

PHILOSOPHY GRADUATE SEMINAR COURSE EVALUATION

Each quarter we ask students in graduate-level philosophy courses to evaluate the quality of the course's content and instruction. The completed forms are filed in the cabinet in the Anscombe Library and Lounge, Stuart 216, for students to read. *Even if you are not in the Philosophy Department, please fill out and return this double-sided form to the Philosophy Office in Stuart 202.*

Quarter and Year: Autumn 2018 Instructor: Malta Willer

Course Number and Title: Phil 30000: Elementary Logic

Your Department and Year (specify grad/undergrad): Grad, 1st year PhD

Is this course in one of your fields of concentration: Yes If not, why did you take it? _____

I. Please describe the syllabus and requirements of the course:

Five homeworks were worth 60% of the course grade. These consisted of practice problems. Test is worth the remaining 40%, and is cumulative.

II. Please answer the following questions on a scale of 1 to 5:

1. How well-conceived and well-organized was the syllabus? (1 = terribly; 5 = very well) 5
2. Did the instructor adhere to the syllabus? (1 = not at all; 5 = like a metronome) 5
3. How demanding were the reading requirements (quality & quantity)? 3
(1 = understanding; 5 = absurdly difficult)
4. Was the class mostly lecture or mostly discussion? (1 = all lecture; 5 = all discussion) 2
5. How successful was this format? (1 = not at all; 5 = very) 5
6. How much material was covered? (1 = narrow focus; 5 = broad range) 5
7. How deeply was it covered? (1 = superficial survey; 5 = specialist's depth) 3
8. Did the range and depth match your expectations (from catalog, syllabus, rec.)? 5
(1 = not at all; 5 = perfect match)
9. Did the range and depth match what you needed from this (kind of) course? 5
(1 = not at all; 5 = perfect match) If imperfect, in what way? _____

10. How well-organized and clear was the instructor? (1 = not very; 5 = very) 5
11. How well did the instructor address questions and arguments offered by students? 5
(1 = not well; 5 = very well)

12. How available/accessible was the instructor outside of class? (1 = not at all; 5 = very) 5
13. How helpful were the instructor's comments on written work? 5
- (1 = no work returned; 5 = very helpful)
14. Would you take another course offered by this instructor? (1 = never; 5 = absolutely) 5

III. Please answer the following questions in a few sentences. Well-chosen details are particularly useful.

1. What did you like best about this course? In particular, what readings worked best? Why?

Content was well suited to give an introduction to the basics of predicate logic. We both spent time talking about the underlying theory and motivation for certain rules, and actually practicing solving problems in the system.

2. What did you like least about this course? In particular, were there readings which didn't

work? Why not? There is a drastic difficulty increase in the work about half-way through. If possible, I would have preferred it be evened out more. Some of this is of course unavoidable due to the later content being more difficult, but my suspicion is that the earlier content could be condensed.

3. What would like to have changed in this course? In particular, are there any readings you think should be changed? Added? Why? See above. Otherwise, no.

PHILOSOPHY GRADUATE SEMINAR COURSE EVALUATION

Each quarter we ask students in graduate-level philosophy courses to evaluate the quality of the course's content and instruction. The completed forms are filed in the cabinet in the Anscombe Library and Lounge, Stuart 216, for students to read. Even if you are not in the Philosophy Department, please fill out and return this double-sided form to the Philosophy Office in Stuart 202.

Quarter and Year: Autumn, 2018 Instructor: M. He Witter

Course Number and Title: Phil. 20100, Elementary Logic

Your Department and Year (specify grad/undergrad): Philosophy, 1st year Graduate

Is this course in one of your fields of concentration: No If not, why did you take it? Logic Requirement

I. Please describe the syllabus and requirements of the course:

Introduction to substantial & practical logic. 5 homework assignments & an exam

II. Please answer the following questions on a scale of 1 to 5:

1. How well-conceived and well-organized was the syllabus? (1 = terribly; 5 = very well) 5
2. Did the instructor adhere to the syllabus? (1 = not at all; 5 = like a metronome) 5
3. How demanding were the reading requirements (quality & quantity)? (1 = understanding; 5 = absurdly difficult) 4
4. Was the class mostly lecture or mostly discussion? (1 = all lecture; 5 = all discussion) 2
5. How successful was this format? (1 = not at all; 5 = very) 4
6. How much material was covered? (1 = narrow focus; 5 = broad range) 3
7. How deeply was it covered? (1 = superficial survey; 5 = specialist's depth) 4
8. Did the range and depth match your expectations (from catalog, syllabus, rec.)? (1 = not at all; 5 = perfect match) 4
9. Did the range and depth match what you needed from this (kind of) course? (1 = not at all; 5 = perfect match) If imperfect, in what way? It probably met my needs well. Nevertheless I found it exceptionally difficult. 4
10. How well-organized and clear was the instructor? (1 = not very; 5 = very) 5
11. How well did the instructor address questions and arguments offered by students? (1 = not well; 5 = very well) 5

