TEACHING PORTFOLIO

Table of Contents

1.   Teaching Statement

1.1 General statement of teaching philosophy

I've worked as a teacher in the US, Finland, Hong Kong, and India. My years of teaching have helped me understand that there is no "normal" when it comes to students. This applies to philosophy as well. Each person comes to the discipline with their unique set of expectations, experiences, goals, anxieties, strengths, and challenges. My teaching philosophy centers on this simple realization. I emphasize skill-building and combine a highly structured course design with flexible policies in an effort to serve the needs of diverse students. I also strive to create a safe and supportive discussion environment by inviting my students to reflect on the nature, goals, and methods of philosophy.

1.1.1 Teaching skills in addition to content

At the beginning of every course I use a survey to ask my students why they are taking the course, if they have prior experiences with philosophy, and if they have concerns, worries, or something else they would like me to know. This helps me design classes and activities in a way that directly addresses the students' needs. For example, since undergraduates often express concerns over their ability to understand philosophical texts and to "think like a philosopher," I incorporate frequent skill-building workshops into my classes. I start by going over basic terminology. I then introduce segments on how to *read* philosophy, how to *evaluate* arguments, how to *write* philosophy, and how to *talk* philosophy. Towards the end of the semester we hone these skills further with additional workshops and discuss how to transfer the skills to other contexts. To make the workshops more effective, I use simple, down-to-earth exercises. For example, in a "write-crumple-throw" activity, students are each given a sheet of paper divided into three columns. I choose a question already covered in class and the students write down arguments in support of their preferred answers in the first column. They then crumple up the papers and throw them across the room. A person who picks up a particular paper has to think of a plausible objection to the argument on that paper and write the objection in the second column. They then repeat the crumple-throw procedure, and a third student responds to the objection in the last column. We then read some of these mini-dialogues out loud and add a few details (examples, supporting arguments, etc.). Finally, I explain how the students can use a similar procedure when outlining their papers. To help make sure that the students are developing the skills they need to succeed in the course, I ask them to periodically reflect on their own progress and to share their thoughts on what kind of further workshops would be beneficial.

1.1.2 Inclusivity through structure and flexibility

I give my students plenty of opportunities to practice their philosophy skills by employing a highly structured course design with lots of low-stakes assignments. The assignments include reading quizzes (untimed, open-book), posters, presentations, reflections, and argumentative writing tasks. I provide detailed grading rubrics and model assignments when appropriate, scaffold major assignments, and invite students to meet with me to discuss their plans. On occasion, I use self-grading and peer reviews to demystify the grading process and to encourage reflection. Giving students lots of low-stakes assignments helps keep them engaged and promotes a growth mindset, but it is important to combine this structure with flexible course policies that allow students to exercise their autonomy

and cope with temporary obstacles and disturbances. The policies I use include "late days" on assignments, dropping lowest grades, offering multiple ways to participate, and allowing students to make up for absences with additional assignments. With these policies I communicate to my students that their wellbeing matters to me and that they are *entitled* to accommodations should they need them. This is an inclusive practice because students' backgrounds affect their willingness to ask for extra time and help. One of my former mentees—a first-generation student from a developing country—told me, *in her senior year*, that she had never asked for an extension on an assignment, even when she was ill or otherwise unable to produce work that was up to her usual standards. Flexible course policies benefit everyone, and especially students like her.

1.1.3 Fostering a sense of belonging with meta-level discussions

I do my best to create a safe and supportive discussion environment in which students feel that they *all* have valuable things to contribute, regardless of background. The philosophy classroom can be an intimidating and alienating place. There has traditionally been a great deal of gate-keeping and hostility towards non-western and minority perspectives, and philosophical writing is often unnecessarily complex and jargony. To help my students feel at home in a philosophy classroom, I assign texts by diverse authors and introduce discussions on metaphilosophical and stylistic topics. If we read Descartes, we might have a discussion about Canon formation and reformation. If we read Nāgārjuna, Tsongkhapa, or Ibn al-Haytham, we might problematize the notion of philosophy as a disembodied view-from-nowhere. Whenever we discuss a particular text, we also discuss the accessibility of the writing and the author's writing style. Most students seem to find these conversations empowering and engaging; even those who are otherwise reluctant to participate usually have things to say. As an instructor, I feel that it's my responsibility to explicitly acknowledge that philosophy is one of the few Humanities fields where women are still vastly outnumbered by men, that racism and Eurocentrism have shaped the Canon and methodology of philosophy, and that some viewpoints, approaches, and questions continue to be marginalized and dismissed in philosophy today. I then like to ask my students what *we* can do to make a difference in the context of *our* class. We come up with explicit ground rules for class discussions and have a conversation about inclusive classroom practices (students tend to have excellent suggestions here!). On my part, I emphasize that our goal is to broaden our horizons and to deepen our understanding, and that we need a variety of different perspectives to accomplish this goal.

1.2 Going forward

Being a good philosophy instructor requires willingness to listen and learn, which is why I continue to educate myself on inclusive and equitable teaching practices and on the challenges facing college students today. I attend and facilitate teaching and mentoring workshops, and elicit lots of feedback from my students. Most recently, I have made forays into disability inclusion and accessible course design: I have co-organized two conferences on Philosophy of Disability and Illness as well as a disability-themed teaching workshop, and I am committed to continuing these dialogues—and many others—in the future. My favorite philosophy instructors have been intellectually humble people who are willing to question their own views, assumptions, and approaches. They listen and read charitably, ask difficult but constructive questions, challenge their students with kindness and compassion, prefer dialogue over monologue, view diversity as an epistemic good, and never stop learning. This is what I try to emulate as a teacher.

2. Teaching Competencies and Experience

2.1 Courses taught

As Primary Instructor	As Teaching Assistant	As Grader
• **Philosophy & Visual Perception** (intermediate), Fall 2022 • **Philosophy & Visual Perception** (intermediate), Fall 2021	• **What is Meaning?** (intermediate), Spring 2020 • **Epistemology** (intermediate), Fall 2019 • **Eye, Mind and Image** (introductory), Spring 2019 • **Logic & Formal Reasoning** (introductory), Fall 2018	• **Philosophy of Science** (advanced), Spring 2021

2.2 Courses prepared to teach

I am particularly interested in designing and teaching courses with a cross-cultural component, an interdisciplinary component, or both. I am also interested in courses organized around a specific theme (such as "pain and suffering" or "animal minds") that span multiple subfields of philosophy.

Introductory	Intermediate	Advanced
• Introduction to Philosophy • Logic & Formal Reasoning • Introduction to Logic • Philosophy & Film • Introduction to Indian Philosophy • Introduction to Cross-cultural Philosophy	• Epistemology • Philosophy of Mind • Animal Minds • Philosophy of Perception: The Senses • Philosophy & Visual Perception • Philosophy of Science • Pain and Suffering • History of Philosophy: Primary and Secondary Qualities	• Philosophy of Perception • Philosophy of Psychology • Pain and Suffering • Color • Perceptual Experience

2.3 Other teaching experience

I've mentored undergraduates both officially (three semesters in the MindCORE Step-Ahead Mentorship Program at the University of Pennsylvania) and unofficially. I've also worked as a TA trainer (2021 and 2022) and as a Philosophy Tutor (2022) at the University of Pennsylvania, and taught EFL/ESL/Critical Writing in Finland, Hong Kong and India.

4

3. Course Evaluations

I have included summaries of *all* the course evaluations I have received at the University of Pennsylvania so far, starting with the course I designed and taught in 2021.

A. Quantitative evaluations:

For the quantitative evaluations, the scale is from **0** (*worst*) to **4** (*best*):

- For overall quality scores the scale is *0 to 4: Poor, Fair, Good, Very good, Excellent*
- For statements the scale is *0 to 4: Strongly disagree, Disagree, Neither agree nor disagree, Agree, Strongly agree*
- For course difficulty ratings the scale is *Easy 0, 1, 2, 3, Difficult 4*
- For the amount of work ratings the scale is *Very Little 0, 1, 2, 3, Very Much 4*

B. Qualitative evaluations:

I have included *all* the qualitative comments from students without omissions.

C. Comparisons:

To show how my course evaluations compare to those of other instructors at the University of Pennsylvania, I have included comparative data from Penn Course Review:

- For the course I designed and taught ("Philosophy & Visual Perception"), I have included key quantitative data for myself and the four other instructors who have taught the course (*names omitted*).
- For the courses I have TA'd, I have included the overall "TA quality" scores for myself and all the other people who had served as a TA for that course under the same professor before me:
  - For "What it Meaning?" and "Epistemology" the highlighted score shows my personal "TA quality" score (I was the sole TA).
  - For "Visual Studies: Eye, Mind, and Image" the highlighted score is the average score of all the three TAs for the course that semester.
  - There is no comparative data for "Logic & Formal Reasoning" because the instructor of record only taught the course once.

D. Full evaluations:

I would be happy to share all the instructor and course evaluation reports on request.

3.1 Philosophy & Visual Perception (Fall 2021)

A. **Seminar**: Enrollment: 15 / Response rate: 87%

*Overall quality of the instructor. (Scale: **0** to **4**: Poor, Fair, Good, Very good, Excellent)*	**3.92**
Overall quality of the course.	**3.46**
The instructor clearly communicated the subject matter.	**3.82**
The instructor effectively stimulated my interest.	**3.73**
The instructor was appropriately accessible outside of class time.	**3.91**
As a result of taking this course, I have a better understanding of factual knowledge, principles and/or theories in this area.	**3.82**
This course helped me to improve my ability to analyze, solve problems and/or think critically.	**3.80**
This course helped me to understand how this field asks and answers questions.	**3.64**
This course challenged me to consider new ideas, concepts, or ways of thinking.	**3.73**
As a result of taking this course, I am more excited about this field of study.	**3.55**

B. Comment suggestions:

Loved it. Great time. Fostered healthy discussion and debate and stayed engaging. I don't think philosophy courses should require papers given the nature of philosophy but that's a personal gripe.
Tiina is one of the best professors I have had at Penn although she is just a masters student. She really engages the class by offering unique examples and challenges us to think outside the box. In addition, she brought us to both the ICA and the materials library in the Fisher Library in order to really encourage us to see how we can apply what we learn in class to other fields. This is one of the most enjoyable classes I have had my entire 4 years at Penn and hope that Tiina can keep teaching this course!
Tiina has been one of the best instructors I have had at Penn (as a grad student!) and the course was structured wonderfully. My previous philosophy courses at Penn have had a challenging discussion environment, and Tiina was able to break through this. Seminar discussions were free-flowing and exceptionally interesting, yet smartly curtailed and guided by the instructor. Communication between the students and instructor was casual, frequent and instructive, which helped me get more out of the course. Exceptional course slightly outside of my interests, but I'm so glad I sprung for it.
Tiina was an excellent instructor and I enjoyed the class! I learned how to read and write philosophy, and I now plan on taking more philosophy classes for my major. I really hope Tiina teaches another philosophy course while I am at Penn.

C. Comparison:

Instructor	Course Quality	Instructor Quali...	Difficulty	Work Required
👤 Tiina C. Rosenqvist ☆	3.46	3.92	2.55	2.73
👤 ▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮	3.15	3.15	3.00	2.62
👤 ▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮	3.06	3.17	2.07	1.79
👤 ▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮	3.35	3.61	2.52	2.55
👤 ▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮	2.78	3.22	2.20	2.20

Showing 5 instructors

3.2 What is Meaning? (Spring 2020)

(**Note.** This was a course that switched to asynchronous online instruction in the middle of the semester because of covid-19.)

A. **Recitation section 1:** Enrollment: 12 / Response rate: 92%

*Overall quality of the TA. (Scale: **0** to **4**: Poor, Fair, Good, Very good, Excellent)*	**3.45**
The TA communicated effectively.	**3.60**
The TA was appropriately accessible outside of class time.	**3.70**
The TA helped me to learn in this course.	**3.60**

B. Comment suggestions:

Tiina was truly an amazing TA and took a lot of time and care to answer any and all questions. Thank you so so much Tiina!
I really appreciated Tiina and the addition of a recitation to this course. I felt like recitation was a space where we could dive deeper into the course material and Tiina was always really helpful in guiding that. The only qualm I had was I didn't feel like she was overly clear in the transition to covid and sometimes I found recitations to drag on a little long.
Tiina was very kind and very effective with how she taught course content. She was also especially communicative after classes went online.
Tiina is a great TA. She prepared a lot of material to help us to understand the content of the lectures and help us to improve a lot our writing and analytical skills. She is very accesible to help with other academic concerns.

