

# Chris Cho

## Teaching Portfolio

Department of Philosophy, Syracuse University

### Contents

<b>1 Teaching Statement</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2 Teaching Experience and Teaching Competencies</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3 Quantitative Evaluations</b>	<b>5</b>
3.1 As Teaching Assistant (Four-point Scale) . . . . .	6
3.2 As Primary Instructor . . . . .	7
<b>4 Qualitative Evaluations</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>5 Sample Syllabi</b>	<b>14</b>
Theories of Knowledge and Reality . . . . .	15
Introduction to Moral Theory . . . . .	21
Critical Thinking . . . . .	25
Metaphysics . . . . .	28
Free Will . . . . .	32

# 1 Teaching Statement

My goal is to help students learn to articulate their ideas with clarity and confidence, both vocally and in writing, while also challenging the assumption that philosophy is too abstract to have any practical use. I strive to create a classroom environment where philosophy feels accessible, engaging, and genuinely fun.

Every time I enter the classroom, I aim to cultivate a learning environment where students feel comfortable participating and taking intellectual risks. Early in the semester, I make a deliberate effort to learn every student's name and to address them by name during class. This small practice signals that each student's contributions are valued and encourages sustained engagement. I also regularly incorporate the "buzz group" technique, in which students briefly discuss philosophical questions in small groups before we reconvene as a class. These peer conversations allow students to test ideas in a low-stakes setting before articulating them publicly, reinforcing the idea that good philosophy emerges from collaborative discussion rather than passive information intake.

While I believe that speaking up and articulating one's ideas is an important skill, I also firmly believe that articulating one's thoughts through careful writing is a fundamental skill in life. To this end, I employ a scaffolded writing sequence in which each assignment builds on the skills developed in the previous one. The first paper emphasizes critical exegesis, where students select a philosophical position, reconstruct it as charitably as possible, and raise a thoughtful objection. Later assignments extend this foundation often by requiring deeper engagement with counterarguments. Throughout the semester, I provide detailed written feedback that highlights both strengths to preserve and areas for improvement. In introductory courses, I am explicit with my students that they may draw on objections discussed in class, because I believe the goal in them is not to generate entirely novel ideas, but to master the fundamentals of philosophical writing: argument reconstruction, precision, and clarity.

In courses that involve problem sets or formal reasoning, I structure class time around a three-step learning cycle. First, I introduce the relevant technique (e.g. Existential Instantiation). Second, I walk through a worked example, making each inferential step explicit. Third, I give students time to solve problems independently or in pairs. After this practice period, I often invite students to present their solutions at the board or on the screen. This serves two pedagogical purposes. One, it breaks down the rather symbolic boundary between "instructor space" and "student space," reinforcing a sense of shared intellectual ownership. Two, it introduces visual variety, which I find helps sustain attention and engagement.

Beyond what happens during individual class meetings, I give careful thought to how courses are structured, both at the curricular level and at the class time level. When preparing my classes, I plan backwards, identifying the knowledge and skills I want students to acquire, determining what kinds of assessments will best measure those outcomes, and selecting readings and in-class activities that prepare students to succeed on those assessments. This approach makes expectations transparent, supports students with diverse academic backgrounds, and allows me to adjust course pacing without losing sight of core learning goals.

When preparing lectures and slides, I prioritize cognitive clarity. I limit each slide to minimal text, reveal points incrementally, and explicitly explain why we are examining a given passage, argument, or example. I think of good teaching as analogous to good philosophical writing; it should guide students carefully through complex material rather than overwhelm them with information. I rather go too slow than too fast.

I also believe that effective teaching requires continual reflection and responsiveness to student feedback. During class, I regularly pause to ask whether a concept was unclear and

often invite other students to attempt an explanation before I intervene. This practice reinforces peer learning and signals that understanding is a shared responsibility. Outside of class, I distribute a mid-semester “Keep, Stop, Start” survey, asking students what is helping their learning, what is not, and what they would like to see added. I use this feedback to refine pacing, assignments, and in-class activities in real time. Students consistently respond positively to this responsiveness, and it helps me ensure that the course remains both challenging yet flexible enough so as to accommodate their needs.

More broadly, I treat pedagogy as an ongoing area of study. To this end, I have pursued multiple professional development opportunities through Syracuse University’s Future Professorial Program, participating in six pedagogical seminars to date, including sessions on metacognition and self-regulated learning, instructional design, assessment design, the ethics of AI in education, universal design for learning, and leading effective classroom discussions. I have also contributed to pedagogical training from the instructor’s side. As one of the few Graduate Teaching Mentors at Syracuse University in recognition of my teaching skills, I led workshops on effective classroom technology use and on facilitating discussion sections in the humanities. And although I was selected in recognition of my teaching skills, leading those workshops for other graduate instructors has deepened my own understanding of pedagogy. Looking ahead, I plan to continue seeking out evidence-based teaching strategies that will help me refine my capabilities as an instructor and ensure that all students make clear and measurable progress in each of my courses.

## 2 Teaching Experience and Teaching Competencies

I have taught eight courses at Syracuse University—six as a Teaching Assistant and two as a primary instructor—and am currently teaching my ninth. As a primary instructor, I had full control of the class, designing my own syllabi, writing quizzes and exams, delivering lectures, and leading in-class discussion. As a teaching assistant, I led discussion sections that supplemented the primary instructor’s lectures, contributed to assignment design, graded student work, and held office hours.

### Primary Instructor (Syracuse University)

Course	Term
Theories of Knowledge and Reality	Summer & Fall 2025
Introduction to Moral Theory	Spring 2025

### Teaching Assistant (Syracuse University)

Course	Term	Instructor
Introduction to Moral Theory	Fall 2022	David Sobel
Logic	Spring 2022	Mark Heller
Theories of Knowledge and Reality	Fall 2023	Robert van Gulick
Logic	Spring 2024	Michael Rieppel
Human Nature	Fall 2024	Pam Ryan
Critical Thinking	Spring 2025	Josh Hunt

Below is a list of areas that I am happy to teach at the undergraduate level. I have marked areas I would also be happy to teach at the graduate level with an asterisk, and have included sample syllabi for the five bolded courses.

#### INTRODUCTORY COURSES IN

- Philosophy
- **Knowledge & Reality**
- **Moral Theory**
- Epistemology
- Symbolic Logic
- **Critical Thinking**
- The Meaning of Life
- Human Nature

#### ADVANCED COURSES IN

- **Free Will\***
- Moral Responsibility\*
- **Metaphysics**
- Manipulation\*

### 3 Quantitative Evaluations

Syracuse University administers quantitative course evaluations at the end of each semester. The tables below summarize numerical student feedback from a representative subset of commonly reported survey items. Full quantitative evaluation data are available upon request.

Because the survey questions are slightly different depending on instructional role, results are reported separately for courses in which I served as a Teaching Assistant and those in which I served as the primary instructor. Additionally, because evaluation scales vary across surveys (e.g., four-, five-, and six-point Likert scales), I have grouped the survey results into separate tables to ensure clarity and interpretability.

