.
- 1 2 3 4 **5** 4. The discussion sections were well-organized.
- 1 2 3 4 **5** 5. The sections effectively reviewed materials covered in lecture.
- 1 2 3 **4** 5 6. The sections helped me to gain new insight into the subject matter.
- 1 2 3 4 **5** 7. The TA did a good job of attempting to stimulate student discussion.
- 1 2 3 **4** 5 8. The TA was able to explain effectively difficult concepts.
- 1 2 3 4 5 9. The TA was available for individual consultation with students.
- 1 2 3 4 **5** 10. Overall, how would you rate the TA? (5 = excellent; 1 = poor)

Written Comments:

Please note: These comments are reviewed by faculty and teaching assistants, and are used in faculty reviews for renewal and tenure, as well as for job placement of TA's.

1. What did you like best about your TA?

Depth of argument, clarity, and ability to make when arguments are missing links and comments, ability to moderate discussions

2. What suggestions do you have to improve TA sessions?

More willingness to let the conversation deviate from the lesson plan to reach new insights

3. In one or two sentences, please describe what you learned in the course.

The systems that perpetuate conflict

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

INTRODUCTION TO PHILOSOPHY AND CRITICAL THINKING

Spring 2016

Principal Instructor: Eric Epstein

Teaching Assistant: Mané Mehrabyan



Cornell University Prison Education Program

115 Day Hall | Ithaca, New York 14853

Department and course number: Phil 101 Title: Logic + Phil

Instructor: Epstein

Facility (check one): ☐ Auburn CF
☒ Cayuga CF
☐ Five Points CF

Please evaluate the class on the following criteria using a 5-point scale, where "1" and "5" are defined as indicated and "3" stands as the midpoint. (Check the appropriate box.)

	1	2	3	4	5
How well did the instructor organize the presentation of the material?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1 = very disorganized ... 5 = well organized					

	1	2	3	4	5
How willing was the instructor to give help to students requesting it?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1 = very unwilling ... 5 = very willing					

	1	2	3	4	5
How well did the course meet its stated objectives?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1 = poorly ... 5 = very well					

If you've taken multiple college courses:

	1	2	3	4	5
How did the workload compare with courses carrying equal credit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1 = much less ... 5 = required much more					

If you've taken multiple college courses:

	1	2	3	4	5
How did the teaching skills of the instructor in this course compare with other college instructors you've had?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1 = very unfavorably ... 5 = very favorably					

If you've taken multiple college courses:

	1	2	3	4	5
The value of this course as a part of my general education, compared with other courses, has been:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1 = very low ... 5 = very high					

	1	2	3	4	5
My overall opinion of this course is:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1 = very low ... 5 = very high					

The aspects of this course I valued most were:

Philosophical concepts introduced

Improvements to the course (if any) should include:

More debates & better presentation of ideas

What have you gained from attending this course?

able to think logically + critically

Does this course fit coherently into the collection of courses you are taking to pursue your college degree? *yes*

Additional comments about the course or the instructor (your comments may remain anonymous):

Additional comments about the prison education program (your comments may remain anonymous):

May we quote a portion of your evaluation for publicity purposes?

- ☐ Yes, and my name is: _____
- ☐ Yes, but I wish to keep my quote anonymous
- ☒ No

Thank you for your feedback!

11.15



Cornell University Prison Education Program

115 Day Hall | Ithaca, New York 14853

Department and course number: Phil. 101 Title: Philosophy 101 - Logic

Instructor: R. Epstein

Facility (check one): ☐ Auburn CF
☒ Cayuga CF
☐ Five Points CF

Please evaluate the class on the following criteria using a 5-point scale, where "1" and "5" are defined as indicated and "3" stands as the midpoint. (Check the appropriate box.)

How well did the instructor organize the presentation of the material? 1 2 3 4 5
☐ ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐
 1 = very disorganized ... 5 = well organized

How willing was the instructor to give help to students requesting it? 1 2 3 4 5
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
 1 = very unwilling ... 5 = very willing

How well did the course meet its stated objectives? 1 2 3 4 5
☐ ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐
 1 = poorly ... 5 = very well

If you've taken multiple college courses:

How did the workload compare with courses carrying equal credit? 1 2 3 4 5
☐ ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐
 1 = much less ... 5 = required much more

If you've taken multiple college courses:

How did the teaching skills of the instructor in this course compare with other college instructors you've had? 1 2 3 4 5
☐ ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐
 1 = very unfavorably ... 5 = very favorably

If you've taken multiple college courses:

The value of this course as a part of my general education, compared with other courses, has been: 1 2 3 4 5
☐ ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐
 1 = very low ... 5 = very high

My overall opinion of this course is: 1 2 3 4 5
☐ ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐
 1 = very low ... 5 = very high

The aspects of this course I valued most were: *Logical analysis & an introduction to classical philosophical dialectics.*

Improvements to the course (if any) should include: *To separate philosophy from the logic work in that it felt as though two separate classes were being combined with the effect of ^{our} not being able to devote ourselves to either.*

What have you gained from attending this course?

A deeper insight to various corners of thought.

Does this course fit coherently into the collection of courses you are taking to pursue your college degree?

Yes.

Additional comments about the course or the instructor (your comments may remain anonymous):

N/A.

Additional comments about the prison education program (your comments may remain anonymous):

N/A.

May we quote a portion of your evaluation for publicity purposes?

- ☒ Yes, and my name is: *Ariel Smith*
☐ Yes, but I wish to keep my quote anonymous
☐ No

Thank you for your feedback!

11.15



Cornell University Prison Education Program

115 Day Hall | Ithaca, New York 14853

Department and course number: Phil 101 Title: Logic

Instructor: E. Epstein

Facility (check one): ☐ Auburn CF
☒ Cayuga CF
☐ Five Points CF

Please evaluate the class on the following criteria using a 5-point scale, where "1" and "5" are defined as indicated and "3" stands as the midpoint. (Check the appropriate box.)

	1	2	3	4	5
How well did the instructor organize the presentation of the material?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1 = very disorganized ... 5 = well organized					

	1	2	3	4	5
How willing was the instructor to give help to students requesting it?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1 = very unwilling ... 5 = very willing					

	1	2	3	4	5
How well did the course meet its stated objectives?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1 = poorly ... 5 = very well					

If you've taken multiple college courses:

	1	2	3	4	5
How did the workload compare with courses carrying equal credit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1 = much less ... 5 = required much more					

If you've taken multiple college courses:

	1	2	3	4	5
How did the teaching skills of the instructor in this course compare with other college instructors you've had?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1 = very unfavorably ... 5 = very favorably					

If you've taken multiple college courses:

	1	2	3	4	5
The value of this course as a part of my general education, compared with other courses, has been:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1 = very low ... 5 = very high					

	1	2	3	4	5
My overall opinion of this course is:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1 = very low ... 5 = very high					

The aspects of this course I valued most were:

learning this type of material
for the first time.

Improvements to the course (if any) should include:

NONE

What have you gained from attending this course?

a headache

Does this course fit coherently into the collection of courses you are taking to pursue your college degree? 50/50

Additional comments about the course or the instructor (your comments may remain anonymous):

NONE

Additional comments about the prison education program (your comments may remain anonymous):

KEEP IT GOING!!!

May we quote a portion of your evaluation for publicity purposes?

- ☐ Yes, and my name is: _____
- ☐ Yes, but I wish to keep my quote anonymous
- ☒ No

Thank you for your feedback!

11.15



Cornell University **Prison Education Program**

115 Day Hall | Ithaca, New York 14853

Department and course number: _____ Title: PHIL 101: LOGIC

Instructor: MR. KRSTECIC

Facility (check one): ☐ Auburn CF
☒ Cayuga CF
☐ Five Points CF

Please evaluate the class on the following criteria using a 5-point scale, where "1" and "5" are defined as indicated and "3" stands as the midpoint. (Check the appropriate box.)

	1	2	3	4	5
How well did the instructor organize the presentation of the material?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1 = very disorganized ... 5 = well organized					

	1	2	3	4	5
How willing was the instructor to give help to students requesting it?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1 = very unwilling ... 5 = very willing					

	1	2	3	4	5
How well did the course meet its stated objectives?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1 = poorly ... 5 = very well					

If you've taken multiple college courses:

	1	2	3	4	5
How did the workload compare with courses carrying equal credit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1 = much less ... 5 = required much more					

If you've taken multiple college courses:

	1	2	3	4	5
How did the teaching skills of the instructor in this course compare with other college instructors you've had?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1 = very unfavorably ... 5 = very favorably					

If you've taken multiple college courses:

	1	2	3	4	5
The value of this course as a part of my general education, compared with other courses, has been:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1 = very low ... 5 = very high					

	1	2	3	4	5
My overall opinion of this course is:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1 = very low ... 5 = very high					

The aspects of this course I valued most were: *THE TEACHER'S WILLINGNESS TO GROW*
NOW THE COURSE IS RELEVANT TO MY OTHER STUDIES

Improvements to the course (if any) should include:

What have you gained from attending this course? *THE ABILITY TO UNDERSTAND A*
VALID ARGUMENT THAT A SOUND ARGUMENT

Does this course fit coherently into the collection of courses you are taking to pursue your college degree? *YES*

Additional comments about the course or the instructor (your comments may remain anonymous):

VERY GOOD INSTRUCTOR. I WOULD BE AN INSTRUCTOR CHAIRS ABOUT
THE COURSE IT IS A GOOD

Additional comments about the prison education program (your comments may remain anonymous): *KEEP IT SIMPLE*

May we quote a portion of your evaluation for publicity purposes?

- ☒ Yes, and my name is: MICHAEL J. JAMES
☐ Yes, but I wish to keep my quote anonymous
☐ No

Thank you for your feedback!

11.15



Cornell University Prison Education Program

115 Day Hall | Ithaca, New York 14853

Department and course number: PHIL 101 Title: Logic

Instructor: Eric Epstein

Facility (check one): ☐ Auburn CF
☒ Cayuga CF
☐ Five Points CF

Please evaluate the class on the following criteria using a 5-point scale, where "1" and "5" are defined as indicated and "3" stands as the midpoint. (Check the appropriate box.)

	1	2	3	4	5
How well did the instructor organize the presentation of the material?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1 = very disorganized ... 5 = well organized					

	1	2	3	4	5
How willing was the instructor to give help to students requesting it?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1 = very unwilling ... 5 = very willing					

	1	2	3	4	5
How well did the course meet its stated objectives?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1 = poorly ... 5 = very well					

If you've taken multiple college courses:

	1	2	3	4	5
How did the workload compare with courses carrying equal credit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1 = much less ... 5 = required much more					

If you've taken multiple college courses:

	1	2	3	4	5
How did the teaching skills of the instructor in this course compare with other college instructors you've had?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1 = very unfavorably ... 5 = very favorably					

If you've taken multiple college courses:

	1	2	3	4	5
The value of this course as a part of my general education, compared with other courses, has been:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1 = very low ... 5 = very high					

	1	2	3	4	5
My overall opinion of this course is:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1 = very low ... 5 = very high					

The aspects of this course I valued most were: *The challenging back-and-forth dialogue.*

Improvements to the course (if any) should include: *N/A*

What have you gained from attending this course? *The ability to express an argument logically and to view an argument from both sides.*

Does this course fit coherently into the collection of courses you are taking to pursue your college degree? *yes*

Additional comments about the course or the instructor (your comments may remain anonymous):

Additional comments about the prison education program (your comments may remain anonymous): *I appreciate the dedication and the helpfulness of the CPEP instructors.*

May we quote a portion of your evaluation for publicity purposes?

- ☐ Yes, and my name is: _____
☒ Yes, but I wish to keep my quote anonymous
☐ No

Thank you for your feedback!

11.15



Cornell University **Prison Education Program**

115 Day Hall | Ithaca, New York 14853

Department and course number: PHIL 101 Title: Logic

Instructor: Eric Epstein

Facility (check one): ☐ Auburn CF
☒ Cayuga CF
☐ Five Points CF

Please evaluate the class on the following criteria using a 5-point scale, where "1" and "5" are defined as indicated and "3" stands as the midpoint. (Check the appropriate box.)

	1	2	3	4	5
How well did the instructor organize the presentation of the material?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1 = very disorganized ... 5 = well organized					

How willing was the instructor to give help to students requesting it?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1 = very unwilling ... 5 = very willing					

How well did the course meet its stated objectives?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1 = poorly ... 5 = very well					

If you've taken multiple college courses:

How did the workload compare with courses carrying equal credit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1 = much less ... 5 = required much more					

If you've taken multiple college courses:

How did the teaching skills of the instructor in this course compare with other college instructors you've had?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1 = very unfavorably ... 5 = very favorably					

If you've taken multiple college courses:

The value of this course as a part of my general education, compared with other courses, has been:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1 = very low ... 5 = very high					

My overall opinion of this course is:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1 = very low ... 5 = very high					

The aspects of this course I valued most were:

Improvements to the course (if any) should include:

What have you gained from attending this course?

Does this course fit coherently into the collection of courses you are taking to pursue your college degree? *per the degree track this fits perfectly*

Additional comments about the course or the instructor (your comments may remain anonymous):

I just didn't grasp why anyone would argue answerless questions to such dept. sorry.

Not to be picky but would suggest less uhs and ums when lecturing.
Additional comments about the prison education program (your comments may remain anonymous): *Love this program!*

May we quote a portion of your evaluation for publicity purposes?

- ☐ Yes, and my name is: _____
- ☐ Yes, but I wish to keep my quote anonymous
- ☐ No

Thank you for your feedback!

11.15



Cornell University Prison Education Program

115 Day Hall | Ithaca, New York 14853

Department and course number: Phil 101 Title: Mr. Epstein Logie

Instructor: Mr. Epstein

Facility (check one): ☐ Auburn CF
☒ Cayuga CF
☐ Five Points CF

Please evaluate the class on the following criteria using a 5-point scale, where "1" and "5" are defined as indicated and "3" stands as the midpoint. (Check the appropriate box.)