A. **Recitation section 2:** Enrollment: 19 / Response rate: 89%

*Overall quality of the TA. (Scale: **0** to **4**: Poor, Fair, Good, Very good, Excellent)*	**3.33**
The TA communicated effectively.	**3.60**
The TA was appropriately accessible outside of class time.	**3.67**
The TA helped me to learn in this course.	**3.67**

B. Comment suggestions:

Your recitations were immensely helpful in solidifying the concepts covered in the course, and your detailed feedback on assignments were truly valuable. Thank you so much!
Tiina was an amazing TA! She helped peak my interest in the subject material and she was very approachable. In past philosophy recitations I have felt intimidated to participate in class, especially as a woman, but I never felt that way in recitation with her. She was very helpful in talking about our papers in office hours as well and always gave helpful comments on Canvas.
This is the second semester I have had Tiina as a TA. She is an excellent teacher - smart, engaging and genuinely cares about her students. She goes above and beyond to be available outside of class and I have really improved my philosophical writing thanks to her help!
The grading was kind of confusing. There would be comments made on the first draft of papers, those changes would be made on the second draft and then more comments would be added about things that were not changed from the first draft on the second draft. Not sure how I was supposed to know of things that needed to be changed if they were not stated beforehand.

Tiina is very passionate and knowledgeable about philosophy and did more to enhance my interest and understanding of the course material than the professor. She gives very good essay feedback and I enjoyed learning from her.
I liked recitations, but I think that they should be more discussion based. I feel like philosophy is taught best when students are challenged in critical thinking, and a very key component (in my opinion) of this is discussion and debate between the students, with the TA guiding the discussion and helping it go as deep as possible. Tiina was also a great TA, and very accessible. I think she could have been a bit more clear about her expectations, but overall this was a good course.

C. Comparison:

Lisa Julia Miracchi

| Ratings | Comments | Edit Columns | | | Q |

Semester	Name	Activity	Forms	Ta Quality
Spring 2020	What is Meaning?	Lecture	30 / 31 (96.8%)	3.50
Fall 2017	What Is Meaning?		48 / 51 (94.1%)	1.83
Fall 2016	What Is Meaning?: Mind And Langua		29 / 31 (93.5%)	3.64

3.3 Epistemology (Fall 2019)

A. **Recitation section 1:** Enrollment: 22 / Response rate: 91%

*Overall quality of the TA. (Scale: **0** to **4**: Poor, Fair, Good, Very good, Excellent)*	**3.47**
The TA communicated effectively.	**3.56**
The TA was appropriately accessible outside of class time.	**3.69**
The TA helped me to learn in this course.	**3.56**

B. Comment suggestions:

I thought she was a great TA!
Tiina is super organized and communicates extremely well with her students. I really appreciated her clarity in teaching as well as in helping with assignments, and in feedback with the assignments in the comments on Canvas. I also really liked the variety of activities we did in recitation, especially the one crumpling up the paper and throwing it!
Tiina is a great TA who explains ideas clearly and is willing to spend time to work with students. I am really glad I have her as a TA, and the comments I get from her really help me do well in the class.
Very well-structured recitations. Tiina was very helpful in the different steps across the class' journey.

A. **Recitation section 2:** Enrollment: 25 / Response rate: 96%

*Overall quality of the TA. (Scale: **0** to **4**: Poor, Fair, Good, Very good, Excellent)*	**3.48**
The TA communicated effectively.	**3.56**
The TA was appropriately accessible outside of class time.	**3.50**
The TA helped me to learn in this course.	**3.56**

B. Comment suggestions:

Tiina was an excellent TA. Her recitations helped me to understand the material better and she was always available and happy to help students who required extra help.
The structure of feedback meant that students who needed it more couldn't receive a lot of feedback, to preserve anonymity and allow everyone time with the TA.
Tiina- you are the best TA I have ever had. You are not intimidating to talk to and make yourself so accessible for the students. I know your office hours were always full even though you had so many extra hours available, but this is just because you are so helpful!! In recitation you really forced us to be engaged and enhanced our learning experience. THANKS:)
She baked us cookies for our last recitation&so nice
Great TA. Tiina is very kind, and works INCREDIBLY hard. The hours she puts in are admirable. Thanks for all the help this semester.
I highly appreciate the amount of work and patience Tiina had given the course. She is accessible after class, and she is very communicative on the subject. The recitation is a great aid to the lecture.

C. Comparison:

Daniel Singer

Ratings	Comments	Edit Columns			Q

Semester	Name	Forms	TA Quality
Fall 2019	Epistemology: Epistemology	46 / 47 (97.9%)	3.59
Fall 2018	Epistemology: Knowledge And Reality	42 / 45 (93.3%)	2.48
Spring 2016	Epistemology: Knowledge And Reality	25 / 26 (96.2%)	N/A
Fall 2014	Epistemology: Knowledge And Reality	17 / 23 (73.9%)	2.83
Fall 2013	Epistemology: Knowledge And Reality	13 / 22 (59.1%)	3.58
Spring 2013	Epistemology	25 / 30 (83.3%)	2.55

3.4 Visual Studies: Eye, Mind, and Image (Spring 2019)

A. **Recitation section 1:** Enrollment: 13 / Response rate: 100%

Overall quality of the TA. (Scale: 0 to 4: Poor, Fair, Good, Very good, Excellent)	**3.85**
The TA communicated effectively.	**3.83**
The TA was appropriately accessible outside of class time.	**3.92**
The TA helped me to learn in this course.	**3.92**

B. Comment suggestions:

The only reason I did well on this course was because of Tiina. She was a phenomenal TA and I genuinely could not imagine taking this course without her help. I can say with almost certainty that I would have failed.
A really good TA and always willing to help
Tiina was an amazing resource for me and my classmates. She really put a lot of effort into helping us learn the material.

She was .... FANTASTIC could not ask for a better TA wish recitation was 2 hours instead of 1 was very helpful.
Very helpful in working through my own understanding of lecture material. Very productive discussions and activities!
Tiina was an outstanding TA. She was accessible and approachable. She had a very good understanding of the material. I really enjoyed getting to know her!
Tiina was an excellent TA! She was very dedicated to helping the class and I always enjoyed going recitation because I knew she would create engaging powerpoint and games. You could tell she put a lot of effort into the course. She had never taken a visual studies course before, yet she seemed fluent in the topics! I <3 Tiina
Tiina was a great TA who made herself available at all times. I appreciated her effort to make powerpoints and materials available for us to study with and how she helped clarify what was expected of us on assignments and exams.
Really wonderful and friendly TA; it was a pleasure to work with her!

A. **Recitation section 2:** Enrollment: 4 / Response rate: 100%

Overall quality of the TA. (Scale: 0 to 4: Poor, Fair, Good, Very good, Excellent)	**4.00**
The TA communicated effectively.	**4.00**
The TA was appropriately accessible outside of class time.	**4.00**
The TA helped me to learn in this course.	**4.00**

B. Comment suggestions:

Great TA. Has great focus on material, hard to be caught slacking in class with this TA.

C. Comparison:

Gary Hatfield

Ratings	Comments	Edit Columns

Semester	Name	Forms	Ta Quality
Spring 2019	Eye, Mind And Image	57 / 58 (98.3%)	3.30 *
Spring 2018	Eye, Mind And Image	41 / 45 (91.1%)	3.00
Spring 2017	Eye, Mind And Image	59 / 61 (96.7%)	3.39
Spring 2016	Eye, Mind And Image	58 / 66 (87.9%)	3.10
Spring 2015	Eye, Mind And Image	50 / 54 (92.6%)	2.43
Spring 2014	Eye, Mind And Image	75 / 85 (88.2%)	3.04
Spring 2013	Eye, Mind And Image	78 / 81 (96.3%)	3.34

* An average for all the three TAs that year; my personal average is around 3.90.

3.5 Logic & Formal Reasoning (Fall 2018)

A. **Recitation section 1:** Enrollment: 20 / Response rate: 95%

*Overall quality of the TA. (Scale: **0** to **4:** Poor, Fair, Good, Very good, Excellent)*	**3.67**
The TA communicated effectively.	**3.80**
The TA was appropriately accessible outside of class time.	**3.79**
The TA helped me to learn in this course.	**3.73**

B. Comment suggestions:

Tiina is one of the best TAs I've had at Penn (I'm in my senior year). She really cares about the students and helps understand difficult concepts.
The TA is extremely helpful and supportive. They were always available for questions and even made extra time for help when difficult work was ahead. Recitations also bolstered my understanding of the material greatly with helpful slides and practice exams.
I do not care about Logic at all (I took this course to fulfill a general requirement), but Tiina (along with the professor) made me appreciate the class. She, in particular, put in an incredible amount of work to help students (extra office hours, practice problems, showing us opportunities for further philosophy study, etc.)

A. **Recitation section 2:** Enrollment: 20 / Response rate: 100%

*Overall quality of the TA. (Scale: **0** to **4:** Poor, Fair, Good, Very good, Excellent)*	**3.45**
The TA communicated effectively.	**3.57**
The TA was appropriately accessible outside of class time.	**3.57**
The TA helped me to learn in this course.	**3.64**

B. Comment suggestions:

Was an incredibly helpful resource for the class! I love Tiina :)
Tiina was very helpful throughout this semester and worked hard to make sure that the students were able to succeed.
Tiina was super nice and helpful!
The recitation was more helpful than lecture. Overall I think I learned more from Tiina than from the professor. She is fantastic and very accessible, reasonable and dedicated.
Tiina was a great TA who went the extra mile for her students. She was extremely accessible outside of class and always kept recitations engaging.

* No comparative data, because the instructor of record only taught the course once.

4. Sample Syllabi

All syllabi assume a 16-week semester and use a format of two 90-minute classes per week, but can be easily modified to accommodate different semesters and formats. I've been inspired and influenced by syllabi created by other philosophers (primarily Gary Hatfield, Lisa (Miracchi) Titus, Daniel Singer, Karen Detlefsen, Louise Daoust, and Zoe Drayson), but in each case the final product is my own.

I've included syllabi for a broad range of courses:

- **"Philosophy & Visual Perception"** is an interdisciplinary seminar course which centers on philosophical questions but also draws from neuroscience, psychology, and visual ecology [**this is the syllabus for a course I taught in 2021; the course was cross-listed with Visual Studies**].

- **"Philosophy Across the Globe: An Introduction"** is a thematic introduction to philosophy from a cross-cultural perspective. It is the introductory course I would have like to have taken as an undergraduate.

- **"Philosophy of Mind"** is a straightforward lecture-based introduction to a subfield of philosophy with a reading list intentionally designed to include a healthy number of texts by female philosophers of mind.

- **"Philosophy of Pain and Suffering"** spans metaphysical, epistemological, and ethical questions and in its current form is designed as a majors seminar with a focus on unpacking, discussing, and evaluating philosophical views and arguments, both orally and in writing.

- **"Philosophy of Perception: Color"** is an advanced, in-depth foray into philosophy of perception. As presented here, it is meant as a higher-level undergraduate course.

In each syllabus, course content is organized into distinct modules to help students grasp the big picture and to see the connections between readings.

In introductory and intermediate courses, I like to include skill-building workshops to help the students develop the skills they need. I also use different kinds of active learning strategies to provide students with opportunities to hone these skills further (see **5.5** for examples).

4.1 Philosophy & Visual Perception

[This is the syllabus for a course I taught at University of Pennsylvania in Fall 2021]

Instructor: Tiina Rosenqvist
Email: trosenq@sas.upenn.edu
Meeting time: TR 12-1:30pm
Meeting room: PWH 108
Office: COHN 403 (or Zoom)
Office hours: T 4-5 PM; R 10:30-11:30 AM & by appointment

The syllabus is subject to change based on the needs of the class. Make sure to always check the up-to-date syllabus on our course Canvas site.

1. Course Description

This course is about seeing. What does it mean to see something? What do we see, how do we see it, and why do we see it?

Visual perception is an area of contemporary research in philosophy of psychology that interacts with empirical sciences and other areas of philosophy. This course is interdisciplinary. We will draw on research in visual ecology, psychology, and neuroscience, and try to bring these different streams into dialogue with one another. We will ask how empirical results bear on the plausibility of the philosophical theories we consider and how they might guide our theory-building. The course is intended to be accessible to students with a previous course in either philosophy, psychology, visual studies, or cognitive science.

