

Teaching Portfolio

Tyler Paytas
www.tylerpaytas.com

Table of Contents

1. Teaching Resume
2. Teaching Philosophy Statement
3. Sample Student Evaluations
 - a) Biomedical Ethics – Washington University in St. Louis
 - b) Business Ethics – Washington University in St. Louis
4. Classroom Observations
 - a) Elizabeth Schechter – Assistant Professor, Department of Philosophy, Washington University in St. Louis
 - b) Corie Fogg – Academic Dean, Johns Hopkins University Center for Talented Youth
5. Sample Syllabi
 - a) Ancient Greek Philosophy
 - b) Problems in Philosophy

Teaching Resume

Tyler Paytas

Email: tyler.paytas@acu.edu.au

Phone: +61 03 9230 8212

Web: www.tylerpaytas.com

Australian Catholic University
Dianoia Institute of Philosophy

Locked Bag 4115 DC
Fitzroy Victoria 3065

Teaching Certificates

Teaching Citation – The Teaching Center at Washington University in St. Louis, 2015

- Completed all introductory-level departmental TA-training and Teaching Center TA-training workshops
- Completed four advanced-level Teaching Center workshops
- Received three classroom observations from Philosophy Department faculty

Certificate in University Teaching – UM-St. Louis Center for Teaching & Learning, 2008

- Completed seven workshops on Teaching for Learning in the University
- Completed seven workshops on Preparing for University Teaching
- Attended two-day Professional Development Conference for Graduate Teaching Assistants (2006, 2007, 2008)
- Received three classroom observations from Center for Teaching & Learning faculty
- Composed reflective responses to feedback following classroom observations
- Submitted weekly teaching logs to Center for Teaching & Learning TA Coordinator

Teaching Awards and Honors

- Ben Floyd-Clapman Memorial Award for Excellence in Teaching: Department of Philosophy, Washington University in St. Louis, 2013
- Senior Teaching Assistant Nomination (recognized for leadership and mentoring): UM-St. Louis Center for Teaching and Learning, 2007, 2008

Teaching

Washington University in St. Louis

Primary Instructor

PHIL 235: Environmental Ethics
PHIL 234: Business Ethics (2 sections)
PHIL 233: Biomedical Ethics
PHIL 120: Problems in Philosophy
PHIL 131: Present Moral Problems

Washington University in St. Louis

Teaching Assistant

PHIL 306: Philosophy of Language, for Gillian Russell
PHIL 235: Environmental Ethics, for Brian Talbot
PHIL 100: Logic, for John Heil
PHIL 315: Philosophy of Mind, for Elizabeth Schechter
PHIL 131: Present Moral Problems, for Julia Driver
PHIL 233: Biomedical Ethics, for Emily Crookston
PHIL 131: Present Moral Problems, for David Speetzen
PHIL 233: Biomedical Ethics, for John Doris

Lindenwood University (St. Charles, MO)

Primary Instructor

PHL 214: Ethics (2 sections)

Johns Hopkins University – Center for Talented Youth

Primary Instructor

Logic: Principles of Reasoning
Ethics
Philosophy (2 sections)
Bioethics (2 sections)

Teaching Assistant

Ethics, for Vahé Shirikjan
Philosophy, for Karl Hein

University of Missouri-St. Louis

Primary Instructor

PHIL 1150: Major Questions in Philosophy
PHIL 2254: Business Ethics (2 sections – online)
PHIL 1130: Approaches to Ethics
PHIL 1091: Significant Figures in Philosophy (2 sections – online)

Teaching Assistant

PHIL 1185: Philosophy of Religion, for Irem Kurtsal Steen
PHIL 1150: Major Questions in Philosophy, for Andrew Black
PHIL 1160: Logic and Language, for Stephanie Ross

Other Training and Experience

- Completed ACU Higher Degree Research Supervisor Training Program, 2018
- Volunteer teaching assistant at La Trobe University Adventures in Ideas Camp, 2018
- Volunteer tutor for ACU Homework Support Club at Sacred Heart Primary School, 2018

- Curriculum Advisor for Bioethics: Johns Hopkins University Center for Talented Youth, 2011-2016
- Tutor in reading, writing, and exam prep (Grades K-12): Huntington Learning Center, 2007-2009
- Substitute Teacher (Grades K-12): Jefferson County Public Schools, 2009

Summary of Teaching Evaluations

Average Instructor Rating

4.70 out of 5 (for courses taught as primary instructor at WUSTL, JHU-CTY, and UM-St. Louis — Lindenwood University evaluations do not include overall instructor rating.)

Selected Student Comments

This is a sample of written comments from students at WUSTL, JHU-CTY, Lindenwood University, and UM-St. Louis. For complete sets of written comments see attached evaluations. Additional complete sets are available at www.tylerpaytas.com

“Tyler presented the material clearly and commanded the classroom effectively. He was able to start up a discussion that was relevant and interesting and still keep us on target. I think Tyler was excellent at leading the class and wish more TAs and professors were as good as he was!”

“Tyler was a great instructor, he explained things very well for our level of knowledge, though you could tell he knew a lot more than he was saying and was actively choosing his wording so as not to confuse us!”

“Tyler Paytas is an excellent professor! At first, I saw a young guy and thought ‘What can he teach me? We’re almost the same age (late 20s)’. He had a thorough understanding of the material and was very knowledgeable on ethical theories. He promoted interactive discussions while guiding us through the topics. It was one of the most enjoyable courses I’ve taken, and I feel I’m becoming a more responsible citizen while applying some of what I learned in Tyler Paytas’ Biomedical Ethics.”

“I liked his teaching style and you could tell that he is passionate about the subject matter and always well prepared.”

“He is a great teacher! I used to think that philosophy is a waste of time, but he made me become interested in the subject. The class was a lot better than I expected!”

“Excellent grasp of the material. Strong ability to share knowledge with students. Can explain concepts on both a high level and low level.”

“Tyler was a great instructor, he used vivid examples when explaining material and was always ready to help. His method of teaching was great, it needs no improvement.”

“My instructor was very good at making sure everyone understood all the material. He was also very fair and always willing to go into further detail with the class. He was a great listener and truly wanted us to learn.”

“Tyler, our TA is generally excited about the material. It’s always amazing to have a TA who really cares about the subject they are helping teach, and Tyler embodies that. He’s always willing to pose questions to you both inside and outside of class time, and he’s interested in your learning as an individual.”