	1	2	3	4	5
How well did the instructor organize the presentation of the material?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1 = very disorganized ... 5 = well organized					

	1	2	3	4	5
How willing was the instructor to give help to students requesting it?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1 = very unwilling ... 5 = very willing					

	1	2	3	4	5
How well did the course meet its stated objectives?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1 = poorly ... 5 = very well					

If you've taken multiple college courses:

	1	2	3	4	5
How did the workload compare with courses carrying equal credit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1 = much less ... 5 = required much more					

If you've taken multiple college courses:

	1	2	3	4	5
How did the teaching skills of the instructor in this course compare with other college instructors you've had?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1 = very unfavorably ... 5 = very favorably					

If you've taken multiple college courses:

	1	2	3	4	5
The value of this course as a part of my general education, compared with other courses, has been:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1 = very low ... 5 = very high					

	1	2	3	4	5
My overall opinion of this course is:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1 = very low ... 5 = very high					

The aspects of this course I valued most were: *the understanding of philosophy*

Improvements to the course (if any) should include:

The class was very well planned and instructed

What have you gained from attending this course?

MUCH understanding of philosophy

Does this course fit coherently into the collection of courses you are taking to pursue your college degree?

yes.

Additional comments about the course or the instructor (your comments may remain anonymous):

great class, enjoyed it and the instructor very much.

Additional comments about the prison education program (your comments may remain anonymous):

I am very thankful for CPEP.

May we quote a portion of your evaluation for publicity purposes?

- ☒ Yes, and my name is: *Carlos Vellalba Jr*
☐ Yes, but I wish to keep my quote anonymous
☐ No

Thank you for your feedback!

11.15



Cornell University Prison Education Program

115 Day Hall | Ithaca, New York 14853

Department and course number: _____ Title: Philosophy 101

Instructor: Epstein

Facility (check one): ☐ Auburn CF
☒ Cayuga CF
☐ Five Points CF

Please evaluate the class on the following criteria using a 5-point scale, where "1" and "5" are defined as indicated and "3" stands as the midpoint. (Check the appropriate box.)

	1	2	3	4	5
How well did the instructor organize the presentation of the material?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1 = very disorganized ... 5 = well organized					

	1	2	3	4	5
How willing was the instructor to give help to students requesting it?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1 = very unwilling ... 5 = very willing					

	1	2	3	4	5
How well did the course meet its stated objectives?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1 = poorly ... 5 = very well					

If you've taken multiple college courses:

	1	2	3	4	5
How did the workload compare with courses carrying equal credit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1 = much less ... 5 = required much more					

If you've taken multiple college courses:

	1	2	3	4	5	6
How did the teaching skills of the instructor in this course compare with other college instructors you've had?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1 = very unfavorably ... 5 = very favorably						

If you've taken multiple college courses:

	1	2	3	4	5
The value of this course as a part of my general education, compared with other courses, has been:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1 = very low ... 5 = very high					

	1	2	3	4	5	6
My overall opinion of this course is:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1 = very low ... 5 = very high						

The aspects of this course I valued most were:

Critical thinking skills

Improvements to the course (if any) should include:

What have you gained from attending this course?

Does this course fit coherently into the collection of courses you are taking to pursue your college degree?

Additional comments about the course or the instructor (your comments may remain anonymous):

The instructor and TA are like peas and carrots. Separately, they're good, but put them together they're amazing.

Additional comments about the prison education program (your comments may remain

anonymous): If I had known I could've gotten a Cornell education by coming to prison I'd have committed a felony years ago! My only concern is that once free I may have to violate my parole to finish getting a degree 😞

May we quote a portion of your evaluation for publicity purposes?

- ☐ Yes, and my name is: _____
- ☐ Yes, but I wish to keep my quote anonymous
- ☐ No

Thank you for your feedback!

11.15



Cornell University Prison Education Program

115 Day Hall | Ithaca, New York 14853

Department and course number: Phil 101 Title: Logic

Instructor: Eric Epstein

Facility (check one): ☐ Auburn CF
☐ Cayuga CF
☐ Five Points CF

Please evaluate the class on the following criteria using a 5-point scale, where "1" and "5" are defined as indicated and "3" stands as the midpoint. (Check the appropriate box.)

	1	2	3	4	5
How well did the instructor organize the presentation of the material?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1 = very disorganized ... 5 = well organized					

How willing was the instructor to give help to students requesting it?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1 = very unwilling ... 5 = very willing					

How well did the course meet its stated objectives?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1 = poorly ... 5 = very well					

If you've taken multiple college courses:

How did the workload compare with courses carrying equal credit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1 = much less ... 5 = required much more					

If you've taken multiple college courses:

How did the teaching skills of the instructor in this course compare with other college instructors you've had?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1 = very unfavorably ... 5 = very favorably					

If you've taken multiple college courses:

The value of this course as a part of my general education, compared with other courses, has been:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1 = very low ... 5 = very high					

My overall opinion of this course is:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1 = very low ... 5 = very high					

The aspects of this course I valued most were: The lectures - Very organized and taught in a way that was "understandable"

Improvements to the course (if any) should include: —

What have you gained from attending this course? a better understanding of the way we evaluate information and/or arguments every day.

Does this course fit coherently into the collection of courses you are taking to pursue your college degree? yes

Additional comments about the course or the instructor (your comments may remain anonymous):

Both instructors are excellent. They complimented each other in teaching styles and their 'desire' to help others in pursuit of higher education is commendable

Additional comments about the prison education program (your comments may remain anonymous): Continued to help prepare individuals for re-entry

May we quote a portion of your evaluation for publicity purposes?

- ☐ Yes, and my name is: _____
- ☐ Yes, but I wish to keep my quote anonymous
- ☐ No

Thank you for your feedback!

11.15



Cornell University Prison Education Program

115 Day Hall | Ithaca, New York 14853

Department and course number: PHI (101) Title: Logic + Phil

Instructor: Eric Epstein / Mance

Facility (check one): ☐ Auburn CF
☒ Cayuga CF
☐ Five Points CF

Please evaluate the class on the following criteria using a 5-point scale, where "1" and "5" are defined as indicated and "3" stands as the midpoint. (Check the appropriate box.)

How well did the instructor organize the presentation of the material? 1 2 3 4 5
☐ ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐
 1 = very disorganized ... 5 = well organized

How willing was the instructor to give help to students requesting it? 1 2 3 4 5
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
 1 = very unwilling ... 5 = very willing

How well did the course meet its stated objectives? 1 2 3 4 5
☐ ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐
 1 = poorly ... 5 = very well

If you've taken multiple college courses:
 How did the workload compare with courses carrying equal credit? 1 2 3 4 5
☐ ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐
 1 = much less ... 5 = required much more

If you've taken multiple college courses:
 How did the teaching skills of the instructor in this course compare with other college instructors you've had? 1 2 3 4 5
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
 1 = very unfavorably ... 5 = very favorably

If you've taken multiple college courses:
 The value of this course as a part of my general education, compared with other courses, has been: 1 2 3 4 5
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
 1 = very low ... 5 = very high

My overall opinion of this course is: 1 2 3 4 5
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
 1 = very low ... 5 = very high

The aspects of this course I valued most were: Learning about philosophy from both Mr. Epstein & Marie

Improvements to the course (if any) should include: Really no improvements needed except for myself, I need to improve

What have you gained from attending this course? I really gained a different way of thinking.

Does this course fit coherently into the collection of courses you are taking to pursue your college degree?

Additional comments about the course or the instructor (your comments may remain anonymous):

Keep sharing information.

Additional comments about the prison education program (your comments may remain anonymous):

May we quote a portion of your evaluation for publicity purposes?

- ☒ Yes, and my name is: William Montague
☐ Yes, but I wish to keep my quote anonymous
☐ No

Thank you for your feedback!

11.15

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

MARX, NIETZSCHE, FREUD

Fall 2016

Principal Instructor: Eric Epstein

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Fall 2016

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name ERTC EASTMAN

Department CRIST Course Number 1170

Course Title More, Faster, Nietzsche

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

The content of the course is interesting and intellectually engaging, however the choice of the topics wasn't as engaging. There was no common thread between all the topics / no connection.

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

No, I don't believe that my writing has improved much as the focus was more aimed toward the content (philosophical discussion and analysis) and less on the techniques of writing.

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

Yes they were because they stressed important and relevant aspects of writing such as coherence, arguments and flow. There aren't however, as many comments on the grammar, language and structure.

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

It is hard to keep up with the amount of writing that we have to do sometimes. However, I believe that most of them were very helpful and went well with the in-class discussions.

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

I consider my greatest strength is active reading and adequate understanding of the author's works as well as incorporating my understanding of the literary works into my essays. My weaknesses are being pretty adequately and using my own voice / opinions.

JOHN S. KNIGHT INSTITUTE FOR WRITING IN THE DISCIPLINES

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Fall 2016

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name Eric Epstein

Department German Studies Course Number GERST1170 18059

Course Title Marx Nietzsche Freud

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

I liked the ~~course~~ course, but I think more interesting readings or essay topics could have been introduced as well as a greater discussion on the social implications of the philosophies could have been addressed.

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

I believe my writing in philosophy has improved because ~~the class~~ ^{the class} taught me to state directly what I was going to talk about in the essay as well as to use first person narration when need. Clarity of writing and relevance of quotations was stressed and I think ~~the~~ ^{these} ~~were~~ are the most ^(over) important points.

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

Yes, written comments on papers were extremely helpful because they helped me see my writing from the perspective of the reader. This showed where I needed to clarify or elaborate on points I otherwise would have found obvious.

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

The class discussions were very useful in analyzing the quotes and complex concepts Freud, Nietzsche, & Marx addressed.

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

Strength: coming up with my own ideas/ revelations on the text.

Weakness: organizing my thoughts into a strong cohesive argument

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Fall 2016

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name Eric Epstein

Department Gerst Course Number 1170

Course Title ~~Class~~ Marx, Nietzsche, Freud

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

- very good!
- adequate workload, interesting material w/ good class discussion
- helpful ~~the~~ instructor critiques

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

- yes
- guiding the reader, paper structuring improved
- more help w/ quote analysis

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

- yes, very
- both general and focused
- helped pinpoint weaknesses and understand how to best organize papers

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

- both were very helpful
- brought up conclusions that might be tough to discern alone

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

- S
- organization / outlining
 - formulating arguments
 - guiding the reader

- W
- complete analysis of quotes / assuming the reader understands

JOHN S. KNIGHT INSTITUTE FOR WRITING IN THE DISCIPLINES

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Fall 2016

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name Eric Epstein

Department German Studies Course Number 18859

Course Title Marx Nietzsche Freud

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

I enjoy the course we get to read about and from several philosophers who have opinions on the origin of society. Some suggest reproductive forces, while others suggest slave morality and master morality. We get to read from noteworthy critics.

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

I think my writing in the philosophical style has improved. There is a distinction between philosophical writing and scientific or literary writing. I have improved in the philosophical style. The dept. could have focused on other aspects but it might detract from the content.

281

(over)

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

Yes. Eric Epstein leaves very helpful comments on a sentence to ~~set~~ sentence, paragraph to paragraph level. He can suggest edits to help incorporate quotes or make overall flow better.

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

Class discussions helped my understanding of readings. I could see other people's interpretations and views on the authors. The discussions helped fuel my writing too.

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

Strengths: -using quotes as evidence
-interpreting quotes to answer essay questions

Weaknesses: Blending in my opinion and the author's opinion. They should be better separated.

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Fall 2016

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name Eric Epstein

Department GERST

Course Number 1170

Course Title Marx, Nietzsche, Freud

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

I enjoyed learning about the different philosophical ideas, but felt that the course was disjointed - would've been nice to learn how their perspectives relate to each other.

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

My writing has improved, just through practice w/ preliminary writing exercises/drafting essays.

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

Yes, especially w/ idea development & making things more concise.

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

Not very useful, but always fun & interesting.

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

Strengths- Ability to write quickly / write concisely

Weaknesses- Idea Development

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Fall 2016

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name Eric Epstein

Department German Studies

Course Number GERST 1170 (18059)

Course Title Marx, Nietzsche, Freud

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

This class was very eye opening to the field of philosophy and writing about philosophy, and the discussions were very intellectually stimulating. Our discussions and small writing assignments served as good inspiration + preparation for the essays. In terms of the course material, I would suggest ^{that} at the end of the course we devote a class period to delineating the viewpoints + differences between Marx, Nietzsche + Freud.

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

My writing has improved in terms of expressing an idea & providing substantial evidence to support it. The conferences provided the most helpful + personalized feedback.

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

Yes, they were, but in-person conferences where I could take my own notes on verbal feedback were more helpful

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

Very useful; they prepared me well for the essays & were really interesting

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

Strengths - presenting & defending an idea, expressing my opinion based on information in a text
Weaknesses - writing conclusions

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

yes, very helpful. The teacher had
expertise in writing these types of essays
I had good comments that improved the
structure, flow & clarity of the papers

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

Class discussion were OK, but I learned
most on my own reading the text & writing essays.

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

● Good at using supporting evidence, sometimes
I oversimplify a simple topic though

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Fall 2016

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name Eric E. peterson

Department GERST Course Number 1170

Course Title Marx, Nietzsche, Freud

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

I'm pretty impressed by the intellectual stimulation from the class. I think it was more a philosophy class rather than a writing class.

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

I don't think I've really improved as a writer, but I've gotten more confident at producing 5-7 page papers in a formulaic process.

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Fall 2016

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name Eric Epstein

Department GERST Course Number 1170

Course Title _____

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

Good, the class is interesting. the little writing assignments are helpful and the class discussion allow me to be more engaged

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

Somewhat improved, I'm more confident about analyzing the text

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

They are helpful, especially when revising the essays

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

Class discussions ~~might~~ help me interpret the authors' works better.

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

My strength might be having my own opinion based on the author's POV, weakness might be that it's difficult for me to locate the most useful passage in the essay

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Fall 2016

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name Eric Epstein

Department GERST Course Number 1170.104

Course Title Marx, Nietzsche, Freud

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

I enjoyed the course material & the in-class discussion & felt that the work load was reasonable & useful.

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

I definitely think my writing has improved. The course helped me learn how to effectively structure & organize a paper & how to incorporate personal arguments while analyzing an author's work.

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

The written comments & one-on-one meetings ~~were extremely helpful in revising the essays~~
were extremely helpful in identifying
how to improve my writing.

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

Class discussions were very engaging
& were extremely helpful in clarifying
& analyzing the readings.

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

STRENGTHS: supporting argument w/ evidence
organization of paper

WEAKNESSES: transitions

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Fall 2016

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name Eric Epstein

Department GERST

Course Number 11059

Course Title Marx, Nietzsche, Freud

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

I enjoyed it a lot, especially the investigations into these philosophers/thinkers that allowed for an interesting dialogue and comparison between their ideas. Although the exercises certainly helped with the final essays, they were initially overwhelming to complete. After they were reduced however, workload was manageable.