The main content of the course is divided into three sections (modules II-IV). We will start by thinking about the nature and structure of perceptual experience itself. What do we see and how do we see it? Do our perceptual states *represent* physical objects and their properties, do we see sense-data, or are we somehow directly "acquainted" with the objects and properties in our environment? Second, we will consider the perception of one particular perceptible quality: color. What, if anything, is colored? Is color a purely physical property or is it subject-dependent in some way? What is the fundamental goal of the color visual system? Third, we will ask how seeing relates to cognition and how it related to other perceptual modalities. Do our beliefs and desires influence what we see? Do other perceptual modalities affect what we see (or vice versa)? What kind of properties are presented to us in visual experience: is it just simple properties like shape, color and motion, or can we literally *see* emotions, kinds, and types of animacy?

2. Course Objectives

Through active participation in this course, you will develop an empirically-informed understanding of key contemporary issues and debates in philosophy of perception, improve you overall critical thinking skills, and practice constructing and evaluating philosophical arguments.

13

3. Course Structure

In-person sessions:

The standard format for the in-person sessions is lecture and discussion. There will also be occasional group work. You are expected to do the assigned readings before class, and participate actively in discussions and other in-class activities.

If the public health and safety measures due to COVID-19 require us to switch to partial or all on-line instruction, the class will meet synchronously on Zoom. In some rare circumstances, asynchronous lectures might be used.

Out-of-class activities:

You are required to take short reading quizzes on Canvas before the in-person sessions. The quizzes are open-book, and *only the ten best quiz scores count towards your grade*.

You are also encouraged (though *not* required) to use the Canvas discussion board and Perusall to share your thoughts on course content, to ask questions, to share links to relevant articles, etc. Both your in-class participation and discussion board/Perusall contributions can count towards your participation grade.

You are required to write two short papers and two drafts of a longer paper, and to conduct two peer reviews. In addition, you will complete a project in which you apply some aspect of what you have learned in this course. You are required to record a video presentation (8-10 min) of the project, which will be made available to the entire class. You are likewise required to watch all the project videos made by your classmates and leave a short constructive comment on each.

4. Assignments & Assessment

- Attendance & Participation —15%
- Reading Quizzes on Canvas —15%
- Short Paper 1 (800-1000 words) —10%
- Short Paper 2 (800-1000 words) —10%
- Perception Project — 10%
- Final Paper Draft 1 (800-1200 words) — 10%
- Final Paper Peer Reviews — 5%
- Final Paper Draft 2 (1800-2200 words) — 25%

5. Course Policies

Readings

All course readings will be posted (or linked) on Canvas. You are not required to buy any books.

Attendance

Attendance is mandatory (please be on time!), but you are allowed to miss two classes without prior notice, unless you are scheduled to conduct peer reviews on that day. If you are going to miss more than two classes (or if you are going to miss the peer review day), prior notice is required (please use the Course Absence Report (CAR) system to notify me of

your absence from class). Depending on the circumstances, your participation grade might be negatively affected, or you might be asked to complete a make-up assignment.

Masking

Per the University's August 25 Message to the Penn Community on the Start of the Fall Semester, *masks covering the nose and mouth must be worn at all times in all public indoor spaces, including classrooms, by all persons.* Students who refuse to wear masks in the classroom will be referred to the Office of Student Conduct for disciplinary action.

Discussion Guidelines

Since this is a philosophy seminar course, there will a lot of discussion of ideas and arguments. To make sure that these discussions remain respectful, inclusive, and constructive, here are some guidelines that we should all follow:

- Be nice. You can be critical of ideas, but remember to argue your points respectfully. Don't make fun of other discussion participants, don't use offensive examples, don't interrupt.
- Don't dominate the discussion. Raise your hand to speak. Acknowledge your fellow students' insights. Listen attentively. Think about what *you* can do to encourage others to participate.
- Ask clarificatory questions, if something doesn't make sense.
- If you feel that these guidelines haven't been appropriately followed, please let me know.

  (These guidelines are based on this more extensive list that David Chalmers has put together: *http://consc.net/guidelines/*.)

Submission of Assignments

You are expected to submit all assignments on time. That said, for the paper assignments you have a *total* of eight "late days" that carry no lateness penalties. If you submit a paper two hours late, you're thereby using one late day. If you submit a paper 25 hours late, you're using two late days, etc. After the eight days are used up, penalties apply (5% per day), except in special cases. No submissions are accepted if more than seven days late, barring extenuating circumstances.

It is *your* responsibility to make sure that your assignments are properly submitted and readable. Corrupted files and other unreadable documents are treated as non-submissions. Formatting guidelines for the paper assignments will be provided.

Please take into account that writing good philosophy papers takes time and effort. You should start as soon as possible and write multiple drafts before you submit the paper. If you are struggling with an assignment, *please get in touch as soon as possible*. Philosophy is hard, but I'm happy to help.

Office Hours

You are invited and encouraged to attend weekly communal office hours. One-on-one meetings with me can also be scheduled, if there is something that you would like to discuss privately, or if you can't make my normal office hours due to a conflict.

Email

I normally respond to emails within 24 hours, though I might take longer during weekends and holidays. If you have not received a response within this time frame, feel free to prompt me with another email. Discussing substantial philosophical questions, paper ideas, or grades over email is not feasible (please come to office hours for that), but if you have questions about logistics or would like to schedule a one-on-one meeting, email away!

Laptops, Tablets, and Phones

Use of laptops and tablets in class is permitted *only for accessing assigned readings*. No phones are permitted. Empirical research suggest that the use of electronics in class reduces long-term retention and negatively impacts class performance (https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01443410.2018.1489046?journalCode=cedp20), as well as distracts everybody around (https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2014-52302-001).

If you have a good reason for why you need to use electronics in class, please get in touch as soon as possible, and we can work something out.

Academic Dishonesty

Do not cheat. Do not plagiarize. Familiarize yourself with the University's Code of Academic Integrity (https://catalog.upenn.edu/pennbook/code-of-academic-integrity/), and if in doubt, ask. Note that violations of the code will be reported to the relevant disciplinary authorities.

Accommodations

Students who require special accommodations are encouraged to contact Student Disabilities Services (https://wlrc.vpul.upenn.edu/sds/). If you have any access needs that you think I should know about, please get in touch as soon as possible.

Religious and Secular Holidays

Accommodations can be made for students observing religious and secular holidays. You should inform me within the first two weeks of the course of your intent to observe such holidays so that appropriate arrangements can be made. You can review the University Policy on Secular and Religious Holidays here: https://catalog.upenn.edu/pennbook/secular-religious-holidays/

6. Resources

University Resources

- Counseling & Psychological Services (CAPS): https://caps.wellness.upenn.edu
- Wellness at Penn: https://wellness.upenn.edu
- Weingarten Learning Resources: https://wlrc.vpul.upenn.edu/lr/
- Tutoring Center: https://wlrc.vpul.upenn.edu/tutoring/
- Writing Center: http://writing.upenn.edu/critical/wc/

Philosophy Resources

- Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy: https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/plato/
- Critical Thinking Web: https://philosophy.hku.hk/think/critical/ct.php

- PhilPapers (a comprehensive index and bibliography of philosophy): https://philpapers.org
- Existential Comics: http://existentialcomics.com

Films That Might Make You Think More About Visual Perception

- *Stalker* (1979)
- *Hero* (2002)
- *Tree of Life* (2011)
- *Samsara* (2011)
- *I Am Belfast* (2015)

7. Class & Readings Schedule

Note on terminology:

- "**Required**" readings are the ones you are expected to read and engage with *before* the relevant in-class session, and the *only* ones you will be quizzed on. Normally you're required to read one paper or book chapter or a collection of shorter excerpts per session.
- "**Recommended**" readings/podcasts/videos will give you a fuller understanding of the topic under discussion. They will likely be useful to you when writing papers. Some ideas in the recommended readings might also be discussed during in-class sessions.
- "**Optional**" readings/podcasts/videos are extra materials for when you are particularly interested in a topic.

○ **Module I**: Getting Started

In the first module, we'll cover some basics. We'll talk about what philosophy is and how it differs (if it does) from the sciences. Since philosophical writing is usually *argumentative* writing, we'll spend some time thinking about arguments. What are they? How can we spot them? What makes them good? Next we'll zoom in on philosophy of perception, and think about how it relates to other areas of philosophy, and what kinds of questions philosophers of perception usually ask. Finally, we'll think about how vision works, from the point of view of neuroscience and psychology. What happens when the light reflected from object surfaces hits the eye? Where does the information travel in the brain and how is it processed?

8/31   **(**1) Syllabus and Logistics. What is philosophy? *PHILSKILLS: What is an argument*
- *Recommended*: Pryor, "Guidelines on Reading Philosophy"
- *Recommended*: Purugganan & Hewitt, "How to Read a Scientific Article"

9/2   **(**2) Contemporary Philosophy of Perception; Science of Vision, *PHILSKILLS: How to Read Philosophy*
- <u>*Required*</u>: Wolfe et al. (2015), *Sensation & Perception*, Ch. 2: The First Steps in Vision
- *Recommended*: Nanay (2010), "Philosophy of Perception: The New Wave" in *Perceiving the World*
- *Optional*: Gregory, *Eye and Brain*, Ch. 3: Eye

9/7   (3) Science of Vision (Group Work in Class)
- <u>*Required*</u>: Wolfe et al. (2015), *Sensation & Perception*, Ch. 3: Spatial Vision: From Spots to Stripes (pp. 53-55, 64-85)
- *Recommended:* Watch *Vision: Crash Course* on YouTube
- *Optional*: Gregory, *Eye and Brain,* Ch. 4: Brain

○ **Module II:** The Nature and Structure of Perceptual Experience

We normally think that we can *just see*—that we are in direct, unmediated contact with ordinary objects and their mind-independent properties. The arguments from illusion and hallucination challenge this ordinary understanding of perception. When we hallucinate, we aren't aware of any ordinary object at all and when we have an illusory experience, we see an ordinary object, but not as it *really* is. So how exactly does visual perception work? Do we see sense-data instead of external objects, do our perceptual states represent (and sometimes misrepresent) external objects and their properties, or is perception constituted in terms of a relation of ordinary objects to perceivers and perhaps perceptual circumstances?

9/9   (4) The Problem of Perception (Quiz 1)
  • *Required*: Fish (2010), *Philosophy of Perception,* Ch. 1: Introduction: Three key principles
  • *Optional*: Crane & French (2021), "The Problem of Perception" *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*

9/14   (5) Russell's Representative Realism and Sense-Data (Quiz 2)
  • *Required*: Russell (1912), *Problems of Philosophy*, Chs. 1-2 (pp. 1-10)
  • *Required*: Dignāga, *Investigation of the Percept* (Ālambana-parīkṣā)
  • *Recommended*: Hume (1758/1999), *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding*, Sect. XII, Part 1: 118
  • *Optional*: Fish (2010), *Philosophy of Perception,* Ch. 2: Sense datum views (Access through Franklin)

9/16   (6) Tye's Representationalism & Transparency, *PHILSKILLS: How to Talk Philosophy*
  • *Required*: Tye (2002), "Representationalism and the Transparency of Experience," *Noûs*
  • *Optional*: Fish (2010), *Philosophy of Perception,* Ch. 5: Intentional theories (Access through Franklin)

9/21   (7) Brewer's Object View (Naïve Realism) (Quiz 3) *(Paper 1 Topics Distributed)*
  • *Required*: Brewer (2006), "Perception and Its Objects," *Philosophical Studies*
  • *Optional:* Byrne's (2021) Review of Brewer's (2011) Book
  • *Optional*: Fish (2010), *Philosophy of Perception,* Ch. 6: Disjunctive theories (Access through Franklin)

9/23   (8) Review & Discussion, *PHILSKILLS: How to write a philosophy paper*
  • *Required*: Pryor," Guidelines on Writing a Philosophy Paper"

○ **Module III:** Science & Philosophy of Color

Color is an extremely salient feature of visual scenes for many animals, but what kind of property is it— is it an intrinsic property of external objects, an illusion created by our brain, or some sort of a relation between objects and perceivers? If colors are *real*, then when are our color perceptions successful—is it when they match some property present in the object or are the success standards more directly utility-based? Finally, what is the best way to approach these metaphysical and epistemological questions about color—should we start with the so-called common-sense conception of color or should we start with what the relevant empirical sciences have to say?