Note: Course abbreviations are as follows: SP = Spring, F = Fall, and S = Summer. The survey I received for Knowledge & Reality (S25) was partial; accordingly, results for this course appear only in the Six-point Scale Items table. I have omitted Knowledge and Reality (F23) from the table in 4.1 because, due to an administrative error, I did not receive a TA evaluation. A general course evaluation that includes indirect assessment of my instructional performance is available upon request.

### 3.1 As Teaching Assistant (Four-point Scale)

Prompt	Course	Mean	% Agree ( $\geq 3$ )
The TA's voice was easily audible and his or her diction was distinct.	Moral Theory (F22)	3.64	100%
	Logic (SP23)	3.64	100%
	Logic (SP24)	3.81	100%
	Human Nature (F24)	3.69	100%
	Critical Thinking (SP25)	3.70	100%
Attentive and prepared students find the TA's lectures and remarks clear.	Moral Theory (F22)	3.64	100%
	Logic (SP23)	3.78	100%
	Logic (SP24)	3.81	100%
	Human Nature (F24)	3.75	100%
	Critical Thinking (SP25)	3.63	96%
The TA knows the subject matter.	Moral Theory (F22)	3.64	100%
	Logic (SP23)	3.78	100%
	Logic (SP24)	3.81	100%
	Human Nature (F24)	3.69	100%
	Critical Thinking (SP25)	3.65	100%
The TA was well prepared for each class.	Moral Theory (F22)	3.64	100%
	Logic (SP23)	3.64	100%
	Logic (SP24)	3.69	100%
	Human Nature (F24)	3.69	100%
	Critical Thinking (SP25)	3.65	100%
Students are able to get an appropriate amount of individual help from the TA.	Moral Theory (F22)	3.45	100%
	Logic (SP23)	3.32	100%
	Logic (SP24)	3.56	100%
	Human Nature (F24)	3.63	100%
	Critical Thinking (SP25)	3.56	97%
The TA treats students with respect.	Moral Theory (F22)	3.64	100%
	Logic (SP23)	3.85	100%
	Logic (SP24)	3.94	100%
	Human Nature (F24)	3.69	100%
	Critical Thinking (SP25)	3.79	100%
The TA's style of conducting the course held my interest.	Moral Theory (F22)	3.54	100%
	Logic (SP23)	3.14	93%
	Logic (SP24)	3.69	100%
	Human Nature (F24)	3.50	100%
	Critical Thinking (SP25)	3.38	87%
The TA is effective in achieving the academic goals of the course.	Moral Theory (F22)	3.36	100%
	Logic (SP23)	3.43	93%
	Logic (SP24)	3.81	100%
	Human Nature (F24)	3.50	100%
	Critical Thinking (SP25)	3.56	97%
I would recommend this TA to others.	Moral Theory (F22)	3.64	100%
	Logic (SP23)	3.64	100%
	Logic (SP24)	4.00	100%
	Human Nature (F24)	3.63	100%
	Critical Thinking (SP25)	3.56	92%

## 3.2 As Primary Instructor

### FOUR-POINT SCALE ITEMS

Prompt	Course	Mean	% Agree ( $\geq 3$ )
The Instructor's voice was easily audible and his or her diction was distinct.	Knowledge & Reality (F25)	3.95	100%
Attentive and prepared students find the Instructor's lectures and remarks clear.	Knowledge & Reality (F25)	3.73	100%
The Instructor knows the subject matter.	Knowledge & Reality (F25)	3.95	100%
The Instructor was well prepared for each class.	Knowledge & Reality (F25)	3.95	100%
Students are able to get an appropriate amount of individual help from the Instructor.	Knowledge & Reality (F25)	3.67	100%
The Instructor treats students with respect.	Knowledge & Reality (F25)	3.91	100%
The Instructor's style of conducting the course held my interest.	Knowledge & Reality (F25)	3.59	100%
The Instructor is effective in achieving the academic goals of the course.	Knowledge & Reality (F25)	3.73	100%
I would recommend this Instructor to others.	Knowledge & Reality (F25)	3.86	100%
The grading is reasonably fair.	Knowledge & Reality (F25)	3.68	100%
I learned to think critically about issues in philosophy.	Knowledge & Reality (F25)	3.68	100%
Graded work was usually returned within a reasonable time.	Knowledge & Reality (F25)	3.86	100%

### SIX-POINT SCALE ITEMS

Prompt	Course	Mean	% Agree ( $\geq 5$ )
The syllabus was an accurate guide to course requirements.	Knowledge & Reality (S25)	5.37	95%
	Knowledge & Reality (F25)	5.55	100%
Student participation and the contribution of ideas, comments, and questions were encouraged.	Knowledge & Reality (S25)	5.26	84%
	Knowledge & Reality (F25)	5.64	100%
I felt a sense of belonging and community in the class.	Knowledge & Reality (S25)	4.68	63%
	Knowledge & Reality (F25)	5.18	100%
Course assessments allowed me to demonstrate what I learned.	Knowledge & Reality (S25)	4.84	68%
	Knowledge & Reality (F25)	5.45	100%
I received helpful feedback from the instructor to guide my progress in this course.	Knowledge & Reality (S25)	5.00	63%
	Knowledge & Reality (F25)	5.64	100%

### FIVE-POINT SCALE ITEM

Prompt	Course	Mean	% Good or Excellent
How would you rank the instructor's overall teaching performance?	Knowledge & Reality (F25)	4.68	100%

## 4 Qualitative Evaluations

Syracuse University also administers qualitative course evaluations at the end of each semester. While independent instructors consistently receive these evaluations, TAs do not always receive them; and when they do, the questions are often not tailored specifically to TA performance. Still, I have included *all* the qualitative evaluations I have received to date *unedited*, organized by course and question, bolding some of the responses that highlight my instructional strengths.

### PHI192: Introduction to Moral Theory, Fall 2022 (Teaching Assistant)

Q: WHAT ASPECTS OF THIS COURSE WERE MOST VALUABLE TO YOUR OVERALL LEARNING EXPERIENCE?

- *It made me think about others opinions more than my own.*
- *the recitation discussion PowerPoints, and word documents were helpful.*
- *I like how in our Friday discussions we would go over all the main ideas of the readings from that week.*
- *The ability to ask questions and receive helpful answers.*
- ***The TA showed passion and attentiveness for every student he taught.***

Q: WHAT ASPECTS OF THIS COURSE WERE LEAST VALUABLE TO YOUR OVERALL LEARNING EXPERIENCE?

- *Sometimes the things that were discussed were a bit boring, and nobody really cares or has an opinion on the topic.*
- *N/A*
- *None. everything in this course was valuable.*

Q: WHICH COURSE READINGS DID YOU FIND MOST HELPFUL? WHY WERE THEY HELPFUL?