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

Yes, the course has highlighted the importance of structure and clarity, especially since writing in philosophy can easily be misinterpreted.

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

Yes, there were comments on small details / flaws and larger, more general problems that helped with essay revision.

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

Quite useful, as they helped me unpack the material and improve my essays.

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

I believe my greatest strength is writing a strong introduction with a clear thesis. However, I still need to work on maintaining clarity throughout.

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Fall 2016

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name Eric Epstein

Department GERST Course Number 1170

Course Title Marx, Nietzsche, Freud

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

It is interesting as a whole but some topics are very dry and difficult to take interest in.

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

A little bit. I am better at being clear and fully explaining quotations, and have begun using more adequate textual evidence.

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

Yes, they helped me to better understand and to make edits after the fact.

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

They were helpful in deciphering the meaning of the text and made writing papers easier.

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

I enjoyed at being concise, but often fail to elaborate on important information fully.

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Fall 2016

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name Eric Epstein

Department GERST Course Number 1170

Course Title Mary Nitzsche Food

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

I really enjoyed this class. This goes through challenging reading and made us write about it. I really like Eric and his teaching.

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

Yes, by making us write a bunch of assignments.

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

Yes, showed what was good and bad about my writing

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

~~Yes~~ The discussions about the readings were extremely helpful.

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

My strength is writing to the point and making a well formed argument. My weakness is writing is in making it sound nice and flow well.

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Fall 2016

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name Eric Epstein

Department GERST Course Number 1170

Course Title Marx, Nietzsche, Freud

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

The course was interesting and writing intensive. It seemed to focus more on philosophy than actually teaching us to write, although we did write many essays. As a normal class it was great but as a writing seminar, it should have focused more on how to write essays in class.

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

Yes, I think my writing has improved as far as the process, I learned to make outlines and several drafts of my writing.

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

Yes, written comments on my paper outlined what my strengths and weaknesses were in writing.

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

They were extremely useful considering the texts we read were difficult to understand on our own.

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

My biggest weakness as a writer is finding the balance between a broad thesis and one that says too much. My strength is finding appropriate diction.

Course Evaluations

Fall 2016

Instructor: E. Epstein

GERST 1170.104

Number of Students Registered: 16

Number of Evaluations Submitted: 15

Freshman Writing Seminar
Department of German Studies (183 Goldwin Smith Hall)
Course Evaluation

Instructor: E. Epstein Course: GERST 1170.104 Semester/Year: **Fall 2016**

You have attended approximately 100 % of class meetings. Expected course grade: A-

Circle one number in each row. Please fill out in ink. **Return completed form to 183 Goldwin Smith Hall.**

Student Performance. Please rate:

	(poor)			(excellent)	
1. your own preparation for class	1	2	3	<u>4</u>	5
2. the quality of your participation in the discussions	1	2	3	<u>4</u>	5
3. the quality of other students' participation	1	2	<u>3</u>	4	5
4. your efforts to improve your writing	1	2	3	<u>4</u>	5

Instructor Performance. Please rate:

	(poor)			(excellent)	
5. planning and organization	1	2	3	4	<u>5</u>
6. appropriateness of reading assignments in terms of length, difficulty, relevance	1	2	3	4	<u>5</u>
7. knowledge of the material	1	2	3	4	<u>5</u>
8. clarity in presenting the material	1	2	3	4	<u>5</u>
9. effectiveness in stimulating and directing discussion	1	2	3	4	<u>5</u>
10. enthusiasm for the subject	1	2	3	4	<u>5</u>
11. effectiveness in helping you to recognize main ideas and grasp abstract concepts	1	2	3	4	<u>5</u>
12. effectiveness in helping you develop coherent and complex arguments (oral and written)	1	2	3	4	<u>5</u>
13. tolerance of differing opinions	1	2	3	4	<u>5</u>
14. responsiveness to students' questions and comments	1	2	3	4	<u>5</u>
15. use of examples from texts (literature, film, style manual, etc.) to illustrate points	1	2	3	4	<u>5</u>
16. helpfulness through comments on written work	1	2	3	4	<u>5</u>
17. helpfulness during individual conferences	1	2	3	4	<u>5</u>
18. overall teaching performance	1	2	3	4	<u>5</u>

19. Elaborate on any of the above (5-18) and/or provide additional comments on the instructor's performance.

20. What aspects of the course did you find the most valuable and helpful; the least valuable and helpful?
 (Do you have suggestions for improvement?)

most:
 - in class discussion
 - comments - peer edits

302 east
 - some small assignments

21. Which reading (viewing) assignments did you consider the most valuable; least valuable? Why?

- the intro reading w/ all three philosophers was a great baseline
- I'd say all readings were useful

22. How well were the reading and writing assignments integrated in the course? To what extent did the writing assignments usefully supplement the reading and class discussion?

both were very useful

23. Do you think your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement?

Are there aspects of writing that should have been stressed more heavily?

- yes bc guiding of reader
- quote support strategies

24. To what extent did this course improve your intellectual and critical abilities? How would you evaluate the intellectual challenge of the course?

- close reading

- very good!

25. Would you recommend this course to a friend? Why or why not?

yes, bc interesting and challenging

26. Additional comments or suggestions (you may also write a letter to the chair of the Department of German Studies, 183 Goldwin Smith Hall):

Freshman Writing Seminar
Department of German Studies (183 Goldwin Smith Hall)
Course Evaluation

Instructor: E. Epstein Course: GERST 1170.104 Semester/Year: Fall 2016

You have attended approximately 85 % of class meetings. Expected course grade: B

Circle one number in each row. Please fill out in ink. **Return completed form to 183 Goldwin Smith Hall.**

Student Performance. Please rate:

	(poor)			(excellent)	
1. your own preparation for class	1	2	3	4	5
2. the quality of your participation in the discussions	1	2	3	4	5
3. the quality of other students' participation	1	2	3	4	5
4. your efforts to improve your writing	1	2	3	4	5

Instructor Performance. Please rate:

	(poor)			(excellent)	
5. planning and organization	1	2	3	4	5
6. appropriateness of reading assignments in terms of length, difficulty, relevance	1	2	3	4	5
7. knowledge of the material	1	2	3	4	5
8. clarity in presenting the material	1	2	3	4	5
9. effectiveness in stimulating and directing discussion	1	2	3	4	5
10. enthusiasm for the subject	1	2	3	4	5
11. effectiveness in helping you to recognize main ideas and grasp abstract concepts	1	2	3	4	5
12. effectiveness in helping you develop coherent and complex arguments (oral and written)	1	2	3	4	5
13. tolerance of differing opinions	1	2	3	4	5
14. responsiveness to students' questions and comments	1	2	3	4	5
15. use of examples from texts (literature, film, style manual, etc.) to illustrate points	1	2	3	4	5
16. helpfulness through comments on written work	1	2	3	4	5
17. helpfulness during individual conferences	1	2	3	4	5
18. overall teaching performance	1	2	3	4	5

19. Elaborate on any of the above (5-18) and/or provide additional comments on the instructor's performance.

Epstein was very knowledgeable of the subjects and set up class in a way that successfully helped students develop ideas.

20. What aspects of the course did you find the most valuable and helpful; the least valuable and helpful?

(Do you have suggestions for improvement?)

The feedback was the most valuable

21. Which reading (viewing) assignments did you consider the most valuable; least valuable? Why?

The most valuable was the first essay assignment because it allowed be to practice comparing the views of different writers.

22. How well were the reading and writing assignments integrated in the course? To what extent did the writing assignments usefully supplement the reading and class discussion?

They were integrated well, every class we had small readings and assignments to do based on the readings.

23. Do you think your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing that should have been stressed more heavily?

Yes my ability to use text to support my claims has improved.

24. To what extent did this course improve your intellectual and critical abilities? How would you evaluate the intellectual challenge of the course?

This course is extremely intellectually challenging, it forces students to think critically.

25. Would you recommend this course to a friend? Why or why not?

Yes because I feel that I learned valuable things.

26. Additional comments or suggestions (you may also write a letter to the chair of the Department of German Studies, 183 Goldwin Smith Hall):



Freshman Writing Seminar
Department of German Studies (183 Goldwin Smith Hall)
Course Evaluation

Instructor: E. Epstein Course: GERST 1170.104 Semester/Year: **Fall 2016**

You have attended approximately 90 % of class meetings. Expected course grade: _____

Circle one number in each row. Please fill out in ink. **Return completed form to 183 Goldwin Smith Hall.**

Student Performance. Please rate:

	(poor)				(excellent)
1. your own preparation for class	1	2	3	4	5
2. the quality of your participation in the discussions	1	2	3	4	5
3. the quality of other students' participation	1	2	3	4	5
4. your efforts to improve your writing	1	2	3	4	5

Instructor Performance. Please rate:

	(poor)				(excellent)
5. planning and organization	1	2	3	4	5
6. appropriateness of reading assignments in terms of length, difficulty, relevance	1	2	3	4	5
7. knowledge of the material	1	2	3	4	5
8. clarity in presenting the material	1	2	3	4	5
9. effectiveness in stimulating and directing discussion	1	2	3	4	5
10. enthusiasm for the subject	1	2	3	4	5
11. effectiveness in helping you to recognize main ideas and grasp abstract concepts	1	2	3	4	5
12. effectiveness in helping you develop coherent and complex arguments (oral and written)	1	2	3	4	5
13. tolerance of differing opinions	1	2	3	4	5
14. responsiveness to students' questions and comments	1	2	3	4	5
15. use of examples from texts (literature, film, style manual, etc.) to illustrate points	1	2	3	4	5
16. helpfulness through comments on written work	1	2	3	4	5
17. helpfulness during individual conferences	1	2	3	4	5
18. overall teaching performance	1	2	3	4	5

19. Elaborate on any of the above (5-18) and/or provide additional comments on the instructor's performance.

Eric is really helpful in the individual meeting

20. What aspects of the course did you find the most valuable and helpful; the least valuable and helpful?

(Do you have suggestions for improvement?)

Nothing particular

21. Which reading (viewing) assignments did you consider the most valuable; least valuable? Why?

Valuable: Nietzsche!

not valuable: Freud! too speculative

22. How well were the reading and writing assignments integrated in the course? To what extent did the writing assignments usefully supplement the reading and class discussion?

Writing assignments are great to deepen my understanding of the reading.

23. Do you think your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing that should have been stressed more heavily?

Yes! I learnt signposting.

24. To what extent did this course improve your intellectual and critical abilities? How would you evaluate the intellectual challenge of the course?

Not a lot, ~~I am in~~

25. Would you recommend this course to a friend? Why or why not?

Yes! I like the write - edit - portfolio procedure.

26. Additional comments or suggestions (you may also write a letter to the chair of the Department of German Studies, 183 Goldwin Smith Hall):

None

Freshman Writing Seminar
Department of German Studies (183 Goldwin Smith Hall)
Course Evaluation

Instructor: E. Epstein Course: GERST 1170.104 Semester/Year: **Fall 2016**

You have attended approximately 85 % of class meetings. Expected course grade: A

Circle one number in each row. Please fill out in ink. **Return completed form to 183 Goldwin Smith Hall.**

Student Performance. Please rate:

	(poor)			(excellent)	
1. your own preparation for class	1	2	3	4	5
2. the quality of your participation in the discussions	1	2	3	4	5
3. the quality of other students' participation	1	2	3	4	5
4. your efforts to improve your writing	1	2	3	4	5

Instructor Performance. Please rate:

	(poor)			(excellent)	
5. planning and organization	1	2	3	4	5
6. appropriateness of reading assignments in terms of length, difficulty, relevance	1	2	3	4	5
7. knowledge of the material	1	2	3	4	5
8. clarity in presenting the material	1	2	3	4	5
9. effectiveness in stimulating and directing discussion	1	2	3	4	5
10. enthusiasm for the subject	1	2	3	4	5
11. effectiveness in helping you to recognize main ideas and grasp abstract concepts	1	2	3	4	5
12. effectiveness in helping you develop coherent and complex arguments (oral and written)	1	2	3	4	5
13. tolerance of differing opinions	1	2	3	4	5
14. responsiveness to students' questions and comments	1	2	3	4	5
15. use of examples from texts (literature, film, style manual, etc.) to illustrate points	1	2	3	4	5
16. helpfulness through comments on written work	1	2	3	4	5
17. helpfulness during individual conferences	1	2	3	4	5
18. overall teaching performance	1	2	3	4	5

19. Elaborate on any of the above (5-18) and/or provide additional comments on the instructor's performance.

He was very enthusiastic & has genuine care about the subject & our learning

20. What aspects of the course did you find the most valuable and helpful; the least valuable and helpful?

(Do you have suggestions for improvement?)

Discussions were most valuable & helpful

21. Which reading (viewing) assignments did you consider the most valuable; least valuable? Why?

They were all valuable except A Case of Hysteria - it didn't seem too relevant to the philosophical style of the class

22. How well were the reading and writing assignments integrated in the course? To what extent did the writing assignments usefully supplement the reading and class discussion?

They were integrated well because they related well to our discussions

23. Do you think your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement?

Are there aspects of writing that should have been stressed more heavily?

It has improved in terms of philosophical writing ^{+ structure} but not from an English standpoint

24. To what extent did this course improve your intellectual and critical abilities? How would you evaluate the intellectual challenge of the course?

