Teaching Portfolio

Minseok Kim

Department of Philosophy
Syracuse University

mkim66@syr.edu
minseokkim.com

Contents

1 Teaching Statement 1

2 Teaching Experience and Interest 4

3 Teaching Evaluations 5
- 3.1 Quantitative Evaluation 6
- 3.2 Qualitative Evaluation 9

4 Sample Syllabi 13
- PHI 107: Theories of Knowledge and Reality 14
- PHI 192: Introduction to Moral Theory 22
- PHI 381: Metaphysics 26
- PHI 400: Philosophy of Language 30
- PHI 341: Philosophy of Religion 33
- Intermediate Logic 36
- Advanced Logic 40

5 Sample Assignment 44

Last updated: October 2026

1 Teaching Statement

On the first day of my introductory philosophy courses, I pose a question about an apparently obvious belief—for instance, "Does Santa Claus exist?" The room answers no. I then show the students how a philosopher might argue that the answer is yes. I do this to achieve three goals. First, it shows them that philosophy refuses to dismiss an idea just because it sounds outlandish. In philosophy, an idea that initially appears unpromising still receives a fair hearing. Second, having just seen an unlikely idea not merely taken seriously but shown to have more plausibility than they initially assumed, students come away more willing to venture a tentative or implausible-sounding thought of their own—a willingness I want to foster early. Finally, it shows them that philosophy can be exhilarating. Watching a belief as settled as "Santa isn't real" come apart under a few minutes of argument allows them to experience a discovery that draws many philosophers to the subject: something that they took to be obvious was never as secure as they assumed. All three serve a single larger aim, one that shapes the rest of my teaching: to draw students into philosophy by showing every one of them that it is something they can do, and enjoy.

In pursuit of that aim, much of my teaching follows one order of operations: I let students feel a philosophical problem from the inside before they have the vocabulary for it, so that the theory, when it comes, answers a question they have already been struggling with rather than one handed to them cold. For instance, before we take up egoism directly, I show a scene from *Friends* in which Joey insists there is no truly selfless good deed and Phoebe sets out to prove him wrong; each candidate she offers, he redescribes until the self-interest in it shows. Students take sides and run the argument themselves, and by the time we reach the theory they have already found its central claim and begun to distinguish being self-interested from being selfish.

The same order shapes how I teach vagueness. Rather than begin with the philosophers' heap of sand, I begin with a promise: I will prove that everyone in the room is rich. Start with Elon Musk. Taking a single cent from a rich man cannot make him poor, so Musk is still rich after one cent is gone, and after the next, and the argument marches him down to a single dollar, to nothing, to deeper and deeper debt, rich at every step. If a man so deeply in debt is rich, so is everyone in the room. The students are puzzled—and then some of them start reaching for a way out: perhaps "rich" is just a word we made up, with no real fact underneath it. That they are already proposing diagnoses before the word "sorites" or "vagueness" has been spoken is exactly the point; we then turn to theories of vagueness to assess those proposals and consider further responses to the puzzle.

What keeps many students engaged is seeing that philosophy is not a purely abstract discipline but bears on questions people actually face. Once students have felt the vagueness of "rich" where nothing hangs on it, I turn them to the abortion debate, which public discussions often treat as turning on a single question—when does a fetus become a person?—as though fixing that point would settle the rest. I ask them to notice that "person" is vague in just the way "rich" is: whatever line a student proposes—conception, first heartbeat, brain activity, viability—I press them on why the moment a millisecond earlier would not do as well, and they find they have no non-arbitrary answer. That a puzzle about vagueness turns out to govern one of the hardest moral questions we face is, for many of them, where philosophy stops looking purely theoretical.

But I stress equally that philosophy's significance lies not only in exposing such difficulties but also in moving past them. Rather than try to locate the point at which a fetus becomes a person, some philosophers deny that the morality of abortion turns on it, and I introduce two such arguments to my students: one that abortion is wrong even if the fetus is not a person, and another that it can be permissible even if the fetus is one. What students see is that a debate public discussions have left deadlocked has room to move once philosophy reframes it.

Teaching a range of courses—in moral theory, media ethics, and epistemology—has shown me that engaging students sometimes means reshaping the course around them. In my moral theory course, for instance, most students arrived with strongly subjectivist intuitions, and often a dismissiveness toward alternatives: morality, they held, is simply a matter of opinion, with nothing there to argue about. This was a problem, since most of the theories the course goes on to examine assume that moral claims are objective, and students who are convinced there is nothing to assess would have little reason to take these theories seriously. So I expanded the opening unit on subjectivism, adding a chapter from Russ Shafer-Landau's *The Fundamentals of Ethics* that sets out eleven arguments for subjectivism and shows where each falls short. This change paid off. Students kept recognizing their own reasoning among the arguments Shafer-Landau examines, and watching it prove less secure than they had assumed moved them from dismissal to openness—and from there into genuine engagement with the theories that followed.

I want students not just to learn philosophy but to do it, and I build each course around three skills: thinking, talking, and writing philosophically. For each, I use structures designed to draw every student in.

For thinking, I lean on a technique students often find intimidating—being called on—but I take out what makes it so. Before each session, students submit a short written response to the reading: a question, an objection, a point where they got stuck. Because any of them might be asked to talk through what they wrote, they have a reason to read closely and think the material through before class—and because they have already written something, being called on means presenting a thought they have had time to shape rather than producing one on the spot.

For talking, I use two complementary structures. The first is a participation-points policy under which many kinds of contribution count—a question, an objection, a half-formed thought offered aloud. There is a ceiling on how many points a student can earn in a single session, which keeps the floor open for everyone else. Since students engage in different ways, and some talk most freely one-on-one, substantive questions raised in office hours count as well. The second is a small-group discussion format I call *Jury Deliberation*: students work through questions or cases in groups formed early in the term, each group must reach a collective judgment, and a rotating foreperson reports the group's conclusion and reasons to the class. Students who might hesitate to address the whole class find it easier to start talking in a small group, and once they have voiced their ideas there, they tend to contribute more readily to whole-class discussion as well.

For writing, I close each unit with a short in-class piece in which students reconstruct, in their own words, one argument or problem we studied. Because they write it then and there, drawing only on what they have understood, the writing is completely their own. I comment on each of these, and those comments feed directly into the longer paper they write later in the term, so

that by the time students take on the major assignment they have already practiced the skills the assignment requires on familiar ground.

Logic can easily be taught as a solitary activity: the instructor demonstrates a derivation, and students then practice on their own. My approach to teaching logic emphasizes two things this model tends to leave out. First, logic benefits from discussion as much as any other part of philosophy. A student who is stuck on a derivation usually understands only part of what is needed. Working through the derivation with peers helps such a student move forward. Different students tend to have grasped different parts of it, and in pooling what they understand, each explains a proposed step to the others and articulates why a rule applies. By doing so, those explaining consolidate their own understanding, while those listening gain what they were missing. As a teaching assistant for "Logic" at Syracuse, I often had students work through derivations together rather than individually, and my sample syllabi for Intermediate Logic and Advanced Logic build the same practice into collaborative workshops.

Second, I teach students not only how to construct a correct derivation but also how to diagnose an incorrect one. Watching an instructor work through a correct derivation can leave students with an illusion of understanding: each step seems obvious as it appears on the board, and students come away more confident than their actual grasp warrants. Diagnosing an incorrect derivation leaves far less room for that illusion. To say exactly where a derivation goes wrong, a student must check each step against the rule it claims to apply, and so must understand not only what each rule permits but also what it forbids. Studies in mathematics education suggest that finding and fixing errors in this way can deepen understanding beyond what studying correct examples alone provides.[1] In the logic courses I have designed, problem sets therefore regularly ask students to identify the flawed step in an inference or proof, explain why it fails, and repair it where possible, and the collaborative workshops combine both practices: groups diagnose and repair deliberately flawed proofs together.

The choices I have described are not just habits I have fallen into; they are informed by ongoing training in pedagogy. As part of Syracuse University's Future Professoriate Program, I have completed the seminar requirement for its Certificate in University Teaching (CUT), with seminars on active learning, student engagement, instructional design, and assessment, and I expect to receive the certificate in March 2027. I am putting that training to work this semester as sole instructor of two sections of an introductory course in epistemology and metaphysics. In Spring 2027, I will teach an upper-level course in philosophy of religion.

[1] See Julie L. Booth et al., "Using Example Problems to Improve Student Learning in Algebra: Differentiating between Correct and Incorrect Examples," *Learning and Instruction* 25 (2013): 24–34.

2 Teaching Experience and Interest

I have taught four course sections as the sole instructor and four as a teaching assistant, and I am currently the sole instructor for two sections of another course. In Spring 2027, I am scheduled to teach an upper-level course in philosophy of religion. As a teaching assistant, I led discussion sections and was responsible for grading assignments, providing students with feedback on their work, and holding office hours. As the sole instructor, I designed and taught the courses independently, developing the syllabi and assessments, preparing and delivering lectures, and structuring and leading class discussions.

Sole Instructor (Syracuse University)

Course	Term
PHI 107. Theories of Knowledge and Reality	Ongoing (Fall 2026)
PHI 192. Introduction to Moral Theory	Fall 2025; Spring & Summer 2026
PHI 293. Ethics and Media Professions	Summer 2024

Teaching Assistant (Syracuse University)

Course	Term	Instructor
PHI 192. Introduction to Moral Theory	Spring 2024	James Lee
PHI 293. Ethics and Media Professions	Fall 2023	William Osborne III
PHI 171. Critical Thinking	Spring 2023	Erica Shumener
PHI 251. Logic	Fall 2022	Michael Rieppel

Teaching Interest

The list below indicates areas I would be happy to teach at the undergraduate level. Areas I would also be happy to teach at the graduate level are marked with an asterisk, and courses for which sample syllabi are included appear in bold and are linked to the corresponding syllabi.