“Tyler was very consistent, both with grading and with keeping up on email correspondence. Some of the best (meaning critical) feedback I received on my assignments came from Tyler and I can’t state enough how important those critiques were in helping me to develop my arguments and think more deeply about my views.”

“Teacher was great. He took a lot of time explaining and answering questions. He made sure we understood. He was also very nice. He did not impose his own views onto the lecture, rather he explained in a very objective way. He kept us engaged in the class. Great teacher.”

“Tyler was very good at explaining what we were supposed to learn. His passion for bioethics is probably what makes him such a good teacher.”

“Overall, bad.”

Teaching References

Elizabeth Schechter	Indiana University	esschech@iu.edu
Gillian Russell	University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill	gillian_russell@unc.edu
Sally Barr Ebest	UM-St. Louis Center for Teaching & Learning	sebest@umsl.edu

Teaching Statement

Tyler Paytas

www.tylerpaytas.com

I am fortunate to have had several teaching opportunities with substantial variance in content, structure, and student background. I have experience as a primary instructor for philosophy courses at a large state university, a selective private university, a liberal arts institution, and a continuing education program. I have also taught intensive introductory courses for advanced adolescents as an instructor at the Johns Hopkins University Center for Talented Youth for eight summers. One of the benefits of this variety is that I have become increasingly adept at explaining difficult concepts and ideas in an accessible manner. I have also benefitted from my unorthodox educational background (for a professional academic). After being a below average student throughout my high school years, I began my post-secondary education at a local community college without much confidence. This experience has helped me to effectively encourage and communicate with students who might not consider themselves especially talented or well-suited for the study of philosophy.

Some aspects of my teaching remain constant no matter the institution, course, or students. The first is my emphasis on student participation. I encourage spirited discussion, and I do everything in my power to help the more reserved students feel comfortable sharing their ideas. To this end, I make a point of setting a positive tone for the course starting on the first day of class. I take time to explain why a welcoming and supportive classroom atmosphere is especially important in philosophy courses. And although I make it clear that I take my role as instructor seriously, I do my best to incorporate humor when appropriate. To make class discussions more open, I often give students time to write down their thoughts on a particular topic, and I invite them to discuss their response with a nearby classmate. After students have had a chance to confer with a peer they typically feel more confident and willing to share with the entire class.

This leads to a second aspect of my teaching that remains constant—I always have my students do some form of written work during each class period. One activity I find especially beneficial is argument reconstruction. I select a key passage from an assigned reading and ask my students to put the argument in premise-conclusion form. I find that this not only facilitates comprehension, it also gives students a better sense of how to structure their own arguments so that their papers are clearer and more compelling. A second exercise I like to use comes in the form of a writing prompt given early in the class period. This helps students begin to focus on that day's topic, and it also gives them a chance to develop their thoughts on the relevant issues. One of my aims when constructing these prompts is to help students see that their views often have implications that extend further than they may have realized. This typically results in more energy and engagement from students.

I put significant effort into measuring student learning and my effectiveness as a teacher. One particularly useful device is the “uncounted” pop quiz. I first started giving short pop quizzes for a health care ethics course at the JHU Center for Talented Youth. Because CTY students do not receive letter grades, I was confident that the surprise quizzes wouldn't be anxiety-inducing. I found that the quizzes are a highly efficient means for finding out which concepts need clarification, and also for reinforcing the key points of previous lessons. I have begun to incorporate “uncounted” pop quizzes in my university courses for the same reasons. A second device I like to use is the “minute paper.” I occasionally set aside a few minutes at the end of class for students to provide answers to the following questions: What were the key points from today's class? Which parts of today's class were unclear? What general questions or concerns do you have about the course? I ask

students not to write their names on their papers so that they feel free to provide candid feedback. The minute paper allows me to gauge the clarity of my lessons and gain a better sense of my students' experiences.

Having had the opportunity to experience life in a research-oriented position, I have realized that what I love most about philosophy is being in the classroom. While contributing to the literature on my favorite topics is certainly rewarding, it does not provide the same sense of meaning that I've felt when contributing to the intellectual and personal growth of my students. I've also found that I learn a great deal from students through their individual perspectives on philosophical questions and life in general.

WUSTL Course Evaluations

5/30/2013

Title of Course: Biomedical Ethics

Course: U22 233 (same as U29 206) **Section:** 01

Semester: Spring 2013

Instructors: Tyler Paytas (Instructor)

Completed Evaluations: 12 of 18 (67%)

Scoring Key

Bold - Score

(S) - System's Average Score For the Template

(D) - Department's Average Score For the Template

(M) - Median Score For the Question

Course Section Requirements:

Number of Quizzes	n/a
Number of Examinations	n/a
Number of short papers (1-5pgs)	n/a
Number of long papers (6 +pgs)	n/a
Number of homework assignments	n/a
Number of individual projects	n/a
Number of group projects	n/a
Number of oral presentations	n/a
Was attendance required?	No
Was class participation required?	No
Were take home exams given?	No

University College

Student Status (Tyler Paytas - Instructor)

Please fill out your status.

(blank)	Admitted to a degree program in another division of Washington University	Nondegree student in University College	Pursuing a degree at another college or university
10 (83.33%)	1 (8.33%)	1 (8.33%)	0 (0.00%)

Instructor (Tyler Paytas - Instructor)

5.00 Syllabus, texts and other course materials were available at the beginning of the semester.

(S) 4.76 of 1234	(blank)	1 - Negative	2	3	4	5 - Positive
(D) 5.00 of 21	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	12 (100.00%)
(M) 5.00						

4.75 Course objectives, expectations, and requirements were clearly defined in the syllabus.

(S) 4.64 of 1234	(blank)	1 - Negative	2	3	4	5 - Positive
(D) 4.79 of 21	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	3 (25.00%)	9 (75.00%)
(M) 5.00						

WUSTL Course Evaluations

5/30/2013

5.00	Instructor was prepared for each class.					
(S) 4.74 of 1234	(blank)	1 - Negative	2	3	4	5 - Positive
(D) 4.95 of 21	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	12 (100.00%)
(M) 5.00						

5.00	Course material was presented in clear, organized manner.					
(S) 4.55 of 1234	(blank)	1 - Negative	2	3	4	5 - Positive
(D) 5.00 of 21	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	12 (100.00%)
(M) 5.00						