12. How available/accessible was the instructor outside of class? (1 = not at all; 5 = very) 5
13. How helpful were the instructor's comments on written work? 5
(1 = no work returned; 5 = very helpful)
14. Would you take another course offered by this instructor? (1 = never; 5 = absolutely) 1

III. Please answer the following questions in a few sentences. Well-chosen details are particularly useful.

1. What did you like best about this course? In particular, what readings worked best? Why?

Professor Keller is an excellent instructor, and discussion sections with him were very helpful in understanding the material. Ability to pose problems in actual lecture. Beyond just reading the textbook was very helpful.

2. What did you like least about this course? In particular, were there readings which didn't work? Why not?

Logic is an exceptionally difficult and dry subject, at least for me. In spite of excellent instruction and much practice, quantified modal logic remains extremely confusing and time-consuming for me. ~~I~~ I would avoid dry logic like the plague in the future.

3. What would like to have changed in this course? In particular, are there any readings you think should be changed? Added? Why?

MA - course is probably taught perfectly as is. I wish it were easier.

PHILOSOPHY GRADUATE SEMINAR COURSE EVALUATION

Each quarter we ask students in graduate-level philosophy courses to evaluate the quality of the course's content and instruction. The completed forms are filed in the cabinet in the Anscombe Library and Lounge, Stuart 216, for students to read. *Even if you are not in the Philosophy Department, please fill out and return this double-sided form to the Philosophy Office in Stuart 202.*

Quarter and Year: Fall 2018 Instructor: Mark Willev

Course Number and Title: 30000 Elementary Logic

Your Department and Year (specify grad/undergrad): Philosophy Grad

Is this course in one of your fields of concentration: yes If not, why did you take it? _____

I. Please describe the syllabus and requirements of the course:

5 homeworks biweekly
Final exam 40% of grade

II. Please answer the following questions on a scale of 1 to 5:

1. How well-conceived and well-organized was the syllabus? (1 = terribly; 5 = very well) 4
2. Did the instructor adhere to the syllabus? (1 = not at all; 5 = like a metronome) 5
3. How demanding were the reading requirements (quality & quantity)? 2
(1 = understanding; 5 = absurdly difficult)
4. Was the class mostly lecture or mostly discussion? (1 = all lecture; 5 = all discussion) 2
5. How successful was this format? (1 = not at all; 5 = very) 5
6. How much material was covered? (1 = narrow focus; 5 = broad range) 5
7. How deeply was it covered? (1 = superficial survey; 5 = specialist's depth) 3
8. Did the range and depth match your expectations (from catalog, syllabus, rec.)? 5
(1 = not at all; 5 = perfect match)
9. Did the range and depth match what you needed from this (kind of) course? 5
(1 = not at all; 5 = perfect match) If imperfect, in what way? _____
10. How well-organized and clear was the instructor? (1 = not very; 5 = very) 5
11. How well did the instructor address questions and arguments offered by students? 5
(1 = not well; 5 = very well)

12. How available/accessible was the instructor outside of class? (1 = not at all; 5 = very) 5

13. How helpful were the instructor's comments on written work? 5

(1 = no work returned; 5 = very helpful)

14. Would you take another course offered by this instructor? (1 = never; 5 = absolutely) 5

III. Please answer the following questions in a few sentences. Well-chosen details are particularly useful.

1. What did you like best about this course? In particular, what readings worked best? Why?

The syllabus & expectations were clear. The lectures & slides were very useful. Malte's explanations were very helpful in understanding the material. A lot better than the book.

2. What did you like least about this course? In particular, were there readings which didn't work? Why not?

The homework seemed significantly more difficult than the book. The book practice problems were helpful but too easy in that they didn't help prepare me for the homework.

3. What would like to have changed in this course? In particular, are there any readings you think should be changed? Added? Why?