Introductory Courses in

- **Moral Theory**
- Media Ethics
- **Knowledge & Reality**
- **Intermediate Logic**
- Critical Thinking
- Human Nature

Advanced Courses in

- **Metaphysics***
- **Advanced Logic***
- **Philosophy of Language***
- **Philosophy of Religion**
- Epistemology
- History of Analytic Philosophy

3 Teaching Evaluations

Syracuse University collects student feedback at the end of each semester through Watermark Course Evaluation & Surveys, which provides both quantitative metrics and qualitative comments. The courses for which evaluation data are available and included in this portfolio are listed below. Quantitative results are presented in the following subsection, followed by qualitative student comments.

Sole Instructor (Syracuse University)

Course	**Term**
PHI 192. Introduction to Moral Theory	Fall 2025; Spring & Summer 2026
PHI 293. Ethics and Media Professions	Summer 2024

Teaching Assistant (Syracuse University)

Course	**Term**	**Instructor**
PHI 293. Ethics and Media Professions	Fall 2023	William Osborne III
PHI 251. Logic	Fall 2022	Michael Rieppel

3.1 Quantitative Evaluation

The quantitative evaluations include only courses taught as the sole instructor. Because evaluation scales vary across questions (i.e., four-, five-, and six-point Likert scales), I have grouped the quantitative evaluation results into separate tables to ensure clarity and interpretability. Means are reported on the original scales used in the evaluations, with higher scores indicating more positive responses. Percentages report favorable responses: Agree or Strongly Agree on the four-point scale, and Somewhat Agree, Agree, or Strongly Agree on the six-point scale. For readability, I use the following abbreviations: F = Fall, S = Spring, and SM = Summer. For example, (F25) indicates that a course was taught in Fall 2025.

Four-point Scale Items

Prompt	**Course**	**Mean**	**% Favorable** (≥ 3)
The instructor's voice was easily audible and his or her diction was distinct.	Moral Theory (S26)	3.67	100
	Moral Theory (F25)	3.56	100
	Moral Theory (SM26)	3.33	100
	Ethics and Media (SM24)	3.60	80
Attentive and prepared students find the instructor's lectures and remarks clear.	Moral Theory (S26)	3.71	100
	Moral Theory (F25)	3.69	100
	Moral Theory (SM26)	3.33	100
	Ethics and Media (SM24)	3.60	80
The instructor knows the subject matter.	Moral Theory (S26)	3.67	100
	Moral Theory (F25)	3.69	100
	Moral Theory (SM26)	3.67	100
	Ethics and Media (SM24)	3.80	100
The instructor was well prepared for each class.	Moral Theory (S26)	3.52	95.24
	Moral Theory (F25)	3.63	100
	Moral Theory (SM26)	3.67	100
	Ethics and Media (SM24)	3.80	100
Students are able to get an appropriate amount of individual help from the instructor.	Moral Theory (S26)	3.57	100
	Moral Theory (F25)	3.50	100
	Moral Theory (SM26)	4.00	100
	Ethics and Media (SM24)	3.80	100
I learned to think critically about issues in philosophy.	Moral Theory (S26)	3.71	95.24
	Moral Theory (F25)	3.56	100
	Moral Theory (SM26)	4.00	100
	Ethics and Media (SM24)	3.80	100

Continued on next page

Prompt	Course	Mean	% Favorable (≥ 3)
The instructor treats students with respect.	Moral Theory (S26)	3.86	100
	Moral Theory (F25)	3.69	100
	Moral Theory (SM26)	4.00	100
	Ethics and Media (SM24)	3.80	100
The instructor's style of conducting the course held my interest.	Moral Theory (S26)	3.52	90.48
	Moral Theory (F25)	3.63	100
	Moral Theory (SM26)	4.00	100
	Ethics and Media (SM24)	3.40	80
The instructor is effective in achieving the academic goals of the course.	Moral Theory (S26)	3.71	95.24
	Moral Theory (F25)	3.56	100
	Moral Theory (SM26)	3.67	100
	Ethics and Media (SM24)	3.80	100
I would recommend this class to others.	Moral Theory (S26)	3.71	100
	Moral Theory (F25)	3.50	100
	Moral Theory (SM26)	3.67	100
	Ethics and Media (SM24)	3.80	100
I would recommend this instructor to others.	Moral Theory (S26)	3.67	95.24
	Moral Theory (F25)	3.69	100
	Moral Theory (SM26)	4.00	100
	Ethics and Media (SM24)	3.60	80

Six-point Scale Items

Prompt	Course	Mean	% Favorable (≥ 4)
Student participation and the contribution of ideas, comments, and questions were encouraged.	Moral Theory (S26)	5.71	90.48
	Moral Theory (F25)	5.63	100
	Moral Theory (SM26)	5.00	100
	Ethics and Media (SM24)	5.40	100
Course assessments allowed me to demonstrate what I learned.	Moral Theory (S26)	5.57	95.24
	Moral Theory (F25)	5.38	100
	Moral Theory (SM26)	5.67	100
	Ethics and Media (SM24)	5.60	80
I received helpful feedback from the instructor to guide my progress in this course.	Moral Theory (S26)	5.14	90.48
	Moral Theory (F25)	5.31	100
	Moral Theory (SM26)	6.00	100
	Ethics and Media (SM24)	4.80	80

Five-point Scale Item

Prompt	**Course**	**Mean**	**% Favorable** (≥ 3)
How would you rank the instructor's overall teaching performance?	Moral Theory (S26)	4.40	100
	Moral Theory (F25)	4.56	100
	Moral Theory (SM26)	4.33	100
	Ethics and Media (SM24)	4.25	100

3.2 Qualitative Evaluation

Below are qualitative comments from all courses taught as either the sole instructor or a teaching assistant. For each course, I have included, unedited, every student response to the following two prompts, bolding portions of some responses that highlight my instructional strengths:

- What aspect of this course was most valuable to your overall learning experience?
- Which course readings did you find most helpful? Why were they helpful?

The second prompt does not apply to courses taught as a teaching assistant and is therefore omitted for those courses. Some courses taught as a teaching assistant do not have qualitative comments at all; accordingly, I include only those courses for which qualitative comments are available. Courses taught as the sole instructor are listed first, with regular-semester courses preceding summer online courses, followed by courses taught as a teaching assistant; within each group, courses appear in reverse chronological order.

A. PHI 192. Introduction to Moral Theory (S26, Sole Instructor)

Q: What aspect of this course was most valuable to your overall learning experience?

- *The Objectivist argument along with Utilitarianism and Kantian Deontology were the exact reasons I took this class. Ethics were framed against challenging situations and topics. Professor Kim also added personal elements to the material, and gave personal feedback from his time as a student.* ***He encouraged students to think critically and participate during lecture, this enabled students to gain unique perspectives and feedback on ethical issues. I've taken PHI 107 (Thoughts on Knowledge and Reality) and PHI 251 (Introduction to Logic), Professor Kim's course PHI 192 effectively synthesizes with these earlier classes. This class was a pleasure to take and Professor Kim provides a catalyst for further introspection if one were inclined****.*
- ***You make the lectures very very clear and precise to follow****, unlike most to the entirely of the STEM department.*
- ***Everything, MS is a fantastic teacher****.*
- ***Participating in class*** *and the quizzes*
- ***I like how much he emphasized class participation about certain societal issues.***
- *Readings.*
- *Open discussion.*
- *I learned critical thinking skills.* ***The open discussion environment helped me feel confident sharing my ideas, which allowed me to improve my thought process****.*
- *In class discussion of topics were in depth and the professor did a good job of addressing each point students brought up.*
- *I feel as though this corse and instructor made complex philosophical concepts easy to understand and lead me to not only have a better grasp on this subject as a whole, but my reading comprehension skills as well.*

Q: Which course readings did you find most helpful? Why were they helpful?

- *All were helpful, they offered unique perspectives and solidified class content.*
- *Everything assigned for weekly reading.*

- *The ones where we had to write about. they helped us deepen our knowledge.*
- *I found the course reading about the time machine the most helpful because it helped reinforce my perspective and value on life and my experiences.*
- *All of the course reading were very helpful as thy made me understand th concepts better in class.*
- *Discussions in class.*
- *Open discussion.*
- *Utilitarianism because I feel like I was able to grasp the content the best here.*
- *The ones on the Utilitarian and Kantian perspectives helped give a good summary of the theories. They gave a good basis of knowledge to work off of in discussion.*
- *All of the course readings were helpful. I enjoyed and related to the utilitarian and consequentialism reading the most though.*
- *I found the reading on AI the most helpful because it shone a light on a pressing issue and took a look at it for a humanitarian perspective which is lacking in most other arguments against AI I heard.*

B. PHI 192. Introduction to Moral Theory (F25, Sole Instructor)

Q: What aspect of this course was most valuable to your overall learning experience?