It improved my critical thinking abilities about philosophical claims, and opened my mind to a new kind of thoughtful writing

25. Would you recommend this course to a friend? Why or why not?

Yes! It was so interesting & eye-opening

26. Additional comments or suggestions (you may also write a letter to the chair of the Department of German Studies, 183 Goldwin Smith Hall):

Nice job, I really enjoyed the philosophy part of this class

Freshman Writing Seminar
Department of German Studies (183 Goldwin Smith Hall)
Course Evaluation

Instructor: E. Epstein Course: GERST 1170.104 Semester/Year: Fall 2016

You have attended approximately 100 % of class meetings. Expected course grade: A

Circle one number in each row. Please fill out in ink. **Return completed form to 183 Goldwin Smith Hall.**

Student Performance. Please rate:

	(poor)			(excellent)	
1. your own preparation for class	1	2	3	(4)	5
2. the quality of your participation in the discussions	1	2	3	(4)	5
3. the quality of other students' participation	1	2	3	(4)	5
4. your efforts to improve your writing	1	2	3	(4)	5

Instructor Performance. Please rate:

	(poor)			(excellent)	
5. planning and organization	1	2	3	(4)	5
6. appropriateness of reading assignments in terms of length, difficulty, relevance	1	2	3	4	(5)
7. knowledge of the material	1	2	3	4	(5)
8. clarity in presenting the material	1	2	3	4	(5)
9. effectiveness in stimulating and directing discussion	1	2	3	4	(5)
10. enthusiasm for the subject	1	2	3	4	(5)
11. effectiveness in helping you to recognize main ideas and grasp abstract concepts	1	2	3	4	(5)
12. effectiveness in helping you develop coherent and complex arguments (oral and written)	1	2	3	(4)	5
13. tolerance of differing opinions	1	2	3	4	(5)
14. responsiveness to students' questions and comments	1	2	3	4	(5)
15. use of examples from texts (literature, film, style manual, etc.) to illustrate points	1	2	(3)	4	5
16. helpfulness through comments on written work	1	2	3	(4)	5
17. helpfulness during individual conferences	1	2	3	(4)	5
18. overall teaching performance	1	2	3	4	(5)

19. Elaborate on any of the above (5-18) and/or provide additional comments on the instructor's performance.

He is really smart and gives the subject so is a good teacher

20. What aspects of the course did you find the most valuable and helpful; the least valuable and helpful?

(Do you have suggestions for improvement?) *The philosophy readings and discussion*

21. Which reading (viewing) assignments did you consider the most valuable; least valuable? Why?

Many. Hard to read but very interesting.

22. How well were the reading and writing assignments integrated in the course? To what extent did the writing assignments usefully supplement the reading and class discussion?

Very well. Readings were more of class time.

23. Do you think your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing that should have been stressed more heavily?

Yes by making me write. General writing ideas and such.

24. To what extent did this course improve your intellectual and critical abilities? How would you evaluate the intellectual challenge of the course?

Pretty good. The readings helped a lot in reading comprehension.

25. Would you recommend this course to a friend? Why or why not?

Yes, good class and teacher, interesting.

26. Additional comments or suggestions (you may also write a letter to the chair of the Department of German Studies, 183 Goldwin Smith Hall):

Freshman Writing Seminar
Department of German Studies (183 Goldwin Smith Hall)
Course Evaluation

Instructor: E. Epstein Course: GERST 1170.104 Semester/Year: **Fall 2016**

You have attended approximately 90 % of class meetings. Expected course grade: A

Circle one number in each row. Please fill out in ink. **Return completed form to 183 Goldwin Smith Hall.**

Student Performance. Please rate:

	(poor)			(excellent)	
1. your own preparation for class	1	2	3	4	5
2. the quality of your participation in the discussions	1	2	3	4	5
3. the quality of other students' participation	1	2	3	4	5
4. your efforts to improve your writing	1	2	3	4	5

Instructor Performance. Please rate:

	(poor)			(excellent)	
5. planning and organization	1	2	3	4	5
6. appropriateness of reading assignments in terms of length, difficulty, relevance	1	2	3	4	5
7. knowledge of the material	1	2	3	4	5
8. clarity in presenting the material	1	2	3	4	5
9. effectiveness in stimulating and directing discussion	1	2	3	4	5
10. enthusiasm for the subject	1	2	3	4	5
11. effectiveness in helping you to recognize main ideas and grasp abstract concepts	1	2	3	4	5
12. effectiveness in helping you develop coherent and complex arguments (oral and written)	1	2	3	4	5
13. tolerance of differing opinions	1	2	3	4	5
14. responsiveness to students' questions and comments	1	2	3	4	5
15. use of examples from texts (literature, film, style manual, etc.) to illustrate points	1	2	3	4	5
16. helpfulness through comments on written work	1	2	3	4	5
17. helpfulness during individual conferences	1	2	3	4	5
18. overall teaching performance	1	2	3	4	5

19. Elaborate on any of the above (5-18) and/or provide additional comments on the instructor's performance.

He was a great instructor!

20. What aspects of the course did you find the most valuable and helpful; the least valuable and helpful?
 (Do you have suggestions for improvement?)

21. Which reading (viewing) assignments did you consider the most valuable; least valuable? Why?

The readings on Nietzsche were the most interesting; the first prompt comparing religion was nearly useless because the excerpts provided were so short.

22. How well were the reading and writing assignments integrated in the course? To what extent did the writing assignments usefully supplement the reading and class discussion?

They were effective.

23. Do you think your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement?

Are there aspects of writing that should have been stressed more heavily?

A little bit. Literary quality should have been stressed more.

24. To what extent did this course improve your intellectual and critical abilities? How would you evaluate the intellectual challenge of the course?

It was highly intellectual.

25. Would you recommend this course to a friend? Why or why not?

Yes, it is interesting and useful to self-development.

26. Additional comments or suggestions (you may also write a letter to the chair of the Department of German Studies, 183 Goldwin Smith Hall):

Freshman Writing Seminar
Department of German Studies (183 Goldwin Smith Hall)
Course Evaluation

Instructor: E. Epstein Course: GERST 1170.104 Semester/Year: **Fall 2016**

You have attended approximately 85 % of class meetings. Expected course grade: A-

Circle one number in each row. Please fill out in ink. **Return completed form to 183 Goldwin Smith Hall.**

Student Performance. Please rate:

	(poor)			(excellent)	
1. your own preparation for class	1	2	3	4	5
2. the quality of your participation in the discussions	1	2	3	4	5
3. the quality of other students' participation	1	2	3	4	5
4. your efforts to improve your writing	1	2	3	4	5

Instructor Performance. Please rate:

	(poor)			(excellent)	
5. planning and organization	1	2	3	4	5
6. appropriateness of reading assignments in terms of length, difficulty, relevance	1	2	3	4	5
7. knowledge of the material	1	2	3	4	5
8. clarity in presenting the material	1	2	3	4	5
9. effectiveness in stimulating and directing discussion	1	2	3	4	5
10. enthusiasm for the subject	1	2	3	4	5
11. effectiveness in helping you to recognize main ideas and grasp abstract concepts	1	2	3	4	5
12. effectiveness in helping you develop coherent and complex arguments (oral and written)	1	2	3	4	5
13. tolerance of differing opinions	1	2	3	4	5
14. responsiveness to students' questions and comments	1	2	3	4	5
15. use of examples from texts (literature, film, style manual, etc.) to illustrate points	1	2	3	4	5
16. helpfulness through comments on written work	1	2	3	4	5
17. helpfulness during individual conferences	1	2	3	4	5
18. overall teaching performance	1	2	3	4	5

19. Elaborate on any of the above (5-18) and/or provide additional comments on the instructor's performance.

nah

20. What aspects of the course did you find the most valuable and helpful; the least valuable and helpful?
 (Do you have suggestions for improvement?)

Readings on my own 314 individual work on essays

21. Which reading (viewing) assignments did you consider the most valuable; least valuable? Why?

~~great~~ all were necessary

22. How well were the reading and writing assignments integrated in the course? To what extent did the writing assignments usefully supplement the reading and class discussion?

well

23. Do you think your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing that should have been stressed more heavily?

Not really

24. To what extent did this course improve your intellectual and critical abilities? How would you evaluate the intellectual challenge of the course?

Somewhat challenging

25. Would you recommend this course to a friend? Why or why not?

yes, interesting to think about these philosophical ideas

26. Additional comments or suggestions (you may also write a letter to the chair of the Department of German Studies, 183 Goldwin Smith Hall):

nah

Freshman Writing Seminar
Department of German Studies (183 Goldwin Smith Hall)
Course Evaluation

Instructor: E. Epstein Course: GERST 1170.104 Semester/Year: **Fall 2016**

You have attended approximately 85 % of class meetings. Expected course grade: B+

Circle one number in each row. Please fill out in ink. **Return completed form to 183 Goldwin Smith Hall.**

Student Performance. Please rate:

	(poor)			(excellent)	
1. your own preparation for class	1	<u>2</u>	3	4	5
2. the quality of your participation in the discussions	1	<u>2</u>	3	4	5
3. the quality of other students' participation	1	2	3	<u>4</u>	5
4. your efforts to improve your writing	1	2	<u>3</u>	4	5

Instructor Performance. Please rate:

	(poor)			(excellent)	
5. planning and organization	1	2	3	4	<u>5</u>
6. appropriateness of reading assignments in terms of length, difficulty, relevance	1	2	3	4	<u>5</u>
7. knowledge of the material	1	2	3	4	<u>5</u>
8. clarity in presenting the material	1	2	3	4	<u>5</u>
9. effectiveness in stimulating and directing discussion	1	2	<u>3</u>	4	5
10. enthusiasm for the subject	1	2	3	4	<u>5</u>
11. effectiveness in helping you to recognize main ideas and grasp abstract concepts	1	2	3	<u>4</u>	5
12. effectiveness in helping you develop coherent and complex arguments (oral and written)	1	2	3	4	<u>5</u>
13. tolerance of differing opinions	1	2	3	4	<u>5</u>
14. responsiveness to students' questions and comments	1	2	3	4	<u>5</u>
15. use of examples from texts (literature, film, style manual, etc.) to illustrate points	1	2	3	4	<u>5</u>
16. helpfulness through comments on written work	1	2	3	4	<u>5</u>
17. helpfulness during individual conferences	1	2	3	<u>4</u>	5
18. overall teaching performance	1	2	3	4	<u>5</u>

19. Elaborate on any of the above (5-18) and/or provide additional comments on the instructor's performance.

Eric's enthusiasm was great, we were the ones who didn't talk (#9)

20. What aspects of the course did you find the most valuable and helpful; the least valuable and helpful?
 (Do you have suggestions for improvement?)

most valuable - readings/ess 2168

least valuable - feedback from peers

21. Which reading (viewing) assignments did you consider the most valuable; least valuable? Why?

I thought all reading assignments were valuable

22. How well were the reading and writing assignments integrated in the course? To what extent did the writing assignments usefully supplement the reading and class discussion?

I didn't think the writing assignments were very integrated in the course - the assignments we did at home felt separate from what we were learning in class

23. Do you think your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing that should have been stressed more heavily?

I think it has improved through practice writing essays. Writing in general could've been stressed more heavily

24. To what extent did this course improve your intellectual and critical abilities? How would you evaluate the intellectual challenge of the course?

This course improved my intellectual + critical abilities. It was intellectually challenging

25. Would you recommend this course to a friend? Why or why not?

Yes but only if Erik was teaching it

26. Additional comments or suggestions (you may also write a letter to the chair of the Department of German Studies, 183 Goldwin Smith Hall):

Freshman Writing Seminar
Department of German Studies (183 Goldwin Smith Hall)
Course Evaluation

Instructor: E. Epstein Course: GERST 1170.104 Semester/Year: **Fall 2016**

You have attended approximately 85 % of class meetings. Expected course grade: ?

Circle one number in each row. Please fill out in ink. **Return completed form to 183 Goldwin Smith Hall.**

Student Performance. Please rate:

	(poor)			(excellent)	
1. your own preparation for class	1	2	3	4	5
2. the quality of your participation in the discussions	1	2	3	4	5
3. the quality of other students' participation	1	2	3	4	5
4. your efforts to improve your writing	1	2	3	4	5

Instructor Performance. Please rate:

	(poor)			(excellent)	
5. planning and organization	1	2	3	4	5
6. appropriateness of reading assignments in terms of length, difficulty, relevance	1	2	3	4	5
7. knowledge of the material	1	2	3	4	5
8. clarity in presenting the material	1	2	3	4	5
9. effectiveness in stimulating and directing discussion	1	2	3	4	5
10. enthusiasm for the subject	1	2	3	4	5
11. effectiveness in helping you to recognize main ideas and grasp abstract concepts	1	2	3	4	5
12. effectiveness in helping you develop coherent and complex arguments (oral and written)	1	2	3	4	5
13. tolerance of differing opinions	1	2	3	4	5
14. responsiveness to students' questions and comments	1	2	3	4	5
15. use of examples from texts (literature, film, style manual, etc.) to illustrate points	1	2	3	4	5
16. helpfulness through comments on written work	1	2	3	4	5
17. helpfulness during individual conferences	1	2	3	4	5
18. overall teaching performance	1	2	3	4	5

19. Elaborate on any of the above (5-18) and/or provide additional comments on the instructor's performance.

N/A

20. What aspects of the course did you find the most valuable and helpful; the least valuable and helpful?
 (Do you have suggestions for improvement?)

NOTHING IN PARTICULAR FOR IMPROVEMENT - VERY NICE CLASS ✓

21. Which reading (viewing) assignments did you consider the most valuable; least valuable? Why?

→ ENJOYED comparing perspectives / views
INTEGRATIVE ASSIGNMENT (w/ MARX, NIETZSCHE, &
(w/ about each philosopher's / thinker's perspective on religion) FREUD)

22. How well were the reading and writing assignments integrated in the course? To what extent did the writing assignments usefully supplement the reading and class discussion?

- REASONABLY WELL-INTEGRATED
- GOOD amount of workload

23. Do you think your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement?
Are there aspects of writing that should have been stressed more heavily?

Yes - improvement through thorough
revision processes

24. To what extent did this course improve your intellectual and critical abilities? How would you evaluate the intellectual challenge of the course?

- IMPROVED CRITICAL READING / WRITING SKILLS
- REASONABLY CHALLENGING, but manageable

25. Would you recommend this course to a friend? Why or why not?

YES - very intellectually stimulating!!

26. Additional comments or suggestions (you may also write a letter to the chair of the Department of German Studies, 183 Goldwin Smith Hall):

!! ♥ BEST 1170 !!