9/28   (9) Why is color so difficult? (Quiz 4)
  • *Required*: Chirimuuta (2015), *Outside Color,* Ch. 1: Color and Its Questions (pp. 1-14)

9/30   (10) The Science of Color Vision (Group Work in class)

- *Required*: Wolfe et al. (2015), *Sensation & Perception,* Ch. 5: The Perception of Color *(excerpts)*
- *Recommended*: Watch *How We See Color* on YouTube

Paper 1 Due 9/30 11:59 PM

10/5   (11) Introduction to Color Metaphysics (Quiz 5), *Class Visit to the Penn Materials Library*
- *Required*: Logue (2016), "Metaphysics of Color 1: Physicalist Theories of Color," *Philosophy Compass* (pp. 211-213)
- *Required:* Logue (2016) "Metaphysics of Color 2: Non-Physicalist Theories of Color," *Philosophy Compass* (pp. 220-221, 224-227)

10/7   (12) Reductive Physicalism (Quiz 6)
- *Required*: Byrne & Hilbert (2003), "Color realism and color science," *BBS* (sections 3-4, pp. 7-18)
- *Recommended*: Logue (2016), "Metaphysics of Color 1: Physicalist Theories of Color" (pp. 213-216)

10/12   (13) Traditional Dispositionalism (Quiz 7)
- *Required:* Levin (2000), "Dispositional theories of Color and the Claims of Common Sense," *Philosophical Studies*
- *Recommended*: Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding,* Book II, Chapter 8: 9-15, 22-26
- *Recommended*: Byrne & Hilbert (2003), Section 2.2
- *Recommended*: Logue (2016) "Metaphysics of Color 2: Non-Physicalist Theories of Color" (pp. 220-224)

(October 14-17 Fall Term Break)

10/19   (14) Visual Ecology (Group Work in class)
- *Required:* Gerl and Morris (2008), "The Causes and Consequences of Color Vision," *Evolution: Education and Outreach*
- *Recommended:* Watch *How Animals and People See the World Differently | National Geographic* on YouTube
- *Optional*: Watch *Life in Colour with David Attenborough* on NETFLIX (Ep. 1 & 2)

10/21   (15) The Function of Color Vision: Detection vs. Discrimination (Quiz 8)
- *Required*: Hatfield (1992), "Color Perception and Neural Encoding: Does Metameric Matching Entail a Loss of Information?" *PSA: Proceedings of the Biennial Meeting of the Philosophy of Science Association,* read until Section 4
- *Recommended:* The rest of Hatfield (1992)

10/26   (16) The Function of Color Vision: Perceptual Enhancement (Quiz 9) (*Paper 2 Topics Distributed*)
- *Required*: Akins & Hahn (2014), "Color Perception" in *The Oxford Handbook of Philosophy of Perception,* Sections **5-7** (pp. 431-440)
- *Recommended*: Akins & Hahn (2014), Sections **1**-4
- *Optional*: Listen to *New Books in Philosophy/ Chirimuuta: Outside Color* (podcast)

10/28   (17) Ecological Relationalism (Quiz 10)
- *Required*: Thompson (1995), "Colour Vision, Evolution, and Perceptual Content," *Synthese* (pp. 1-11, 22-27)
- *Recommended*: Thompson (1995). *Colour Vision: A study in Cognitive Science and the Philosophy of Perception* (excerpt, 3 pages)
- *Recommended*: Byrne & Hilbert (2003), section **2.5**

○ **Module IV:** Perception & Cognition

In this section, we'll think about how visual perception relates to other perceptual modalities, and how it relates to cognition. Do our beliefs, desires, and other cognitive states affect what we see or is visual perception cognitively impenetrable? Do other sensory modalities affect what we see or is visual perception informationally encapsulated? Do visual experiences sometimes represent complex properties like kind memberships or animacy?

11/2   (18) Fodor's Modularity (Quiz 11)
- *Required*: Fodor (1985): "Précis of the Modularity of Mind," *BBS*
- *Optional*: Pylyshyn (1999), "Is vision continuous with cognition: The case for cognitive impenetrability of visual perception," *BBS*

11/4   (19) Modularity, Integration, Cognitive Penetration (Quiz 12), *Class Visit to the Institute of Contemporary Art (ICA)*
- *Required*: Burnston & Cohen (2015), "Perceptual Integration, Modularity, and Cognitive Penetration" in *The Cognitive Penetrability of Perception: New Philosophical Perspectives*

Paper 2 Due 11/4 11:59 PM

11/9   (20) Experimental Evidence for Cognitive Penetration (Group Work in class)
- *Required*: Banerjee, Chatterjee & Sinha (2012), "Is it light or dark? Recalling moral behavior changes perception of brightness," *Psychological Science*
- *Required*: Levin & Banaji (2006), "Distortions in the perceived lightness of faces: The role of race categories," *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*
- *Required:* Hansen et al. (2006) "Memory modulates color appearance," Nature Neuroscience

11/11   (21) Evaluating the Evidence (Quiz 13) *(Final Paper Topics Distributed)*

- *Required*: Firestone & Scholl (2016), "Cognition does not affect perception: Evaluating the evidence for "top-down" effects," *BBS* (pp. 1-19)
- *Recommended*: Re-visit papers from last time

11/16   (22) Contents of Visual Experience, Siegel on K-Properties (Quiz 14)

- *Required:* Siegel (2011), "Kinds" in *The Contents of Visual Experience*
- *Recommended*: Tye (1995), Ten Problems of Consciousness, pp. 100-105 (section 4.2)

Projects Due 11/16 11:59 PM

11/18   (23) Thin vs. Rich Contents: The Debate (Quiz 15)

- *Required*: Siegel & Byrne (2017), "Rich or Thin?" in *Current Controversies in Philosophy of Perception*

11/23   (24) Experimental Evidence for Rich Content

- *Required:* Gao et al. (2009), "The psychophysics of chasing: A case study in the perception of animacy," *Cognitive Psychology*
- *Recommended:* Yale Perception & Cognition Lab Demos: http://perception.yale.edu
- *Optional:* Scholl & Gao (2013), "Perceiving animacy and intentionality: Visual processing or higher-level judgment?" in *Social Perception: Detection and Interpretation of Animacy, Agency, and Intention*

(Nov 25-28 Thanksgiving)

○ **Module V:** Wrapping Up

This last section of the course is dedicated to drawing connections between the different topics we've covered, to consolidating our knowledge, and to honing our philosophy skills. We'll start with a writing workshop and experiment with strategies for improving the exposition, argumentation, and philosophical engagement in paper assignments. We'll also view all the project videos and discuss them on Canvas. Then our guest speaker, Sam Clarke, will zoom in on some of the intricacies involved in the discussions of modularity and cognitive penetration. After this we'll have a peer review session: you'll provide feedback on two of your peers' final paper drafts and they'll do the same for you. We'll end with one last discussion of what we have learned and what new questions have arisen.

11/30   (26) Final Paper Writing Workshop

- *Required:* Watch all the project presentations on Canvas, leave a short (constructive!) comment or question on each.

Final Paper Draft 1 Due **11/30 11:59 PM**

12/2   (25) Guest Speaker: Sam Clarke

- *Recommended*: Clarke (2020), "Cognitive penetration and informational encapsulation: Have we been failing the module?" *Philosophical Studies*

Final Paper Peer Reviews Due 12/3 11:59 PM

12/7   (27) Final Paper Peer Reviews in Class

- *Recommended:* Read the reviews of your paper draft

12/9   (28) Final Review & Discussion

Final Paper Draft 2 Due 12/15 11:59 PM

ASSIGNMENT Due Dates

- *Before Each Class* (11:45 AM) *Quizzes*
- *Sept 30 Short Paper 1*
- *Nov 4 Short Paper 2*
- *Nov 16 Project*
- *Nov 30 Final Paper Draft 1*
- *Dec 3 Final Paper Peer Reviews*
- *Dec 15 Final Paper Draft 2*

4.2 Philosophy Across the Globe: An Introduction

1. Course Description

This course is an introduction to philosophy through a cross-cultural lens. We will engage with Chinese, Indian, Islamic, African, and Native American texts and ideas, in addition to discussing canonical and contemporary texts from the Western tradition. When appropriate, we will bring these different philosophical traditions into dialogue with one another.

The content of the course is divided into six modules. The first module deals with *metaphilosophy*: we will ask what philosophy is, how it differs from science and religion, and why a growing number of philosophers are demanding that academic philosophy diversify. In the second module we will trace the *historical* developments that led to the exclusion of non-Western thinkers from the canon of philosophy. In the third module we will focus on one particular *metaphysical* topic: personal identity. We will draw on European, Native American, and Buddhist perspectives here. In the fourth module we will cover two *epistemological* problems: the problem of skepticism, and the problem of knowledge. We will first discuss the skeptical scenarios of al-Ghazālī and Descartes, and then consider how the traditional analyses of knowledge have been challenged by clever thought experiments in the Western and Indian traditions. In the fifth module we will compare and contrast ethical theories from around the world. The sixth module is dedicated to review.

"Whenever people think about deep, fundamental questions concerning the nature of the universe and ourselves, the limits of human knowledge, their values and the meaning of life, they are thinking about philosophy. Philosophical thinking is found in all parts of the world, present, and past."

— Thomas Metcalf, 2020

2. Course Objectives

Through active participation in this course, you will develop an understanding of a number of important issues and debates in philosophy, improve your overall critical thinking skills, and learn to construct and evaluate philosophical arguments. You will practice close reading and interpretation of primary texts, construct comparative analyses of philosophical views, engage in collaborative learning projects, and hone your philosophy writing skills.

3. Course Structure

In-person sessions:

The standard format for the in-person sessions is lecture and discussion. There will also be occasional group work. You are expected to do the assigned readings before class and participate actively in discussions and other in-class activities.

Out-of-class activities:

You are required to make one discussion board contribution for each required reading. To get full credit, you need to submit your contributions *before* the relevant in-person session and demonstrate meaningful engagement with the text in question. Each discussion contribution should be at least three sentences long. You can ask developed questions, agree/disagree with reasons, draw connections to other course readings, etc. Late contributions are accepted for up to seven days, for 1/2 credit.

You are also required to write three short papers, take one short quiz and one longer cumulative exam, and give a group presentation.

4. Assignments & Evaluation

- Attendance & Participation — 10%
- Discussion Board Contributions — 10%
- Module I Reflection Paper (300-500 words) — 5%
- Module II Quiz— 10%
- Module III Argumentative Paper (800-1000 words) — 15%
- Module IV Argumentative Paper (800-1000 words) — 15%
- Module V Group Presentation — 10%
- Exam — 25%

5. PHILSKILLS Workshops

Throughout the semester, we will workshop skills that you need in order to succeed in this course. The workshops are marked with the label "PHILSKILLS" on the class schedule. We will practice reconstructing and evaluating arguments, reading philosophy, writing philosophy papers, and having discussions and debates about philosophical topics. So don't worry if this your first philosophy course; I'm not expecting you to already know how to do these things. And if you've taken philosophy courses before, there's always room for improvement!

6. Course Policies

[omitted, see the syllabus for **Philosophy & Visual Perception**]

7. Resources

[omitted, see the syllabus for **Philosophy & Visual Perception**]

8. Class & Readings Schedule

Note on terminology:

- "*Required*" readings are the ones you are expected to read *before* the relevant in-class session. I have kept the required readings short, and I ask that you really engage with those texts. Read them carefully, preferably multiple times. Take notes and write down any questions that come to mind.
- "*Recommended*" readings/podcasts/videos will give you a fuller understanding of the topic under discussion. They will likely be useful to you when writing papers.
- "*Optional*" readings/podcasts/videos are extra materials for when you are particularly interested in a topic, or when you are struggling with a difficult reading.

■ Module I. Getting Started: Metaphilosophy

(1) Metaphilosophy: What is Philosophy? **PHILSKILLS**: What is an Argument
  - *Required*: Metcalf (2020), "What is Philosophy?" *1000-word Philosophy*

(2) Metaphilosophy: Eurocentrism
- *__Required__*: Coleman: "Philosophy is dead white—and dead wrong," *World.edu*
- *__Required__*: Garfield & Van Norden: "If Philosophy Won't Diversify, Let's Call it What it Really Is," *New York Times*

(3) Metaphilosophy: Diversifying Philosophy
- *__Required__*: Struhl (2010): "No (more) philosophy without cross-cultural philosophy," *Philosophy Compass*
- *__Optional__*: Mitchell (2018), "The Dimensions of Diversity, Teaching Non-Western Works in Introductory Philosophy Courses," *Dialogue.*
- *__Optional__*: Edelglass & Garfield (2011), "Introduction" in *The Oxford Handbook of World Philosophy*.