- ***I think what was more valuable to me was how much the instructor was able to get the class to participate in discussions. At the beginning of the semester, the class never spoke, and he was able to fix that by curating lectures to be more focused on what the students had to say about philosophical topics.*** *I also really liked that the slide shows were posted ahead of class time.* ***I also really liked the way the reading responses were set up; it gave me a chance to talk about specific things on my mind from the readings, without having to adhere to a rubric or censor myself and my thinking****.*
- *Made me think about important things I didn't before.*
- *Anything regarding morality and how to question what's right and wrong.*
- *Videos and presentations.*
- ***I valued that Professor Kim encouraged in class participation.***
- *Thought experiments and seminar-based discussion.*
- *Learning the basics of philosophy and then expanding on that basic knowledge.*
- ***He included many interactive activities****.*
- *The pace was very reasonable.*
- *The incorporation of videos to in the lecture.*
- *I found analyzing arguments extremely valuable in this class rather than just having opinions. Also working with concpets like Kantian ethics, utilitarianism etc.. aloud me to slow down, break down claims into clear premises, and really understand why a position is valid or not.*
- ***I really enjoyed the class discussions and also the different games/exercises we did in class. We often discussed different topics/problems in small groups which was honestly very helpful in order to understand topics. We were able to get really into different scenarios in relation to different moral/philosophical theories, and I felt very connected to the coursework.***
- *Yes the course lectures were helpful at explaining topics.*

Q: Which course readings did you find most helpful? Why were they helpful?

- *I really liked the AI one and the abortion discussion. I actually liked most of the readings, but sometimes they were long and a little boring and repetitive. I am talking about the spinach-test one specifically, but I can't remember the name of the reading or the author.*
- *I learned something useful from each.*
- *Any of the readings about philosophers. They gave me more insight on how we as a society are.*
- *The readings on abortion I found them interesting.*
- *I liked the readings by Kant and the ones on utilitarianism, allowed me to change my pattern of thought.*
- *I thought they were all helpful, they helped me gain knowledge on each lecture following them.*
- *All.*
- *The weekly ones that were needed for assignments really helped me understand the material we were going to discuss.*
- *The course reading on the experience machine was particularly interesting to me.*
- *All of them were good.*
- *I found the readings by Kant, Marquis, and Huemer the most helpful. Kant's work helped me understand how moral reasoning is built on universal principles and intentions, which made it easier to evaluate actions using a consistent moral standard. Marquis' presented very clear understandings, and huemers was also useful as it connected philosophical concepts to real life societal issues.*
- *I enjoyed when we learned about different views such as Utilitarianism, Kantian ethics, Rationalism, etc.*

C. PHI 192. Introduction to Moral Theory (SM26, Sole Instructor)

Q: What aspect of this course was most valuable to your overall learning experience?

- ***I loved the links to videos, movies and stories that tied into the lectures and readings. They kept my interest and were engaging. I also appreciated the feedback from MK. It was helpful to know that I was on the right track and he was quick to answer any questions I had**.*
- *The contact was great and made me think outside my own beliefs.*

Q: Which course readings did you find most helpful? Why were they helpful?

- *I loved reading about utilitarianism and understanding its strong points and shortcomings.*
- *Being new to the subject matter, all of the readings were relevant and helpful.*

D. PHI 293. Ethics and Media Professions (SM24, Sole Instructor)

Q: What aspect of this course was most valuable to your overall learning experience?

- ***The teacher taught exactly what was important to know, and the examples he gave were practical. It was straight down the line and never steered away from the topic. I walked away from each lecture knowing the key takeaways**.*
- *Asynchronous work that was very manageable and well-paced. Recorded lectures sometimes provided additional insight and made the class more accessible. Course accurately followed the syllabus. Email reminders were appreciated.*

Q: Which course readings did you find most helpful? Why were they helpful?

[No Response]

E. PHI 293. Ethics and Media Professions (F23, Teaching Assistant)

Q: What aspect of this course was most valuable to your overall learning experience?

- ***The slideshows at each recitation were very helpful in that the key concepts from each lecture were broken down so that students could easier understand them.***
- *Looking at examples of what we learned in class through clips shown through different media outlets.*
- *The relaxed environment of the class and inclusion of modern media situations and content kept it engaging.*
- *The test review the class before the tests were extremely helpful and helped me piece everything i learned together.*

F. PHI 251. Logic (F22, Teaching Assistant)

Q: What aspect of this course was most valuable to your overall learning experience?

- *Things I learned the most valuable are the ways you see a problem and issue so I can think of solutions for computer science more efficiently.*
- *Knowing how to use philosophy.*

4 Sample Syllabi

The following are sample syllabi for seven undergraduate courses. The first is presented in full, including all supporting sections; the remaining six are abridged. Each is built around two 80-minute meetings per week across a fourteen-week semester, and each can be adapted to a different scheduling pattern. I would also welcome the chance to adjust course content to suit departmental needs or student interests.

Introductory Courses

- Moral Theory
- Knowledge & Reality
- Intermediate Logic

Advanced Courses

- Metaphysics
- Philosophy of Language
- Philosophy of Religion
- Advanced Logic

The syllabi for *Theories of Knowledge and Reality* and *Introduction to Moral Theory* are lightly revised versions of syllabi I have used. The syllabus for *Philosophy of Religion* was prepared for the course I am scheduled to teach in Spring 2027.

PHI 107: Theories of Knowledge and Reality

Fall 2027

Instructor:	Minseok Kim ("MK")	Time & Place:	TuTh 11:00–12:20 HB Crouse 213A
Email:	mkim66@syr.edu	Office Hours:	TH 14:00–16:00 (Bird 443)

Course Description

> "It is through wonder that [humans] now begin and originally began to philosophize; wondering in the first place at obvious perplexities, and then by gradual progression raising questions about the greater matters too, for example … about the stars and about the origin of the universe. Now he who wonders and is perplexed feels that he is ignorant; therefore if it was to escape ignorance that [humans] studied philosophy, it is obvious that they pursued science for the sake of knowledge…"
>
> —Aristotle, *Metaphysics*

As the passage indicates, philosophy often starts from puzzles. Philosophical puzzles are interestingly puzzling because they often take one from seemingly self-evident, ordinary truths to absurdities. For example, apparently, it is true that Santa Claus has a sled; but it is also (presumably) true that Santa Claus does not exist; a puzzle arises: how can something have the feature of having a sled while not existing? In this course, we will investigate theories of knowledge and reality by way of philosophical puzzles, and will endeavor to solve these puzzles together.

Among the questions we will consider are the following: Can we know that there is an external world? Can we prove that God exists? Can two distinct objects occupy exactly the same place at the same time? Can we identify the precise moment when a fetus becomes a person? Is justified true belief sufficient for knowledge? How do echo chambers, conspiracy theories, and disagreement influence our beliefs? Could a machine genuinely think or be conscious? Do we really have free will?

Learning Objectives

Upon completion of this course, students will be able to:

(a) Articulate and defend at least one solution of their own to a philosophical puzzle.
(b) Use a basic philosophical toolkit for engaging in philosophical inquiry.
(c) Explain, in their own words, the philosophical puzzles addressed in class.
(d) Read, interpret, and critically engage with philosophical texts.
(e) Debate as a philosophically rigorous but respectful and humble interlocutor.
(f) Analyze and evaluate debates, arguments, and ideas, philosophical or everyday.

Course Materials

- All the required readings are available through Blackboard under the heading 'Content'.
- Lecture slides and handouts will be posted on Blackboard under the same heading.

Course Expectations

(a) Complete all assigned readings before each session.

- Lectures proceed on the assumption that everyone has completed the assigned readings. Failing to do so will likely result in an incomplete understanding of the material discussed in class.
- Evaluations will be based, in part, on your in-class and out-of-class participation. Not completing assigned readings will hinder your ability to participate and may result in a lower grade. See Assessment below.
- Reading a philosophy text is not an easy task. Readings can often be quite complex and time-consuming. I recommend you allocate some time of your week to read assigned readings. Here is a guide on how to read a philosophy text.
- You will be expected to write. Strong philosophical writing is clear, concise, and well-reasoned. Helpful resources include:
  - ✓ A Sample Philosophy Paper
  - ✓ How to Write a Philosophy Paper
  - ✓ Guidelines on Writing a Philosophy Paper

(b) Actively participate in class discussions and activities.

- Ask and answer questions, express your own views, offer comments, and engage respectfully and constructively in discussion.
- Your ideas and questions are valuable, so please share them.
- Please do not be afraid to share an idea just because it may sound implausible or turn out to be mistaken. Class discussion is where we work things out together, not where you show me what you have already figured out. Half-formed thoughts, hunches, and questions you are still trying to articulate are exactly the kinds of contributions I hope to hear.

Course Assessment

Component	Percentage
Attendance & Participation	15%
Reading Responses	10%
In-class Short Writings	15%
In-class Essay	15%
1000-word Essay	20%
Group Presentation	15%
Final Exam	10%
Total	**100%**

(A) Attendance: 5%

(B) Participation: 10%

- A student earns one participation point for each meaningful contribution during class.
  - Examples include asking or answering a question, offering a comment, expressing your own views, and so on.
- Earning a total of **30 participation points** by the end of the semester grants full credit.
- Students may earn up to 3 points per class.
- Visiting office hours with questions or other substantive matters to discuss earns up to 2 points per visit.

(C) Reading Responses (Pass/Fail & max. 100 words): 10%

- For each session with assigned readings, you will submit a reading response.
- A reading response can be a question, an objection, or a comment about the content of the assigned reading.
- Pass or Fail: to receive a Pass, your response must demonstrate careful engagement with the assigned reading.
- Submit your reading response on Blackboard by the night prior to the class session in which the assigned reading is discussed.

(D) In-class Short Writings (about 200 words): 15%

- In the last 15 minutes of the final session of each unit, you will choose one theory, argument, or puzzle from that unit and briefly explain it in your own words.
- Your two lowest scores will be dropped.