Freshman Writing Seminar
Department of German Studies (183 Goldwin Smith Hall)
Course Evaluation

Instructor: E. Epstein Course: GERST 1170.104 Semester/Year: **Fall 2016**

You have attended approximately 100 % of class meetings. Expected course grade: B+/A-

Circle one number in each row. Please fill out in ink. **Return completed form to 183 Goldwin Smith Hall.**

Student Performance. Please rate:

	(poor)			(excellent)	
1. your own preparation for class	1	2	3	4	5
2. the quality of your participation in the discussions	1	2	3	4	5
3. the quality of other students' participation	1	2	3	4	5
4. your efforts to improve your writing	1	2	3	4	5

Instructor Performance. Please rate:

	(poor)			(excellent)	
5. planning and organization	1	2	3	4	5
6. appropriateness of reading assignments in terms of length, difficulty, relevance	1	2	3	4	5
7. knowledge of the material	1	2	3	4	5
8. clarity in presenting the material	1	2	3	4	5
9. effectiveness in stimulating and directing discussion	1	2	3	4	5
10. enthusiasm for the subject	1	2	3	4	5
11. effectiveness in helping you to recognize main ideas and grasp abstract concepts	1	2	3	4	5
12. effectiveness in helping you develop coherent and complex arguments (oral and written)	1	2	3	4	5
13. tolerance of differing opinions	1	2	3	4	5
14. responsiveness to students' questions and comments	1	2	3	4	5
15. use of examples from texts (literature, film, style manual, etc.) to illustrate points	1	2	3	4	5
16. helpfulness through comments on written work	1	2	3	4	5
17. helpfulness during individual conferences	1	2	3	4	5
18. overall teaching performance	1	2	3	4	5

19. Elaborate on any of the above (5-18) and/or provide additional comments on the instructor's performance.

He was very passionate about philosophy & genuinely wanted to help us learn

20. What aspects of the course did you find the most valuable and helpful; the least valuable and helpful?

(Do you have suggestions for improvement?)

The most valuable & helpful were the in-class discussions.

21. Which reading (viewing) assignments did you consider the most valuable; least valuable? Why?

MOST VALUABLE: main texts by Marx, Nietzsche, Freud

LEAST VALUABLE: optional supplemental rds

22. How well were the reading and writing assignments integrated in the course? To what extent did the writing assignments usefully supplement the reading and class discussion?

They were well integrated. The writing assignments were related to the readings & built on each other.

23. Do you think your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement?

Are there aspects of writing that should have been stressed more heavily?

I think this course helped me improve my skills in structuring & organizing an academic paper & in developing a logical & coherent argument.

24. To what extent did this course improve your intellectual and critical abilities? How would you evaluate the intellectual challenge of the course?

This course challenged me to think critically & evaluate the arguments of philosophers. The course was an appropriate level of difficulty.

25. Would you recommend this course to a friend? Why or why not?

Yes, I found the workload appropriate & the material interesting.

26. Additional comments or suggestions (you may also write a letter to the chair of the Department of German Studies, 183 Goldwin Smith Hall):

Thank you!

Freshman Writing Seminar
Department of German Studies (183 Goldwin Smith Hall)
Course Evaluation

Instructor: E. Epstein Course: GERST 1170.104 Semester/Year: **Fall 2016**

You have attended approximately 85 % of class meetings. Expected course grade: B⁺/A⁻

Circle one number in each row. Please fill out in ink. **Return completed form to 183 Goldwin Smith Hall.**

Student Performance. Please rate:

	(poor)			(excellent)	
1. your own preparation for class	1	(2)	3	4	5
2. the quality of your participation in the discussions	1	2	(3)	4	5
3. the quality of other students' participation	1	2	3	4	(5)
4. your efforts to improve your writing	1	2	(3)	4	5

Instructor Performance. Please rate:

	(poor)			(excellent)	
5. planning and organization	1	2	3	(4)	5
6. appropriateness of reading assignments in terms of length, difficulty, relevance	1	2	3	(4)	5
7. knowledge of the material	1	2	3	4	(5)
8. clarity in presenting the material	1	2	3	4	(5)
9. effectiveness in stimulating and directing discussion	1	2	3	4	(5)
10. enthusiasm for the subject	1	2	3	4	(5)
11. effectiveness in helping you to recognize main ideas and grasp abstract concepts	1	2	3	4	(5)
12. effectiveness in helping you develop coherent and complex arguments (oral and written)	1	2	3	(4)	5
13. tolerance of differing opinions	1	2	3	4	(5)
14. responsiveness to students' questions and comments	1	2	3	4	(5)
15. use of examples from texts (literature, film, style manual, etc.) to illustrate points	1	2	3	4	(5)
16. helpfulness through comments on written work	1	2	3	4	(5)
17. helpfulness during individual conferences	1	2	3	4	(5)
18. overall teaching performance	1	2	3	4	(5)

19. Elaborate on any of the above (5-18) and/or provide additional comments on the instructor's performance.

The instructor is very effective in stimulating & directing discussion

20. What aspects of the course did you find the most valuable and helpful; the least valuable and helpful? (Do you have suggestions for improvement?)

Class discussion

21. Which reading (viewing) assignments did you consider the most valuable; least valuable? Why?

The reading about Marx

22. How well were the reading and writing assignments integrated in the course? To what extent did the writing assignments usefully supplement the reading and class discussion?

It's very integrated, writings are based on reading assignments.

23. Do you think your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing that should have been stressed more heavily?

It's improved, the practice of short assignments.
Nothing should have been stressed more heavily

24. To what extent did this course improve your intellectual and critical abilities? How would you evaluate the intellectual challenge of the course?

I get to know the ideas of German philosophers
more in depth, hard to interpret sometimes

25. Would you recommend this course to a friend? Why or why not?

yes, the instructor is good

26. Additional comments or suggestions (you may also write a letter to the chair of the Department of German Studies, 183 Goldwin Smith Hall):

N/A

Freshman Writing Seminar
Department of German Studies (183 Goldwin Smith Hall)
Course Evaluation

Instructor: E. Epstein Course: GERST 1170.104 Semester/Year: **Fall 2016**

You have attended approximately 85 % of class meetings. Expected course grade: B⁺

Circle one number in each row. Please fill out in ink. **Return completed form to 183 Goldwin Smith Hall.**

Student Performance. Please rate:

	(poor)			(excellent)	
1. your own preparation for class	1	2	3	4	5
2. the quality of your participation in the discussions	1	2	3	4	5
3. the quality of other students' participation	1	2	3	4	5
4. your efforts to improve your writing	1	2	3	4	5

Instructor Performance. Please rate:

	(poor)			(excellent)	
5. planning and organization	1	2	3	4	5
6. appropriateness of reading assignments in terms of length, difficulty, relevance	1	2	3	4	5
7. knowledge of the material	1	2	3	4	5
8. clarity in presenting the material	1	2	3	4	5
9. effectiveness in stimulating and directing discussion	1	2	3	4	5
10. enthusiasm for the subject	1	2	3	4	5
11. effectiveness in helping you to recognize main ideas and grasp abstract concepts	1	2	3	4	5
12. effectiveness in helping you develop coherent and complex arguments (oral and written)	1	2	3	4	5
13. tolerance of differing opinions	1	2	3	4	5
14. responsiveness to students' questions and comments	1	2	3	4	5
15. use of examples from texts (literature, film, style manual, etc.) to illustrate points	1	2	3	4	5
16. helpfulness through comments on written work	1	2	3	4	5
17. helpfulness during individual conferences	1	2	3	4	5
18. overall teaching performance	1	2	3	4	5

19. Elaborate on any of the above (5-18) and/or provide additional comments on the instructor's performance.

None

20. What aspects of the course did you find the most valuable and helpful; the least valuable and helpful? (Do you have suggestions for improvement?)

Most valuable: unpacking of thinkers' ideas, organizing arguments, first assignment
 Least valuable: Dora

21. Which reading (viewing) assignments did you consider the most valuable; least valuable? Why?

First (thinkers views on religion) and Nietzsche - valuable

See prev. question - least

22. How well were the reading and writing assignments integrated in the course? To what extent did the writing assignments usefully supplement the reading and class discussion?

Very well, writing assignments were relevant.

23. Do you think your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement?

Are there aspects of writing that should have been stressed more heavily?

Yes, the concentration of ideas helped promote paragraph cohesion, organization and clarity

24. To what extent did this course improve your intellectual and critical abilities? How would you evaluate the intellectual challenge of the course?

I found it very intellectually challenging, but it helped me improve my ability to unpack tough material.

25. Would you recommend this course to a friend? Why or why not?

Yes, very engaging.

26. Additional comments or suggestions (you may also write a letter to the chair of the Department of German Studies, 183 Goldwin Smith Hall):

None

Freshman Writing Seminar
Department of German Studies (183 Goldwin Smith Hall)
Course Evaluation

Instructor: E. Epstein Course: GERST 1170.104 Semester/Year: **Fall 2016**

You have attended approximately 90 % of class meetings. Expected course grade: B+

Circle one number in each row. Please fill out in ink. **Return completed form to 183 Goldwin Smith Hall.**

Student Performance. Please rate:

	(poor)			(excellent)	
1. your own preparation for class	1	2	3	4	5
2. the quality of your participation in the discussions	1	2	3	4	5
3. the quality of other students' participation	1	2	3	4	5
4. your efforts to improve your writing	1	2	3	4	5

Instructor Performance. Please rate:

	(poor)			(excellent)	
5. planning and organization	1	2	3	4	5
6. appropriateness of reading assignments in terms of length, difficulty, relevance	1	2	3	4	5
7. knowledge of the material	1	2	3	4	5
8. clarity in presenting the material	1	2	3	4	5
9. effectiveness in stimulating and directing discussion	1	2	3	4	5
10. enthusiasm for the subject	1	2	3	4	5
11. effectiveness in helping you to recognize main ideas and grasp abstract concepts	1	2	3	4	5
12. effectiveness in helping you develop coherent and complex arguments (oral and written)	1	2	3	4	5
13. tolerance of differing opinions	1	2	3	4	5
14. responsiveness to students' questions and comments	1	2	3	4	5
15. use of examples from texts (literature, film, style manual, etc.) to illustrate points	1	2	3	4	5
16. helpfulness through comments on written work	1	2	3	4	5
17. helpfulness during individual conferences	1	2	3	4	5
18. overall teaching performance	1	2	3	4	5

19. Elaborate on any of the above (5-18) and/or provide additional comments on the instructor's performance.

He was overall a good teacher who had a good grasp of the material.

20. What aspects of the course did you find the most valuable and helpful; the least valuable and helpful? (Do you have suggestions for improvement?)

The ideas that we learned about Marx, Freud, Nietzsche, how they relate to reality.

21. Which reading (viewing) assignments did you consider the most valuable; least valuable? Why?

The best reading assignments that we got was Freud's Civilization and its Discontents.

22. How well were the reading and writing assignments integrated in the course? To what extent did the writing assignments usefully supplement the reading and class discussion?

The small writing assignments had nothing to do with the major assignments as well as some of the reading assignment.

23. Do you think your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement?

Are there aspects of writing that should have been stressed more heavily?

Not so much because I was mainly concerned with finishing the assignments as there were too many.

24. To what extent did this course improve your intellectual and critical abilities? How would you evaluate the intellectual challenge of the course?

It improved them slightly as the ideas discussed weren't as intellectually engaging. I think that we didn't make use of the texts appropriately.

25. Would you recommend this course to a friend? Why or why not?

Yes, because it is, overall, a good course and the teacher is nice.

26. Additional comments or suggestions (you may also write a letter to the chair of the Department of German Studies, 183 Goldwin Smith Hall):

I appreciate tremendously the continuous effort that the teacher made to improve the course and engage the students.

Freshman Writing Seminar
Department of German Studies (183 Goldwin Smith Hall)
Course Evaluation

Instructor: E. Epstein Course: GERST 1170.104 Semester/Year: **Fall 2016**

You have attended approximately 100 % of class meetings. Expected course grade: A-

Circle one number in each row. Please fill out in ink. **Return completed form to 183 Goldwin Smith Hall.**

Student Performance. Please rate:

	(poor)			(excellent)	
1. your own preparation for class	1	2	3	4	5
2. the quality of your participation in the discussions	1	2	3	4	5
3. the quality of other students' participation	1	2	3	4	5
4. your efforts to improve your writing	1	2	3	4	5

Instructor Performance. Please rate:

	(poor)			(excellent)	
5. planning and organization	1	2	3	4	5
6. appropriateness of reading assignments in terms of length, difficulty, relevance	1	2	3	4	5
7. knowledge of the material	1	2	3	4	5
8. clarity in presenting the material	1	2	3	4	5
9. effectiveness in stimulating and directing discussion	1	2	3	4	5
10. enthusiasm for the subject	1	2	3	4	5
11. effectiveness in helping you to recognize main ideas and grasp abstract concepts	1	2	3	4	5
12. effectiveness in helping you develop coherent and complex arguments (oral and written)	1	2	3	4	5
13. tolerance of differing opinions	1	2	3	4	5
14. responsiveness to students' questions and comments	1	2	3	4	5
15. use of examples from texts (literature, film, style manual, etc.) to illustrate points	1	2	3	4	5
16. helpfulness through comments on written work	1	2	3	4	5
17. helpfulness during individual conferences	1	2	3	4	5
18. overall teaching performance	1	2	3	4	5

19. Elaborate on any of the above (5-18) and/or provide additional comments on the instructor's performance.

Individual conferences were extremely helpful - need to do more of them.

20. What aspects of the course did you find the most valuable and helpful; the least valuable and helpful? (Do you have suggestions for improvement?)

Most valuable: writing conferences

Least valuable: tiny writing assignments

21. Which reading (viewing) assignments did you consider the most valuable; least valuable? Why?

Most valuable: Freud

least valuable: Nietzsche

22. How well were the reading and writing assignments integrated in the course? To what extent did the writing assignments usefully supplement the reading and class discussion?

I personally didn't like the writing assignments, but they were mostly relevant to the assigned readings.

23. Do you think your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing that should have been stressed more heavily?

Yes. I think I learned how to write more clearly and can better craft an argument. This should continue to be heavily stressed.

24. To what extent did this course improve your intellectual and critical abilities? How would you evaluate the intellectual challenge of the course?

This course was pretty intellectually stimulating since the readings were a bit difficult.

25. Would you recommend this course to a friend? Why or why not?

Yes, Eric is awesome.

26. Additional comments or suggestions (you may also write a letter to the chair of the Department of German Studies, 183 Goldwin Smith Hall):

Freshman Writing Seminar
Department of German Studies (183 Goldwin Smith Hall)
Course Evaluation

Instructor: E. Epstein Course: GERST 1170.104 Semester/Year: **Fall 2016**

You have attended approximately 90 % of class meetings. Expected course grade: B-

Circle one number in each row. Please fill out in ink. **Return completed form to 183 Goldwin Smith Hall.**

Student Performance. Please rate:

	(poor)					(excellent)				
1. your own preparation for class	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
2. the quality of your participation in the discussions	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
3. the quality of other students' participation	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
4. your efforts to improve your writing	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

Instructor Performance. Please rate:

	(poor)					(excellent)				
5. planning and organization	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
6. appropriateness of reading assignments in terms of length, difficulty, relevance	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
7. knowledge of the material	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
8. clarity in presenting the material	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
9. effectiveness in stimulating and directing discussion	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
10. enthusiasm for the subject	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
11. effectiveness in helping you to recognize main ideas and grasp abstract concepts	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
12. effectiveness in helping you develop coherent and complex arguments (oral and written)	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
13. tolerance of differing opinions	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
14. responsiveness to students' questions and comments	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
15. use of examples from texts (literature, film, style manual, etc.) to illustrate points	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
16. helpfulness through comments on written work	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
17. helpfulness during individual conferences	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
18. overall teaching performance	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

19. Elaborate on any of the above (5-18) and/or provide additional comments on the instructor's performance.

He knows what he's talking about even though the material is not his focus. He prepares well for class.