- *All of them were slightly useful, however they just became too long and boring. Paying attention in class was much better than reading the articles.*
- *N/A*
- *They were all helpful and added to my understanding of the course.*

Q: WHICH COURSE READINGS DID YOU FIND LEAST HELPFUL? WHY WERE THEY NOT HELPFUL?

- *Same answer as above.*
- *N/A*
- *None, all readings were helpful in my opinion.*

## PHI107: Theories of Knowledge and Reality, Fall 2023 (Teaching Assistant)

Q: WHAT ASPECTS OF THIS COURSE WERE MOST VALUABLE TO YOUR OVERALL LEARNING EXPERIENCE?

- *the recitation*
- ***I enjoyed getting to know my smaller discussion section and thought my TA was very good at leading the class.***
- *The discussion sections gave me the most understanding on topics covered in lecture.*
- *In depth explanations of the course concepts*
- *Papers*
- *Being able to apply logical thinking within a premise/conclusion format. Moreover, this type of thinking is necessary for the betterment of oneself, so I think it was particularly valuable.*
- *talking about what we learned in lecture*
- *The small group lessons with mr. cho running us through everything front to back*
- ***the TA was very helpful in understanding the content and explained it at reasonable pace***

Q: WHAT ASPECTS OF THIS COURSE WERE LEAST VALUABLE TO YOUR OVERALL LEARNING EXPERIENCE?

- *lecture*
- *A lot of time was spent on the first unit and not as much for the others*
- *So many lecture slides at such a fast pace, it was so difficult to retain any of the information when I couldn't even write it down in time.*
- *professor went on unnecessary tangents sometimes but not too often*
- *Exams*
- *none*
- *The way the weekly questions were formatted*
- *not all examples presented were easiest to understand*

Q: WHICH COURSE READINGS DID YOU FIND MOST HELPFUL? WHY WERE THEY HELPFUL?

- *idk*
- *I think they all helped me understand the content better.*
- *all helped me understand the concepts better*
- **Chris's handouts**
- *none*
- *No readings come to mind. **Recitation discussions were my bread and butter.***
- *the textbook because it was helpful with understanding the lectures more*

Q: WHICH COURSE READINGS DID YOU FIND LEAST HELPFUL? WHY WERE THEY HELPFUL?

- *n/a*
- *The book.*
- *none*
- *No readings come to mind. Recitation discussions were my bread and butter.*
- *i didn't find the separate readings from the textbook because they were harder to understand*
- *Some were more difficult to understand with the language used.*

## **PHI107: Theories of Knowledge and Reality, Summer 2025 (Primary Instructor)**

Q: WHICH PARTS OF THIS COURSE WERE MOST VALUABLE TO YOUR OVERALL LEARNING EXPERIENCE?

- *I think the lectures structured by weekly topics really helped properly lay out all the content students need to know in a way that students don't feel too overwhelmed by several concepts at once.*
- *At home quizzes and office hours are helpful*
- *The part of the course that was the most valuable to my overall learning experience was hearing the lectures being talked about in depth everyday and always having those office hours to lean on to whenever the course became too difficult to understand. Although my grade wasn't the best I started to better understand the course work because the teacher adjusted the format to better help the class.*
- *One of the most valuable parts of my math class was when the teacher provided the answers to the classwork. It really helped me go back, review my work, and understand what I got wrong.*
- *Learning how to handle a long lecture class and how to take proper notes.*

- *The lectures*
- *I value that the lectures are very informative and during the quizzes every week it is open notes so we can look back at what we wrote or at the slides that Chris post after every class which is helpful.*
- *Asking questions to clarify any doubts I might have had on a topic. Then being able to look back at the slides was really helpful especially they were posted before class.*
- *The support from my instructor and his desire to help us succeed in the class.*
- *The quizzes and occasional class discussions.*
- *The parts of this course that were most valuable to me were when we were learning about God and freewill those were topics that really interested me and made me question some beliefs I had. Overall, this class was very interesting, we learned about many philosophers, theories and contradictions.*
- *The first paper and the last paper gave me a little eye and touch on what the fall would be like.*
- *I don't really know what kind of things were valuable to learning overall because I didn't really have a great understanding to the class.*
- *Being able to practice writing philosophy papers that get straight to the point, the quizzes were short so I didn't have to worry about studying too hard for the quizzes which made it easier to get higher grades, and overall the professor made understanding the content easier by the way he taught.*
- *The times that I spent after class talking to Chris about content I was confusing about or asking questions during class.*

#### WHICH PARTS OF THIS COURSE WOULD YOU SUGGEST CHANGING?

- *Honestly, I really enjoyed this course as it was taught this summer. Our professor was so clearly capable, knowledgable, and enthusiastic about the subject in a way that genuinely brought a ton of life into the class. I honestly don't think I would've learned as much or been as engaged/interested in the class and subject if it wasn't for the professor and the way he conducted his class.*
- *Nothing*
- *I would recommend having more examples such as videos since some student might be visual learners with the course work and just make the class more engaging. Overall everything was good and at the end I retrieved valuable information that will challenge the way I view the world.*
- *I wouldn't suggest changing the course itself, but I do think the pace of the teaching could be improved. The teacher moves through the material too quickly, which makes it harder to keep up and fully understand everything.*
- *Have more group work in class to prevent the entire class from being one long lecture every day.*

- *The 4 question quizzes always made me worry*
- *Nothing.*
- *More interactive activities ? I'm aware there wasn't enough time though*
- *More interactive activities like debates or projects.*
- *The hardest part of this class was getting adjusted to it being more of a lecture-based class I'm not really sure if that's able to really be adjusted though.*
- *A part of this course that I would suggest changing is to make it more engaging, for example having open discussions or doing activities. I feel like the lectures weren't really engaging and to be honest I saw many sleepy people in that class. I am not saying that it's a bad class it should just be more interactive for all of us. What Chris taught was interesting and I like writing notes about what we learned; he is also easygoing and a chill professor overall. Thank you, Chris!!*
- *I would suggest more interactive and activities to keep us engaged.*
- *Having people ask more questions and really making sure people understand the work.*
- *N/A*
- *I would suggest just changing the level of participation and engagement in the class.*

## **PHI107: Theories of Knowledge and Reality, Fall 2025 (Primary Instructor)**

Q: WHAT ASPECTS OF THIS COURSE WERE MOST VALUABLE TO YOUR OVERALL LEARNING EXPERIENCE?