(E) In-class Essay: 15%

This essay will be completed during an 80-minute class session (Session 16). A set of prompts will be distributed one week before the in-class essay. You will select one prompt and prepare a brief outline, which you are encouraged to use while writing your essay. Each prompt will ask you to explain and evaluate a philosophical position examined in class. Essays should be approximately 600–800 words. Before the in-class essay, we will hold a writing workshop on how to write a philosophical essay and prepare an effective outline. I will return your graded essay with written feedback within two weeks.

(F) 1000-word Essay: 20%

- Select one philosophical puzzle examined in class.
- Clearly explain what generates the puzzle and why it presents a philosophical problem.
- Explain at least one response to the puzzle examined in class.
- Defend a clear thesis by either arguing for a response to the puzzle or criticizing one of the responses examined in class. You may defend a position from the assigned readings; you are not expected to develop an entirely original solution.
- Your paper must engage substantively with at least one assigned reading.
- The paper is due December 10 at 11:59 p.m. ET.

(G) Group Presentation (10-15 mins): 15%

- Each student will be randomly assigned to a group of 3-4 members. Each group will designate one member as its coordinator. Each group will complete the following tasks:
  (a) Select one of the philosophical puzzles examined in class.
  (b) Explain the puzzle clearly, including why the relevant claims appear to generate a problem.
  (c) Explain one response to the puzzle examined in class and reconstruct the central reasoning supporting it.
  (d) Evaluate whether that response successfully resolves the puzzle and justify the group's conclusion.
- Sessions 26 & 27 will be devoted to presentations. Each presentation should be 10–15 minutes long and will be followed by a brief Q&A session.
- After the presentation, each student will submit a confidential evaluation of the group members' contributions. Group members will normally receive the same grade, but individual grades may be adjusted in cases of inadequate participation.

(H) Final Exam: 10%

- The final exam covers material from the entire course.

Course Policies.

(a) Absences Policy: You are allowed up to one unexcused absence without penalty. An absence from a quiz, in-class writing, or exam is excused only if it is due to a legitimate and verifiable reason, such as religious observance, a health-related issue, or another serious circumstance beyond the student's control. Health-related absences must be confirmed by an absence notification from the Barnes Center. Other absences may require appropriate documentation or verification. Students should notify me in advance whenever reasonably possible; if advance notice is not possible, they should contact me as soon as possible afterward. In the case of an excused absence, a make-up will be scheduled for a different date. No make-up will be offered for an unexcused absence.

(b) Late Work Policy: Written work is due by the deadline indicated in the Assessment section. An extension will be granted only for a legitimate and verifiable reason, such as religious observance, a health-related issue, or another serious circumstance beyond the student's

control. Health-related circumstances must be confirmed by an absence notification from the Barnes Center. Other circumstances may require appropriate documentation or verification. Students should request an extension in advance whenever reasonably possible; if advance notice is not possible, they should contact me as soon as possible afterward. In the case of an approved extension, a new deadline will be arranged. Work submitted late without an approved extension loses one-third of a letter grade per day.

(c) Office Hours: Thursday 14:00–16:00 in Bird Library Room 443. Please book office hours in advance by email.

(d) Email Policy: I will reply to your emails within 24 hours on weekdays.

(e) Academic Integrity: Cheating is prohibited. It's unfair to your instructors and fellow students. Any established academic integrity violation may result in course failure, regardless of the severity of the violation. For details on SU's academic integrity expectations and policies, visit: Academic Integrity Policy. All work submitted for in-class writings, reading responses, the 1000-word Essay, quizzes, group presentations, and exams must be your own. Communicating with anyone about quiz or exam questions during the quiz or exam period violates academic integrity expectations. Discussion with your peers to improve your writing assignment or group presentations is allowed; however, if two writings from different students are substantially similar, this may be considered a violation of academic integrity.

(f) AI Policy: 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 (e.g., 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.

(g) Religious Observances: If you need to miss a class or deadline for a religious observance, you will be entitled to make-up opportunities, provided you give notice no later than the end of the second week of class. Notice must be submitted through MySlice. You can find the relevant information here.

(h) Accommodations for Students with Disabilities: Syracuse University values diversity and inclusion and is committed to a climate of mutual respect and full participation. There may be aspects of the instruction or design of this course that result in barriers to your inclusion or full participation. I invite any student to contact me to discuss strategies and accommodations (academic adjustments) that may be essential to your success and to collaborate with the Center for Disability Resources (CDR) in this process. If you would like to discuss disability accommodations or register with CDR, please visit the Center for Disability Resources, call (315) 443-4498, or email disabilityresources@syr.edu for more detailed information.

(i) Health: Mental health and overall well-being have a significant impact on academic success. It is important to develop skills and access resources to effectively navigate stress, anxiety,

depression, and other mental health concerns. I encourage you to explore the range of services offered by the Barnes Center and to seek support as needed. Counseling services are available 24/7 year-round at 315.443.8000. Additional resources, including wellness education workshops, are available through the Wellness Leadership Institute.

Letter Grade.

A	93–100	C^+	77–79.99
A^-	90–92.99	C	73–76.99
B^+	87–89.99	C^-	70–72.99
B	83–86.99	D^+	67–69.99
B^-	80–82.99	D	63–66.99
		D^-	60–62.99
		F	0–59.99

Course Schedule

Unit	Session	Topic	Reading
Philosophical Toolkit	1	Syllabus & Philosophy	—
	2	Definitions	—
	3	Argument, Validity, & Soundness	—
⟨Knowledge⟩	4	Intro to Skepticism	-Pollock, J., 2017 'A Brain in a Vat'
	5	Responses to Skepticism	-Audi, R. 2017. 'Skepticism'
	6	Justified True Belief & Luck	-Gettier, E. 'Is Justified True Belief Knowledge?'
	7	Response to the Gettier Problem	-Nozick, R. 'Philosophical Explanations'
⟨Metaphysics⟩	8	Ontology & Parsimony	-Lewis & Lewis. 1970. 'Holes'
	9	Coincident Objects	-Sider, T. 2007. 'Constitution'
	10	The Paradox of the Heap	-Sainsbury, M. 2009. 'Vagueness: the paradox of the heap' (§3.1–§3.2)
	11	Vagueness & Abortion	-Boonin, D. "Why Abortion Should be Legal" (ch.1–4)
Writing Workshop	12	How to Write Philosophically	—
⟨God⟩	13	Divine Hiddenness	-Bayless, D. 'Do Some People Not Find God Because God Doesn't Exist?'
	14	Proving God's Existence	-Chapman, A. 'The Ontological Argument'
	15	Problem of Evil	-Mackie, J.L. 1955. 'Evil and Omnipotence'
In-class Essay	16	In-class Essay	—
⟨Free Will⟩	17	Free will and Questions	-Chisholm, R.M. 2003. 'Human Freedom and the Self'
	18	Compatibilism	-Beebee, H. 2017. 'Compatibilism and the Ability to Do Otherwise'
⟨Good Life⟩	19	Hedonism & Egoism	-Epicurus. 'Letter to Menoeceus'
	20	Objection to Hedonism	-Nozick, R. 1974. 'Experience Machine'

Continued on next page

Unit	Session	Topic	Reading
⟨Belief Polarization⟩	21	Epistemic Bubbles	-Nguyen, C. 2020. 'Echo Chambers and Epistemic Bubbles'
	22	Conspiracy Theory	-Brooks, P. 2023. 'On the Origin of Conspiracy Theories'
	23	Belief Polarization	-Kelly, T. 2008. 'Disagreement, Dogmatism, and Belief Polarization'
⟨AI & Consciousness⟩	24	Machine & Mind	-Searle, J. 1980. 'Minds, Brains, and Programs'
	25	AI	-Chalmers, D. 2023. 'Could a Large Language Model be Conscious?'
Group Presentation	26	Group 1, 2, 3, 4	—
	27	Group 5, 6, 7, 8	—
Exam Week	28	Review Session for Final Exam	—

Final Exam will be held during the university's scheduled examination period.

PHI 192: Introduction to Moral Theory

Fall 2027

Instructor:	Minseok Kim ("MK")	Time & Place:	TBD
Email:	mkim66@syr.edu	Office Hours:	TH 14:00–16:00 (Bird 443)

Course Description

> "Morality is not properly the doctrine of how we should make ourselves happy, but how we should become worthy of happiness."
>
> —Kant, *Critique of Practical Reason*

Our concern with morality is one of the defining features of human life. We do not merely act; we ask whether our actions—and those of others—are right or wrong, good or bad, just or unjust. This course examines three dimensions of morality. We begin with metaethics, asking whether moral claims can be true and whether morality is objective or instead depends on individual attitudes or cultural practices. We then turn to normative ethics, examining influential theories of what makes actions right or wrong and what it means to live well. Finally, in applied ethics, we use these theories to think carefully about concrete moral problems that arise in our everyday lives and in society more broadly. Throughout the course, students will learn to identify, reconstruct, evaluate, and defend philosophical arguments.

Learning Objectives

Upon completion of this course, students will be able to:

(a) Use a basic philosophical toolkit for engaging in philosophical inquiry.
(b) Explain, in their own words, the central theses of major moral theories.
(c) Read, interpret, and critically engage with philosophical texts.
(d) Analyze and evaluate ongoing ethical debates, arguments, and ideas.
(e) Debate as a philosophically rigorous but respectful and humble interlocutor.

Course Assessment

Component	Percentage
Attendance & Participation	15%
In-class Quizzes	15%
In-class Short Writings	15%
Reading Responses	10%
Group Presentation	15%
Exam 1&2	30%
Total	**100%**

[For the omitted components, please refer to the corresponding section in the syllabus for PHI 107.]