20. What aspects of the course did you find the most valuable and helpful; the least valuable and helpful?
 (Do you have suggestions for improvement?)

Analysis of complicated language (a) Mark (b) Nietzsche

21. Which reading (viewing) assignments did you consider the most valuable; least valuable? Why?

Manne	Least Valuable	The valuable ones helped me think a lot about events around me	
Herzkovits	with		I didn't like the poem.
anything by Marx	And in memory of Freud		

22. How well were the reading and writing assignments integrated in the course? To what extent did the writing assignments usefully supplement the reading and class discussion?

The reading and writing assignments were well integrated into the course. We spent ample time without losing focus of the big 3.

23. Do you think your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing that should have been stressed more heavily?

I think my writing has improved. The course promoted the improvement through small improvements.

24. To what extent did this course improve your intellectual and critical abilities? How would you evaluate the intellectual challenge of the course?

I can somewhat understand complicated language. The intellectual challenge is an 8.

25. Would you recommend this course to a friend? Why or why not?

Yes. Eric is a great instructor.

26. Additional comments or suggestions (you may also write a letter to the chair of the Department of German Studies, 183 Goldwin Smith Hall):

None so far.

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

MINDS AND MACHINES

Spring 2017

Principal Instructor: Will Starr

You are asked to respond to the following questions, in as objective a spirit as possible, in order to help the instructor to evaluate his/her performance and improve it in the future.
Please use the following rating scale for questions 5 - 19, and again for questions 21-28, which pertain to the TAs for the class, and for 29-31 for the TA and/or lecture (rating items as not useful -> useful).

RATING SCALE

1= Strongly Disagree

2= Disagree

3= Neutral

4= Agree

5= Strongly Agree

OR

1) Not at all useful

2) Slightly useful

3) Neutral

4) Useful

5) Very useful

For question 32, there are 3 choices - YES/Neutral/No.

Thank you!

Question	Mean	StDevP	Count	1	2	3	4	5
N01. Class Year 1) Freshman 2) Sophomore 3) Junior 4) Senior 5) Graduate	2.61	1.24	44	11	11	8	12	2
N02. Status of this class in your program 1) Major 2) Elective 3) Other degree/major requirement 4) Uncertain	2.23	0.79	44	9	17	17	1	
N03. Based on 100% completion of assignments and attendance, rate the amount of effort you put into this course 1) Almost none 2) Slightly below required amount 3) Required Amount 4) More than required	3.00	0.85	44	2	9	21	11	1
N04. What grade do you expect in this course 1) A or passing 2) B 3) C 4) D 5) F or failing	1.47	0.84	43	29	11	1	1	1
N05. Instructor was well prepared 1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral 4) Agree 5) Strongly Agree	4.28	0.87	43	1	1	3	18	20
N06. Instructor presented course material in a clear and effective manner 1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral 4) Agree 5) Strongly Agree	4.35	0.83	43	1	0	4	16	22
N07. Instructor's presentations were stimulating and held my interest 1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral 4) Agree 5) Strongly Agree	3.83	0.81	42	0	3	9	22	8
N08. The instructor covered a sufficient amount of course material 1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral 4) Agree 5) Strongly Agree	4.33	0.88	43	1	2	0	19	21
N09. The instructor presented the course material in an organized manner 1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral 4) Agree 5) Strongly Agree	4.31	0.83	42	1	1	1	20	19

N10. The instructor's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted 1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral 4) Agree 5) Strongly Agree	3.62	1.19	42	4	4	5	20	9
N11. The instructor's comments on written work were thorough and instructive 1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral 4) Agree 5) Strongly Agree	3.67	1.13	39	3	3	7	17	9
N12. The instructor was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of class 1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral 4) Agree 5) Strongly Agree	4.06	0.95	35	1	1	6	14	13
N13. The course topic was interesting and thought provoking 1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral 4) Agree 5) Strongly Agree	4.37	0.91	43	1	2	1	15	24
N14. Based on the course level and prerequisites, the difficulty level of this course was suitable 1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral 4) Agree 5) Strongly Agree	3.84	0.95	44	1	2	12	17	12
N15. The amount of required reading for this course was appropriate 1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral 4) Agree 5) Strongly Agree	3.95	0.92	42	1	2	7	20	12
N16. The amount of written work (papers, exams, etc.) for this course was appropriate 1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral 4) Agree 5) Strongly Agree	4.11	0.90	44	1	2	4	21	16
N17. The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate 1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral 4) Agree 5) Strongly Agree	3.79	1.13	43	3	3	6	19	12
N18. The student discussion that occurred in the course was valuable 1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral 4) Agree 5) Strongly Agree	3.56	1.10	43	3	3	13	15	9

N19. Overall, this course met my expectations 1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral 4) Agree 5) Strongly Agree	3.82	1.02	44	1	4	10	16	13
N20. PLEASE ANSWER THE NEXT SERIES OF QUESTIONS FOR THE TAs. YOU MAY ENTER SPECIFIC FEEDBACK FOR INDIVIDUAL TAs in the TEXT SECTION at the end of the questionnaire. Please estimate the percentage of discussion section meetings you have attended 1) 0-25% 2) 25-50% 3) 50-75% 4) 75-100%	1.50	0.90	14	10	2	1	1	
N21. The teaching assistant/s was/were well prepared. 1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral 4) Agree 5) Strongly Agree	3.85	0.90	20	1	0	4	11	4
N22. The teaching assistant/s reviewed course material in a clear and effective manner. 1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral 4) Agree 5) Strongly Agree	3.79	1.05	19	1	1	4	8	5
N23. The teaching assistants' discussions were stimulating and held my interest. 1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral 4) Agree 5) Strongly Agree	3.72	0.98	18	1	0	6	7	4
N24. The teaching assistant/s reviewed a sufficient amount of course material. 1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral 4) Agree 5) Strongly Agree	3.82	1.04	17	1	0	5	6	5
N25. The teaching assistant/s reviewed course material in an organized manner. 1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral 4) Agree 5) Strongly Agree	3.82	1.04	17	1	0	5	6	5
N26. The teaching assistants' grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted. 1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral 4) Agree 5) Strongly Agree	3.57	1.32	28	4	1	6	9	8
N27. The teaching assistant's comments on written work were thorough and instructive. 1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral 4) Agree 5) Strongly Agree	3.61	1.28	31	4	2	4	13	8

N28. The teaching assistant/s was/were responsive in discussing course related materials outside of section. 1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral 4) Agree 5) Strongly Agree	3.95	1.07	20	1	1	3	8	7
N29. If you had a TA draft meeting for Essay 1 or 2, how useful was it? 1) Not at all useful 2) Slightly useful 3) Neutral 4) Useful 5) Very useful	4.10	0.99	20	1	0	3	8	8
N30. ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS regarding the LECTURE PORTION: How useful were the discussion postings for engaging with your classmates? 1) Not at all useful 2) Slightly useful 3) Neutral 4) Useful 5) Very useful	3.12	1.19	41	4	9	12	10	6
N31. How useful were the discussion postings for engaging with the class material? 1) Not at all useful 2) Slightly useful 3) Neutral 4) Useful 5) Very useful	2.55	0.67	38	4	9	25		
N32. Was the 75 minute format too long? 1) YES 2) Neutral 3) NO	2.23	0.90	40	9	16	13	1	1

C01. What were the major strengths of this course?

32437. Very interesting topic

32421. Interterring material

32397. material was very interesting though sometimes a bit tedious.

32379. The order of material made the whole semester flow cohesively from one concept to the next; the inherent interest of minds made even abstract philosophical constructions worth parsing.

32451. interesting topic and discussions

32422. N/A

32445. the course material was very interesting and it was structured in a very organized manner

32414. That it was amazingly fun, super interesting, and well taught. One of my favorite courses at Cornell!

32389. Interesting content.

32419. The interdisciplinary speech helped me learn a lot about several different fields.

32376. The subject matter (and relevancy to our world today)

32449. interesting topic

32382. The course subject.

32406. Interesting subject material.

32439. Interesting course material and readings.

32410. The ability to gain an understanding of what exactly a computer is and how the mind might be similar to such a machine.

32447. It is very inspiring and, in fact, provides another way of thinking for me. Also it introduces the idea of AI to me, which is very interesting and changes my former opinion a lot.

32380. The topic is interesting and the readings were engaging.

32423. Fascinating subject material

32403. I'm just going to note here that I wanted to put 5 on the second to last question but only 1-3 showed up as options.

32371. The breadth yet depth of concepts covered.

32434. The material itself is fascinating, and the discussion posts were a good way to engage the material.

32436. Good prof

32398. Discussion posting allowed students to communicate with others students and discuss ideas.

32390. The topics covered are pretty interesting and thought-provoking; instructor really know the stuff

32442. Organized lectures

32415. When students participated and got to interact with what was going on in class, the classes were much more engaging. Writing on chalkboard is more effective than using powerpoint slides, since on chalkboard students can affect what you write and really get involved, instead of class just being a lecture, which doesn't work well for philosophy and made me less excited about philosophy.

C02. What were the major weaknesses of this course?

32437. Lecture feels really long

32421. None

32397. Discussion sections would be helpful to have to allow for time to discuss potentially confusing topics

32379. Discussion postings - I'd have preferred additional essays or alternative assignments instead of mere discussion postings; most of the time the boards just seemed to be freedom-of-association that people posted because they had to for the points.

32451. sometimes instructions for assignments were not clear (essay 1)

32422. N/A

32414. No major weaknesses. Only minor weakness is that discussion posting didn't seem to have much incentive to interact with others. My suggestion would be to have students alternate between weeks where they make their own posts and where they comment on others.

32389. Strange and unintuitive expectations for essays.

32419. The fact that all major written assignments were graded using a rigid rubric that required mere regurgitation of the lecture material and no original thought made it feel like this class was pandering to the CS/econ/stats (i.e. non-philosophy) majors in it.

32376. I found the discussion posts to be tedious and not particularly helpful/effective.

32449. not very interactive

32384. too much material, not enough specifics, would've been nice to concentrate on particular subjects rather than cover a little bit of everything

also for a humanities course, the beginning of the course was too scientific

32382. The course was too scientific at times.

32406. The readings. So Long.

32439. Some readings were very difficult and dry.

32410. Dry lectures at times that felt like mere summaries of the readings - no interesting spin on things in lecture.

32447. The reading material sometimes is quite hard. Therefore, sometimes the concept is hard to understand, and the correlation between different concepts is hard to build.

32380. Almost always began late. Often ended early. It really doesn't need to be 75 minutes. I feel like we often skirted over some of the most major issues involved with a problem. Arguments usually did not seem rigorous in the way they were presented in class.

32423. Grading of essay #1

32371. Essay draft discussions were too short.

32434. I absolutely HATED the way the papers were graded. They are graded on a rubric that is entirely different from the prompt, and it is essentially a guessing game as to what is on the rubric, plus if you miss one thing on the rubric you could lose ~15 points on the paper, meaning an otherwise perfect paper is now an 85 or so. For example, the prompt will say "name an example of XYZ" where we have discussed 6 different examples in class. However, the rubric will be looking for exactly one of those examples, and if you don't put that one, you lose 15 points on your paper. I think the separate rubric should be done away with entirely, and the papers should be graded based on how well they answered the prompt, even if it wasn't the exact answer the teacher is looking for. Philosophy, in my view, should be all about looking for different/creative answers to problems, rather than simply grading based on a checklist of what the professor thinks the answer should be. This one aspect really ruined an otherwise enjoyable class for me.

32398. The grading rubrics and schematics seemed a little unreasonable in certain aspects.

32390. Sometimes it's hard to focus for an entire 75 minutes

32442. Posts were meant to get students to discuss, might have worked better in actual discussion section where we could debate

32415. Not enough in class discussion when powerpoint slides were used.

Did not like coverage of free will. Simply going over what terms philosophers use is not very thought provoking.

C03. What aspects of the instructor's performance in the course did you like?

32437. Well organized, clear objectives for essays and assignments

32421. Clicker quiz is life

32379. Professor Starr knew the material very well, and worked hard to get students engaged in spite of the larger lecture format. His integration of multimedia (videos, photos, etc.) was very helpful in understanding some of the concepts.

32451. discussion posts and journals are thoughtful ways to engage with material

32422. N/A

32445. He was very into the material and had thought provoking lectures given with enthusiasm

32414. Really beautiful PowerPoints, excellent speaking manner, great job at keeping even the dry stuff interesting

32389. Personable and engaging.

32419. He constantly encouraged audience discussion during lectures.

32376. Integration of relevant examples into the lectures. Also, the journal posts.

32449. engaging speaker

32382. Professor Starr is a brilliant orator.

32406. Really engaging and took our views and explained and used them quite well.

32439. The informative slides and engaging lectures were good.

32410. clear presentation of material.

good video content at times.

32447. The instructor is very knowledgeable, and provides very strong background information about the material, which makes the class very valuable.

32380. He's a good speaker, and usually gave fairly unbiased presentations of differing points of view.

32423. His engaging personality. Kept class light and quick.

32403. Engaging lecturer

32371. His loud voice and clear lecture slides with emphasis on key concepts.

32434. Good knowledge of the material.

32436. He was engaging.

32398. Engages with students during lecture

32390. The way the instructor presented class material and related previous topics with ongoing ones are great! Short videos are also helpful for understanding the topics

32442. willingness to answer questions

C04. What would you recommend to improve the instructor's performance in this course?