4.92	Instructor was responsive and sensitive to questions in class.					
(S) 4.72 of 1234	(blank)	1 - Negative	2	3	4	5 - Positive
(D) 4.79 of 21	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (8.33%)	11 (91.67%)
(M) 5.00						

4.82	Instructor was available for assistance outside of class.					
(S) 4.52 of 1234	(blank)	1 - Negative	2	3	4	5 - Positive
(D) 4.78 of 21	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (16.67%)	9 (75.00%)
(M) 5.00						

5.00	Overall instructor rating.					
(S) 4.61 of 1234	(blank)	1 - Negative	2	3	4	5 - Positive
(D) 4.89 of 21	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	12 (100.00%)
(M) 5.00						

Course Content and Grading (Tyler Paytas - Instructor)

5.00	Assigned readings were valuable.					
(S) 4.41 of 1234	(blank)	1 - Negative	2	3	4	5 - Positive
(D) 4.95 of 21	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	12 (100.00%)
(M) 5.00						

4.83	Written assignments and papers were valuable.					
(S) 4.48 of 1234	(blank)	1 - Negative	2	3	4	5 - Positive
(D) 4.84 of 21	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (16.67%)	10 (83.33%)
(M) 5.00						

4.92	Exams were fair and reflected course material.					
(S) 4.57 of 1234	(blank)	1 - Negative	2	3	4	5 - Positive
(D) 4.88 of 21	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (8.33%)	11 (91.67%)
(M) 5.00						

WUSTL Course Evaluations

5/30/2013

4.92 Papers and exams were graded fairly.

(S) 4.64 of 1234	(blank)	1 - Negative	2	3	4	5 - Positive
(D) 4.79 of 21	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (8.33%)	11 (91.67%)
(M) 5.00						

4.42 Comments on written work were sufficient and useful.

(S) 4.47 of 1234	(blank)	1 - Negative	2	3	4	5 - Positive
(D) 4.58 of 21	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	3 (25.00%)	1 (8.33%)	8 (66.67%)
(M) 5.00						

5.00 Evaluation of my work was clear and timely.

(S) 4.55 of 1234	(blank)	1 - Negative	2	3	4	5 - Positive
(D) 5.00 of 21	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	12 (100.00%)
(M) 5.00						

Overall Course Rating (Tyler Paytas - Instructor)

4.42 This was a challenging course.

(S) 4.01 of 1234	(blank)	1 - Negative	2	3	4	5 - Positive
(D) 4.47 of 21	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (16.67%)	3 (25.00%)	7 (58.33%)
(M) 5.00						

5.00 I learned a great deal in this course.

(S) 4.44 of 1234	(blank)	1 - Negative	2	3	4	5 - Positive
(D) 4.89 of 21	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	12 (100.00%)
(M) 5.00						

4.92 The workload was appropriate.

(S) 4.43 of 1234	(blank)	1 - Negative	2	3	4	5 - Positive
(D) 4.84 of 21	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (8.33%)	11 (91.67%)
(M) 5.00						

4.83 Overall course rating.

(S) 4.45 of 1234	(blank)	1 - Negative	2	3	4	5 - Positive
(D) 4.78 of 21	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (16.67%)	10 (83.33%)
(M) 5.00						

Approximately how many hours each week <i>outside of class</i> did you spend on this course?

(blank)	less than 3	4-6	7-9	10-12	more than 12
0 (0.00%)	7 (58.33%)	4 (33.33%)	1 (8.33%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)

General Comments (Tyler Paytas - Instructor)

What did you like most about this course?

- 00 Open discussion.
- 01 He always went over assigned reading and asked if we had questions.
- 03 There was a good discussion on each topic for the class. All opinions were given equal consideration and examination.
- 05 Class discussions were engaging, and the subject matter itself was interesting.
- 07 Tyler Paytas is an excellent professor! At first, I saw a young guy and thought "What can he teach me? We're almost the same age. (late 20s)" He had a thorough understanding of the material and was very knowledgeable on ethical theories. He promoted interactive discussions while guiding us through the topics. It was one of the most enjoyable courses I've taken, and I feel I'm becoming a more responsible citizen while applying some of what I've learned in Tyler Paytas' Biomedical Ethics.
- 08 The information that was provided throughout the course and being able to try to come to a conclusion of an argument.
- 09 The book, reading material, discussion, professor's enthusiasm for topics, his eagerness in helping students and learning from students, group discussions were very helpful. This was overall a very helpful course for me to take.
- 11 He did a very good job leading effective, interesting class discussions. I really liked getting both Tyler's perspectives as well as those of others in the class.

What did you like least about this course?

- 01 Tests were very hard.
- 05 I have no complaints.
- 07 I would like even more discussion and material, but I realize it is not feasible to have a 5-hour class period one night per week.
- 08 Trying to make a moral decision on an argument.
- 09 I wish the questions on midterms were more asking about student's objections or support to particular views.
- 11 2 1/2 hours can make for a long class.

What would you tell another student about this course?

- 01 Take it.
- 02 Great course! Tyler waws awesome instructor. Discussions in class were lively and informational.
- 03 It explains. in simple terms the various viewpoints of ethical debates that are within healthcare
- 05 That it was interesting and worthwhile.
- 07 I would recommend the course whether a student required it or not. Regardless of whether the student is going into a health career or other field, everyone will be affected by medical ethics. The more informed we are on medical ethics, the better our outcomes will be when participating in medical policy.
- 08 Yes...this course was a great way to open your brain to many choices in life's ethics...
- 09 This course covers broad range of different situations that go on in healthcare. It is exactly what it sounds - learning about biomedical ethics. I would recommend this course to anybody going into any field of healthcare.
- 11 Yes, definitely.

What would you like to tell the instructor?

- 00 Enjoyed the class.
- 02 Awesome job
- 05 If I had one suggestion for you, it would be to seek out some general medical knowledge specific to the topics you cover in the course. It might add another dimension to your teaching.
- 07 Thank you for teaching this course and for making it an insightful approach to medical ethics. Encouraging both sides of each case helped to more clearly see each issue. Thank you for putting in the thoughtful effort to make this course a big success. I could see you as an effective patient care advocate. Thanks again and good luck to you.
- 08 Very understanding and considerate instructor...