(A) In-class Quizzes: 15%

- A quiz will be given in the first session of each unit, covering material discussed in the previous unit.
- Your two lowest quiz scores will be dropped.

(B) Group Presentation (10-15 mins): 15%

- Each student will be randomly assigned to a group of 3-4 members. Each group will designate one member as its coordinator. Each group will complete the following tasks:
  (a) Watch the two designated movie-summary videos. The videos will be shown in class during Session 17.[2]
  (b) Draw one or two moral questions from one of the two movies.
  (c) Select two moral theories examined in class, explain how each would answer the question(s), and briefly evaluate those answers.
  (d) Present your group's own answer and a brief justification.
- Sessions 27 & 28 will be devoted to presentations. Each presentation should be 10–15 minutes long and will be followed by a brief Q&A session.
- After the presentation, each student will submit a confidential evaluation of the group members' contributions. Group members will normally receive the same grade, but individual grades may be adjusted in cases of inadequate participation.

(C) Exam 1&2: 30%

- Exam 1 (Session 16) covers material through Session 15.
- Exam 2 covers material introduced after Exam 1.

[2] Movie 1 & Movie 2.

Course Schedule

Unit	Session	Topic	Reading
Philosophical Toolkit	1	Syllabus & Philosophy	—
	2	Definitions	—
	3	Argument, Validity, & Soundness	—
⟨Metaethics⟩ Objectivism & Subjectivism	4	Argument for Objectivism	-Enoch, D. 2014. 'Why I am an Objectivist about Ethics (Why You Are, Too)'
	5	Arguments for Subjectivism and Their Limitations	-Shafer-Landau, R. 2021. 'Eleven Arguments Against Moral Objectivity' (excerpt: *The Fundamentals of Ethics*)
	6	Arguments for Subjectivism and Their Limitations (cont.)	-Cont.
⟨Consequentialism⟩ Part I	7	Consequentialism	-Mill, J.S. 1863. '*What Utilitarianism Is*'
	8	Consequentialism (cont.)	-Shafer-Landau, R. 2021. 'Consequentialism and its Attractions' (excerpt: *The Fundamentals of Ethics*)
⟨Consequentialism⟩ Part II	9	Famine & Consequentialism	-Singer, P. 1972. 'Famine, Affluence, and Morality'
	10	Arguments against Consequentialism	-(i) Nozick, R. 1974. 'Experience Machine' -(ii) Le Guin, U. 'The Ones Who Walk Away From Omelas'
⟨Deontology⟩ Part I	11	Deontology: Fairness & Intention	-Shafer-Landau, R. 2021. 'The Kantian Perspective' (Ch.11)
	12	Deontology: Free Will	-Shafer-Landau, R. 2021. 'The Kantian Perspective' (Ch.12)
⟨Deontology⟩ Part II	13	Kant's Ethics	-O'Neill, O. 1985. 'A Simplified Account of Kant's Ethics'
	14	Hypothetical Imperatives	-Foot, P. 1972. 'Morality as a System of Hypothetical Imperatives'
Exam Week	15	Review/Q&A Session	—
	16	Exam 1	—
Group Work	17	Watch Videos & Begin Prep for Group Presentation	—

Continued on next page

Unit	Session	Topic	Reading
⟨Virtue Ethics⟩	18	Virtue Ethics	-Annas, J. 2006. *Virtue Ethics*
	19	Comparison: Mengzi's Ethics, Virtue Ethics & Deontology	-Van Norden, B.W. 2003. 'Mengzi and Virtue Ethics'
Game Day!	20	Trolley Card Game	-*Extra Credit for Winners!*
⟨Free Speech⟩	21	Free Speech	-Huemer, M. 2022. 'The Scope of the Freedom of Speech'
	22	Free Speech (cont.)	-Messina, J.P. 2020. 'Freedom of Expression and the Liberalism of Fear: A Defense of the Darker Mill'
⟨Abortion⟩	23	Abortion	-Thomson, J. 1971. 'A Defense of Abortion'
	24	Abortion (cont.)	-Marquis, D. 1989. "Why Abortion is Immoral"
⟨AI⟩	25	Self-Driving Cars and the Trolley Problem	-Nyholm, S. & Smids, J. 2016. 'The Ethics of Accident-Algorithms for Self-Driving Cars: An Applied Trolley Problem?'
	26	Does AI Deserve Moral Consideration?	-Schwitzgebel, E. & Garza, M. 2015. 'A Defense of the Rights of Artificial Intelligences'
Group Presentation	27	Group 1, 2, 3, 4	—
	28	Group 5, 6, 7, 8	—

Exam 2 will be held during the university's scheduled examination period.

[Course Materials, Course Expectations, Course Policies, and Letter Grade are omitted. Please refer to the corresponding sections in the syllabus for PHI 107.]

PHI 381: Metaphysics

Fall 2027

Instructor:	Minseok Kim ("MK")	Time & Place:	TuTh 11:00–12:20 HB Crouse 213A
Email:	mkim66@syr.edu	Office Hours:	TH 14:00–16:00 (Bird 443)

Course Description

> "The aim of philosophy, abstractly formulated, is to understand how things in the broadest possible sense of the term hang together …"
>
> —Wilfrid Sellars, *Philosophy and the Scientific Image of Man*

Metaphysics investigates reality at its most general level and asks how its different parts fit together. What exists? Are there things other than perceivable, concrete objects? Are such things required to explain reality? Could reality have been otherwise, and what makes claims about possibility and necessity true? When do several objects compose a further object? Can numerically distinct things occupy exactly the same place? How do objects persist through change? Are the past and future as real as the present? Is some of reality fundamental while the rest is derivative?

This advanced undergraduate course examines these questions primarily through contemporary analytic metaphysics. We will formulate competing metaphysical theories, reconstruct central arguments for them, and evaluate their explanatory power and vulnerability to counterexamples.

Previous coursework in philosophy is expected. Familiarity with elementary logic is helpful but not required.

Learning Objectives

Upon completion of this course, students will be able to:

(a) Use a basic philosophical toolkit for engaging in philosophical inquiry.
(b) Explain, in their own words, major positions and debates in metaphysics.
(c) Read, interpret, and critically engage with philosophical texts.
(d) Compare competing philosophical approaches to questions of metaphysics.
(e) Engage in philosophical disagreement with rigor, charity, intellectual humility, and respect.

Course Assessment

Component	Percentage
Attendance & Participation	15%
In-class Quizzes	15%
Reading Responses	10%
In-class Essays 1&2	30%
Final Paper	30%
Total	**100%**

[For the omitted components, please refer to the corresponding section in the syllabus for PHI 107 and Moral Theory.]

(A) In-class Essays 1 & 2: 30%

Each essay will be completed during an 80-minute class session. A set of prompts will be distributed one week before each essay. You will select one prompt and prepare a brief outline, which you are encouraged to bring to the in-class essay. Each prompt will ask you to explain and evaluate a philosophical position examined in class. Essays should be approximately 600–800 words. Early in the semester, we will hold a writing workshop on how to write a philosophical essay and prepare an effective outline. I will return your graded essay with written feedback within two weeks.

(B) Final Paper (2,000–2,500 words, excluding bibliography): 30%

- The final paper asks you to develop and defend a clear answer to a focused philosophical question about a topic covered in this course. A set of prompts will be distributed **six weeks before the paper deadline**. You may select one of these prompts or propose a different question, subject to my approval.
- Your paper must state a clear thesis, accurately explain the competing philosophical positions, and raise and respond to at least one possible objection to your view. You must give philosophical reasons for your conclusion and explain why those reasons should persuade someone who does not already accept it.
- You may defend a position taken in the assigned readings, but you must evaluate the arguments for it critically and give your own justification for accepting it.
- Your paper must engage substantively with at least two assigned readings.
- **Three weeks before the paper deadline**, you will submit a one-page proposal stating your question, a preliminary thesis, an outline of your argument, an objection you plan to address, and the assigned readings you intend to discuss. I will return comments within one week. The proposal is graded on completeness (5% out of 30%).
- Part of one class session will be devoted to a paper workshop. Formatting requirements and grading criteria will be provided.
- The paper is due December 10 at 11:59 p.m. ET.

Course Schedule

Textbook: Loux, M.J. & Crisp, T.M. 2017. *Metaphysics: A Contemporary Introduction*
The textbook will be referred to as "TB".