PHILOSOPHY GRADUATE SEMINAR COURSE EVALUATION

Each quarter we ask students in graduate-level philosophy courses to evaluate the quality of the course's content and instruction. The completed forms are filed in the cabinet in the Anscombe Library and Lounge, Stuart 216, for students to read. *Even if you are not in the Philosophy Department, please fill out and return this double-sided form to the Philosophy Office in Stuart 202.*

Quarter and Year: Fall 2017 **Instructor:** Malte Willer

Course Number and Title: PHIL 34010

Your Department and Year (specify grad/undergrad): Grad/Law School - 3rd Year

Is this course in one of your fields of concentration: No **If not, why did you take it?** _____

I took it for background that is important for other projects I am doing.

I. Please describe the syllabus and requirements of the course:

The course surveyed the literature on the use and meaning of terms that refer to the world, starting with Frege and ending with modern innovation in predicativism. The course required weekly readings, discussions, and papers.

II. Please answer the following questions on a scale of 1 to 5:

1. How well-conceived and well-organized was the syllabus? (1 = terribly; 5 = very well) 5
2. Did the instructor adhere to the syllabus? (1 = not at all; 5 = like a metronome) 5
3. How demanding were the reading requirements (quality & quantity)? 3
(1 = understanding; 5 = absurdly difficult)
4. Was the class mostly lecture or mostly discussion? (1 = all lecture; 5 = all discussion) 3
5. How successful was this format? (1 = not at all; 5 = very) 3
6. How much material was covered? (1 = narrow focus; 5 = broad range) 4
7. How deeply was it covered? (1 = superficial survey; 5 = specialist's depth) 3
8. Did the range and depth match your expectations (from catalog, syllabus, rec.)? 5
(1 = not at all; 5 = perfect match)
9. Did the range and depth match what you needed from this (kind of) course? 5
(1 = not at all; 5 = perfect match) If imperfect, in what way? _____

10. How well-organized and clear was the instructor? (1 = not very; 5 = very) 5
11. How well did the instructor address questions and arguments offered by students? 5
(1 = not well; 5 = very well)

12. How available/accessible was the instructor outside of class? (1 = not at all; 5 = very) 5
13. How helpful were the instructor's comments on written work? 3
(1 = no work returned; 5 = very helpful)
14. Would you take another course offered by this instructor? (1 = never; 5 = absolutely) 5

III. Please answer the following questions in a few sentences. Well-chosen details are particularly useful.

1. What did you like best about this course? In particular, what readings worked best? Why?

I liked the nature of the course as a survey and the depth with which the professor reviewed and summarized the material. The readings that probably worked best were the one-shot articles, like Kaplan's or Graf Fara's since the summaries and class discussion were most helpful there. It was somewhat difficult to discuss all of the arguments being made in Naming and Necessity because of the casual nature of the presentation there.

2. What did you like least about this course? In particular, were there readings which didn't work? Why not?

I have no major objections, though I have a personal preference for additional lecture and less discussion. As said above, I thought that the Naming and Necessity readings were the least effective, but they pretty much had to be included given their importance.

3. What would like to have changed in this course? In particular, are there any readings you think should be changed? Added? Why?

I would have liked to have had some of the approaches to philosophy of language that deemphasize reference included, like Brandom's inferentialism. That would have opened up the range of possible views to consider.

PHILOSOPHY GRADUATE SEMINAR COURSE EVALUATION

Each quarter we ask students in graduate-level philosophy courses to evaluate the quality of the course's content and instruction. The completed forms are filed in the cabinet in the Anscombe Library and Lounge, Stuart 216, for students to read. *Even if you are not in the Philosophy Department, please fill out and return this double-sided form to the Philosophy Office in Stuart 202.*

Quarter and Year: SPRING 2017 Instructor: MALTE WILLER

Course Number and Title: PHIL 39425 Logic for Philosophy

Your Department and Year (specify grad/undergrad): INTERNATIONAL STUDENT
GRADUATE

Is this course in one of your fields of concentration: YES If not, why did you take it? _____

I. Please describe the syllabus and requirements of the course:

THE SYLLABUS WAS A DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE COURSE TOPICS AND REQUIREMENTS, AS WELL AS OF THE HOMEWORK SCHEDULE AND EXAMS SCHEDULE.