- *Lectures*
- *The god unit*
- *The posted powerpoint slides were very helpful.*
- ***I think that Chris's willingness to help us was very nice. I think that he was good at adapting his plan to accommodate our needs.***
- *Everything. I really liked the God unit the most out of all of them though.*
- *Lot of times in each class he allows us to turn to a student and discuss a topic, and after a few minutes we get to hear insight from everyone on their opinions. Alongside this, **the professor does not move on until he thinks everyone fully understands a topic or theory which I liked. Even if he asked the class "do you guys understand?" and no one responds, he sometimes goes back and re explains the material in a better way. Great professor, wants best for students.***
- *Structuring long written responses on my papers and collaborating with others class about my current thoughts on the topic.*
- *Posting the slides after class to review*

- *I appreciated how the instructor gave us multiple examples of a lot of different topics and viewpoints to help us understand it better. The first time listening to a particular viewpoint or theory, I was often confused and didn't really process what we just went over. After listening to a few different examples, I think it helped me better understand what we just learned. **I appreciate how Chris really made sure to try and give us as much examples and applications of what we were learning so we could understand it the best we could.***
- *concepts that will help me in life*
- ***The engagement between the instructor and students. Clear and concise.***
- ***The slides were amazing and well put together***

Q: WHAT ASPECTS OF THIS COURSE WERE LEAST VALUABLE TO YOUR OVERALL LEARNING EXPERIENCE?

- *N/A*
- *the time unit*
- *The closed-note papers were a little difficult for the course.*
- *Course readings weren't discussed enough, maybe discuss them before class too so that they are more digestible. A lot of them were extremely dense and confusing. Maybe annotations would help? Or a reading guide? I think it's good to have complex sources directly from the famous philosophers but more assistance would make it more digestible.*
- *I think that the readings were a bit unnecessary, but they were nice to have. Chris did a good job explaining everything, regardless of their use. I think that the low amount of points for the system is a little harsh towards the final grade because one point goes a long way.*
- *N/A All of it was needed.*
- *I think just the material in general was difficult. As someone who has never taken philosophy, its not the easiest.*
- *N/A*
- *N/A*
- *I felt at times, lectures were a little dry and not particularly designed to increase class participation. Sometimes I felt the instructor was just flying through the slideshow just to get through it. I think part of this had to do with some of the course material, which naturally was more bland compared to other topics in the class. I'd just say at times it felt like we were sitting there listening to a slideshow without really going over the information and course material.*
- *n/a*
- *N/A*
- *The slides and class size made for a good experience*

## 5 Sample Syllabi

Below are sample syllabi for five undergraduate courses. The first syllabus includes all supporting sections, while the rest are slightly abridged. Each course is designed for roughly two 1.5-hour lectures per week for 14 weeks, though they can be modified to fit departmental schedules. I would also be happy to modify course content to better match departmental needs or student interests. The syllabus you see for *Theories of Knowledge and Reality* is a slightly revised version of the syllabus I used for my Fall 2025 course. Likewise for the syllabus for *Introduction to Moral Theory*. The original versions are available upon request. The syllabus for *Critical Thinking* is an introductory course, aimed at first- and second-year undergraduate students. The syllabi for *Metaphysics* and *Free Will* are aimed at upper-level undergraduates.

# Theories in Knowledge and Reality

Fall 2026, Syracuse University

Monday & Wednesday, 12:45–2:05 PM @ Sims Hall 437

**Instructor:** Chris Cho

**Email:** hcho25@syr.edu

**Office Hours:** Monday 2:30–3:30 PM @ Bowne Hall 103

## Course Description

What is the mind, and how does it relate to the body? Do we really have free will, or are our actions determined? Can we know anything for certain? Does God exist? In this course, we'll explore some of the central questions that have puzzled philosophers for centuries. Topics include the mind-body problem, free will and responsibility, the nature of knowledge, the nature of time, personal identity, and the existence of God. This course is designed for students new to philosophy and requires no prior experience. All that is required is curiosity, open-mindedness, and a willingness to think carefully and critically about big questions.

## Learning Goals

This course is designed to help students:

1. Develop a clear understanding of some of the central topics in both epistemology and metaphysics.
2. Practice formulating clear, well-structured philosophical arguments in writing.
3. Learn how to critically evaluate arguments by identifying assumptions, raising objections, and considering alternative views
4. Gain confidence in expressing complex ideas with clarity, precision, and logical coherence

## Course Requirements

Component	Points
Attendance & Participation	10
Quizzes	18
First Paper	7
Second Paper	15
Third Paper	20
Final Exam	30
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>

#### ATTENDANCE AND PARTICIPATION (10 POINTS)

Consistent attendance and focused engagement are important for succeeding in this course. You are expected to arrive on time, listen actively, and take notes during class. You should be prepared to respond to questions and think critically about the material as it is presented. If there is an open discussion, you are expected to engage respectfully. This includes listening to others, offering thoughtful comments, and being open to different perspectives.

#### QUIZZES (18 POINTS)

There will be six short quizzes throughout the course after each unit, each worth three points. These quizzes are designed to check your understanding of the material covered in lectures. All quizzes will consist of multiple-choice questions focused on basic comprehension rather than deep analysis. Quizzes will be open-note and administered through Blackboard. Late quizzes will not be accepted.

After we finish each unit, I will open the corresponding quiz, and you will have until the end of that week to complete it. The current deadlines are:

Unit	Deadline
God	Sept. 21
Free Will	Oct. 5
Consciousness	Oct. 26
Personal Identity	Nov. 9
Time	Nov. 16
Epistemology	Dec. 7th

**Note:** These deadlines are tentative, based on the current course schedule. If we finish a unit later than planned, I will adjust the corresponding quiz deadline accordingly.

#### PAPERS (42 POINTS)

After every two units, you will write an **in-class, closed-note, hand-written** paper. This means you will write three papers for this course:

- **Paper 1 – Critiquing a view** (7 points; **Date: Oct. 1st**)  
You will *critique* a view we saw either in the God or Free Will unit. Your goal is to *present* the view as clearly and charitably as possible and *raise* an objection.
- **Paper 2 – Defending a view** (15 points; **Date: Nov 5th**)  
For this assignment, you will choose and *defend* a view we saw either in the Consciousness or Personal Identity unit. Your goal is to *present* the view as clearly and charitably as possible, *raise* an objection, and *respond* to that objection.
- **Paper 3 – Defending a view again** (20 points; **Date: Dec 8th**)  
In this assignment, you will do the same thing as Paper 2. But you will choose a view either in the Time or Epistemology unit. It is also worth a bit more, so it's a place where you incorporate the comments you received for Paper 1 and 2 so that you can write a better paper.

**Note:** For all of these papers, you will choose a view *before* you come into class on the date of writing the paper.

## FINAL EXAM (30 POINTS)

The final exam will be cumulative and closed-note, and its primary aim is to assess your comprehension of material covered throughout the course. The exam will include several questions for each unit. **You will choose three units to answer.** The exam will be held during the final exam period. DATE: December 16th, 10:15-12:15PM @ Sims Hall 437

## Grading Scale

Score Range (%)	Letter Grade	Grade Point
94-100	A	4.00
90-93	A-	3.66
87-89	B+	3.33
83-86	B	3.00
80-82	B-	2.66
77-79	C+	2.33
73-76	C	2.00
70-72	C-	1.66
60-69	D	1.00
<60	F	0.00

## Extensions and Late Policy

Almost always, I'm willing to grant an extension on an assignment, but you must contact me at least 24 hours before the deadline. Assignments submitted after the deadline will incur a penalty of one-third of a letter grade for each day late. For example:

- 1 day late: A → A/A-
- 2 days late: A → A-
- 3 days late: A → A-/B+

This penalty continues for each additional day late. Assignments more than one week late will not be accepted unless you have made prior arrangements with me.