32421. None

32379. Nothing comes to mind.

32451. more engagement in class

32422. N/A

32445. Give more thought experiments - I really liked those (like the mary's room and philosophical zombie)

32389. Switch to powerpoint.

32419. Be on time more often and don't repeat ideas so much in the lecture slides.

32449. less time reviewing reading, harder quizzes so people actually read the material

32384. less slides/powerpoint

32382. Don't read off the slides as often.

32406. Not much.

32439. Shorter lectures could improve the quality.

32410. Try make lectures more than a pure summary of the readings.

32447. It would be better if the instructor can make the correlation between different concepts more explicitly. Or give big picture more clearly, since there are so many concepts.

32380. The last two lectures where the chalk board was used instead of slides were a lot more engaging and didn't start late, so I preferred those.

32423. Shorten the time period.

32371. I don't see any drastic changes to make to improve the instructor's performance.

32434. Besides paper grading, the professor missed a few lectures which was kind of weird. The TAs' lectures weren't nearly as good (understandably), which threw off the course a little.

32436. Learn how to mediate discussions a little better. He did a good job, but there were a few times where he had trouble getting the class back on track.

32398. Was late to class quite often.

C05. Please comment on how helpful and interesting you found the required reading and how well it served its purpose in the course.

32437. Very helpful and interesting, prepared me well to think about the subject

32421. Reading can be hard sometimes, but most of time is reasonable

32379. The reading was interesting, when I could do it, but there was a ton in the context of having other classes. Often I needed to do a skim-read just to (hopefully) get quiz points.

32451. it was very interesting, sometimes very dense -- but professor does a good job explaining it in the course

32422. N/A

32445. The readings were interesting but sometimes a bit long so I would get bit bored and not want to read the entire article

32414. Most of the readings were really interesting and fun to read. Some of them were maybe a bit hard to read (Millikan for example).

32389. Was always relevant and generally helpful.

32419. It was an appropriate amount and skill level.

32376. The readings ranged from engaging/exciting to quite tiresome. Generally, though, I found the readings to be interesting and pertained to the lectures.

32449. very helpful

32384. very interesting

32406. Really interesting, but also long.

32439. The readings were generally very useful.

32410. Good readings

32447. It's very interesting, but sometimes it's a little overwhelmed and hard to understand.

32380. It was useful and interesting, but you didn't actually need to do the reading for the quizzes. The quizzes were way too easy!

32423. It was helpful and interesting, but I felt sometimes things were repetitive.

32403. It was helpful to come to lecture having done the reading as lots of the lectures were clarifications and expansions of the material from the readings.

32371. They helped me gain a brief background of the concept we were going to learn in class. Sometimes, the readings were very dense and long.

32434. The readings were great, introduced a lot of really cool material.

32398. Readings were interesting. But

32390. They are pretty interesting and not too hard to read. Maybe could also include some more application side of the theory?

32442. Very useful, explained a lot of concepts and introduced new viewpoints

C06. Other comments/suggestions for the instructor?

32421. None

32379. Nothing else.

32422. N/A

32414. Just a quality of life suggestion: the readings on the syllabus are numbered so that it fits within the table. I think it would be easier if those numbers were also in the titles of the readings posted on blackboard just so you can find them easier

32389. Nope.

32406. N/A

32447. In all, I really like the class.

32423. Review your grading standard.

32371. If some passages of the reading were made clearer (they were being made clear in lecture, just a bit more could be useful) in lecture, that would be great!

32434. Yea I kind of covered it with my rant, but either change the way the papers are graded or make the papers not worth 55% of your final grade or, ideally, both.

32442. I would have put a 4 for "How useful were the discussion postings for engaging with the class material?" but for some reason only options 1-3 showed up

Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Spring 2017 Course Owner: PHIL
Course: PHIL 2621 LEC 001 CID: 8821
Title: Minds and Machines
Instructor: Starr/EpsteinTAOne/PaskellTATwo
45 Responses, 81 Enrolled, 55.56% Response

C07. PLEASE ANSWER THE NEXT SERIES OF QUESTIONS FOR THE TAs. Please be specific as you can be. What aspects of the teaching assistant/s' performance in the section did you like?

32421. None

32379. I didn't attend section - unable to comment.

32422. N/A

32445. I liked that they held essay review sessions

32389. No section.

32419. They were very approachable and accommodating if meeting times didn't work out.

32384. n/a

32406. really helpful comments.

32447. The TA is very helpful, and help me understand the concept better, since he always listens to my opinion, and gives specific response to me.

32380. We didn't have section meetings.

32423. n/a

32371. Their efforts to break the concepts down into understandable terms.

32398. Was able to run the classes and involved in discussion

C08. What changes in the teaching assistant/s' conduct of section would you recommend?

32421. None

32379. I didn't attend section - unable to comment

32422. N/A

32389. No section.

32384. n/a

32406. More times

32447. No

32380. I think it would be a good idea to have discussions.

32423. maybe more outreach to students.

32403. I really would have liked to have a TA meeting on the second essay but the limited days the office hours were available conflicted with a large projects due dates in another class and the office hours for it so I had no chance to do so. I think more spread out OH for the essays would be much better.

32371. More organization and more time.

32434. See: paper grading rant. The TAs themselves grade the paper, although my issue is more with the professor for establishing the terrible method of grading than the TAs who obviously had to follow that system.

32398. More open to essay grading. "Rubric" was harsh and many points were missed despite them being ther

Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Spring 2017 Course Owner: PHIL
Course: PHIL 2621 LEC 001 CID: 8821
Title: Minds and Machines
Instructor: Starr/EpsteinTAOne/PaskellTATwo
45 Responses, 81 Enrolled, 55.56% Response

C09. Other comments/suggestions? Please be specific as to which TA.

32421. None

32379. I didn't attend section - unable to comment

32422. N/A

32389. None.

32384. n/a

32406. N/A

32447. No

32380. I think TA Epstein's comments and questions in lecture were often elucidating and intriguing.

32423. Eric is a nice guy. Though I did come to office hours once and he wasn't there. helpful overall.

32371. If essay draft sessions were longer, that would be good. Mr. Epstein was really clear and insightful. Mr. Paskell was also insightful.

32390. I went to Matt's TA meeting for essay 1 and Eric's for essay 2. Both are very helpful and did a great job clarifying my confusions and presenting the material!

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

CRITICAL THINKING

Fall 2017

Principal Instructor: Dr. Eric G. Epstein

Enrollment numbers are acquired before the end of the semester and may differ from the final figure.

Reporting Date: 12/26/2017 7:24 PM **Semester:** 2017/18 FA



Instructor ID: exe51 **Instructor:** Epstein, Eric

Course ID	Course Title	Students	Responses	Response Rate
201718FA____PPHIL_10__002_1__21781--15492	PHIL10- Crit Think	36	30	83.3%












University Items

A1 Are you taking this course as an elective? Yes: 8 No: 4 I don't know: 0 N: 12 Percent Yes: 66.7%

A2 What grade do you expect to earn in this course? A: 10 / 83.3% B: 2 / 16.7% C or lower: 0 / 0.0%

		Lowest Rating		Average Rating			Highest Rating		N	Mean	N/A	
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7				
A3	Rate the overall quality of this course.	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	1/ 3%	4/13%	2/ 7%	7/23%	16/53%	30	6.10	0	
A4	Rate the overall quality of the instructor.	0/ 0%	1/ 3%	1/ 3%	2/ 7%	2/ 7%	7/23%	17/57%	30	6.13	0	

Department Items

		Lowest Rating		Average Rating			Highest Rating		N	Mean	N/A	
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7				
B001	Rate the clarity of the instructor's presentations.	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	2/ 7%	3/10%	2/ 7%	8/27%	15/50%	30	6.03	0	
B002	Rate the effectiveness of the examples used to clarify difficult concepts.	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	1/ 3%	1/ 3%	5/17%	5/17%	17/59%	29	6.24	1	
B003	Rate the clarity of the instructor's explanations.	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	3/10%	0/ 0%	6/20%	7/23%	14/47%	30	5.97	0	
B004	Rate the instructor's skill in using visual as well as verbal communication.	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	1/ 3%	1/ 3%	2/ 7%	10/33%	16/53%	30	6.30	0	
B005	Rate the instructor's skill in relating course material to real life situations.	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	1/ 3%	2/ 7%	3/10%	8/27%	16/53%	30	6.20	0	
B006	Rate the clarity of the examples used.	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	2/ 7%	0/ 0%	3/10%	10/33%	15/50%	30	6.20	0	
B008	Rate the effectiveness of the instructor's definitions of terms, concepts, and principles.	0/ 0%	1/ 3%	0/ 0%	2/ 7%	2/ 7%	10/33%	15/50%	30	6.17	0	
B009	Rate the effectiveness of the instructor's explanations of why certain processes, techniques, or formulas were used.	1/ 3%	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	6/21%	5/17%	17/59%	29	6.21	0	
B010	Rate the instructor's skill in handling students' questions and comments.	0/ 0%	1/ 3%	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	4/13%	7/23%	18/60%	30	6.33	0	
B011	Rate the instructor's pacing of lectures and presentations to allow for note taking.	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	1/ 3%	1/ 3%	4/13%	4/13%	20/67%	30	6.37	0	
B012	Rate the effectiveness of the instructor as a classroom leader.	0/ 0%	1/ 3%	1/ 3%	1/ 3%	5/17%	9/30%	13/43%	30	5.97	0	

B013	Rate the effectiveness of the instructor as a speaker.	0/ 0%	1/ 3%	2/ 7%	3/10%	3/10%	7/23%	14/47%	30	5.83	0	
B014	Rate the instructor's skill in organizing classroom activities.	1/ 3%	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	1/ 3%	6/20%	7/23%	15/50%	30	6.07	0	
B015	Rate the instructor's skill in using a variety of teaching methods.	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	1/ 3%	1/ 3%	7/23%	7/23%	14/47%	30	6.07	0	

University Open Ended Items

Open 1 What helped you learn in this course?

- the teacher
- Homework really forced me to learn the material when I wanted to be lazy and not read.
- the set up of the course was very easy for me to understand and the professor made it very flexible for me.
- how to think logically without fallacy
- The groupwork that we did in class gave us the opportunity to discuss the topics together and get as many perspectives as possible.
- Videos & pictures in class. Class discussions
- The instructor was very forgiving and always there to help the students. Tried to learn everyone's name making a great learning environment
- Dr. Epstein's use of a planner that was attached to the syllabus, which included the lesson plan, assignments, and other important information, helped me learn because I was able to use it to organize the class better.
- Clarity of examples and in class discussions. Exam packets and discussion board helped.
- Lectures related to real life applications.
- The study guides and independent work that was given to us was very helpful for my own knowledge. Also, the extra credit offered was very helpful and the level of understanding from the professor was also helpful.
- I thought his homework's were very helpful and the way he posted study guides were very helpful.
- The lectures taught everything that was needed on the exams and quizzes.
- the professor
- homework
- The examples that Dr. Epstein used were flawless and really helped me relate the material to everyday situations which is beneficial for the way that I learn.
- Professor Epstein's teaching style helped me learn the most, more than any other factor. He is enthusiastic, informative, and knowledgeable. Could not recommend more highly.
- The professor's lectures and the homework assignments.
- The instructor used various methods to make sure the students were able to learn the subjects that were being presented, realizing that not everyone learns in the same method. This ranged from pictures, videos, readings to skits. I also felt something that was very effective was the explanation of why this information is important and to what field it pertained to heavily. I felt something that also helped me learn in this class was the relaxed and understanding manner the professor used. He understood that in some cases the questions were not fair and actively tried to understand if the questions were fair to ask.The professor also realized that not all students perform well on test/exams and attempted to make other ways for the students to gain points.
- The visual images and the information that the instructor wrote on the board helped me learn in this course. He did I great job answering questions and trying to get the entire class involved. We also did numerous group activities where we paired up and answered questions and brainstormed about topics and definitions.
- Professor Epstein posted his lessons online, and I think that helped quite a lot, especially with studying for quizzes/exams.
- Dr. Epstein was just such a nice and understanding professor who took lots of time out of his day to ensure we understood the material taught in class. He had many office hours, let students have extensions on work if needed and really created an environment that i was not afraid to approach the professor.
- in class discussion
- Studying for and taking the LSAT before I took this course. This course was highly redundant for me.
- Videos, class discussions, lectures, and other activities. There was a large variety of teaching methods used in this course.
- Clear instructions. And great formatting of tests and study guides were a great help.
- The professor was very clear and structured in what was required.
- The lecture notes helps a lot.

Open 2 What changes would improve your learning?

- I would not make any changes
- I felt that in some cases the homework did not pertain to the subjects we were learning in the classroom. The rigid format of the homework did not work with the lecture-style he was using. Perhaps choosing different questions in certain cases **348** asking his own questions could have worked better.
- I think it would have been more helpful to get explanations that were more clear. Sometimes I felt the class material was explained too quickly and there were awkward moments where we were expected to smoothly answer a question.

To improve this course I would add more real life visual image examples that would relate to the topics more. Some topics were boring and dense and if they had been spiced up relating them to entertaining examples it would have been better.

More application to real life examples like the news or maybe tv/movies

Dr. Epstein is really understanding in giving students every opportunity to get both a good grade and how to understand the course material, though I feel as if sometimes his explanations of topics do not provide further clarification from the textbook.

Nothing. Was a great, clear, fun class.

Better handwriting on the chalkboard from the professors end.

I would maybe have some more videos that related the concepts learned to real life situations.

Additional Readings.

Make lectures more dynamic. Encourage debates and maybe devote a few class periods to interesting topics for debate.

Nothing, great class!

more open discussions on philosophical topics

none, class was good

handwriting

More interaction with peers

Maybe better handwriting.

None

No group activities. Better explanations. DEFINITELY use of a different book. The Critical Thinking textbook is so superfluous and overexplains everything for no reason. It also uses different terms than the standard in arguments. I suggest using A Rulebook for Arguments by Weston. Much shorter, to the point, super useful. I didn't gain anything from the books assigned in this class.Also, while Dr. Epstein was very kind and seems like a great guy, in my humble opinion as someone who has already undergone rigorous philosophical work in and about arguments and rhetoric, he poorly explained a lot and in some cases had no good answer to a question about the difference between one version of the book's rhetoric and another.

Overall, all the things Professor Epstein provided us with helped me learn, I don't think I would add anything.


Maybe some more exposure to information outside the textbook, but still thoroughly enjoyed the class and learned a lot.

I think the format of the quizzes should be multiple choice, true and false along with short answer. Maybe even have weekly summarizations of the class lectures.

none

If there's ppt sending out would be perfect.