Unit	Session	Topic	Reading
Logical Toolkit	1	Syllabus & Philosophy	—
	2	First-order language: Translation	—
	3	Some Inferences in FOL	—
	4	What Is Metaphysics?	-TB. 'Introduction'
⟨Existence⟩	5	Ontology & Parsimony	-Lewis & Lewis. 1970. 'Holes'
	6	Ontological Commitment & Parsimony	-Quine, W.V. 1948. 'On What There Is'
Writing Workshop	7	How to Write Philosophically	—
⟨Properties⟩	8	Realism: Universals	-TB. Ch.1 (pp.17–29)
	9	Concept & Class Nominalism	-Armstrong, D. 1978. *Nominalism and Realism* (pp.25–43)
	10	Tropes	-Williams, D.C. 1953. 'On the Elements of Being: I'
	11	Austere Nominalism	-Van Cleve, J. 1994. 'Predication without universals? A Fling with Ostrich Nominalism' -(Optional) TB: pp.50–59
⟨Particulars⟩	12	Bundle Theory	-TB. pp.82–99
	13	Substratum Theory	-Sider, T. 2006. 'Bare Particulars'
	14	Bundle Theory+	-Ayer, A.J. 1954. 'The Identity of Indiscernibles'
	15	Substance Theory	-TB. pp.104–114
In-class Essay 1	16	In-class Essay 1	—
⟨Persistence⟩	17	Parts, Whole & Persistence	-Wiggins, D. 'On Being in the Same Place at the Same Time' -TB. pp.250–253
	18	Tibbles the Cat	-Burke, M.B. 1996. 'Tibbles The Cat: A Modern Sophisma'
	19	Solutions	-Sider, T. 2008. 'Temporal Parts' (§3)

Continued on next page

Unit	Session	Topic	Reading
	20	Vagueness: Sorites Paradox	-Sainsbury, R.M. 2009. 'Vagueness: the paradox of the heap' (§3.1–§3.2)
	21	Vagueness & Abortion	-Thomson, J.J. 1971. 'A Defense of Abortion'
⟨Composition⟩	22	The Special Composition Question	-van Inwagen, P. 1990. *Material Beings* (pp.17–37)
	23	Answers to SCQ	-TB. pp.250–263
⟨Modality⟩	24	Possible Worlds	-TB. pp.149–162
	25	Modal Actualism & Realism	-TB. pp.162–180
⟨Grounding⟩	26	Grounding Metaphysics	-Schaffer, J. 2009. 'On What Grounds What'
	27	Grounding Metaphysics (cont.)	-(cont.) Schaffer, J. 2009. 'On What Grounds What'
In-class Essay 2	28	In-class Essay 2	—

[Course Materials, Course Expectations, Course Policies, and Letter Grade are omitted. Please refer to the corresponding sections in the syllabus for PHI 107.]

PHI 400: Philosophy of Language

Fall 2027

Instructor:	Minseok Kim ("MK")	Time & Place:	TuTh 11:00–12:20 HB Crouse 213A
Email:	mkim66@syr.edu	Office Hours:	TH 14:00–16:00 (Bird 443)

Course Description

> "The limits of my language mean the limits of my world."
>
> —Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, 5.6

Wittgenstein's remark suggests that questions about language are also questions about the boundaries of thought and our relation to reality. Language enables us to represent the world, express our thoughts, communicate with others, and perform actions. But how can sounds and marks possess meaning or refer to things? Can two expressions refer to the same object while differing in meaning? How do proper names and descriptions refer? Are meanings located in the minds of speakers, or are they partly determined by the external world? How does context affect what words such as 'I', 'here', and 'now' express? How do speakers communicate more than their words literally say? Can utterances themselves constitute actions, and can a speaker's social position affect what actions their words are able to perform?

This course examines these questions primarily through the methods of analytic philosophy. We will begin with the influential theories of meaning and reference developed by Frege and Russell. We will then examine debates about descriptions, proper names, natural-kind terms, indexicals, and reports of belief. The second half of the course turns to speaker meaning, conversational implicature, speech acts, truth, and the problem of what makes the use of a word correct or incorrect. Throughout the course, we will reconstruct and evaluate philosophical arguments concerning the relationships among language, thought, communication, and the world.

Previous coursework in philosophy is expected. Familiarity with elementary logic is helpful but not required.

Learning Objectives

Upon completion of this course, students will be able to:

(a) Use a basic philosophical toolkit for engaging in philosophical inquiry.
(b) Explain, in their own words, major positions and debates in philosophy of language.
(c) Read, interpret, and critically engage with philosophical texts.
(d) Compare competing philosophical approaches to questions of philosophy of language.
(e) Engage in philosophical disagreement with rigor, charity, intellectual humility, and respect.

Course Schedule

Textbook: Kemp, G. *What Is This Thing Called Philosophy of Language?* (2nd ed., 2018).
The textbook will be referred to as "TB".

Unit	Session	Topic	Reading
Logical Toolkit & Intro	1	Syllabus & Philosophy	—
	2	First-order Language: Translation	—
	3	Some Inferences in FOL	—
	4	What Is Philosophy of Language?	-TB. 'Introduction' (pp.1–13)
⟨Naïve Semantics⟩	5	Reference & Names, Predicates, Atomic Sentences	-TB. 'Naïve Semantics' (pp.14–26)
	6	Naïve Semantics, Empty Names and Frege's Puzzles	—
⟨Frege⟩	7	Sense and Reference	-Frege, G. 1948. 'Sense and Reference'
	8	Frege's Solutions to the Puzzles	(Cont.)
⟨Russell⟩	9	Definite Descriptions	-Russell, B. 1905. 'On Denoting'
	10	Russell's Solution to the Puzzles	(Cont.)
Writing Workshop	11	Writing Workshop	—
⟨Descriptive Theory⟩	12	Presupposition	-Strawson, P.F. 1950. 'On Referring'
	13	Referential and Attributive Uses	Donnellan, K. 1966. 'Reference and Definite Descriptions'
	14	Cluster Descriptivism	Searle, J. 1958. 'Proper Names'
In-class Essay 1	15	In-class Essay 1	—
⟨Kripke⟩	16	Rigid Designation	-Kripke, S. 1980. *Naming and Necessity* (pp.34–39 & 48–60)
	17	Against Descriptivism	-Kripke, S. 1980. *Naming and Necessity* (pp.71–97)
⟨Semantic Externalism⟩	18	Problems for Causal Theory	-Evans, G. 1973. 'The Causal Theory of Names'
	19	Natural Kinds & Externalism	-Putnam, H. 1973. 'Meaning and Reference'

Continued on next page

Unit	Session	Topic	Reading
	20	Indexicals & Two-Dimensionalism	-TB. 'Context-dependence, Indexicality and Natural Kind' (ch.6)
⟨Talk about Thoughts⟩	21	Essential Indexicals	-Perry, J. 1979. 'The Problem of the Essential Indexical'
	22	Belief Reports	-Kripke, S. 1979. 'A Puzzle about Belief' (§II)
⟨Davidson⟩	23	Truth-Conditional Theory of Meaning	-TB. 'Davidson's Philosophy of Language' (ch.9)
⟨Speech Acts & Pragmatics⟩	24	Performative Utterances	-Austin, J.L. 1961. 'Performative Utterances'
	25	Conversational Implicature	-Grice, H.P. 1975. 'Logic and Conversation'
⟨Meaning & Rule-Following⟩	26	Meaning as Use	-TB. 'The Late Wittgenstein' (ch.11)
	27	The Rule-Following Paradox	-Kripke, S. 1982. *Wittgenstein on Rules and Private Language* (pp.7–25)
In-class Essay 2	28	In-class Essay 2	—

[Course Materials, Course Expectations, Course Policies, and Letter Grade are omitted. Please refer to the corresponding sections in the syllabus for PHI 107.]

Course Assessment

Component	**Percentage**
Attendance & Participation	15%
In-class Quizzes	15%
Reading Responses	10%
In-class Essays 1&2	30%
Final Paper	30%
Total	**100%**

[For descriptions of these components, please refer to the corresponding section in the syllabus for Metaphysics.]

PHI 341: Philosophy of Religion

Fall 2027

Instructor:	Minseok Kim ("MK")	Time & Place:	TuTh 11:00–12:20 HB Crouse 213A
Email:	mkim66@syr.edu	Office Hours:	TH 14:00–16:00 (Bird 443)

Course Description

> "Religion is the audacious attempt to conceive of the entire universe as being humanly significant."
>
> —Peter L. Berger, *The Sacred Canopy*

Religion concerns some of the most fundamental questions human beings can ask: Why is there anything at all? Does God exist? What would God have to be like? Is faith rational when conclusive evidence is unavailable? Can religious experience provide knowledge of God? Do evil, suffering, and divine hiddenness count against God's existence? Does morality depend on God? And what, if anything, is the self that religious traditions claim can be saved, resurrected, or reborn?

This course examines these questions primarily through the methods of analytic philosophy. Although contemporary analytic philosophy of religion provides the course's principal framework, readings from Buddhist philosophical traditions will broaden that framework.

Learning Objectives

Upon completion of this course, students will be able to:

(a) Use a basic philosophical toolkit for engaging in philosophical inquiry.
(b) Explain, in their own words, major positions and debates in the philosophy of religion.
(c) Read, interpret, and critically engage with philosophical texts.
(d) Compare competing philosophical approaches to questions concerning God, faith, suffering, morality, and the self.
(e) Engage in philosophical disagreement with rigor, charity, intellectual humility, and respect.