## Attendance Policy

You are allowed up to **one** unexcused absence without penalty. Beginning with the second unexcused absence, I will deduct one point from your attendance & participation grade. For example, if you missed two classes without prior notice, you will receive a 9/10 for your final attendance & participation grade. If you need to miss class, just send me an email in advance.

## Academic Integrity

As a pre-eminent and inclusive student-focused research institution, Syracuse University considers academic integrity at the forefront of learning, serving as a core value and guiding pillar of education. Syracuse University's Academic Integrity Policy provides students with the necessary guidelines to complete academic work with integrity throughout their studies. Students are required to uphold both course-specific and university-wide academic integrity

expectations such as crediting your sources, doing your own work, communicating honestly, and supporting academic integrity. The full Syracuse University Academic Integrity Policy can be viewed by visiting the Syracuse University Policies website.

Upholding Academic Integrity includes the protection of faculty's intellectual property. Students should not upload, distribute, or share instructors' course materials, including presentations, assignments, exams, or other evaluative materials without permission. Using websites that charge fees or require uploading of course material (e.g., Chegg, Course Hero) to obtain exam solutions or assignments completed by others, which are then presented as your own violates academic integrity expectations in this course and may be classified as a Level 3 violation. All academic integrity expectations that apply to in-person assignments, quizzes, and exams also apply online.

Students found in violation of the policy are subject to grade sanctions determined by the course instructor and non-grade sanctions determined by the School or College where the course is offered. Students may not drop or withdraw from courses in which they face a suspected violation. Any established violation in this course may result in course failure regardless of violation level.

**All generative-AI tools are prohibited in this course** because their use inhibits achievement of the course learning objectives. This policy applies to all stages of project and writing processes including researching, brainstorming, outlining, organizing, and polishing. Do not use Generative-AI tools to create any content (i.e., images and video, audio, text, code, etc.). If you have any questions about a feature and whether it is considered Generative-AI, ask your instructor.

## **Mental Health Resources**

Mental health and overall well-being are significant predictors of academic success. If at any point you have health-related concerns that might affect your ability to perform well in the course, please let me know and I will find a way to accommodate you. The Barnes Center also has a 24-hour Support at (315) 443-8000.

## **Diversity and Inclusivity Statement**

This classroom is a space where all students, regardless of background, identity, or belief, are respected. Diverse perspectives enhance learning, and respectful dialogue is a shared responsibility.

## **Accommodations for Disability**

I am committed to an inclusive and welcoming classroom environment. If you believe that you need accommodations for a disability, please contact the Center for Disability Resources (CDR), <http://disabilityresources.syr.edu>, located in Room 309 of 804 University Avenue, or call (315) 443-4498 for an appointment to discuss your needs and the process for requesting accommodations.

## **Philosophy Writing Resources**

Strong philosophical writing is clear, concise, and well-reasoned. Helpful resources include:

- Jim Pryor's 'Guidelines on Writing a Philosophy Paper'

- Eileen Nutting’s ‘Philosophical Writing’
- Amy Kind’s ‘How to Write a Philosophy Paper’
- Peter Horban’s ‘Writing a Philosophy Paper’
- Angela Mendelovici’s ‘Sample philosophy paper’

## Course Schedule

Day	Unit	Topic	Reading
1	Intro	Syllabus and course overview	–
2	Intro	Toolkit building	–
3	God	Introduction; the Cosmological Argument	Aquinas, <i>Summa Theologica</i> Rowe, <i>The Cosmological Argument</i>
4	God	The Design Argument	Paley, <i>The Argument from Design</i>
5	God	The Ontological Argument	Anselm, <i>Proslogion</i>
6	God	Pascal’s Wager and the Problem of Evil	Mackie (1955), <i>Evil and Omnipotence</i>
7	Free Will	Introduction & Incompatibilism	Conee and Sider (2005), <i>Chapter 6</i>
8	Free Will	Compatibilism	Frankfurt (1969), <i>Alternate Possibilities and Moral Responsibility</i>
9	Free Will	Manipulation arguments against compatibilism	Pereboom (1995), <i>Determinism al Dente</i>
10	Free Will	Libertarianism	Kane (2007), <i>Libertarianism</i>
11	Free Will	Philosophy Writing Workshop	–
12	Free Will	Paper 1	–
13	Consciousness	Introduction & Dualism	Descartes (1641), <i>Meditations VI</i>
14	Consciousness	Behaviorism	–
15	Consciousness	Physicalism & Functionalism	Fodor (1981), <i>The Mind–Body Problem</i>
16	Consciousness	Minds, AI, and notebooks	Clark and Chalmers (1998), <i>The Extended Mind</i>
17	Personal Identity	Introduction to personal identity	Conee and Sider (2005), <i>Chapter 1</i>
18	Personal Identity	Psychological continuity	Bernard Williams (1957), <i>Personal Identity and Individuation</i>

*Continued on next page*

<b>Day</b>	<b>Unit</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Reading</b>
19	Personal Identity	Parfit	Parfit (1971), <i>Personal Identity</i>
20	Personal Identity	Paper 2	–
21	Time	Introduction to time	Conee and Sider (2005), <i>Chapter 3</i>
22	Time	Spacetime and time travel	Lewis (1987), <i>Paradoxes of Time Travel</i>
23	Epistemology	Introduction to the JTB account of knowledge	Lemos (2007), <i>Chapter 1</i>
24	Epistemology	Gettier cases	Lemos (2007), <i>Chapter 2</i>
25	Epistemology	Internalism vs. Externalism	Lemos (2007), <i>Chapter 6</i>
26	Epistemology	Skepticism	Lemos (2007), <i>Chapter 7</i>
27	Epistemology	Paper 3	–
28	Epistemology	Exam Review	–

# Introduction to Moral Theory

Spring 2026, Syracuse University

Tuesday & Thursday, 12:30–1:50 PM @ 110 Maxwell Hall

**Instructor:** Chris Cho

**Email:** hcho25@syr.edu

**Office Hours:** Tuesday 2:00PM–3:00PM @ Bowne Hall 103

## Course Description

This course provides an introduction to ethics and is divided into three parts. We begin with *normative ethics*, focusing on general theories about what we ought to do and why. Then we turn to *applied ethics*, where we use these theories to think through real-world moral problems and dilemmas. Finally, we explore *metaethics*, which asks more fundamental questions about the nature of morality itself, such as what moral claims mean and whether they can be true.