-
- 09 I struggled with writing the paper a little bit. Probably because I grew up speaking, reading, and writing three different languages? not sure. Can you please provide an example of a well written paper? If you did, I might've missed it since there were days I missed of class. I think I did ok... but I think I could've done better looking at an example...
 - 10 Great class, enjoyed how everyone was involved and free to share their opinions
 - 11 I really appreciate all the time and effort he put into this class. I learned a lot and really enjoyed it.

What other course would you like to see offered in University College?

- 07 An autonomy v. paternalism political course from Tyler Paytas would be interesting.
- 09 higher level of biomedical ethics.

Why did you choose University College over other area continuing education programs?

- 01 Tuition Benefit
- 03 Offered a Healthcare Program that had classes directly applicable to the industry.
- 07 This course was funded for me through Washington University's employee education benefits.
- 08 Conveniency...
- 09 UC provides the classes and degree program I was looking for. UC is convenient - works with my work schedule. UC also has teachers wanting to genuinely help students improve, learn, and get better education.

WUSTL Course Evaluations

1/11/2014

Title of Course: Business Ethics

Course: U22 234

Section: 01

Semester: Fall 2013

Instructors: Tyler Paytas (Instructor)

Completed Evaluations: 10 of 15 (67%)

Scoring Key

Bold - Score

(S) - System's Average Score For the Template

(D) - Department's Average Score For the Template

(M) - Median Score For the Question

Course Section Requirements:

Number of Quizzes	n/a
Number of Examinations	n/a
Number of short papers (1-5pgs)	n/a
Number of long papers (6 +pgs)	n/a
Number of homework assignments	n/a
Number of individual projects	n/a
Number of group projects	n/a
Number of oral presentations	n/a
Was attendance required?	No
Was class participation required?	No
Were take home exams given?	No

University College

Student Status (Tyler Paytas - Instructor)

Please fill out your status.

(blank)	Admitted to a degree program in another division of Washington University	Nondegree student in University College	Pursuing a degree at another college or university
10 (100.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)

Instructor (Tyler Paytas - Instructor)

4.90 Syllabus, texts and other course materials were available at the beginning of the semester.

(S) 4.83 of 1181	(blank)	1 - Negative	2	3	4	5 - Positive
(D) 4.93 of 15	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (10.00%)	9 (90.00%)
(M) 5.00						

4.80 Course objectives, expectations, and requirements were clearly defined in the syllabus.

(S) 4.66 of 1181	(blank)	1 - Negative	2	3	4	5 - Positive
(D) 4.86 of 15	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (20.00%)	8 (80.00%)
(M) 5.00						

WUSTL Course Evaluations

1/11/2014

4.80	Instructor was prepared for each class.					
(S) 4.70 of 1181	(blank)	1 - Negative	2	3	4	5 - Positive
(D) 4.71 of 15	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (20.00%)	8 (80.00%)
(M) 5.00						

4.90	Course material was presented in clear, organized manner.					
(S) 4.43 of 1181	(blank)	1 - Negative	2	3	4	5 - Positive
(D) 4.57 of 15	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (10.00%)	9 (90.00%)
(M) 5.00						

5.00	Instructor was responsive and sensitive to questions in class.					
(S) 4.65 of 1181	(blank)	1 - Negative	2	3	4	5 - Positive
(D) 4.86 of 15	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	10 (100.00%)
(M) 5.00						

4.70	Instructor was available for assistance outside of class.					
(S) 4.43 of 1181	(blank)	1 - Negative	2	3	4	5 - Positive
(D) 4.71 of 15	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (10.00%)	1 (10.00%)	8 (80.00%)
(M) 5.00						

4.70	Overall instructor rating.					
(S) 4.53 of 1181	(blank)	1 - Negative	2	3	4	5 - Positive
(D) 4.57 of 15	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	3 (30.00%)	7 (70.00%)
(M) 5.00						

Course Content and Grading (Tyler Paytas - Instructor)

4.80	Assigned readings were valuable.					
(S) 4.38 of 1181	(blank)	1 - Negative	2	3	4	5 - Positive
(D) 4.64 of 15	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (20.00%)	8 (80.00%)
(M) 5.00						

4.60	Written assignments and papers were valuable.					
(S) 4.42 of 1181	(blank)	1 - Negative	2	3	4	5 - Positive
(D) 4.36 of 15	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (10.00%)	2 (20.00%)	7 (70.00%)
(M) 5.00						

4.60	Exams were fair and reflected course material.					
(S) 4.43 of 1181	(blank)	1 - Negative	2	3	4	5 - Positive
(D) 4.46 of 15	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (10.00%)	2 (20.00%)	7 (70.00%)
(M) 5.00						

WUSTL Course Evaluations

1/11/2014

4.70 **Papers and exams were graded fairly.**

(S) 4.60 of 1181	(blank)	1 - Negative	2	3	4	5 - Positive
(D) 4.57 of 15	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (10.00%)	1 (10.00%)	8 (80.00%)
(M) 5.00						

4.60 **Comments on written work were sufficient and useful.**

(S) 4.39 of 1181	(blank)	1 - Negative	2	3	4	5 - Positive
(D) 4.50 of 15	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (20.00%)	0 (0.00%)	8 (80.00%)
(M) 5.00						

4.70 **Evaluation of my work was clear and timely.**

(S) 4.47 of 1181	(blank)	1 - Negative	2	3	4	5 - Positive
(D) 4.50 of 15	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (10.00%)	1 (10.00%)	8 (80.00%)
(M) 5.00						

Overall Course Rating (Tyler Paytas - Instructor)

3.90 **This was a challenging course.**

(S) 3.98 of 1181	(blank)	1 - Negative	2	3	4	5 - Positive
(D) 3.93 of 15	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (10.00%)	2 (20.00%)	4 (40.00%)	3 (30.00%)
(M) 4.00						

4.30 **I learned a great deal in this course.**

(S) 4.37 of 1181	(blank)	1 - Negative	2	3	4	5 - Positive
(D) 4.14 of 15	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (20.00%)	3 (30.00%)	5 (50.00%)
(M) 4.50						

4.60 **The workload was appropriate.**

(S) 4.38 of 1181	(blank)	1 - Negative	2	3	4	5 - Positive
(D) 4.64 of 15	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	4 (40.00%)	6 (60.00%)
(M) 5.00						

4.60 **Overall course rating.**

(S) 4.39 of 1181	(blank)	1 - Negative	2	3	4	5 - Positive
(D) 4.43 of 15	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (20.00%)	0 (0.00%)	8 (80.00%)
(M) 5.00						

Approximately how many hours each week <i>outside of class</i> did you spend on this course?