Module I Reflection Paper—5%

■ **Module II. The Canon: How Did We Get Here?**

(4) Canon Formation #1
- *__Required__*: Park (2013), A*frica, Asia, and the History of Philosophy: Racism in the Formation of the Modern Canon, 1780-1830*. Ch. 1 (excerpts)

(5) Canon Formation #2
- *__Required__*: Park (2013), *Africa, Asia, and the History of Philosophy: Racism in the Formation of the Modern Canon, 1780-1830*. Ch. 4 (excerpts)

(6) Gatekeeping #1; **PHILSKILLS**: How to Read Philosophy
- *__Required__*: Cordova (2001), "What is Philosophy?" *APA Newsletter on American Indians in Philosophy,* pp. 14-16
- *__Recommended__*: Pryor, "Guidelines on Reading Philosophy"

(7) Gatekeeping #2
- *__Required__*: Dotson (2012), "How is This Paper Philosophy?" *Comparative Philosophy* (excerpts)

(8) *Module II Quiz—10%*, **PHILSKILLS**: How to reconstruct an argument

■ **Module III. Metaphysics: Personal Identity**

(9) What is Metaphysics?; The Problem of Personal Identity
- *__Required__*: Sider (2005), "Personal Identity" in *Riddles of Existence: A Guided Tour of Metaphysic.*
- *__Recommended__*: Vance (2014), "Personal Identity: How We Exist Over Time," *1000-word Philosophy.*

(10) Locke vs. Reid
- *__Required__*: Locke (1690), "The Prince and the Cobbler" in *Reason and Responsibility: Readings in Some Basic Problems of Philosophy*.
- *__Required__*: Reid (1785), "Of Mr. Locke's Account of Our Personal Identity" in *Reason and Responsibility: Readings in Some Basic Problems of Philosophy*.

(11) American Indian View of Personal Identity
- *__Required__*: Norton-Smith (2010), *The Dance of Person and Place: One Interpretation of American Indian Philosophy*, Ch. 5: An Expansive Conception of Persons (excerpts)

(12) Buddhism: No-Self and the Skandha Theory, *Module III Paper Topics Distributed*
- *__Required__*: *Milindapanha* (Milinda's Questions) in *Buddhist Philosophy: Essential Readings*.

- *Recommended*: Parfit (1987), "Divided Minds and the Nature of Persons" in *Reason and Responsibility: Readings in Some Basic Problems of Philosophy*.

(13) Review; **PHILSKILLS:** How to Write a Philosophy Paper
- *Required*: Pryor, "Guidelines on Writing a Philosophy Paper"

Module III Argumentative Paper—15%

■ **Module IV. Epistemology: Knowledge & Skepticism**

(14) Introduction to Epistemology; What Can We Know?
- *Required*: Pojman, *What Can We Know: An Introduction to the Theory of Knowledge (excerpts)*
- *Recommended*: Metcalf (2020), "Epistemology, or Theory of Knowledge," *1000-word Philosophy.*

(15) Skeptical Challenges: Dreams and Demons
- *Required*: Al-*Ghazālī's Path to Sufism: His Deliverance from Error* (excerpt)
- *Recommended*: Descartes (1641), *Meditations on First Philosophy*, First Meditation: What Can Be Called Into Doubt?
- *Optional*: Moad (2009), "Comparing Phases of Skepticism in al-Ghazali and Descartes: Some First Meditations on Deliverance from Error," *Philosophy East & West*

(16) Responses to Skepticism, **PHILSKILLS**: How to Talk Philosophy
- *Required*: Feldman (2003), *Epistemology* (excerpt)
- *Optional*: Vogel (1990), "Cartesian Skepticism and Inference to the Best Explanation," *The Journal of Philosophy*
- *Optional*: Nagel (2019) "Classical Indian Skepticism: Reforming or Rejecting Philosophy," *Comparative Philosophy.*

(17) The Traditional Account of Knowledge: Justified True Belief
- *Required*: Feldman (2003), *Epistemology,* Ch. 2: The Traditional Analysis of Knowledge
- *Optional*: Potter (1984), "Does Indian epistemology concern justified true belief?" *Journal of Indian Philosophy.*

(18) Dharmottara & Gettier, *Module IV Paper Topics Distributed*
- *Required*: Dreufys (1997), *Recognizing Reality: Dharmakirti's Philosophy and Its Tibetan Interpretations,* pp. 292-293 (on Dharmottara)
- *Required*: Gettier (1963), "Is Justified True Belief Knowledge?" *Analysis*.

(19) Responses to Gettier
- *Required*: Feldman (2003), *Epistemology,* Ch. 3: Modifying the *Traditional Account of Knowledge*
- *Optional*: *Wi-Phi*: Epistemology Ch. 6 Analyzing Knowledge 2: No-False-Lemma and No-Defeater Approaches (Jennifer Nagel)

Module IV Argumentative Paper—16%

■ **Module V. Normative Ethics**

(20) Introduction to Ethics; Deontology & Virtue Ethics
- *Required*: Kant, "The Good Will and the Categorical Imperative" in *Reason and Responsibility: Readings in Some Basic Problems of Philosophy* (excerpt)
- *Required*: Aristotle, "Virtue and the Good Life" in *Reason and Responsibility: Readings in Some Basic Problems of Philosophy* (excerpt)
- *Optional*: Chapman (2014), "Deontology: Kantian Ethics." *1000-word Philosophy.*

(21) Utilitarianism

- *Required*: Mill (1879), "Utilitarianism" in *Reason and Responsibility: Readings in Some Basic Problems of Philosophy* (excerpt)
- *Optional*: Gronholz (2014), "Consequentialism and Utilitarianism," *1000-word Philosophy.*

(22) Indian Mahayana Buddhist Ethics: The Way of the Bodhisattva
- *Required*: Śāntideva, *The Way of Bodhisattva (*excerpts)
- *Recommended*: Garfield, Jenkins & Priest (2016), "The Śāntideva Passage: Bodhicaryavatara VIII. 90-103" in *Moonpaths* (excerpts)

(23) African Social Ethics: Reciprocity and Interdependence
- *Required*: Gyekye (2010), "African ethics."*Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Sections 4-8
- *Optional*: Hallen (2011), "African Philosophy" in *Oxford Handbook of World Philosophy*
- *Optional*: Metz (2019), "The African Ethic of Ubuntu," *1000-word Philosophy*.

(24) Confucian Role Ethics
- *Required*: Ramsey (2016), "Confucian Role Ethics: A Critical Survey," *Philosophy Compass*

(25) Module Review; Preparation for Group Presentations, *Group Presentation Topics Distributed*

(26) *Module V Group Presentation*s (10%) in class

■ **Module VI. Wrapping Up**

(27) Final Exam Review Session

(28) *Final Exam (25%) in Class*

4.3 Philosophy of Mind

1. Course Description

This course is an introduction to the mysteries of the mind and mentality from the point of view of philosophy. Over the last few decades, philosophy of mind has become a rich and prominent subfield of philosophy with extensive connections to psychology, cognitive science, and neuroscience.

The content of the course is divided into five modules. The first module serves as an introduction to the key debates in philosophy of mind. Consciousness and intentionality are traditionally taken to be the "marks of the mental," but what exactly is intentionality, and why is it so difficult to give a satisfactory account of consciousness? Is there such a thing as a "self," and if there is, then where is it to be found? The second module focuses on the relationship between the mental and the physical: are the mental and the physical distinct, is the mental reducible to the physical, or is the relationship between the two more complicated somehow? Since most contemporary philosophy of mind strives to be scientific and naturalistic, the third and fourth modules deal with the problems of naturalizing intentionality and consciousness, respectively. The fifth module is dedicated to review.

"If intentionality is real, it must really be something else."

—Jerry Fodor: *Psychosemantics*

"The consciousness debates have provoked more mudslinging and fury than most in modern philosophy, perhaps because of how baffling the problem is: opposing combatants tend not merely to disagree, but to find each other's positions manifestly preposterous."

—Oliver Burkeman, *Guardian*

2. Course Objectives

Through active participation in this course, you will develop an understanding of key issues and debates in contemporary philosophy of mind, improve you overall critical thinking skills, and practice constructing and evaluating philosophical arguments.

3. Course Structure

In-person sessions:

The standard format for the in-person sessions is lecture and discussion. You are expected to do the assigned readings before class, and participate actively in discussions and other in-class activities.

Out-of-class activities:

You are required to take short reading quizzes on Canvas before the in-person sessions. The quizzes are open-book, and *only the 10 best quiz scores count towards your grade*.

You are also encouraged (though *not* required) to use the Canvas discussion board to share your thoughts on course content, to ask questions, to share links to relevant articles, etc. Both your in-class participation and discussion board participation can count towards your participation grade.

You are required to write two short papers and two drafts of a longer paper, and to conduct two peer reviews.

4. Assignments & Assessment

- Attendance & Participation —15%
- Reading Quizzes on Canvas —15%
- Short Paper 1 (800-1000 words) —15%
- Short Paper 2 (800-1000 words) —15%
- Final Paper Draft 1 (800-1200 words) — 5%
- Final Paper Peer Reviews — 5%
- Final Paper Draft 2 (1600-2000 words) — 30%

5. PHILSKILLS Workshops

Throughout the semester, we will workshop skills that you need in order to succeed in this course. The workshops are marked with the label "PHILSKILLS" on the class schedule. We will practice reconstructing and evaluating arguments, reading philosophy, writing philosophy papers, and having discussions and debates about philosophical topics. So don't worry if this your first philosophy course; I'm not expecting you to already know how to do these things. And if you've taken philosophy courses before, there's always room for improvement!

6. Course Policies

[omitted, please see the syllabus for **Philosophy & Visual Perception**]

7. Resources

[omitted, please see the syllabus for **Philosophy & Visual Perception**]

8. Class & Readings Schedule

Note on terminology:

- "*Required*" readings are the ones you are expected to read and engage with *before* the relevant in-class session, and the *only* ones you will be quizzed on. Normally you're required to read one paper or book chapter or a collection of shorter excerpts per session.
- "*Recommended*" readings/podcasts/videos will give you a fuller understanding of the topic under discussion. They will likely be useful to you when writing papers. Some ideas in the recommended readings might also be discussed during in-class sessions.
- "*Optional*" readings/podcasts/videos are extra materials for when you are particularly interested in a topic.

■ **Module 1. Getting Started**

(1) Syllabus and logistic. What is philosophy?
- *Optional*: Metcalf (2020), "What is Philosophy?" *1000-word Philosophy*
- *Optional:* Radcliffe & Shaw (2015), "'Philosophy is for posh, white boys with trust funds' – why are there so few women?" *Guardian*

(2) Introduction to philosophy of mind, **PHILSKILLS**: What is an argument
- *Required:* Kim (2006), *Philosophy of Mind,* Ch.1: Introduction (excerpt)

(3) The marks of the mental (Quiz 1), **PHILSKILLS**: How to Read Philosophy
- *Required*: Brentano (1874), *Psychology from an Empirical Standpoint* (excerpt)
- *Required*: "Franz Brentano," *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Section 3
- *Recommended*: Pryor, "Guidelines on Reading Philosophy"

(4) Consciousness (Quiz 2)
- *Required*: Blackmore (2010), *Consciousness — An Introduction*, Ch. 1: What's the Problem?
- *Optional*: Kim (2006), *Philosophy of Mind*, Ch. 8: Consciousness

(5) Intentionality (Quiz 3), *Short Paper 1 Topics Distributed*
- *Required*: Sainsbury (2018), *Thinking about Things*, Ch. 1: Intentionality and Intensionality
- *Optional*: Crane (2014), "Intentionality as the Mark of the Mental" in *Aspects of Psychologism*

(6) Where am I? (Quiz 4), **PHILSKILLS**: How to write a philosophy paper
- *Required*: Dennett (1978), "Where am I?" in *Brainstorms*
- *Recommended*: Pryor, "Guidelines on Writing a Philosophy Paper"

(7) Who am I? (Quiz 5)
- *Required*: Garfield (2015), *Engaging Buddhism: Why it Matters to Philosophy?*, Ch. 4 The Self

Short Paper 1 — 15%

Module II. The Mental and the Physical

(8) Dualism, **PHILSKILLS**: How to talk philosophy
- *Required*: Descartes (1641), *Meditations on First Philosophy*, Second Meditation: The nature of the human mind, and how it is better known than the body
- *Optional*: Seager (2009), "Panpsychism" in *The Oxford Handbook of Philosophy of Mind*

(9) Dualism and the problem of mind-body interaction (Quiz 6)
- *Required*: Descartes and Princess Elisabeth, *Correspondence* (excerpt)
- *Optional*: Bennett, "Why I Am Not A Dualist" in *Oxford Studies in Philosophy of Mind*

(10) Behaviorism (Quiz 7)
- *Required*: Ryle (1949), *Descartes' Myth* (excerpt)
- *Required*: Chomsky (1959), "Review of B.F. Skinner's *Verbal Behavior,*" *Language*

(11) Identity theory (Quiz 8)
- *Required*: Place (1956), "Is consciousness a brain process?" *British Journal of Psychology* (excerpt)
- *Optional*: Smart (1959), "Sensations and Brain Processes," *The Philosophical Review*