## Learning Goals

This course is designed to help students:

1. Develop a clear understanding of some of the central moral theories.
2. Practice formulating clear, well-structured philosophical arguments in writing.
3. Learn how to critically evaluate arguments by identifying assumptions, raising objections, and considering alternative views
4. Gain confidence in expressing complex ideas with clarity, precision, and logical coherence

## Course Requirements

Component	Points
Attendance & Participation	10
Exam 1	25
Exam 2	25
Exam 3	25
Group Presentation	15
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>

### ATTENDANCE AND PARTICIPATION (10 POINTS)

Consistent attendance and focused engagement are important for succeeding in this course. You are expected to arrive on time, listen actively, and take notes during class. You should be prepared to respond to questions and think critically about the material as it is presented. If there is an open discussion, you are expected to engage respectfully. This includes listening to others, offering thoughtful comments, and being open to different perspectives.

## GROUP PRESENTATIONS

In groups of 3–4, you will give a presentation for about 20 minutes on a real-world ethical issue of your group's choosing, applying what you have learned in this course. This application can take multiple forms. For example, you may

1. evaluate how different ethical theories would assess the case, and explain why; or
2. examine common reactions or intuitions about the issue and assess whether they are supported—or undermined—by an ethical theory; or
3. do both.

This is a non-exhaustive list. I'm open to hearing something, as long as I see engagement with the course material and evidence of philosophizing. Presentations will take place at the end of the semester. Groups must submit a proposal by March 25th that tells me (i) what topic the group has chosen and why, and (ii) how the group will apply the course materials. Further details about group presentations will be provided down the road.

## EXAMS (75 POINTS)

After we finish roughly three units, you will have an exam. The exams are designed primarily to assess your comprehension of the previous units, including key concepts, theories, and arguments discussed in readings and lectures. Each exam will consist of a combination of multiple-choice questions and short-answer questions. Specific exam dates are listed in the course schedule. Exam 2 and 3 will not be cumulative.

## Course Schedule

Day	Unit	Topic	Reading
1	Course Introduction	Syllabus	–
2	Course Introduction	Toolkit building	–
3	Normative ethics	Consequentialism (Part I)	Shafer-Landau (2023), <i>Consequentialism: Its Nature and Attractions</i>
4	Normative ethics	Consequentialism (Part II)	Shafer-Landau (2023), <i>Consequentialism: Its Difficulties</i>
5	Normative Ethics	Deontology (Part I)	Shafer-Landau (2023), <i>The Kantian Perspective - Fairness and Justice</i>
6	Normative Ethics	Deontology (Part II)	Shafer-Landau (2023), <i>The Kantian Perspective - Autonomy, Free will, and Respect</i>
7	Normative Ethics	Virtue Ethics & Exam Review	Giles (2023), <i>How can I be a better person?</i>
8	Exam 1	–	–
9	Abortion	Is abortion morally permissible? (Part I)	Thomson (1971), <i>A defense of abortion</i>
10	Abortion	Is abortion morally permissible? (Part II)	Marquis (1989), <i>Why abortion is immoral</i>
11	Famine relief	How far must morality go in helping others? (Part I)	Singer (1972), <i>Famine, Affluence, and Morality</i>
12	Famine relief	How far must morality go in helping others? (Part II)	Hardin (1974), <i>Lifeboat Ethics</i>
13	Animal rights	Do/Should animals have (moral) rights? (Part I)	Cohen (1997), <i>Do Animals Have Rights?</i>
14	Animal rights	Do/Should animals have (moral) rights? (Part II) & Exam Review	Norcross (2004), <i>Puppies, Pigs, and People</i>
15	Exam 2	–	–
16	Life and Death	Is it good to exist? (Part I)	Benatar (1997), <i>Why it is better to never to come into existence</i>

*Continued on next page*

<b>Day</b>	<b>Unit</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Reading</b>
17	Life and Death	Is it good to exist? (Part II)	Nagel (1970), <i>Death</i>
18	Distributive Justice	What counts as a just distribution? (Part I)	Rawls (1958), <i>Justice as Fairness</i>
19	Distributive Justice	What counts as a just distribution? (Part II)	Nozick (1973), <i>Distributive Justice</i>
20	Metaethics	God and morality	Morgan (2019), <i>Can We Have Ethics Without Religion?</i>
21	Metaethics	God and morality cont	–
22	Metaethics	Is morality objective or subjective? (Part I)	Shafer-Landau (2023), <i>Ethical Relativism</i>
23	Metaethics	Is morality objective or subjective? (Part II)	Rachels and Rachels (2019), <i>The Challenge of Cultural Relativism</i>
24	Metaethics	Do moral claims express beliefs or emotions? (Part I)	van Roojen (2024), <i>Moral Cognitivism vs. Non-Cognitivism</i> (only Sections 1-4)
25	Metaethics	Do moral claims express beliefs or emotions? (Part II) & Exam Review	–
26	Exam 3	–	–
27	Presentations	–	–
28	Presentations	–	–

# Critical Thinking

**Instructor:** Chris Cho

**Email:** hcho25@syr.edu

## Course Description

When are you justified in accepting a claim as true? What constitutes adequate evidence for a claim, and when is such evidence needed? What standards should be used for assessing sources of information? The purpose of this course is to answer these questions and to improve your critical thinking and writing skills. In studying critical thinking, you enhance your ability to draw logically correct conclusions from the available evidence, learn concepts and principles that can be used to decide whether a conclusion follows from the reasons given for it, and build skills of persuasive writing. You also learn to express your views with clarity and support, to consider and assess alternative points of view, and to structure your writing in a way that is appropriate to your logical goals.

## Required Course Materials

Govier, Trudy. *A Practical Study of Argument* (7th Edition, enhanced).

Ways to acquire this book:

- I suggest renting an E-Textbook for the semester through Cengage's website. There is no need to rent the 'Cengage Unlimited' option.
- You can also rent the book through Amazon, which can sometimes be slightly less expensive. Amazon also has new and used paperback copies for sale, but they are typically more expensive.
- Another website, 'Vital Source' has a rental option that comes with a "read aloud" feature if that's of interest.

## Learning Goals

This course is designed to help students:

1. Practice identifying premises and intermediate conclusions of arguments, via careful reading
2. Practice schematizing arguments into premise–conclusion form
3. Learn how to find and object to a relatively weak premise of an argument, and object to your objection
4. Become comfortable with critical dialogue in real time, all the while being polite

<b>Component</b>	<b>Points</b>
Attendance & Participation	10
Quizzes	25
Exam 1	20
Exam 2	20
Final Exam	25
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>

## Course Requirements

### ATTENDANCE AND PARTICIPATION (10 PTS)

Consistent attendance and focused engagement are important for succeeding in this course. You are expected to arrive on time, listen actively, and take notes during class. You should be prepared to respond to questions and think critically about the material as it is presented. If there is an open discussion, you are expected to engage respectfully. This includes listening to others, offering thoughtful comments, and being open to different perspectives.