(blank)	less than 3	4-6	7-9	10-12	more than 12
0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	7 (70.00%)	2 (20.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (10.00%)

General Comments (Tyler Paytas - Instructor)

What did you like most about this course?

- 00 i liked that the instructor allowed questions and encouraged open classroom discussions
- 01 I enjoyed the lively class discussions. I never felt afraid to voice my opinion on a variety of subjects.
- 03 Individual presentations on cases at the end of the chapters
- 04 Great discussions and freedom to go off tangent when appropriate. Tyler set an open atmosphere.
- 05 I loved being able to debate with other classmates as well as the teacher. It gave me the ability to think outside of the box.
- 06 Right to the point and no hidden objectives.
- 07 HE WAS VERY ENGAGING AND INFORMATIVE
- 08 Knowledge about the material.
- 09 I found the discussions in class very helpful. I also enjoyed learning about the different perspectives on relevant moral issues we are likely to encounter in business and in general. I valued the tools and practice we had that helped us develop and defend a moral argument

What did you like least about this course?

- 00 i felt the quizzes were somewhat vague and unclear.
- 03 The exams, but they were fair and covered course material. A great course overall.
- 05 I wish the oral presentation was worth more points. I worked very hard on the project and thought it should have been worth more than just 10 points.
- 06 Essay exams
- 07 WERNT ABLE TO COVER EVERYTHING
- 09 Perhaps we touched briefly on some of the topics or discussions.

What would you tell another student about this course?

- 00 it was a goot course, but make sure you do your weekly reading and that you understand and comprehend it
- 01 It's a valuable course with an excellent instructor.
- 03 Great course and great teacher, a fair amount of work but thought provoking.
- 04 Solid class for learning the basics of ethics - doesn't dive too deep but stays broad and relevant for a general education
- 05 Make sure to do the assigned readings. Without reading those, you will be completely lost on the exams (and lose points on the reading quizzes). I also highly recommend recording the lectures for playback. I did this the 2nd part of the semester (with his permission) and did MUCH better.
- 06 I would tell them to take his course because his information is not confusing.
- 07 GREAT CLASS
- 08 Great class, great instructor!
- 09 Read the material and learn to argue. Crash your argument and then defend it.
Read every week!

What would you like to tell the instructor?

- 00 good class
- 01 I enjoyed this course and would recommend it to others. I liked the lively class discussions. I feel that made classtime interesting.
- 03 Thanks for a great semester and good luck with all of your future pursuits. Grab a rib-eye they are good for you.
- 04 Great balance and objectivity maintained throughout the semester
- 05 I thoroughly enjoyed the class. Your teaching methods and personal inputs forced me to think differently about things-in a way I wouldn't have before this class.

-
- 06 Thank you for being clear with the subject matter and letting us talk about the issues.
 - 07 YOUR AWESOME
 - 08 Keep doing the great job.
 - 09 I think the class was great, Tyler. I also think it was good your emphasis on the different philosophers and how they approach moral issues and present their justifications. The outlines you do for each class helps to keep a framework on the important topics, that was good too. Finally, I like the structure of the class, we have those outlines that give clear expectation of the subjects we are going to talk about, but we also get the discussions where we can attempt to argue our points. Thank you.

What other course would you like to see offered in University College?

- 03 Any that he would be willing to teach.
- 05 I would like to see more back-to-back courses offered.
- 08 Most likely some international business courses.

Why did you choose University College over other area continuing education programs?

- 05 I am an employee at Wash U.
- 08 Only one offering me what I am looking for in the evening time.

Detailed Checklist for the Evaluation of Teaching

Name: Tyler Paytas
 Course: Biomedical Ethics, Spring 2013
 Faculty Evaluator: Elizabeth Schechter

Critiquing Topics	Not Observed	Needs More Emphasis	Shown Very Well	Comments
Organization			✓	
Arrives early to session			✓	
Begins session on time in an organized manner			✓	
Arranges material or information before session			✓	
Starts with agenda/outline (written)			✓	
Gives preliminary overview of session			✓	
Reviews prior session topics			✓	
Clearly signals transition from one topic to a new topic			✓	
Adapts smoothly to back-up plan when necessary			✓	
Ends session on time			✓	
Gives mini-summaries throughout			✓	
Appears well-prepared for session			✓	
Frequently checks student understanding			✓	

Comments about Organization:

Critiquing Topics	Not Observed	Needs More Emphasis	Shown Very Well	Comments
Clarity			✓	
Uses concrete examples of ideas			✓	
Gives a variety of examples			✓	
Stresses important points			✓	
Slowed down when ideas were complex and difficult			✓	
Explains connections between topics			✓	
Summarizes main ideas			✓	
Makes assumptions clear			✓	
Rephrases questions to ensure understanding			✓	
Answers question completely, clearly, and directly			✓	

Comments about Clarity:

Critiquing Topics	Not Observed	Needs More Emphasis	Shown Very Well	Comments
Content			✓	
Uses visuals during session	✓			(N/A)
Relates content to previous knowledge or session			✓	
Relates information to practical application			✓	
Respects or shares more than one point of view			✓	
Shares up-to-date information in the field	✓			(N/A)
Distinguishes between fact and opinion			✓	

Comments about Content:

Critiquing Topics	Not Observed	Needs More Emphasis	Shown Very Well	Comments
Handling of Questions			✓	
Seems prepared for questions			✓	
Listens to entire question before answering			✓	
When necessary, asks for clarification of question			✓	
Rephrases question before answering			✓	

Comments about Handling Questions:

Critiquing Topics	Not Observed	Needs More Emphasis	Shown Very Well	Comments
Teaching Strategies			✓	
Uses a variety of teaching methods			✓	
Uses a variety of activities in class		g	✓	
Activities are appropriate for class	✓		✓	
Explains concepts in more than one way			✓	
Adapts to changes in student attention			✓	
Encourages active participation			✓	
Demonstrates effective teaching strategy for given content			✓	
Teaches material at an appropriate level for class			✓	
Students are continually engaged			✓	

Comments about Teaching Strategies:

I was very impressed by the quality and diversity of student participation.