(12) Functionalism (Quiz 9)
- *Required*: Armstrong (1981) "The Causal Theory of Mind" in *The Nature of Mind and Other Essays.*
- *Recommended*: Ravenscroft (2005), *Philosophy of Mind*, Ch. 5 Computational theory of the mind

(13) Challenges to functionalism (Quiz 10) , *Short Paper 2 Topics Distributed*
- *Required*: Block, "Troubles with Functionalism" in Chalmers (20002), *Philosophy of Mind: Classical and Contemporary Readings* (excerpt)

29

- *Optional*: Blackmore (2006), *Conversations on consciousness,* Ch 3: Conversation with Ned Block

(14) Enactivism (Quiz 11)
- *Required*: Ward, Silverman & Villalobos (2017), "Introduction: The Varieties of Enactivism," *Topoi*
- *Optional*: Shapiro (2010), *Embodied Cognition*, Ch. 2. Challenging Standard Cognitive Science

(15) Review & discussion
- *Required*: Prepare for discussion

Short Paper 2 — 15 %

■ Module III. Naturalizing Intentionality

(16) What does it mean to naturalize intentionality?
- *Required:* Millikan (2000), "Naturalizing Intentionality," *The Proceedings of the Twentieth World Congress of Philosophy*

(17) Asymmetric dependence theory (Quiz 12)
- *Required*: Fodor (1987), *Psychosemantics* (excerpt)
- *Recommended:* Adams & Aizawa (2021), "Causal Theories of Mental Content," *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Section 3.4

(18) Teleosemantics (Quiz 13)
- *Required*: Neander (2007), "Teleological Theories of Mental Content: Can Darwin Solve the Problem of Intentionality?" in *The Oxford Handbook of Philosophy of Biology*
- *Optional*: Dretske (1983) "Precis of Knowledge and the Flow of Information," *BBS*

(19) Enactivism (Quiz 14)
- *Required*: Schlicht & Starzak (2019), "Prospects of enactivist approaches to intentionality and cognition," *Synthese*
- *Optional*: Ryle (1949), *Descartes' Myth*, Ch. 1: The Concept of Mind

(20) Review & discussion
- *Required*: Prepare for discussion

■ Module IV. Naturalizing Consciousness

(21) The explanatory gap (Quiz 15)
- *Required*: Nagel (1974), "What is it like to be a bat?" *The Philosophical Review* (excerpt)
- *Required:* Jackson (1982), "Epiphenomenal qualia," *The Philosophical Quarterly* (excerpt)
- *Optional*: Kind (2011), "Nagel's 'What is it like to be a bat?' argument against physicalism" in *Just the Arguments: 100 of the Most Important Arguments in Western Philosophy*

(22) Consciousness in nature (Quiz 16)
- *Required*: Chalmers (2003), "Consciousness and its Place in Nature" in *Blackwell Guide to the Philosophy of Mind* (excerpt)
- *Optional*: Kind (2011), "Chalmers' zombie argument" in *Just the Arguments: 100 of the Most Important Arguments in Western Philosophy*.

(23) Intentionalism (Quiz 17), *Final Paper Topics Distributed*
- *Required*: Tye (1995), *Ten Problems of Consciousness*, Ch. 5: What What It's Like Is Really Like

(24) Varieties of physicalism
- *__Required__*: Dasgupta (2014), "The Possibility of Physicalism," *The Journal of Philosophy* (excerpts)
- *__Recommended__:* Wilson (2014), "No Work for a Theory of Grounding," *Inquiry*

Final Paper Draft 1 — 5%

(25) Perception and action (Quiz 18)
- *__Required__*: Hurley, "Alternative Views of Perception and Action" in *Consciousness and Action* (excerpt)

(26) Review & discussion
- *__Required__*: Prepare for discussion (questions on Canvas)

Final Paper Peer Review — 5%

◼ **Module V. Wrapping up**

(27) Final paper peer reviews in class

(28) Final review and discussion
- *__Required__:* Prepare for discussion (questions on Canvas)

Final Paper Draft 2 — 30%

4.4 Philosophy of Pain & Suffering

1. Course Description

This course is about pain and suffering. What is pain? Why do we experience it? Can pain be illusory? Is pain bad by nature? What differentiates pain and suffering? If animals can feel pain and suffer, then what should follow from that? Do medical professionals have a duty to believe their patients' pain testimony? What are the ethics of opioid prescription?

Philosophy of pain and suffering is a vibrant area of contemporary research. We will consider a number of important pain-related metaphysical, epistemological, and ethical questions, and critically evaluate answers proposed by philosophers, bioethicists, psychologists, and neuroscientists. We will read journal articles, monograph excerpts, and chapters from two recently published collections: *The Routledge Handbook of Philosophy of Pain* (2017) and *Philosophy of Suffering: Metaphysics, Value and Normativity* (2019).

"All pain is simple. And all pain is complex. You're in it and you want to get out. How can the ocean be not beautiful? The ocean is not beautiful today."

— Lisa Olstein: *Pain Studies*

2. Course Objectives

Through active participation in this course, you will develop an empirically-informed understanding of key contemporary issues and debates in philosophy of pain and suffering. You will practice unpacking, discussing, and evaluating philosophical views and arguments, both orally and in writing.

3. Course Structure

In-person sessions:

The standard format for the seminar sessions is short lecture/presentation and discussion. You are expected to do the assigned readings before class, and participate actively in discussions and other in-class activities.

Each enrolled student is required to present on one of the required course readings to the rest of the seminar. The presentations should take about 20 minutes (~ 15 minutes of careful exegesis & ~ 5 minutes of critical evaluation). You should prepare a handout or a powerpoint.

- *Exegesis*: What is at stake in the debate? What is the author's thesis? What kind arguments does the author make? What are the premises of those arguments? What objections does the author consider? How does she respond to those objections?
- *Critical discussion*: Are the author's arguments compelling? Are there plausible objections that the author does not explicitly consider? Is the author's exposition of other views accurate and charitable?

Attendance is mandatory (please be on time!), but you are allowed to miss two sessions without prior notice, unless you are scheduled to give a presentation that day or expected to participate in the peer review. If you are going to miss more than two classes, prior notice is required. Depending on the circumstances, your participation grade might be negatively affected, or you might be asked to complete a make-up assignment.

Out-of-class activities:

You are required to make an online discussion board contribution about each of the required readings. In order to get full credit, you should submit your discussion post *before* the relevant class session and demonstrate meaningful engagement with the text(s). Each contribution should be *at least three sentences long*. You can ask developed questions, agree/disagree with reasons, draw meaningful connections to other course readings, etc. Late submissions are accepted for up to seven days for 1/2 credit.

You are also required to write one short paper and one longer paper. For the longer paper, you will write an outline first and workshop the outline with your peer review group.

4. Assignments & Assessment

- Attendance & Participation —20%
- Discussion Board Contributions —10%
- In-class Presentation —10%
- Short Paper (1500-2000 words) —20%
- Long Paper (2500-3500 words) + outline —40%
  - (Penalty for missing outline: 5%)

5. Course Policies

[omitted, please see the syllabus for **Philosophy & Visual Perception**]

6. Resources

[omitted, please see the syllabus for **Philosophy & Visual Perception**]

7. Class & Readings Schedule

Note on terminology:

- "*Required*" readings are the ones you are expected to read and engage with *before* the relevant class session.
- "*Recommended*" readings/podcasts/videos will give you a fuller understanding of the topic under discussion. They will likely be useful to you when writing papers. Some ideas in the recommended readings might also be discussed during in-class sessions.
- "*Optional*" readings/podcasts/videos are extra materials for when you are particularly interested in a topic.

■ Module I. Getting Started

(1) Reminders: What is an argument, How to read philosophy,
- *Required*: Jim Pryor, "Guidelines on Reading Philosophy"

(2) What is philosophy of pain and why do we do it?
- *Required*: Corns (2017), "Pain Research: Where are we and why it matters?" *The Routledge Handbook of Philosophy of Pain*
- *Optional*: Scarry (1985), "Introduction." *The Body in Pain: The Making and Unmaking of the World*

(3) What is philosophy of suffering and why do we do it?
- *__Required__*: Bain, Brady and Corns (2019). "Introduction." *Philosophy of Suffering*

(4) The psychology of pain and suffering: a brief introduction
- *__Required__*: Williams (2017), "Psychological models of pain." The *Routledge Handbook of Philosophy of Pain*
- *__Recommended__*: "The Mysterious Science of Pain" (TED-Ed) / YouTube

(5) The neuroscience of pain and suffering: a brief introduction
- *__Required__*: Wiesel & Pauli (2016), "Neuroscience of Pain and Emotion" *APA PsycNET* (excerpts)
- *__Recommended__*: "Nociceptors—An Introduction to Pain" / YouTube
- *__Optional__*: "The Neuroscience of Pain," *The New Yorker*

■ Module II. Epistemology of Pain

(6) Wittgenstein on pain
- *__Required__*: Wittgenstein (1953/2009), *Philosophical Investigations* (excerpts)
- *__Required__*: Hacker (2006), "Of Knowledge and of Knowing That Someone Is in Pain." *Wittgenstein: The Philosopher and his Works* (excerpts)

(7) Can you be wrong about *your* pain?
- *__Required__*: Langland-Hassan (2017), "Pain and incorrigibility." The *Routledge Handbook of Philosophy of Pain*

(8) Can you *see* the pain of others?
- *__Required__*: De Vignemont (2017), "Can I see your Pain?" The *Routledge Handbook of Philosophy of Pain*

■ Module III. The Nature & Content of Pain

(9) Meanings of pain
- *__Required__*: Duncan (2017), "The Meanings of 'Pain' in Historical, Social, and Political Context," *The Monist*

(10) Philosophical theories of pain
- *__Required__*: Hardcastle (2017), "A brief and potted overview on the philosophical theories of pain." *The Routledge Handbook of Philosophy of Pain*

(11) Representationalism
- *__Required__*: Tye (1995), "A Representational Theory of Pains and their Phenomenal Character," *Philosophical Perspectives*
- *__Recommended__*: Cutter (2017). "Pain and representation," *The Routledge Handbook of Philosophy of Pain*

(12) Evaluativism
- *__Required__*: Bain (2017), "Evaluativist accounts of pain's unpleasantness," *The Routledge Handbook of Philosophy of Pain*

(13) The biological function of pain
- *__Required__*: Casser (2020), "The Function of Pain," *Australasian Journal of Philosophy*
- *__Recommended__*: Klein (2015), "The biological role of pain," *The Brains Blog.*

(14) Imperativism, *Short Paper Topics Distributed*
- **<u>Required</u>**: Klein (2014), *What the Body Commands,* Ch. 3: "Pain and Imperatives"
- ***Recommended:*** Klein (2017), "Imperativism," The *Routledge Handbook of Philosophy of Pain*
- ***Optional***: Klein interviewed on *New Books in Philosophy* (NBP) / podcast

(15) Review of Modules I, II and III; Writing Workshop #1
- **<u>Required</u>**: Pryor, "Guidelines on Writing a Philosophy Paper"

Short Paper —10%

■ Module IV. The Badness of Pain

(16) Is pain bad by nature? (*Dolorism*)
- **<u>Required</u>**: Massin (2017), "Bad by nature: an axiological theory of pain," The *Routledge Handbook of Philosophy of Pain*

(17) Distinguishing pain and suffering (C*onditionalism*)
- **<u>Required</u>**: Klein (2014), *What the Body Commands,* Ch. 4: "Pain and Suffering"
- ***Optional***: Bain (2014). "Pains that Don't Hurt." *Australasian Journal of Philosophy*

(18) Reverse conditionalism
- **<u>Required</u>**: Bradford (2020), "The Badness of Pain," *Utilitas*
- ***Optional***: Coleman (2017), "Painfulness, Suffering, and Consciousness," The *Routledge Handbook of Philosophy of Pain*

(19) Pain & agency
- **<u>Required</u>**: Beck & Haggard (2017), "Pain, voluntary action, and the sense of agency," *The Routledge Handbook of Philosophy of Pain* (excerpt)

(20) Pain and suffering in Buddhist philosophy
- **<u>Required</u>**: Gyal & Flanagan (2017), "The role of pain in Buddhism: The conquest of suffering," *The Routledge Handbook of Philosophy of Pain*
- ***Optional***: "Buddhist Philosophy of Pain and Suffering" / YouTube

■ Module V. Pain & Applied Ethics

(21) Pain, bias, and epistemic injustice
- **<u>Required</u>:** Wiggleton-Little (2019), "Pain Testimonies, Testimonial Injustice, and the Burden of Trust," *Blogs on the APA*
- **<u>Required</u>**: Drwecki (2015), "Education to Identify and Combat Racial Bias in Pain Treatment," *AMA Journal of Ethics*.