Unrestricted Items

Philosophy Question	Rate the course in terms of how much you learned in it.	2/ 7%	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	4/15%	4/15%	8/30%	9/33%	27	5.52	0	
---------------------	---	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	----	------	---	---

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

Introduction to Business Ethics: Section 001

Fall 2017

Principal Instructor: Dr. Eric G. Epstein

Enrollment numbers are acquired before the end of the semester and may differ from the final figure.

Reporting Date: 12/27/2017 3:35 AM **Semester:** 2017/18 FA



Instructor ID: exe51 **Instructor:** Epstein, Eric

Course ID	Course Title	Students	Responses	Response Rate
201718FA____PPHIL_106_001_1__21781--15519	PHIL106- Intro Bus Ethics	35	32	91.4%












University Items




A1 Are you taking this course as an elective? Yes: 20 No: 5 I don't know: 2 N: 25 Percent Yes: 80.0%

A2 What grade do you expect to earn in this course? A: 23 / 85.2% B: 4 / 14.8% C or lower: 0 / 0.0%

		Lowest Rating		Average Rating			Highest Rating		N	Mean	N/A	
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7				
A3	Rate the overall quality of this course.	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	1/ 3%	4/13%	8/26%	9/29%	9/29%	31	5.68	0	
A4	Rate the overall quality of the instructor.	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	1/ 3%	7/23%	12/39%	11/35%	31	6.06	0	

Department Items

		Lowest Rating		Average Rating			Highest Rating		N	Mean	N/A	
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7				
B001	Rate the clarity of the instructor's presentations.	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	2/ 6%	2/ 6%	6/19%	9/29%	12/39%	31	5.87	0	
B002	Rate the effectiveness of the examples used to clarify difficult concepts.	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	1/ 3%	1/ 3%	3/10%	10/32%	16/52%	31	6.26	0	
B003	Rate the clarity of the instructor's explanations.	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	2/ 6%	0/ 0%	10/32%	9/29%	10/32%	31	5.81	0	
B004	Rate the instructor's skill in using visual as well as verbal communication.	0/ 0%	1/ 3%	1/ 3%	1/ 3%	7/23%	8/26%	13/42%	31	5.90	0	
B005	Rate the instructor's skill in relating course material to real life situations.	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	2/ 6%	2/ 6%	8/26%	19/61%	31	6.42	0	
B006	Rate the clarity of the examples used.	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	2/ 6%	4/13%	15/48%	10/32%	31	6.06	0	
B008	Rate the effectiveness of the instructor's definitions of terms, concepts, and principles.	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	1/ 3%	2/ 6%	8/26%	7/23%	13/42%	31	5.94	0	
B009	Rate the effectiveness of the instructor's explanations of why certain processes, techniques, or formulas were used.	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	1/ 3%	0/ 0%	7/24%	12/41%	9/31%	29	5.97	2	
B010	Rate the instructor's skill in handling students' questions and comments.	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	1/ 3%	5/16%	7/23%	18/58%	31	6.35	0	
B011	Rate the instructor's pacing of lectures and presentations to allow for note taking.	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	2/ 6%	5/16%	10/32%	14/45%	31	6.16	0	
B012	Rate the effectiveness of the instructor as a classroom leader.	0/ 0%	1/ 3%	0/ 0%	3/10%	6/19%	7/23%	14/45%	31	5.94	0	

B013	Rate the effectiveness of the instructor as a speaker.	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	1/ 3%	3/10%	4/13%	9/29%	14/45%	31	6.03	0	
B014	Rate the instructor's skill in organizing classroom activities.	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	2/ 7%	1/ 3%	3/10%	12/40%	12/40%	30	6.03	0	
B015	Rate the instructor's skill in using a variety of teaching methods.	0/ 0%	1/ 3%	3/10%	3/10%	3/10%	8/27%	12/40%	30	5.67	0	

University Open Ended Items

Open 1 What helped you learn in this course?

- Being able to read the articles again in class on canvas when we are discussing them in order to be able to pull specific examples.
- Different types of media other than reading articles really reinforced the material being taught at hand. I enjoyed the various clips and podcasts on the ethical dilemmas we discussed in class.
- As this was Dr Epstein’s first course teaching here I think he did very well and improved over the course of the semester.
- learn something about philosophy and some phenomenon
- Going to class and participating in the discussions.
- Discussing the articles in class, no pressure of the exams, given decent amount of times to work on essays
- Breaking down the readings and explaining the main points to better understand the concepts.
- Professor Epstein adapted very well to needs of the students throughout this class.He was very responsive in what the students wanted or needed.
- Looking through the provided articles and book readings, as well as re-reading old notes from class
- Examples, videos on top of the readings
- I like how the teacher username real life examples to explain a point that he was making. It helped clarify. Also that he wrote all his points out on the board.
- Debates, Lectures, and connecting ideas.
- Videos, and visual aids. Lectures from the professor were well organized and used examples from readings.
- When we watched videos and read an article similar to the video.
- Class notes posted on Canvas
- I learned through discussions about the topic. This is a really opinionated course and when I was able to hear and give opinions, it was interesting having a conversation about the topic. Having the readings online was very beneficial when writing essays so I could directly copy and paste quotes and have access anytime.
- Going to office hours
- Dr. Epstein had notes online which made it easy to find the important points and write essays about. Also, he was very welcoming when we asked questions about him.
- class discussions
- The readings and the teacher’s notes about the readings
- The online material that are always posted in Canvas, and Dr.Eric general way of thinking. Dr.Epstein has a great sense of logic that helped me to apply in other areas of life,such as always consider the opposition’s perspective and analyze it in a fair manner.
- His passion for philosophy and excitement for teaching it to us every day helped engage students and get us into the subject matter as well. Leniency on deadlines allowed us to work hard on our assignments and not worry as much. Great professor all around.
- the examples in class and doing the readings together. Also discussions were fun and helped to see other people's opinions on different topics.
- Examples of the topics that we learned about definitely helped me understand the material better. The visuals and videos shown in class were also helpful as they explained the content as well.
- Seeing all the real world examples, and how they related to our topics
- Going through the articles and material in class in detail helped me learn a lot.Some of the articles in philosophy are difficult to understand the author's opinions,but Dr. Epstein went through each one thoroughly.This gave me good points to use in the essays we were assigned. I liked how the essays were based on the articles we reviewed during class.
- The course relies on the reading a lot. so reading in advance of the class is helping me to engage in the in-class discussions.
- The professor cares about the students understanding more than anything! He understands what the students go through and make changes to deadlines just to make sure his students do their best.Also, it really helps when the professor is open to the feedback and the ideas from students and really apply their ideas! I told my friends about him and because of his endless care, they are all interested in applying for the course!!Also his passion is another story :) I can’t describe
- the debates

Open 2 What changes would improve your learning?

- more discussion on each section
- Having a more clear grading system on how the essays are graded rather than just how to write a philosophy paper.
- Way less lecturing at us and rather videos and stuff. Lecturing gets boring.

Engaging the students more and have more debates that allow the students to exchange ideas

I might be able to understand the reading materials better if you could offer some reading questions to guide me when reading the materials. I like the group discussion occurs at the beginning of the semester, but we lost it later in the semester. You could set up worksheet of questions on topics that answered by the group together. And those should have points. being here does not equal to participation in class.

maybe do one less essay since extensions were given so often. This would reduce extensions and give students more time to do each one Also, do other small assignments for points instead of just 4 essays.

I would change how we read numerous articles about various ethical concepts and dilemmas in business, but did not use them all when we were to write our essays. It would be more helpful to go into specific detail about four or five subjects and then used the knowledge we learned from them in four or five essays.

I would clarify the course a little bit.Professor Epstein was extremely knowledgeable and passionate about all of the topics in class.This was awesome, but he could not effectively transfer all of this knowledge to us, due to some of the complexity of the class.

Explanation of articles, some were difficult but for the most part you explained them

more of the students talking

Having more discussions and maybe socratic seminars would be good for this course. Talking about the readings with a mix of visuals and Dr. Epstein's explanations would be better for me, only because that is the type of the learner I am. I learned the most when I was involved with the topic. I rated the course at a 5 for that reason.

Maybe do more group work (not necessary but may help or mix up classes)

clear notes of the reading on canvas

more debates, better way of keeping track of attendance

Maybe just a few more class debates. We had some but I think if we had even 2 or 3 more the class would have really been able to get engaged with the material

More diverse and interactive activities in class.

Some quizzes to solidify information learned.

The professor listens to his students and cares for them, I believe he will know what to improve more than anyone else :)

N/A

More practice with the difference between an english paper and a philosophy paper

I thought the overall class went well and was taught very well


More clarity on how essay's will be graded. Also maybe having a recap of each section to make sure each topic is nailed down for everyone.

The only change would be to help write papers better. Dr. Epstein did give feedback if we asked him, which was very helpful. I think if we learned to write about our arguments better, that would improve my learning.

N/a

Other activities other than just talking about the readings

Unrestricted Items

Philosophy Question	Rate the course in terms of how much you learned in it.	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	1/ 3%	4/13%	5/17%	10/33%	10/33%	30	5.80	0	
---------------------	---	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	--------	--------	----	------	---	---

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

Introduction to Business Ethics: Section 002

Fall 2017

Principal Instructor: Dr. Eric G. Epstein

Enrollment numbers are acquired before the end of the semester and may differ from the final figure.

Reporting Date: 12/26/2017 7:27 PM **Semester:** 2017/18 FA



Instructor ID: exe51 **Instructor:** Epstein, Eric

Course ID	Course Title	Students	Responses	Response Rate
201718FA____PPHIL_106_002_1__21781--17895	PHIL106- Intro Bus Ethics	35	21	60.0%












University Items

A1 Are you taking this course as an elective? Yes: 6 No: 8 I don't know: 0 N: 14 Percent Yes: 42.9%

A2 What grade do you expect to earn in this course? A: 13 / 100.0% B: 0 / 0.0% C or lower: 0 / 0.0%

		Lowest Rating		Average Rating			Highest Rating		N	Mean	N/A	
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7				
A3	Rate the overall quality of this course.	0/ 0%	1/ 5%	0/ 0%	2/10%	1/ 5%	3/14%	14/67%	21	6.24	0	
A4	Rate the overall quality of the instructor.	0/ 0%	1/ 5%	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	2/10%	0/ 0%	18/86%	21	6.57	0	

Department Items

		Lowest Rating		Average Rating			Highest Rating		N	Mean	N/A	
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7				
B001	Rate the clarity of the instructor's presentations.	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	2/10%	0/ 0%	1/ 5%	2/10%	16/76%	21	6.43	0	
B002	Rate the effectiveness of the examples used to clarify difficult concepts.	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	1/ 5%	1/ 5%	0/ 0%	5/24%	14/67%	21	6.43	0	
B003	Rate the clarity of the instructor's explanations.	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	1/ 5%	1/ 5%	0/ 0%	5/24%	14/67%	21	6.43	0	
B004	Rate the instructor's skill in using visual as well as verbal communication.	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	3/14%	3/14%	15/71%	21	6.57	0	
B005	Rate the instructor's skill in relating course material to real life situations.	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	5/25%	15/75%	20	6.75	0	
B006	Rate the clarity of the examples used.	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	1/ 5%	1/ 5%	2/10%	17/81%	21	6.67	0	
B008	Rate the effectiveness of the instructor's definitions of terms, concepts, and principles.	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	1/ 5%	0/ 0%	2/10%	3/14%	15/71%	21	6.48	0	
B009	Rate the effectiveness of the instructor's explanations of why certain processes, techniques, or formulas were used.	0/ 0%	1/ 5%	0/ 0%	1/ 5%	3/14%	1/ 5%	15/71%	21	6.29	0	
B010	Rate the instructor's skill in handling students' questions and comments.	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	3/14%	3/14%	15/71%	21	6.57	0	
B011	Rate the instructor's pacing of lectures and presentations to allow for note taking.	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	1/ 5%	0/ 0%	1/ 5%	1/ 5%	18/86%	21	6.67	0	
B012	Rate the effectiveness of the instructor as a classroom leader.	1/ 5%	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	2/10%	1/ 5%	4/19%	13/62%	21	6.14	0	

B013	Rate the effectiveness of the instructor as a speaker.	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	2/10%	2/10%	3/14%	14/67%	21	6.38	0	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div> <div>1234567</div>
B014	Rate the instructor's skill in organizing classroom activities.	1/ 5%	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	2/10%	4/19%	14/67%	21	6.33	0	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div> <div>1234567</div>
B015	Rate the instructor's skill in using a variety of teaching methods.	0/ 0%	0/ 0%	2/10%	0/ 0%	3/14%	3/14%	13/62%	21	6.19	0	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div> <div>1234567</div>

University Open Ended Items

Open 1 What helped you learn in this course?

The lectures coupled w the examples such as YouTube videos, readings, etc.
Organized material
His down to earth personality and interest in the subject and our willingness to learn it
one on one essay review and edit
I learned how to claim and make arguments that are related to business ethics. In addition,
his explanations and readings
Readings, interactions with professor
Class discussions and hw assignments related to the essays.
The professors feedback on assignments was very helpful. He also had very informative lectures that were well put together.
Dr. Epstein is very enthusiastic and always willing to help the students.
Prof. Epstein is very helpful!
EVERYTHING. HE IS SO GOOD AT TEACHING
All of Eric's examples.
Open 2 What changes would improve your learning?
Maybe add more interactive learning in groups to further engage the students.
Making assignments that related to material that we learned in class.
Provide more revenant examples Have students write a paragraph every month or so about how one specific topic interest them in class and how it pertains to life today
maybe include rubric for essay
Just because I care too much about the environment, I think it is better to ask the students to bring the readings with them instead of passing out printed copies. Personally, I prefer reading on my Ipad or laptop
Not much.
Dr.Eric Epstein is the best professor in Penn State. He is simply amazing and always helps us if we had any questions. I went to his office hours and he was so helpful with his feedbacks regarding my essay. If I had the chance to take the course again, I would definetly do it if Professor Eric is teaching it.
Providing up to date essays.
Drafts of essays. Feedback from professor.
More videos.
less in class reading

Unrestricted Items

Philosophy Question	Rate the course in terms of how much you learned in it.	1/ 5%	1/ 5%	0/ 0%	1/ 5%	2/10%	5/24%	11/52%	21	5.90	0	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div> <div>1234567</div>
----------------------------	---	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	--------	----	------	---	---