Course Schedule

Unit	Session	Topic	Reading
Logical Toolkit	1	Syllabus & Philosophy	—
	2	Definitions	—
	3	Forms of Philosophical Arguments	—
⟨*Introduction*⟩ Philosophy of Religion	4	Philosophy of Religion	-Bayne, T. 2018. *Philosophy of Religion: A Very Short Introduction*
	5	"God"	-Rowe, W. 2007. 'The Idea of God'
	6	Omnipotence	-Mavrodes, G. I. 1963. 'Some Puzzles Concerning Omnipotence'
⟨*Ontological Argument*⟩	7	God's Existence	-Millican, P. 2018. 'Anselm'
	8	Response	-Gaunilo. 'On Behalf of the Fool'
⟨*Design and Fine-Tuning Arguments*⟩	9	Design Argument	-Paley, W. 1802. *Natural Theology* (chs. 1–3, abridged)
	10	Criticism of the Design Argument	-Hume, D. *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion* (Parts II and V)
	11	Fine-Tuning Argument	-Collins, R. 'The Fine-Tuning Argument'
Writing Workshop	12	Writing Workshop	—
⟨*Cosmological Argument*⟩	13	Classical Cosmological Argument	-Thomas Aquinas. 'The Five Ways'
	14	The Cosmological Argument	-Rowe, W. 1971. 'The Cosmological Argument' -Clarke, S. 'A Modern Formulation of the Cosmological Argument'
⟨*Divine Hiddenness*⟩	15	Divine Hiddenness	-Rea, M. 'Divine Hiddenness, Divine Silence'
In-class Essay 1	16	In-class Essay 1	—
⟨*God and Morality*⟩	17	Euthyphro Problem	-Plato. *Euthyphro* (5d–15e)
	18	Divine-Command Ethics	-Adams, R. M. 'A Modified Divine Command Theory of Ethical Wrongness' (Sections I–III)

Continued on next page

Unit	Session	Topic	Reading
⟨*Problem of Evil*⟩	19	The Logical Problem of Evil	-Mackie, J. L. 1955. 'Evil and Omnipotence'
	20	The Evidential Problem of Evil	-Rowe, W. 1979. 'The Problem of Evil and Some Varieties of Atheism'
	21	Free Will Defense	-Plantinga, A. 2014. 'The Free Will Defense'
	22	More Defenses	-Swinburne, R. 1996. 'Why God Allows Evil'
⟨*Religious Experience*⟩	23	Miracles & Testimony	-Hume, D. 1748. 'Of Miracles' (abridged)
	24	Experience of God	-Alston, W. P. 2004. 'Religious Experience Justifies Religious Belief'
⟨*Faith*⟩	25	Faith and Evidence	-James, W. 1896. 'The Will to Believe' (excerpt)
⟨*Buddhism*⟩	26	Buddhism and Suffering	-Gäb, S. 'Why Do We Suffer? Buddhism and the Problem of Evil'
	27	Buddhism and the Self	-Siderits, M. 'Empty Persons'
In-class Essay 2	28	In-class Essay 2	—

[Course Materials, Course Expectations, Course Policies, and Letter Grade are omitted. Please refer to the corresponding sections in the syllabus for PHI 107.]

Course Assessment

Component	**Percentage**
Attendance & Participation	15%
In-class Quizzes	15%
Reading Responses	10%
In-class Essays 1&2	30%
Final Paper	30%
Total	**100%**

[For descriptions of these components, please refer to the corresponding section in the syllabus for Metaphysics.]

Intermediate Logic

Fall 2027

Instructor:	Minseok Kim ("MK")	Time & Place:	TBD
Email:	mkim66@syr.edu	Office Hours:	TBD

Course Description

> "'Metalogic' is so-called because it is the discipline that studies logic itself."
>
> —Richard Zach, *Sets, Logic, Computation*

An introductory logic course teaches us to construct derivations and countermodels. This course asks the next question: why do those methods work? To answer it, we study formal languages, interpretations, and proof systems as objects in their own right. Central to this investigation are the concepts of *soundness*—everything provable is semantically valid—and *completeness*—everything semantically valid is provable.

We begin with the set-theoretic tools needed for metalogical reasoning. Propositional logic then serves as a manageable first case: we define its syntax, semantics, and an axiomatic proof system precisely and prove soundness and completeness. We next briefly introduce modal propositional logic through Kripke semantics, countermodels, and axiomatic systems. The second half of the course develops the syntax, semantics, proof theory, and metatheory of first-order logic. We prove soundness and completeness for first-order logic, along with other central metalogical theorems. We close by applying formal techniques to the analysis of meaning in natural language, including semantic types, functional application, lambda abstraction, and quantification.

Prerequisite: one introductory course in symbolic logic, or permission of the instructor. Students should already be comfortable constructing propositional and first-order derivations and evaluating formulas in interpretations. No further mathematics is presupposed.

Learning Objectives

Upon completion of this course, students will be able to:

(a) Use mathematical induction in proofs concerning formulas and formal derivations.
(b) State and prove soundness and completeness for classical propositional logic.
(c) Construct modal models and countermodels and compare the systems K, T, S4, and S5.
(d) Explain the central steps in soundness and completeness arguments for first-order logic and the significance of its central metalogical theorems.
(e) Apply elementary type-theoretic and logical techniques to the analysis of natural-language meaning.

Course Materials

(a) Theodore Sider, *Logic for Philosophy* (Oxford University Press, 2010).
(b) Open Logic Project, *Sets, Logic, Computation*, Fall 2025 edition.
(c) Irene Heim and Angelika Kratzer, *Semantics in Generative Grammar* (Blackwell, 1998).

Sider's *Logic for Philosophy* is the primary textbook; students should obtain a copy. Instructor handouts will supplement Sider's treatment of first-order metalogic by providing detailed proofs of the major results. All other readings will be posted on Blackboard.

Course Assessment

Component	**Percentage**
Attendance	10%
Weekly Problem Sets	30%
Collaborative Logic Workshops	20%
Midterm Exam	15%
Cumulative Final Exam	25%
Total	**100%**

(A) Weekly Problem Sets (10): 30%

- Problem sets will provide regular practice with formal proofs, model and countermodel construction, semantic analysis, and metalogical proofs.
- Some problems will ask you to identify flaws in inferences or proofs, explain precisely where the reasoning fails, and repair the argument when possible.
- Ten problem sets will be assigned over the semester. Your lowest score will be dropped.
- You are encouraged, but not required, to use LaTeX to typeset your solutions. A free online LaTeX editor is available through Overleaf.

(B) Collaborative Logic Workshops (2): 20%

- Each group will be assigned two sets of formal inferences or proofs containing deliberate gaps or errors.
- The first set concerns propositional logic, and the second concerns first-order logic.
- Working together, the group will analyze each item and propose an appropriate repair.
- The group will present one repaired inference or proof during the relevant session.
- Each group will submit its completed analyses of all the assigned items.

(C) Midterm Exam: 15%

- The midterm will cover the metalogical tools; the syntax, semantics, proof theory, soundness, and completeness of propositional logic; and the introductory modal-logic unit.

(D) Cumulative Final Exam: 25%

- The final will be cumulative, with greater emphasis on first-order logic, its metatheory, and formal semantics.

Course Schedule

Unit	Session	Topic	Reading
⟨*Metalogical Tools*⟩	1	Logic and Metalogic	Sider, §§ 1.1–1.7
	2	Sets, Relations & Functions	Open Logic, chs. 1–3 (selected sections)
	3	Infinity, Countability & Diagonalization	Open Logic, ch. 4; Sider, § 1.8
⟨*Propositional Logic*⟩	4	Syntax & Semantics	Sider, §§ 2.1–2.2
	5	Semantics, Validity & Invalidity	Sider, §§ 2.3–2.4
	6	Axiomatic Proofs	Sider, § 2.6
	7	Induction & Proofs	Open Logic, app. A (selected sections) and app. B, §§ B.1–B.5
	8	Soundness for PL	Sider, § 2.7
	9	The Deduction Theorem	Sider, § 2.8
	10	Completeness for PL	Sider, § 2.9
⟨*Modal Logic*⟩ Brief Overview	11	Modal Languages & Kripke Models	Sider, §§ 6.1–6.3.1
	12	Modal Validity & Countermodels	Sider, §§ 6.3.2–6.3.3
	13	Systems K, T, S4 & S5	Sider, § 6.4
Midterm Exam	14	Midterm Exam	—
⟨*First-Order Logic*⟩	15	Syntax & Satisfaction	Sider, §§ 4.1–4.2
	16	Semantics & (In)Validity	Sider, §§ 4.2–4.3
	17	Axiomatic Proofs	Sider, § 4.4
	18	Identity & Definite Descriptions	Sider, §§ 5.1 & 5.3
	19	Soundness for FOL	Sider, § 4.5; handout
	20	Intro: Completeness	Handout (Open Logic, §§ 12.1–12.2)
	21	Consistent Sets, Henkin Expansion & Lindenbaum's Lemma	Handout (Open Logic, §§ 12.3–12.5)
	22	Model Construction & the Truth Lemma	Handout (Open Logic, §§ 12.6–12.7)
	23	Completeness & Compactness	Handout (Open Logic, §§ 12.8–12.10)
	24	The Löwenheim–Skolem Theorem & Significance	Handout (Open Logic, § 12.11)

Continued on next page

Unit	Session	Topic	Reading
⟨*Formal Semantics*⟩ Natural Language	25	Truth-Conditional Semantics	Heim & Kratzer, ch. 1
	26	Functional Application	Heim & Kratzer, ch. 2; handout
	27	Quantifiers in English	Heim & Kratzer, ch. 6 (selected sections); handout
Final Exam	28	Cumulative Final Exam	—

[Course Expectations, Course Policies, and Letter Grade are omitted. Please refer to the corresponding sections in the syllabus for PHI 107.]

Advanced Logic

Fall 2027

Instructor:	Minseok Kim ("MK")	Time & Place:	TuTh 11:00–12:20 HB Crouse 213A
Email:	mkim66@syr.edu	Office Hours:	TH 14:00–16:00 (Bird 443)

Course Description

> *"In logic, there are no morals. Everyone is at liberty to build up his own logic, i.e. his own form of language, as he wishes."*
>
> —*Rudolf Carnap, The Logical Syntax of Language, § 17*

Classical first-order logic provides a powerful account of valid reasoning, but it is neither the only logical system nor always the most appropriate one. This course studies several important extensions and alternatives to classical logic, asking both how they work and why philosophers have developed them.

The first half of the course examines modal extensions of classical logic: propositional and quantified modal logic. The second half turns to alternatives to classical logic: free, intuitionistic, many-valued, and paraconsistent logics. Throughout, we compare the syntax, semantics, proof theory, and philosophical motivations of these systems.