### QUIZZES (25PTS)

You will have ten quizzes throughout the semester, practicing the content you learned for the week. You will get five questions, each question being worth 1pt. They will be due every Sunday 11:59pm. Your lowest quiz grade will be dropped.

### EXAMS (65PTS)

You will have three in-class exams in this class. It will most likely comprise a mix of multiple-choice questions and short answer. I will provide details in advance.

## Course Schedule

<b>Day</b>	<b>Unit</b>	<b>Reading</b>
1	What is an argument?	Syllabus
2		Chapter 1, pgs. 1–9
3		Chapter 1, pgs. 9–17
4		Chapter 1 cont.
5	Argument Structure	Chapter 2, pgs. 22–30
6		Chapter 2, pgs. 31, 34–41
7		Chapter 2, pgs. 41–48, 51–52, 54–55
8		<b>Exam 1 Review</b>
9		<b>Exam 1</b>

*Continued on next page*

<b>Day</b>	<b>Unit</b>	<b>Reading</b>
10	Good Arguments	Chapter 4, pgs. 87–93
11		Chapter 4, pgs. 94–100
12		Chapter 4, pgs. 103–106, 108–112
13		Chapter 4: The Challenge of the Argument
14		Chapter 4 Buffer Day
15	Looking at Language	Chapter 3, pgs. 57–62, 65–69
16		Chapter 3, pgs. 72–79
17		Chapter 3, pgs. 81–84
18		Chapter 3 Buffer Day
19		<b>Exam 2 Review</b>
20		<b>Exam 2</b>
21	Premises: What to Accept and Why	Chapter 5, pgs. 116–124
22		Chapter 5, pgs. 124–128, 131–135
23		Chapter 5 Buffer Day, pgs. 145–146
24	Relevance	Chapter 6, pgs. 148–152
25		Chapter 6, pgs. 155–163
26		Chapter 6, pgs. 163–167, 170–171, 174–176
27		<b>Final Exam Review</b>
28		<b>Final Exam</b>

# Metaphysics

**Instructor:** Chris Cho  
**Email:** hcho25@syr.edu

## Course Description

Metaphysics is the study of the basic structure of reality. What kinds of things exist? What are properties? What are space and time like? What does it mean for objects to persist over time? What makes a person the same person across change? What is consciousness? Do we have free will? In this course, we will explore these fundamental questions together and think carefully about different ways philosophers have tried to answer them. Along the way, we will learn how to read and write philosophy and how to engage with arguments that can be challenging but rewarding to work through.

## Learning Goals

This course is designed to help students:

1. Develop a clear understanding of central metaphysical questions and competing views.
2. Practice formulating clear, well-structured philosophical arguments in writing.
3. Learn how to critically evaluate arguments by identifying assumptions, raising objections, and considering alternative views.
4. Gain confidence in expressing complex ideas with clarity, precision, and logical coherence.

## Course Requirements

Component	Points
Attendance & Participation	15
In-class Essays 1	15
In-class Essays 2	20
In-class Essays 3	26
Unit Discussion Questions (8 × 3pts)	24
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>

### ATTENDANCE AND PARTICIPATION (15 POINTS)

Consistent attendance and focused engagement are important for succeeding in this course. You are expected to arrive on time, listen actively, and take notes during class. You should be prepared to respond to questions and think critically about the material as it is presented. If there is an open discussion, you are expected to engage respectfully. This includes listening to others, offering thoughtful comments, and being open to different perspectives.

#### IN-CLASS ESSAYS (61 POINTS TOTAL)

You will complete three short in-class essays. These essays are designed to assess your ability to explain and critically evaluate a philosophical position discussed in the unit. I will provide comments on your essays—mainly on clarity, argumentative structure, and engagement with the material—and you should be demonstrating some improvement over the course of three essays. To help you out with this for the first essay, I will conduct a philosophy paper writing workshop before our first essay to discuss the various nuts and bolts of what makes a good philosophy paper.

#### UNIT DISCUSSION QUESTIONS (24 POINTS TOTAL)

At least once in each unit, you must submit a short reading response by 11:59pm the night before class. These are very small, low-pressure assignments graded on completion, provided your response shows that you have done the reading and engaged with it thoughtfully. A paragraph should suffice.

You should not summarize the reading. Instead, offer a short evaluative comment. This could take the form of:

- raising a potential objection to the author's argument,
- identifying an ambiguity or gap in the author's reasoning,
- suggesting an alternative or stronger argument in support of the author's conclusion,  
or
- flagging something unclear or puzzling in the text.

I will not provide written feedback on these responses, but I may follow up on them in class and ask you to share your thoughts with the group. The goal is to help you build the habit of actively and critically engaging with philosophical texts.

## Course Schedule

Day	Unit	Topic	Reading
1	Course Introduction	Introduction to the class; Mini Logic Lesson	–
2	Course Introduction	Mini Logic Lesson cont.	–
3	Things and Properties	Things	Mumford (2012), <i>Introduction &amp; Chapter 1</i>
4	Things and Properties	Properties	Mumford (2012), <i>Chapter 2</i>
5	Space	Spatial Substantivalism	Koons & Pickavance (2017), <i>Is Space Merely Relational?</i>
6	Space	Spatial Relationalism	–
7	Time	Presentism	Sider (2001), <i>Two Issues in the Philosophy of Time</i> (Four-Dimensionalism §2.1)
8	Time	Eternalism	–
9	Time	Philosophy paper writing workshop	–
10	Time	In-class essay	–
11	Persistence	Paradoxes of material constitution	Thomson (1998), <i>The Statue and the Clay</i>
12	Persistence	Perdurantism	Sider (2008), <i>Temporal Parts</i>
13	Persistence	The problem of temporary intrinsics	Mumford (2012), <i>Chapter 4</i> & Lewis (1986) <i>The Problem of Temporary Intrinsics</i>
14	Personal Identity	The bodily criterion	Conee and Sider (2005), <i>Chapter 1</i>
15	Personal Identity	The psychological criterion	Gordon-Roth, Jessica (2025), §1-2
16	Personal Identity	Parfit	Parfit (1971), <i>Personal Identity</i>
17	Consciousness	Dualism	Descartes, <i>Meditations VI</i>
18	Consciousness	Physicalism	Jackson (1982), <i>Epiphenomenal Qualia</i>
19	Consciousness	Functionalism	Searle (1980), <i>Minds, Brains and Programs</i>
20	Consciousness	Extended Mind Hypothesis	Clark and Chalmers (1998), <i>The Extended Mind</i>

*Continued on next page*

<b>Day</b>	<b>Unit</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Reading</b>
21	Consciousness	In-class essay	–
22	Free Will	Incompatibilism	van Inwagen (1983), excerpts from <i>An Essay on Free Will</i>
23	Free Will	Compatibilism	Lewis (1981), <i>Are We Free to Break the Laws of Nature?</i>
24	Free Will	Frankfurt cases	Frankfurt (1969), <i>Alternate Possibilities and Moral Responsibility</i>
25	Free Will	Libertarianism	Clark, Capes, and Swenson (2021), <i>Incompatibilist (Nondeterministic) Theories of Free Will</i>
26	Race & Gender	Metaphysics of Race	Ney & Hazlett (2014), <i>The Metaphysics of Race</i>
27	Race & Gender	Metaphysics of Gender	Barnes (2011), <i>The Metaphysics of Gender</i>
28	Course Wrap-up	In-class essay	–

# Free Will

**Instructor:** Chris Cho

**Email:** hcho25@syr.edu

## Course Description

Do we have free will? This seemingly simple question has perplexed philosophers for centuries. In this course, we will take a guided journey into this question by examining different views about free will and, relatedly, moral responsibility. We will mainly explore whether free will is compatible with determinism, engaging with both classic and contemporary positions in the free will debate. We will also explore whether God's knowledge of the future, certain social pressures, or findings from neuroscience have any bearing on our freedom. I will not assume any familiarity with the free will literature. However, having taken an introductory course in first-order logic is highly recommended.