(22) Treatment of pain: the ethics of prescribing opioids
- **<u>Required</u>:** Lajam et al. (2019), "Ethics of Opioid Prescriber Regulations: Physicians, Patients, and Pain," *The Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery*
- ***Recommended***: Rider (2016), "An Ethical Dilemma for doctors: When is it OK to prescribe opioids?" *STAT*
- ***Recommended***: Christo (2020). "Opioids May be Appropriate for Chronic Pain," *The Journal of Law, Medicine, and Ethics*

(23) Animal pain
- **<u>Required</u>:** Singer (2009), *Animal Liberation* (excerpt)
- **<u>Required</u>:** "How do animals experience pain?" (TED-Ed) / YouTube

35

(24) Animal suffering, *Long Paper Topics Distributed*
- **_Required_**: Regan (2004), *Empty Cages: Facing the Challenge of Animal Rights,* prologue and parts 1-4

(25) Robots and pain
- **_Required_**: Mandik (2017), "Robot Pain," The *Routledge Handbook of Philosophy of Pain*

■   **MODULE VI. Wrapping Up**

(26) Review of modules IV & V; Writing Workshop #2

Final Paper Outline

(27) Long Paper Outline Workshop/Peer Review in Class

(28) Final Review & Discussion

Final Paper—30%

4.5 Philosophy of Perception: Color

1. Course Description

Color is an important part of most of our lives; it guides our actions, affects our mood, and gives us aesthetic pleasure. It's strange to think that philosophers have debated color for centuries. Color is not something abstract or recondite, but a property with which most of us are intimately acquainted every day. Color is there when we open our eyes. We use color language to communicate successfully. We've even mastered the art of *producing* color, both in the form of mixing lights of different wavelengths to give us the colors on our screens, and in the form of mixing pigments to give us surface colors.

Yet the more we think about color, the more we come to appreciate its complexity. In contemporary philosophical discussions, we find little agreement on the status, nature and location of chromatic properties. We can also ask what kind of knowledge color perception grants us and what determines the correctness standards for color experiences. Here, too, philosophical views diverge.

This is a higher-level undergraduate seminar in philosophy of perception with a focus on color. The course is interdisciplinary and draws from neuroscience, visual ecology, and psychophysics. We will ask what color is and how we know when our color experiences are correct (if they ever are). We will also inquire into the function of color vision and whether that function varies across the animal kingdom. Finally, we will consider what color might tell us about the nature of visual perception more generally.

2. Course Objectives

Through active participation in this course, you will develop an empirically-informed understanding of key debates in contemporary color metaphysics and philosophy of perception. You will practice unpacking, discussing, and evaluating philosophical views and arguments, both orally and in writing.

3. Course Structure & Expectations

The standard format for the seminar sessions is lecture/presentation and discussion. You are expected to do the assigned readings before class, participate actively in discussions, make discussion board contributions, present on one of the required readings, write two papers and one paper outline, participate in a peer review process, and introduce your paper idea to the rest of the seminar.

4. Assignments & Assessment

- Attendance & In-Class Participation—10%
- Discussion Board Participation—10%
- In-Class Presentation—10%
- Paper 1 (1500-2000 words)—20%
- Paper 2 (3000-4000 words) + Outline—45%
  - Penalty for a missing outline: 5%
  - Penalty for a missing 5-minute paper presentation: 5%
- Paper 2 Outline Peer Reviews—5%

Attendance

Attendance is mandatory (please be on time!), but you are allowed to miss two sessions without prior notice, unless you are scheduled to give a presentation that day or expected to participate in the peer review. If you are going to miss more than two classes, prior notice is required. Depending on the circumstances, your participation grade might be negatively affected, or you might be asked to complete a make-up assignment.

Discussion Board Participation

You are required to make an online discussion board post about each of the required readings. In order to get full credit, you should submit your discussion contribution before the relevant class session and demonstrate meaningful engagement with the text(s). Each contribution should be at least five sentences long. You can ask developed questions, agree/disagree with reasons, draw meaningful connections to other course readings, etc. Late submissions are accepted for up to seven days for 1/2 credit.

In-Class Presentations

Each enrolled student is required to present on one of the required course readings to the rest of the seminar. The presentations should take about 20 minutes (~ 15 minutes of careful exegesis & ~ 5 minutes of critical discussion). You should prepare a handout or a powerpoint.

- *Exegesis*: What is at stake in the debate? What is the author's thesis? What kind arguments does the author make? What are the premises of those arguments? What objections does the author consider? How does she respond to those objections?
- *Critical discussion*: Are the author's arguments compelling? Are there plausible objections that the author does not explicitly consider? Is the author's exposition of other views accurate and charitable?

Papers & Peer Reviews & 5-Minute Presentations

You are required to write one short paper (1500-2000 words) and one longer paper (3000-4000 words). You are also required to submit a preliminary outline for the longer paper. Outlines are workshopped in peer review groups.

You will submit your peer reviews in writing (300-500 words/review).

On the last day of class, you will present your long paper idea to the rest of the seminar. Your presentation should be *no more than five minutes* long. You should prepare a handout (the handout can be an updated version of your outline). Make sure to introduce your thesis, your main argument, your key evidence, and the most important objection you will consider in your paper.

5. Course Policies

[omitted, please see the syllabus for <u>Philosophy & Visual Perception</u>]

6. Resources

[omitted, please see the syllabus for <u>Philosophy & Visual Perception</u>]

7. Seminar & Readings Schedule

■ **Module I. Getting Started**

(1) Syllabus & Logistics. Introduction: The Problem(s) of Color
- *__Required__*: Chirimuuta (2015), *Outside Color*, Ch. 1: "Color and Its Questions"

(2) Historical Overview
- *__Required__*: Chirimuuta (2015), *Outside Color*, Ch. 2: "What Everyone Thinks about Color and Why"

■ **Module II. Color Metaphysics**

(3) The Landscape of Color Metaphysics
- *__Required__*: Chirimuuta (2015), *Outside Color*, Ch. 3: "Realism, Antirealism, Relationalism"

(4) Conservative and Radical Theories
- *__Required__*: Logue (2016), "Metaphysics of Color 1: Physicalist Theories of Color," *Philosophy Compass*
- *__Required__*: Logue (2006), "Metaphysics of Color 2: Non-Physicalist Theories of Color," *Philosophy Compass*

(5) Reductive Physicalism
- *__Required__*: Byrne & Hilbert (2003), "Color realism and color science," *BBS*
- *Optional*: McLaughlin (2003),"The Place of Colour in Nature" in *Colour Perception: Mind and the Physical World*

(6) Primitivism
- *__Required__*: Allen (2014), "Colour Physicalism, Naïve Realism, and the Argument from Structure," *Minds and Machines*
- *Optional:* Campbell (1993),"A Simple View of Color" in *Reality: Representation and Projection*

(7) Anti-realism
- *__Required__*: Hardin (2003), "Spectral Reflectance Doth Not a Color Make," *The Journal of Philosophy*
- *Optional:* Maund (2006), "The Illusion Theory of Colours: An Anti-Realist Theory," *Dialectica*

(8) Traditional Dispositionalism
- *__Required:__* Levin (2000), "Dispositional theories of Color and the Claims of Common Sense" *Philosophical Studies*
- *Optional:* Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding,* Book II, Chapter 8: 9-15, 22-26

(9) "Ecumenical" Relationalism
- *__Required:__* Cohen (2004), "Color properties and color ascriptions: A relationalist manifesto," *Philosophical Review*

(10) True Colors — The Debate! *Short Paper Topics Distributed*
- *__Required:__* Tye (2006), "The Puzzle of True Blue," *Analysis*
- *__Required:__* Cohen, Hardin & McLaughlin (2006), "True Colors," *Analysis*
- *__Required:__* Tye (2006), "The Truth about True Blue," *Analysis*
- *__Required:__* J. Cohen, C.L. Hardin & B. McLaughlin (2006), "The Truth about ˊThe Truth about True Blue,ˊ" *Analysis*

- *Optional:* Tye (2007), "True Blue Redux," *Analysis*
- *Optional:* Byrne & Hilbert (2007), "Truest Blue," *Analysis*

(11) Review & Discussion; Writing Workshop

Short Paper —20%

■ Module III. The Function of Color Vision

(12) The Function of Color Vision: Detection
- *Required:* Hilbert (1992), "What is Color Vision?" *Philosophical Studies'*
- *Optional:* Revisit Byrne & Hilbert (2003)

(13) The Function of Color Vision: Discrimination
- *Required:* Hatfield (1992), "Color Perception and Neural Encoding: Does Metameric Matching Entail a Loss of Information?" *PSA: Proceedings of the Biennial Meeting of the Philosophy of Science Association*
- *Optional:* Gerl & Morris (2008), "The Causes and Consequences of Color Vision," *Evolution: Education and Outreach*

(14) Ecological Relationalism: Hatfield
- *Required:* Hatfield (2003), "Objectivity and Subjectivity Revisited: Color as a Psychobiological Property" in *Colour Perception: Mind and the Physical World*

(15) Ecological Relationalism: Thompson
- *Required:* Thompson (1995), "Colour Vision, Evolution, and Perceptual Content," *Synthese* (pp. 1-11, 22-27)
- *Required*: Thompson (1995). *Colour Vision: A study in Cognitive Science and the Philosophy of Perception* (excerpt)

(16) The Function of Color Vision: Akins & Hahn
- *Required:* Akins & Hahn (2015), "Color Perception" in *The Oxford Handbook of Philosophy of Perception*
- *Optional:* Wolfe et al. (2015), *Sensation & Perception,* Ch. 5: The Perception of Color *(excerpts)*

(17) The Function of Color Vision: Chirimuuta
- *Required:* Chirimuuta (2015), *Outside Color,* Ch. 4: "Coloring In, and Coloring For"
- *Optional*: Listen to Chirimuuta on *New Books in Philosophy*

(18) Perceptual Pragmatism
- *Required:* Chirimuuta (2015), *Outside Color*, Ch. 5: "Perceptual Pragmatism"
- *Optional*: Chirimuuta (2015), *Outside Color,* Ch. 6: "Active Colors"

(19) Review & Discussion

■ Module IV. Color and the Nature of Perceptual Experience

(20) Color & Representationalism #1
- *Required*: Jackson (2007), "Colour for Representationalists," *Erkenntnis*

(21) Color & Representationalism #2
- *Required:* Wright (2010), "Projectivist Representationalism and color," *Philosophical Psychology*

(22) Color & Naïve Realism: Selectionism
- *Required:* Allen (2011), "Revelation and the Nature of Colour," *Dialectica*
- *Optional:* Kalderon (2007), "Color Pluralism," *Philosophical Review*

(23) Color & Naïve Realism: Mind-Independent Appearances
- *Required:* Genone (2014), "Appearance and Illusion," *Mind*

(24) Color Adverbialism and Theories of Visual Experience, *Long Paper Topics Distributed*
- *Required:* Chirimuuta (2015), *Outside Color*, Ch. 7: "True Colors"
- *Optional*: Gupta (2017), "Chirimuuta's Adverbialism about Color," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*

(25) "Narsissistic" and action-oriented senses
- *Required:* Akins (1996), "Of Sensory Systems and the "Aboutness" of Mental States," *The Journal of Philosophy*

Final Paper Outline

(26) Sensorimotor account of visual consciousness
- *Required:* O'Regan & Noë (2001), "A Sensorimotor Account of Vision and Visual Consciousness", *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*

Final Paper Peer Reviews

◼ **Module V. Wrapping Up**

(27) Outline Workshop/Peer Reviews

(28) 5-Minute Paper Presentations, Final Review

Final Paper

4.6 Additional syllabi available on request

I have also created syllabi for the following courses and would be happy to share them upon request:

- Epistemology

- Animal Minds

- Philosophy of Perception: The Senses

- Logic & Formal Reasoning

5. Other Samples

5.1 Sample writing assignment

FINAL PAPER DRAFT 2 (PHILOSOPHY & VISUAL PERCEPTION)

A. Instructions

Write a 1800-2200 word **final** draft of the paper (double-spaced, 12-font, 1-inch margins, references **not** included in the word count) responding to *one* of the prompts below (ideally the same prompt you wrote draft 1 on). Make sure to take into account the feedback you've received from your peers and me.