II. Please answer the following questions on a scale of 1 to 5:

1. How well-conceived and well-organized was the syllabus? (1 = terribly; 5 = very well) 5
 2. Did the instructor adhere to the syllabus? (1 = not at all; 5 = like a metronome) 5
 3. How demanding were the reading requirements (quality & quantity)? 3
(1 = understanding; 5 = absurdly difficult)
 4. Was the class mostly lecture or mostly discussion? (1 = all lecture; 5 = all discussion) 3
 5. How successful was this format? (1 = not at all; 5 = very) 5
 6. How much material was covered? (1 = narrow focus; 5 = broad range) 5
 7. How deeply was it covered? (1 = superficial survey; 5 = specialist's depth) 4
 8. Did the range and depth match your expectations (from catalog, syllabus, rec.)? 5
(1 = not at all; 5 = perfect match)
 9. Did the range and depth match what you needed from this (kind of) course? 5
(1 = not at all; 5 = perfect match) If imperfect, in what way? _____
-
10. How well-organized and clear was the instructor? (1 = not very; 5 = very) 4
 11. How well did the instructor address questions and arguments offered by students? 5
(1 = not well; 5 = very well)

12. How available/accessible was the instructor outside of class? (1 = not at all; 5 = very) 5

13. How helpful were the instructor's comments on written work? 4

(1 = no work returned; 5 = very helpful)

14. Would you take another course offered by this instructor? (1 = never; 5 = absolutely) 5

III. Please answer the following questions in a few sentences. Well-chosen details are particularly useful.

1. What did you like best about this course? In particular, what readings worked best? Why?

2. What did you like least about this course? In particular, were there readings which didn't work? Why not?

3. What would like to have changed in this course? In particular, are there any readings you think should be changed? Added? Why?

PHILOSOPHY GRADUATE SEMINAR COURSE EVALUATION

Each quarter we ask students in graduate-level philosophy courses to evaluate the quality of the course's content and instruction. The completed forms are filed in the cabinet in the Anscombe Library and Lounge, Stuart 216, for students to read. Even if you are not in the Philosophy Department, please fill out and return this double-sided form to the Philosophy Office in Stuart 202.

Quarter and Year: Spring 2017 Instructor: Matt Wilton

Course Number and Title: PHIL 39425

Your Department and Year (specify grad/undergrad): Grad - Law School Student - 2L

Is this course in one of your fields of concentration: No If not, why did you take it?

Preparation for further work in philosophy

I. Please describe the syllabus and requirements of the course:

The course went through Ted Sider's Logic for Philosophy covering a number of ~~logical~~ logics from a semantic perspective in order to illuminate problems of philosophical interest. Bi-weekly problem sets and a final were required.

II. Please answer the following questions on a scale of 1 to 5:

1. How well-conceived and well-organized was the syllabus? (1 = terribly; 5 = very well) 5
2. Did the instructor adhere to the syllabus? (1 = not at all; 5 = like a metronome) 4
3. How demanding were the reading requirements (quality & quantity)? 2
(1 = understanding; 5 = absurdly difficult)
4. Was the class mostly lecture or mostly discussion? (1 = all lecture; 5 = all discussion) 2
5. How successful was this format? (1 = not at all; 5 = very) 5
6. How much material was covered? (1 = narrow focus; 5 = broad range) 3
7. How deeply was it covered? (1 = superficial survey; 5 = specialist's depth) 4
8. Did the range and depth match your expectations (from catalog, syllabus, rec.)? 5
(1 = not at all; 5 = perfect match)
9. Did the range and depth match what you needed from this (kind of) course? 5
(1 = not at all; 5 = perfect match) If imperfect, in what way? _____
10. How well-organized and clear was the instructor? (1 = not very; 5 = very) 5
11. How well did the instructor address questions and arguments offered by students? 5
(1 = not well; 5 = very well)

12. How available/accessible was the instructor outside of class? (1 = not at all; 5 = very) 5
13. How helpful were the instructor's comments on written work?
(1 = no work returned; 5 = very helpful) 4
14. Would you take another course offered by this instructor? (1 = never; 5 = absolutely) 5

III. Please answer the following questions in a few sentences. Well-chosen details are particularly useful.

1. What did you like best about this course? In particular, what readings worked best? Why?

What I really liked about the course was how well it fit my abilities and interests. It was challenging and informative, but never devastatingly hard. Moreover, it gave me exactly what I wanted in terms of logic training.

2. What did you like least about this course? In particular, were there readings which didn't work? Why not?

I found the work on axiomatic proofs very tedious, but there wasn't anything the instructor could have done about that.

3. What would like to have changed in this course? In particular, are there any readings you think should be changed? Added? Why?