Critiquing Topics	Not Observed	Needs More Emphasis	Shown Very Well	Comments
Interaction			✓	
Addresses student by name			✓	
Encourages questions and comments			✓	
Uses wait-time when asking questions to student			/	
Constructively admits error or insufficient knowledge			✓	
Integrates student's ideas back into session			✓	
Provides frequent feedback			✓	
Shows respect and sensitivity to diverse learners			✓	
Promotes student participation			✓	
Notes and responds to signs of puzzlement, boredom, etc.			/	
Talks informally with students before session and after session			/	

Comments about Interaction:

Critiquing Topics	Not Observed	Needs More Emphasis	Shown Very Well	Comments
Presentation Style			✓	
<i>Enthusiasm</i>			✓	
Demonstrates sincere interest or excitement about session and content			✓	
Smiles during session		✓		
Shows respectful facial expressions			✓	
Appears relaxed and confident			✓	
<i>Verbal and nonverbal</i>			✓	
Speaks in an acceptable tone and volume			✓	
Speaks clearly			✓	
Does not use filler words such as "um"			✓	
Speaks at an appropriate pace			✓	
Speaks with expressive manner (not monotone)			✓	
Maintains eye contact with audience			✓	
Speaks in respectful, easy-to-understand language			✓	

Comments about Presentation Style:

Mr. Paytas doesn't smile much, but the students clearly felt comfortable and encouraged to speak regardless.

Critiquing Topics	Not Observed	Needs More Emphasis	Shown Very Well	Comments
Use of Media			✓	
Writes legibly			✓	
Uses graphs, pictures, data to explain ideas	✓			(N/A)
Presents information in an organized and easy-to-follow manner			✓	
Uses media to add to students' comprehension of the concept being taught	✓			(N/A)
Instructor speaks to class, not board or screen			✓	

Comments about Media:

Critiquing Topics	Not Observed	Needs More Emphasis	Shown Very Well	Comments
Room Physical Conditions			✓	
Clean			✓	
Lighting adequate			✓	
Free from distracting outside noise			✓	

Comments about Room Conditions:

Strengths (list 3 or 4):

Very organized, nice review, great mix of abstract ideas + concrete examples. Again class participation was exceptional.

Key points to improve on (list no more than 3 or 4):

Maybe use some group work? But to be honest this was a great class.

To: Tyler
From: Corie
Re: Class Visit
Date: June 29, 2012

Johns Hopkins University - CTY
Observation from Corie Fugg, Academic Dean

Tyler, thank you for having me visit your class on June 27, from 7-8 PM.

Classroom Observations

You were working with students on subjectivism, abductive reasoning, fallacies, ethics, and the Euthyphro Dilemma. The students had taken a quiz earlier in the day, and you began the evening session by returning this assessment to them. The students were seated around the room in a *u-shape* arrangement, and there was an even distribution of gender in this arrangement. There was a large space at the center of the classroom for movement. Matt sat to the side of the room, taking notes on students' contributions, while you moved freely through the front of the room for your lecture/lesson. Both of you moved around the room during the portion of the session when students were working in pairs on reading questions.

Classroom Interactions

The classroom seemed friendly and scholarly; students shared their ideas without difficulty and asked relative questions of you with ease. You have obviously established a respectful classroom culture, referenced in your course description and syllabus, in which the students are comfortable. You were in good control of the students and the discussion.

Strengths

Often students are inclined, as you aptly noted, to share their scores with one another. I felt that, when you said, "We're not going to share our scores with one another; is that clear? We'll review the answers together, and, that way, we'll get better," you preemptively prepared them for this temptation. You also set the stage for lower scores to be an opportunity for growth and success via your language.

You asked questions such as, "Why is Sherlock Holmes theory/hypothesis an example of abductive reasoning?" This style of questioning allows students to think on many levels and produce a variety of answers. Your students were able to think critically about something from the previous day, and it fostered discussion. This was a different style of inquiry from that of something such as, "What is abductive reasoning?" where there is only one *true* answer. A healthy balance of these is good, and you did that very well in your lesson.

When you reviewed ethics, you made some effective cross-curricular connections to science. You said, "In ethics, we look at these thought experiments and see how the principles line up." Continuing to clarify, because you seemed to innately perceive that the students had missed something, you explained how ethics and science differ because "we reason, but we do not know real moral truths... [because] maybe there is no agreement possible on facts about morality." This is a complex notion, and you explained it well, taking appropriate time to review subjectivism with the two students who were grappling with its application to the reading question about slavery. I appreciated that you distinguished further that a "subjectivist could not see moral progress; they could only see differences." Because you have established a classroom culture of respect and comfort, the extra time with these students did not feel forced nor was attention called, particularly, to their misunderstanding. Well done!

I think that you have an excellent rapport with this group, and your personality is well-suited for this age group. Your use of humor in explaining how, when you learned about *divine command theory* and the Euthyphro Dilemma, “it was early in [your] college career, and it make you want to study Plato,” was stellar. Although it was humorous, for you said it was the most important dilemma you ever studied, you showed your intrinsic passion for philosophy. This is wonderful for young people to see, and it is contagious. The question was a complex one, regarding God’s role in morality, and they ostensibly processed it well. One student inquired, “So, Tyler, is the question about whether God is the one setting the standard?” I felt that you responded well to this, again showing enthusiasm, saying, “Outstanding! That’s it exactly.” Your response felt wholly genuine.

Suggestions

When navigating these complex philosophical concepts, dilemmas, and theories, you have a difficult task with adolescents. Their sense of right and wrong is still biologically developing, for their brains have not yet fully developed with regard to predictive reasoning and metacognition. In light of this, you may try to pepper your lessons on theory with more concrete examples from their lives. Could you, for example, have provided an example from their life through the lens of the Euthyphro Dilemma? Giving them something such as *honesty*, *stealing*, etc. to apply to the dilemma may reinforce it more concretely for them. This would not elongate the lesson necessarily, and it may help them to make a more personal connection.