Prerequisite: Intermediate Logic or an equivalent course, or permission of the instructor. Students should be familiar with the syntax, semantics, and proof theory of classical propositional and first-order logic, as well as the basic concepts of soundness and completeness.

Learning Objectives

Upon completion of this course, students will be able to:

(a) Explain how modal and non-classical logics extend, restrict, or revise classical logic.
(b) Distinguish the standard modal systems K, D, T, B, S4, and S5 and relate their axioms to conditions on frames.
(c) Construct modal tableaux and explain the principal steps in their soundness and completeness proofs.
(d) Compare constant- and varying-domain quantified modal logics and evaluate the Barcan and Converse Barcan formulas.
(e) Distinguish positive, negative, and neutral free logics and explain their treatments of denotation, existence, and identity.
(f) Construct models, countermodels, and tableaux for intuitionistic, many-valued, and paraconsistent logics.
(g) Evaluate philosophical arguments for adopting different logical systems.

Course Materials

(a) Melvin Fitting and Richard L. Mendelsohn, *First-Order Modal Logic*, 2nd ed. (Springer, 2023)
(b) Graham Priest, *An Introduction to Non-Classical Logic: From If to Is*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge University Press, 2008)

Students should obtain access to both textbooks. Instructor handouts and all other readings will be posted on Blackboard.

Course Assessment

Component	**Percentage**
Attendance	10%
Problem Sets	30%
Collaborative Logic Workshops	15%
Midterm Exam	20%
Cumulative Final Exam	25%
Total	**100%**

[For the omitted components, please refer to the corresponding section in the syllabus for PHI 107.]

(A) Problem Sets (10): 30%
  - Problem sets will provide regular practice with formalizations, derivations, tableaux, model and countermodel construction, and metalogical proofs.
  - Some problems will ask you to identify and explain flaws in inferences or proofs.
  - Ten problem sets will be assigned over the semester. Your lowest score will be dropped.
  - You are encouraged, but not required, to use LaTeX to typeset your solutions. A free online LaTeX editor is available through Overleaf.

(B) Collaborative Logic Workshops: 15%
  - Each group will be assigned a set of deliberately incomplete or flawed formal arguments involving one of the logical systems studied in the course.
  - Working together, the group will analyze the arguments and propose appropriate repairs.
  - During the relevant course session, each group will present one of the assigned arguments together with the group's analysis and proposed repair.
  - Each group will submit its completed analyses of all the assigned arguments.

(C) Midterm Exam: 20%
  - The midterm will cover propositional and quantified modal logic.

(D) Cumulative Final Exam: 25%
  - The final examination will be cumulative, with greater emphasis on free, intuitionistic, many-valued, and paraconsistent logics.

Course Schedule

Unit	Session	Topic	Reading
⟨*Logical Systems*⟩	1	Classical Logic: Extensions & Restrictions	-Priest, ch. 1; instructor handout
⟨*Modal Logic*⟩ Propositional	2	Modal Languages & Kripke Semantics	-Fitting & Mendelsohn, §§ 5.1–5.3
	3	Frames, Validity & Countermodels	-Fitting & Mendelsohn, §§ 5.4–5.6
	4	Axiomatic Systems K, D, T, B, S4 & S5	-Fitting & Mendelsohn, §§ 6.1–6.3; § 6.4 (overview)
	5	Propositional Modal Tableaux	-Fitting & Mendelsohn, §§ 7.1–7.3
	6	Soundness for Modal Tableaux	-Fitting & Mendelsohn, § 7.4
	7	Completeness for Modal Tableaux	-Fitting & Mendelsohn, §§ 7.5–7.6
⟨*Modal Logic*⟩ Quantified	8	Quantified Modal Languages & De Re/De Dicto Modality	-Fitting & Mendelsohn, §§ 8.1–8.4
	9	Constant and Varying Domains	-Fitting & Mendelsohn, §§ 8.5–8.8
	10	First-Order Modal Tableaux	-Fitting & Mendelsohn, §§ 9.1–9.2
	11	Soundness & Hintikka Sets	-Fitting & Mendelsohn, §§ 9.3–9.4
	12	Completeness	-Fitting & Mendelsohn, §§ 9.5–9.6
	13	Equality, Indiscernibility & Necessary Identity	-Fitting & Mendelsohn, §§ 11.1–11.5
	14	Existence & the Barcan Formulas	-Fitting & Mendelsohn, § 8.10; §§ 12.1–12.2 and 12.7–12.8
Midterm Exam	15	Midterm Exam	—
⟨*Free Logic*⟩	16	Free Logic & Priest-Style Tableaux	-Fitting & Mendelsohn, § 7.7.1 -Priest, §§ 13.1–13.3
	17	Positive, Negative & Neutral Free Logics	-Priest, § 13.4
	18	Quantification, Existence & Identity	-Priest, §§ 13.5–13.7

Continued on next page

Unit	Session	Topic	Reading
⟨*Intuitionistic Logic*⟩	19	Motivation & Kripke Semantics	-Priest, §§ 6.1–6.3
	20	Intuitionistic Tableaux & Failures of Classical Principles	-Priest, §§ 6.4–6.6
	21	Soundness & Completeness	-Priest, § 6.7
⟨*Many-Valued & Paraconsistent Logics*⟩	22	Logical Matrices & Designated Values	-Priest, §§ 7.1–7.2
	23	K3, Łukasiewicz Logic & Truth-Value Gaps	-Priest, § 7.3
	24	LP & Three-Valued Paraconsistency	-Priest, §§ 7.4–7.5
	25	FDE & Four-Valued Semantics	-Priest, §§ 8.1–8.4
	26	Paraconsistency & Disjunctive Syllogism	-Priest, §§ 8.5–8.6
	27	Applications of Truth-Value Gaps & Gluts	-Priest, §§ 7.6–7.9
⟨*Pluralism*⟩	28	Logical Pluralism	-Beall & Restall, "Logical Pluralism"

Final Examination: The cumulative final examination will be held during the university's scheduled examination period.

[Course Expectations, Course Policies, and Letter Grade are omitted. Please refer to the corresponding sections in the syllabus for PHI 107.]

5 Sample Assignment

The following is the group presentation assignment from PHI 192: Introduction to Moral Theory, presented as students receive it, together with its grading rubric and peer-evaluation form.

Group Presentation: Moral Theories at the Movies

PHI 192: Introduction to Moral Theory | 15% of the final grade

So far in this course, we have studied moral theories mainly through arguments and thought experiments. This assignment asks you to put them to work on a story. Films raise moral questions that are richer and messier than textbook cases: characters act under pressure, with mixed motives and incomplete information. Working in a group, you will draw a moral question from a film, determine what two moral theories would say about it, and decide what you yourselves think. The assignment develops three abilities from the course learning objectives:

- explaining the central claims of moral theories in your own words;
- applying those theories to a concrete case and evaluating their answers;
- defending a view of your own while engaging respectfully with those who disagree.

Groups

Each student will be randomly assigned to a group of 3–4 members. Each group will designate one member as its coordinator, who arranges group meetings and serves as the group's point of contact with me.

The Task

(a) **Watch the two movie-summary videos.** The videos, on I Saw the Devil (Kim Jee-woon, 2010) and Oldboy (Park Chan-wook, 2003), will be shown in class during Session 17.

(b) **Draw one or two moral questions from one of the two films.** A good question is one on which reasonable people could disagree and on which the theories we have studied give different answers, or the same answer for different reasons. For example: *Can Dae-su's revenge be justified, given what was done to him?*

(c) **Select two moral theories examined in class**—for instance, consequentialism, Kantian deontology, virtue ethics, or Mengzi's ethics. Explain how each would answer your question, and briefly evaluate those answers: Does the theory's verdict seem right? If not, what does it miss?

(d) **Present your group's own answer and a brief justification.** Your answer may agree with one of the theories, combine elements of both, or depart from both, as long as you explain why.

Content note: Both films deal with mature themes and include violence and sexual content. If you have concerns about viewing either video, please let me know in advance, and we will arrange an alternative.

Format and Schedule

- **Session 17:** Watch the videos in class, meet your group, and designate a coordinator.
- **Sessions 27 & 28:** Presentations. Each presentation should be approximately 10 minutes long and will be followed by a brief Q&A session. You may use slides or a handout.
- **After your presentation:** Each student submits the confidential peer evaluation below.

Grading Rubric

Criterion	Weight	What strong work does
Moral question	15%	States a clear, genuinely contestable question grounded in specific events of the film.
Explanation of theories	25%	States each theory's central claims accurately and correctly works out what it would say about the question.
Evaluation	25%	Assesses each theory's answer with reasons, identifying what it gets right and what it misses or gets wrong.
The group's own answer	25%	Takes a clear position and supports it with reasons that respond to the theories discussed.
Delivery and Q&A	10%	Is clearly organized, stays within the time limit, and responds thoughtfully to questions.

Group members will normally receive the same grade, but individual grades may be adjusted in cases of inadequate participation, as indicated by the peer evaluations.

Peer Evaluation Form (Confidential)

Rate each of your group members (not yourself) on each item from 1 (rarely) to 4 (consistently). Your responses will be seen only by me.

	Member 1	**Member 2**	**Member 3**
	_____	_____	_____
Came to group meetings prepared			
Contributed ideas and helped develop the group's analysis			
Completed agreed tasks reliably and on time			
Engaged respectfully with other members' ideas			

(1) Briefly describe each member's main contribution to the presentation.
(2) Is there anything else I should know about how your group worked together?