It might have been cool to read/evaluate actual papers published in the areas of epistemic

PHILOSOPHY GRADUATE SEMINAR COURSE EVALUATION

Each quarter we ask students in graduate-level philosophy courses to evaluate the quality of the course's content and instruction. The completed forms are filed in the cabinet in the Anscombe Library and Lounge, Stuart 216, for students to read. *Even if you are not in the Philosophy Department, please fill out and return this double-sided form to the Philosophy Office in Stuart 202.*

Quarter and Year: Fall 2016 Instructor: Willet, Matte

Course Number and Title: LING 53307

Your Department and Year (specify grad/undergrad): Grad, Ling, 4th yr.

Is this course in one of your fields of concentration: cy If not, why did you take it? _____

I. Please describe the syllabus and requirements of the course:

Introduction to basic game-theoretic ~~notions~~ notions, solution-concepts. Introduction to signaling games for modeling linguistic conventions. Application of these to modeling linguistic phenomena, including Gricean conversational implicatures and sociolinguistic variation.

II. Please answer the following questions on a scale of 1 to 5:

1. How well-conceived and well-organized was the syllabus? (1 = terribly; 5 = very well) 4
2. Did the instructor adhere to the syllabus? (1 = not at all; 5 = like a metronome) 4
3. How demanding were the reading requirements (quality & quantity)?
(1 = understanding; 5 = absurdly difficult) 3
4. Was the class mostly lecture or mostly discussion? (1 = all lecture; 5 = all discussion) 4
5. How successful was this format? (1 = not at all; 5 = very) 5
6. How much material was covered? (1 = narrow focus; 5 = broad range) 4
7. How deeply was it covered? (1 = superficial survey; 5 = specialist's depth) 5
8. Did the range and depth match your expectations (from catalog, syllabus, rec.)?
(1 = not at all; 5 = perfect match) 5
9. Did the range and depth match what you needed from this (kind of) course?
(1 = not at all; 5 = perfect match) If imperfect, in what way? _____ 5

10. How well-organized and clear was the instructor? (1 = not very; 5 = very) 5
11. How well did the instructor address questions and arguments offered by students?
(1 = not well; 5 = very well) 5

12. How available/accessible was the instructor outside of class? (1 = not at all; 5 = very) ~~5~~

13. How helpful were the instructor's comments on written work? ~~5~~

(1 = no work returned; 5 = very helpful)

14. Would you take another course offered by this instructor? (1 = never; 5 = absolutely) 5

III. Please answer the following questions in a few sentences. Well-chosen details are particularly useful.

1. What did you like best about this course? In particular, what readings worked best? Why?

Lots of time allotted to going over the machinery in detail (w/ blackboard examples) and to higher-level conceptual questions about relevance of the machinery for linguistic research. Demonstrations of the workings of the machinery sometimes not included, or not made clear, in the papers themselves. Good for acquiring a technical skill and for getting at the broader issues. Fascinating topic, great lecturer, fun class.

2. What did you like least about this course? In particular, were there readings which didn't work? Why not?

The philosophical background (Ayer, Quine) leading up to Lewis' Convention may have been front-loaded a bit much; it could have been possible to begin with the game theory and Convention directly. Link between early discussion of meaning by Convention and analyticity w/ later game-theoretic concerns a little tenuous.

3. What would like to have changed in this course? In particular, are there any readings you think should be changed? Added? Why?

• The Quine, Ayer, and possibly some of the rudimentary pragmatics readings (Grice, Horn) could have been replaced with more straight game theory, (or maybe left as background reading).

PHILOSOPHY GRADUATE SEMINAR COURSE EVALUATION

Each quarter we ask students in graduate-level philosophy courses to evaluate the quality of the course's content and instruction. The completed forms are filed in the cabinet in the Anscombe Library and Lounge, Stuart 216, for students to read. *Even if you are not in the Philosophy Department, please fill out and return this double-sided form to the Philosophy Office in Stuart 202.*

Quarter and Year: Fall 2016 Instructor: Malte Willer

Course Number and Title: Phil 3307 Language and Games

Your Department and Year (specify grad/undergrad): _____

2nd year Philosophy PhD

Is this course in one of your fields of concentration: Y If not, why did you take it? _____