At one point you were discussing the notion of arbitrary morality and talked about how “might does not make it right.” You asked the class, “Does everybody know what [arbitrary] means?” I would suggest a phrase that I learned from another educator this year; that is, “Is arbitrary a word that we are all comfortable with?” While this is a small difference, when teachers ask students if they *know* a word’s meaning, they may be reticent to reply that they do not. Especially in our CTY community, students may not want to look *foolish* in front of their peers or *disappoint* you via their lack of knowledge. I would suggest changing the question slightly, however you see fit.

Matt seemed slightly underutilized at times, though I am glad that he moved throughout the room with ease during the group work. I know that we only just began working on the relationship between TA and instructor, but, whenever you spoke about something that he seemed passionate about, he was nodding. Perhaps there is an upcoming lesson that Matt can teach or tandem-teach with you. He can also write important terms on the board as you talk about them with the group. This will, as you know, help the visual learners in your class without distracting you or consuming extra time.

Thank you, again, for a genuinely interesting and engaging class!

Ancient Greek Philosophy

Classroom: XXX
Class Hours: XXX

Instructor: Tyler Paytas
E-mail: tylerpaytas@outlook.com
Office: XXX
Office Hours: XXX

Course Description

This course is an introduction to ancient Greek philosophy. Over the course of the semester we shall investigate some of the most important ideas and arguments from central figures in ancient philosophy including Thales, Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle. Our coverage of each of these thinkers and the particular period of ancient philosophy they represent will occur in three stages. First, we shall attempt to understand and appreciate the motivations and arguments for the philosophical positions defended. Second, we shall critically examine the arguments presented, as well as the background assumptions underlying the various positions. Third, we shall explore the connections among the views of the different periods and individuals, and also consider the relevance of their views and arguments for the historical development of Western philosophy up to the present day.

Learning Objectives

Students who take this class can expect

- to learn how to think in a rigorous philosophical way about important issues and positions in ancient Greek thought.
- to gain a deeper understanding of philosophical methodology.
- to experience a learning environment that encourages independent thought and discussion.
- to hone their critical reading and writing skills.

Expectations

This course has no prerequisites. Students are expected to attend all lectures, read the required texts, and do the best work they can on all assignments. Students are also expected to take an active role in their learning by raising questions in class and participating in discussion. The instructor will attempt to provide interesting and informative material for students to read, give helpful lectures, provide assignments and activities that challenge and stimulate interest, be available to answer any questions, and provide fair and timely evaluations of student achievement.

Required Texts

- *Ancient Philosophy: A Contemporary Introduction* 2nd ed. Christopher Shields. Routledge, 2011.
- *Readings in Ancient Greek Philosophy: From Thales to Aristotle* 4th ed. Marc Cohen, Patricia Curd, and C.D.C. Reeve. Hackett, 2011
- Additional readings will be distributed in class.

Evaluation

10%	Participation	
30%	Midterm Exam	(10/23)
30%	Term Paper	(12/1)
30%	Final Exam	(12/18)

Participation – Much class time will be spent discussing the assigned readings. For that reason, it is essential that each student come to class prepared with questions, comments, or objections. To ensure that this is the case, each student will submit a one page (typed, double spaced) summary of the assigned readings at the beginning of each class period. Participation grades will be determined by the quality of the weekly summaries, the quality and frequency of contributions to class discussion, and regularity of attendance. Students can also participate by attending office hours. Please do not be afraid to share your thoughts with the class—undeveloped ideas often lead to fruitful discussions.

Term Paper – Students are expected to write one paper with a length of 1,200 – 1,500 words. Students can either choose a topic suggested by the instructor, or come up with their own paper idea. Anyone who wants to do the latter must have the paper proposal approved by the instructor. I will provide further details about the paper assignment and expectations later in the semester. Some class time will be devoted to discussion of strategies for writing papers.

Late Papers – Papers are due at the beginning of class on the assigned date. Papers not received then will be penalized 5% off their base grade immediately, and another 5% for every 24 hour period thereafter until they are received.

Academic Integrity – All students are expected to adhere to high standards of academic integrity. In this class especially, that means that all work presented as original must, in fact, be original, and the ideas and contributions of others must always be appropriately acknowledged. Quotations must, of course, be acknowledged, but so must summaries, paraphrases, and the ideas of others. *Course Listings* and *Bearings*, and the [University Policies website \(www.wustl.edu/policies/undergraduate-academic-integrity.html\)](http://www.wustl.edu/policies/undergraduate-academic-integrity.html) all contain full statements of the University's policy on academic integrity. The policy is summarized at www.ja.wustl.edu/academicintegrity/resources-policysummary.php. If you have any doubts or questions about documentation requirements, please ask me.

Semester Overview:

Week 1: The Presocratics

Shields, ch. 1

Cohen, Curd, and Reeve, pp. 1-28

Week 2: The Presocratics and Socrates

Cohen, Curd, and Reeve, pp. 29-51; 104-117

Shields, ch. 2

Week 3: Introduction to Plato; Meno

Shields, pp.61-72

Cohen, Curd, and Reeve, pp. 241-266

Week 4: Plato – Phaedo

Shields, pp.72-82

Cohen, Curd, and Reeve, pp. 267-319

Week 5: Plato – Republic 1-2

Shields, pp. 82-97

Cohen, Curd, and Reeve, pp. 369-423

Week 6: Plato – Republic 3-5

Shields, pp. 97-111

Cohen, Curd, and Reeve, pp. 424-514

Week 7: Plato – Republic 6-8

Cohen, Curd, and Reeve, pp. 515-593

Week 8: Plato – Republic 9-10; Parmenides

Cohen, Curd, and Reeve, pp. 594-641; 642-651

Week 9: Aristotle – Introduction and Categories

Shields, pp. 117-124

Cohen, Curd, and Reeve, pp. 683-700

Week 10: Aristotle - Posterior Analytics

Shields, pp. 125-140

Cohen, Curd, and Reeve, pp. 714-731

Week 11: Aristotle – Metaphysics

Shields, pp. 140-144

Cohen, Curd, and Reeve, pp. 796-846

Week 12: Aristotle – De Anima

Cohen, Curd, and Reeve, pp. 847-869

Week 13: Aristotle – Nicomachean Ethics

Shields, pp. 144-163

Cohen, Curd, and Reeve, pp. 870-929

Week 14: Hellenistic philosophy

Shields, ch. 5; Excerpts from Epicurus

Week 15: Hellenistic philosophy

Excerpts from Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius

Phil 120: Problems in Philosophy

Spring 2012
Tuesday 6:30-9:00
Wilson 104

Instructor: Tyler Paytas
E-mail: tylerpaytas@wustl.edu
Office: Wilson 116
Office Hours: Tuesday 3:00-4:00, Thursday 2:30-3:30, and by appointment

Course Description

Is there a real world, or is everything a figment of my imagination? Do we have free will, or do our brains simply respond mechanically to stimuli? What, if anything, distinguishes right from wrong? Philosophers relentlessly pursue the fundamental questions of life, and their techniques apply to problems in any discipline or endeavor. They establish standards of evidence, provide rational methods of resolving conflicts, and create techniques for evaluating ideas and arguments.