This is your chance to show what you have learned in this course. The paper should be extremely polished and properly edited. Your thesis should be clear and unambiguous, your exposition accurate and charitable, your argument valid and strong, your examples relevant and interesting, your writing clear and easy to follow, your objections plausible, your responses to the objections compelling, and so on. **You should cite (and engage with) at least three relevant course readings**. Please review the writing tips and the grading rubric for additional guidance, and come to office hours if you have questions!

The assignment is due on **12/15** at **11:59 PM.** You are free to use your remaining late days, but note that **no submissions are accepted after 12/22**.

B. Prompts

1. **Is visual perception cognitively impenetrable?** Provide an argument for your thesis. Explain the key concepts and what is at stake in this debate. Consider evidence for and against your thesis. Use examples, when appropriate.
2. **Do perceptual states sometimes have "rich" content?** Provide an argument for your thesis. Explain the key concepts and what is at stake in this debate. Consider evidence for and against your thesis. Use examples, when appropriate.
3. **Is color vision modular?** Provide an argument for your thesis. Explain the key concepts and what is at stake in this debate. Consider evidence for and against your thesis. Use examples, when appropriate.
4. **Are perception and cognition "continuous"?** Provide an argument for your thesis. Explain the key concepts and what is at stake in this debate. Consider evidence for and against your thesis. Use examples, when appropriate.

C. Grading

The grading standards are higher for Draft 2 than for Draft 1. Please see <u>rubric.</u>

D. Writing Help

See the <u>sample paper here</u>. The sample paper responds to this imaginary prompt:

"**Is the common factor principle true?** Provide an argument for your theses. Explain the key concepts and what is at stake in this debate. Consider evidence for and against your thesis. Use examples, when appropriate." **NB. This is not an actual Final Paper prompt. DO NOT RESPOND TO THIS PROMPT.**

<u>PHILSKILLS: What is an Argument</u> and <u>PHILSKILLS: How to Write a Philosophy Paper</u>

5.2 Sample grading rubric

Composition The paper should be on topic, be structured in a way that is logical and rhetorically effective, exhibit proper road-mapping, signposting, and smooth transitions between parts, provide adequate citations, respect the formatting guidelines (double-spaced, 12-font, 1-inch margins), and exhibit correct grammar, spelling, and punctuation.	**20 to >18.0 pts** **Very Good** The paper is extremely polished and properly edited. The paper is on topic, is logically and rhetorically effective, exhibits proper road-mapping, signposting, and smooth transitions between parts, provides adequate citations, respects the formatting guidelines, and exhibits correct grammar, spelling, and punctuation.	**18 to >17.0 pts** **Good** The paper is (mostly) on topic, is structured in a way that is logically and rhetorically effective, exhibits proper road-mapping and relatively smooth transitions between parts, provides adequate citations, respects the formatting guidelines, and exhibits correct grammar, spelling, and punctuation. There are issues, but they are relatively minor. The paper is somewhat polished.	**17 to >15.0 pts** **Satisfactory** The paper is somewhat on topic. Rhetorically effective structure is attempted, but there might be some room for improvement here. The transitions between parts might not be very smooth. There might be issues with grammar, spelling, and/or punctuation. The paper needs further editing, and isn't very polished. Please see comments for suggestions on additional skill-building resources.	**15 to >0 pts** **Lacking or not attempted** Plenty of room for improvement. Please see comments for suggestions on additional skill-building resources.
Argument The paper's thesis should be stated at the outset, be specific and unambiguous, and be appropriate given the space limitations and the prompt. The paper should put forward (a) plausible argument(s) in support of the thesis. It should be clear what the premises of the argument(s) are. It should be clear that the argument(s) is (are) valid or strong, or at very least not clear that it is (they) are) not. The argument(s) should be informative. Each premise should be explicitly justified (by sub-arguments if necessary), or purposefully assumed. The paper should consider and anticipate plausible objections. The objections should be compelling, given the chosen argumentative strategy. The paper should reply to objections in a way that is responsive, plausible, and avoids foot-stomping.	**30 to >28.0 pts** **Very good** The paper's thesis is stated at the outset, it is specific and unambiguous, and it's appropriate given the space limitations and the prompt. The paper puts forward (a) plausible argument(s) in support of the thesis. It is clear what the premises of the argument(s) are. The argument(s) is (are) valid and/or strong, as well as informative. Each premise is explicitly and carefully justified (by sub-arguments if necessary), or purposefully assumed. The argumentation is very easy to follow. The paper considers and anticipates plausible objections (at least two). The objections are compelling, given the chosen argumentative strategy. The paper responds to objections in a way that is responsive, plausible, and avoids foot-stomping. The responses are clear and convincing and show philosophical engagement.	**28 to >26.0 pts** **Good** The paper's thesis is stated at the outset, it is specific and unambiguous, and it's appropriate given the space limitations and the prompt. The paper puts forward (a) plausible argument(s) in support of the thesis. It is clear what the premises of the argument(s) are. The argument(s) is (are) valid and/or strong. Each premise is explicitly justified (by sub-arguments if necessary), or purposefully assumed. The argumentation is easy to follow, at least for the most part. The paper considers and anticipates plausible objections (at least one). The objections are compelling, given the chosen argumentative strategy. The paper replies to objections in a way that is responsive, plausible, and avoids foot-stomping. The responses are clear and convincing and show at least some philosophical engagement. If there are issues with argumentation, they are relatively minor.	**26 to >22.0 pts** **Satisfactory** The paper's thesis is stated at the outset, it is specific and unambiguous, and it's appropriate given the space limitations and the prompt. The paper puts forward (a) plausible argument(s) in support of the thesis. It is clear what the premises of the argument(s) are. The argument(s) is (are) valid, or at least there is a valid argument in the vicinity of what is said. Justification of the premises is attempted, but there are issues. The argumentation might not always be easy to follow. The paper considers objections (at least one), but the objections might not be clear or compelling, given the chosen argumentative strategy. The paper responds to the objection(s), but the responses might not be clear or convincing or might show little philosophical engagement. Please see comments for suggestions on additional skill-building resources.	**22 to >0 pts** **Lacking or not attempted** Plenty of room for improvement. Please see comments for suggestions on additional skill-building resources.
Exposition The paper should make adequate use of at least three relevant course readings. It should provide accurate and charitable expositions of the views and arguments expressed in the texts. The paper should adequately explain complex ideas and concepts in sufficient depth. When necessary, the paper should define any key or technical terms it employs. The paper should make distinctions necessary for more than a superficial treatment of the ideas and concepts. The paper should use examples to explain difficult or complex ideas or concepts. The paper should avoid vagueness and unnecessary jargon.	**30 to >28.0 pts** **Very good** The relevant views/concepts/ ideas/arguments are all explained accurately, charitably and in sufficient depth. The expositions show mastery of the subject matter. There are no issues in understanding (or only very minor ones), and no ambiguities/vagueness.	**28 to >26.0 pts** **Good** For the most part, the relevant views/concepts/ideas/arguments are explained accurately, charitably and in sufficient depth. There might be some inaccuracies and/ or occasional vagueness, but all in all the expositions show fairly good mastery of the subject matter.	**26 to >22.0 pts** **Satisfactory** Explanation of the relevant views/ concepts/ideas/arguments is attempted, but there are issues in understanding. The exposition shows limited mastery of the subject matter. Please see comments for suggestions on additional skill-building resources.	**22 to >0 pts** **Lacking or not attempted** Plenty of room for improvement. Please see comments for suggestions on additional skill-building resources.
Philosophical Engagement and Originality The paper should exhibit meaningful philosophical engagement and original thinking on the subject, as evidenced by (though not limited to): making conceptual distinctions not already made in course readings or discussions, demonstrating awareness of alternative interpretations of texts and giving reasons in favor of the preferred ones, using novel examples or thought-experiments to explain a view or to advance an argument, and/or displaying awareness of possible downstream issues with the view defended.	**20 to >19.0 pts** **Very good** The paper shows a great deal of originality and exhibits meaningful philosophical engagement. The paper builds on the readings and class discussions in insightful new ways, and exhibits deep thinking.	**19 to >17.0 pts** **Good** The paper shows some originality and exhibits meaningful philosophical engagement. The paper builds on readings and class discussions.	**17 to >15.0 pts** **Satisfactory** The paper stays mostly within the confines of what was said in class and/or readings, but offers at least one novel example and/or thought experiment. Please see comments for suggestions on additional skill-building resources.	**15 to >0 pts** **Lacking or not attempted** The paper stays within the confines of what was said in class and/or readings, and does not offer novel examples and/or thought experiments. Please see comments for suggestions on additional skill-building resources.

The rubric is based on a paper grading rubric created by Carlos Pereira Di Salvo. I've added the ratings columns and a few things in the criteria themselves. I like to embed rubrics on Canvas and link them to the relevant assignments to make grading more efficient. This way I can enter a numerical value for each criterion individually and add comments directly on the rubric. This also makes it easier for students to get an overall sense of where their strengths and weaknesses lie.

Note. I use different rubrics for different assignments. This is a grading rubric for the *final* draft of the *final* paper in the course, which is why the expectations are quite high.

5.3 Sample active learning tasks

Group Work: Argument from Perceptual Variation

A. Instructions:

Recall Hume's and Russell's arguments from perceptual variation (you can review the **slides** here). Your task is to create your **own version** of this argument and produce visual illustrations. You can use any relevant visual phenomena (but please no tables!).

• Meet with your pre-assigned group in class, decide on a phenomenon, and head out to take photographs or draw images to illustrate your argument.
• Write out your argument in standard form (you can review **PHILSKILLS: What is an argument** here). Make sure that the argument is valid!
• Create a simple digital poster which includes both the argument and the photographs/images. If you have time, you can also mention ways to challenge the argument.
• Submit the poster as a PDF or JPG file in this discussion thread by midnight on 9/21 (only one group member should do this). Please include the names of all the participating group members in the poster.

Have fun! I will be available to answer questions.

B. Allocated time: Expect to spend 60-70 minutes on this activity.

C. Learning objectives: You will practice constructing valid philosophical arguments and coming up with novel examples to illustrate an idea. You will need both these skills when you write your papers. You will also get a chance to practice talking about philosophy with your peers in a low-stakes, informal setting.

Reflection: Class Visit to the Materials Library

A. Instructions:

At the Materials Library, we viewed samples of Vantablack and other pigments, aerogel, Houdini glass, dichroid glass and other iridescent surfaces, transparent concrete and wood, etc. Choose one of the samples and reflect on the following questions:

• Why did you find the sample interesting?
• What does your experience with the sample reveal about visual perception?

Your responses need not be polished or carefully argued, but try to engage with the questions seriously. Submit your reflections in this discussion thread by midnight on 10/10.

B. Allocated time: Expect to spend 5-15 minutes on this activity.

C. Learning objectives: You will practice thinking carefully and philosophically about the things you perceptually interact with and expressing your thoughts in writing.

---

6. Training

- *Certificate in College & University Teaching*, Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL), University of Pennsylvania, 2020.

- Teaching workshops attended:

  CTL workshops:

  - TA Training, August 2018
  - Making Group Works Work (Dana Cypress), September 2018
  - Establishing Relationships with Students (Elizabeth Bynum), October 2018
  - Teaching to Non-Majors (Phoebe Askelson), October 2018
  - Teaching Outside Your Area of Expertise (Ava Creemers), October 2018
  - Giving Effective Feedback (Sherelle Ferguson), October 2018
  - Designing for Disability: Pedagogical Practices That Support Disabled Folks (and Everyone Else) (Cait Kirby), August 2022

  CTL/Philosophy Department workshops:

  - Teaching Philosophy to Pre-College Students (Karen Detlefsen), October 2018
  - Designing and Teaching an Online Course (Susan Sauvé Meyer), November 2018
  - Using Office Hours Effectively (Errol Lord), November 2018
  - Wellness Advising in Difficult Spaces (Lisa (Miracchi) Titus), March 2019
  - Effective Lecturing (Daniel Singer), April 2019

  CTL/MindCORE workshops:

  - Mentor Training Workshop (Jamiella Brooks & Emily Elliot), October 2020.

  Disability Services / Weingarten Learning Center workshops:

  - Inclusive Teaching Strategies: Supporting Students with Disabilities (Aaron Spector), August 2022

- Teaching workshops taught/facilitated:

  - Leading Discussions in the Humanities and Social Sciences (x 2), August 2021
  - Teaching Demonstration Workshop, August 2021
  - Scenarios for Humanities & Qualitative Social Sciences, August 2021
  - Introduction to Canvas, August 2021
  - Teaching Demonstration Workshop, August 2022

- Teaching events organized:

  - Penn Philosophy Teaching Workshop on Disability Inclusions and Accessibility, August 2022