## Learning Goals

This course is designed to help students:

1. Develop a clear understanding of central debates in the free will literature.
2. Learn how to read philosophical texts critically and identify the arguments they contain.
3. Practice formulating clear, well-structured philosophical arguments in writing.
4. Gain confidence in discussing philosophical questions respectfully and thoughtfully with others.

## Course Requirements

Component	Points
Attendance & Participation	15
In-class Essays 1	15
In-class Essays 2	20
In-class Essays 3	26
Unit Discussion Questions (8 × 3pts)	24
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>

### ATTENDANCE AND PARTICIPATION (15 POINTS)

Consistent attendance and focused engagement are important for succeeding in this course. You are expected to arrive on time, listen actively, and take notes during class. You should be prepared to respond to questions and think critically about the material as it is presented. If there is an open discussion, you are expected to engage respectfully. This includes listening to others, offering thoughtful comments, and being open to different perspectives.

#### IN-CLASS ESSAYS (61 POINTS TOTAL)

You will complete three short in-class essays. These essays are designed to assess your ability to explain and critically evaluate a philosophical position discussed in the unit. I will provide comments on your essays—mainly on clarity, argumentative structure, and engagement with the material—and you should be demonstrating some improvement over the course of three essays. To help you out with this for the first essay, I will conduct a philosophy paper writing workshop before our first essay to discuss the various nuts and bolts of what makes a good philosophy paper.

#### UNIT DISCUSSION QUESTIONS (24 POINTS TOTAL)

At least once in each unit, you must submit a short reading response by 11:59pm the night before class. These are very small, low-pressure assignments graded on completion, provided your response shows that you have done the reading and engaged with it thoughtfully. A paragraph should suffice.

You should not summarize the reading. Instead, offer a short evaluative comment. This could take the form of:

- raising a potential objection to the author's argument,
- identifying an ambiguity or gap in the author's reasoning,
- suggesting an alternative or stronger argument in support of the author's conclusion,  
or
- flagging something unclear or puzzling in the text.

I will not provide written feedback on these responses, but I may follow up on them in class and ask you to share your thoughts with the group. The goal is to help you build the habit of actively and critically engaging with philosophical texts.

## Course Schedule

Day	Unit	Topic	Reading
1	Course Introduction & Tools	Syllabus; Introduction to the problem of free will	–
2	Course Introduction & Tools	Mini Logic Lesson	–
3	Incompatibilism	The Consequence Argument	van Inwagen (1983), excerpts from <i>An Essay on Free Will</i>
4	Incompatibilism	Replies to The Consequence Argument	Kapitan (2012), <i>A Compatibilist Reply to the Consequence Argument</i> ; Lewis (1981), <i>Are We Free to Break the Laws?</i>
5	Compatibilism	Classical compatibilism	Ayer (1954), <i>Freedom and Necessity</i>
6	Compatibilism	Frankfurt cases (Part I)	Frankfurt (1969), <i>Alternate Possibilities and Moral Responsibility</i> ; Widerker (1995), <i>Libertarianism and Frankfurt's Attack on the PAP</i>
7	Compatibilism	Frankfurt cases (Part II)	Mele and Robb (1998), <i>Rescuing Frankfurt-Style Cases</i>
8	Compatibilism	Mesh-theories	Frankfurt (1971), <i>Freedom of the Will and the Concept of the Person</i>
9	Compatibilism	Reasons-responsiveness	Fischer and Ravizza (1998), excerpts from <i>Responsibility and Control</i>
10	Compatibilism	Philosophy writing workshop	–
11	Compatibilism	<b>In-class essay (I)</b>	–
12	Compatibilism	Deep Self	Wolf (1987), <i>Sanity and the Metaphysics of Responsibility</i>

*Continued on next page*

<b>Day</b>	<b>Unit</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Reading</b>
13	Manipulation	Manipulation cases (Part I)	Pereboom (1995), <i>Determinism al Dente</i> ; De Marco and Cyr (2024), <i>Manipulation Cases in Free Will and Moral Responsibility: Cases and Arguments</i>
14	Manipulation	Manipulation cases (Part II)	McKenna (2008), <i>A Hard-line Reply to Pereboom's Four-Case Manipulation Argument</i>
15	Skepticism	Free will skepticism (I)	Pereboom (2011), <i>Free-Will Skepticism and Meaning in Life</i>
16	Skepticism	Free will skepticism (II)	Fischer (2023), <i>Moral Responsibility Skepticism and Semiretributivism</i>
17	Libertarianism	Agent causation libertarianism	O'Connor (2012), <i>Agent-causal Theories of Freedom</i>
18	Libertarianism	<b>In-class essay (II)</b>	–
19	Libertarianism	Event-causation libertarianism	Kane (2024), <i>Libertarianism</i>
20	Libertarianism	Non-causal libertarianism	Pink (2012), <i>Freedom and action without causation</i>
21	God	Divine Foreknowledge	Hasker (2012), <i>Divine Knowledge and Human Freedom</i>
22	God	Libertarianism and Divine Foreknowledge	Balaguer and Chan (2024), <i>How We Could Have Libertarian Free Will Even if God Were a Total Know-It-All About the Future</i>
23	Further Issues & Science	Revisionism	Vargas (2024), <i>Revisionism</i>
24	Further Issues & Science	Situationism	McKenna and Warmke (2017), <i>Does Situationism Threaten Free Will and Moral Responsibility?</i>

*Continued on next page*

<b>Day</b>	<b>Unit</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Reading</b>
25	Further Issues & Science	Situationism	Sartorio (2018), <i>Situations and Responsiveness to Reasons</i>
26	Further Issues & Science	The neuroscience of free will (I)	Mele (2012), <i>Free Will and Science</i> (only up to p. 507)
27	Further Issues & Science	The neuroscience of free will (II)	Mele (2012), <i>Free Will and Science</i> (read until the end)
28	Further Issues & Science	<b>In-class essay (III)</b>	–