This course is a survey of several major areas of Western philosophy: logic, epistemology, ethics, philosophy of mind, and philosophy of religion. Students explore such concepts as the nature of the world and how we have access to knowledge of the world; moral behavior and the nature of good and evil; the relationship between minds and bodies; the relationship between our thoughts and the external world; arguments for and against the existence of God; and how we should employ logical analysis and empirical observation to evaluate arguments.

For each topic, students consider positions of historical thinkers such as Plato, Descartes, and Hume, as well as those of contemporary philosophers such as Derek Parfit and John Heil. Students reflect upon philosophical issues through reading assignments, lectures, class discussions, and formal critical essays in order to develop the analytical skills necessary for effectively evaluating arguments, thinking carefully, and communicating with clarity.

Learning Objectives

Logic and Reasoning: Understand the fundamentals of argument construction and evaluation. Be able to recognize logical fallacies.

Philosophy of Religion: Understand and explain clearly the theistic conception of God; explain the different arguments for the existence of God; explain the problem of evil for theistic belief; and understand the complexity of evaluating justified religious belief.

Epistemology: Learn how to evaluate the commonsense idea that we often have knowledge and that we are often rationally justified in the beliefs we have. Understand the prominent theories of knowledge including their strengths and weaknesses.

Philosophy of Mind: Understand the significance of the mind/body problem and the problem of free will, and gain knowledge of the most important proposed solutions to these problems.

Ethics: Learn different principles and theories which attempt to explain what makes an action right or wrong, or what makes a character trait good or bad. Investigate the deeper meaning of moral concepts such as 'right', 'wrong', 'duty', 'justice', and 'obligation'. Understand what is at issue in the debate between moral realists and moral anti-realists.

Expectations

This course has no prerequisites. Students are expected to attend all lectures, read the required texts, and do the best work they can on all assignments. Students are also expected to take an active role in their learning by raising questions in class and participating in discussion. The instructor will attempt to provide interesting and informative material for students to read, give helpful lectures, provide assignments and activities that challenge and stimulate interest, be available to answer any questions, and provide fair and timely evaluations of student achievement.

Required Texts

- *Core Questions in Philosophy: A Text with Readings* 5th ed. Elliot Sober. Pearson Prentice Hall, 2009
- *Philosophy of Mind: A Contemporary Introduction* 2nd ed. John Heil. Routledge, 2009
- Additional readings will be distributed in class.

Evaluation

10%	Participation	
30%	Midterm Exam	(10/23)
30%	Term Paper	(12/1)
30%	Final Exam	(12/18)

Participation – Much class time will be spent discussing the assigned readings. For that reason, it is essential that each student come to class prepared with questions, comments, or objections. To ensure that this is the case, each student will submit a one page (typed, double spaced) summary of the assigned readings at the beginning of each class period. Participation grades will be determined by the quality of the weekly summaries, the quality and frequency of contributions to class discussion, and regularity of attendance. Students can also participate by attending office hours. Please do not be afraid to share your thoughts with the class—undeveloped ideas often lead to fruitful discussions.

Term Paper – Students are expected to write one paper with a length of 1,200 – 1,500 words. Students can either choose a topic suggested by the instructor, or come up with their own paper idea. Anyone who wants to do the latter must have the paper proposal approved by the instructor. I will provide further details about the paper assignment and expectations later in the semester. Some class time will be devoted to discussion of strategies for writing papers.

Late Papers – Papers are due at the beginning of class on the assigned date. Papers not received then will be penalized 5% off their base grade immediately, and another 5% for every 24 hour period thereafter until they are received.

Academic Integrity – All students are expected to adhere to high standards of academic integrity. In this class especially, that means that all work presented as original must, in fact, be original, and the ideas and contributions of others must always be appropriately acknowledged. Quotations must, of course, be acknowledged, but so must summaries, paraphrases, and the ideas of others. *Course Listings* and *Bearings*, and the [University Policies website \(www.wustl.edu/policies/undergraduate-academic-integrity.html\)](http://www.wustl.edu/policies/undergraduate-academic-integrity.html) all contain full statements of the University's policy on academic integrity. The policy is summarized at www.ja.wustl.edu/academicintegrity/resources-policysummary.php. If you have any doubts or questions about documentation requirements, please ask me. Don't guess.

Electronic Devices – Cell phones, music players, and computers may not be used during class. Ringers should be turned off before entering, and texting is prohibited.

Course Schedule (Subject to change. Any changes will be announced in class and via e-mail.)

PART I: Logic and Reasoning

<u>Date</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Reading Due</u>
8/28	Introduction to Philosophy	None
9/4	Arguments and Reasoning	Sober chs 1-3

PART II: Philosophy of Religion

9/11	The Cosmological and Ontological Arguments	Sober chs 4 & 8
9/18	Design vs. Evolution	Sober chs 5-7
9/25	Pascal's Wager and the Problem of Evil	Sober chs 10-11

PART III: Epistemology

10/2	Defining Knowledge	Sober ch 12; Zagzebski
10/9	Foundationalism and Reliabilism	Sober chs 13-14
10/16	Problem of Induction	Sober chs 15-16
10/23	Midterm	None

PART IV: Philosophy of Mind

10/30	Dualism and the Mind/Body Problem	Heil chs 1, 3-4
11/6	Identity Theory	Heil ch 6
11/13	Functionalism and Qualia	Sober ch 23; Heil ch. 9
11/20	Free Will	Sober chs 24-26; Ekstrom

PART V: Ethics

11/27	Utilitarianism	Sober ch 32; excerpts from Sidgwick
12/4	Kant	Sober ch 33
12/11	Virtue Ethics	Sober ch 34; Hursthouse
12/18	Final Exam	None