I. Please describe the syllabus and requirements of the course:

Weekly readings + Term paper

II. Please answer the following questions on a scale of 1 to 5:

1. How well-conceived and well-organized was the syllabus? (1 = terribly; 5 = very well) 4
2. Did the instructor adhere to the syllabus? (1 = not at all; 5 = like a metronome) 5
3. How demanding were the reading requirements (quality & quantity)?
(1 = understanding; 5 = absurdly difficult) 3
4. Was the class mostly lecture or mostly discussion? (1 = all lecture; 5 = all discussion) 4
5. How successful was this format? (1 = not at all; 5 = very) 5
6. How much material was covered? (1 = narrow focus; 5 = broad range) 3
7. How deeply was it covered? (1 = superficial survey; 5 = specialist's depth) 4
8. Did the range and depth match your expectations (from catalog, syllabus, rec.)?
(1 = not at all; 5 = perfect match) 5
9. Did the range and depth match what you needed from this (kind of) course?
(1 = not at all; 5 = perfect match) If imperfect, in what way? _____ 4
10. How well-organized and clear was the instructor? (1 = not very; 5 = very) 5
11. How well did the instructor address questions and arguments offered by students?
(1 = not well; 5 = very well) 5

12. How available/accessible was the instructor outside of class? (1 = not at all; 5 = very) 5
13. How helpful were the instructor's comments on written work? N/A
(1 = no work returned; 5 = very helpful)
14. Would you take another course offered by this instructor? (1 = never; 5 = absolutely) 5

III. Please answer the following questions in a few sentences. Well-chosen details are particularly useful.

1. What did you like best about this course? In particular, what readings worked best? Why?

While the material was often quite challenging, Motte did an excellent job explaining the issues involved and getting at the heart of what was going on. Getting to read David Lewis' *Convention* in this context was a pleasure.

2. What did you like least about this course? In particular, were there readings which didn't work? Why not?

No real complaints.

3. What would like to have changed in this course? In particular, are there any readings you think should be changed? Added? Why?

No suggestions.

PHILOSOPHY GRADUATE SEMINAR COURSE EVALUATION

Each quarter we ask students in graduate-level philosophy courses to evaluate the quality of the course's content and instruction. The completed forms are filed in the cabinet in the Anscombe Library and Lounge, Stuart 216, for students to read. *Even if you are not in the Philosophy Department, please fill out and return this double-sided form to the Philosophy Office in Stuart 202.*

Quarter and Year: FALL 2016 Instructor: M. WILLER

Course Number and Title: PHIL 53307 LANGUAGE AND GAMES

Your Department and Year (specify grad/undergrad): EXCHANGE STUDENT
(GRADUATE) PHILOSOPHY

Is this course in one of your fields of concentration: YES If not, why did you take it? _____

I. Please describe the syllabus and requirements of the course:

THE SYLLABUS MAINLY DESCRIBED THE STRUCTURE OF COURSE, THE CLASS SCHEDULE AND THE MAIN BOOKS AND ARTICLES USED.

II. Please answer the following questions on a scale of 1 to 5:

1. How well-conceived and well-organized was the syllabus? (1 = terribly; 5 = very well) 5
2. Did the instructor adhere to the syllabus? (1 = not at all; 5 = like a metronome) 4
3. How demanding were the reading requirements (quality & quantity)? 4
(1 = understanding; 5 = absurdly difficult)
4. Was the class mostly lecture or mostly discussion? (1 = all lecture; 5 = all discussion) 3
5. How successful was this format? (1 = not at all; 5 = very) 4
6. How much material was covered? (1 = narrow focus; 5 = broad range) 5
7. How deeply was it covered? (1 = superficial survey; 5 = specialist's depth) 5
8. Did the range and depth match your expectations (from catalog, syllabus, rec.)? 5
(1 = not at all; 5 = perfect match)
9. Did the range and depth match what you needed from this (kind of) course? 4
(1 = not at all; 5 = perfect match) If imperfect, in what way? _____

10. How well-organized and clear was the instructor? (1 = not very; 5 = very) 5
11. How well did the instructor address questions and arguments offered by students? 4
(1 = not well; 5 = very well)

12. How available/accessible was the instructor outside of class? (1 = not at all; 5 = very) 5

13. How helpful were the instructor's comments on written work? 5

(1 = no work returned; 5 = very helpful)

14. Would you take another course offered by this instructor? (1 = never; 5 = absolutely) 5

III. Please answer the following questions in a few sentences. Well-chosen details are particularly useful.

1. What did you like best about this course? In particular, what readings worked best? Why?

I LIKED THE KIND OF SPECIFICITY OF THE ARTICLES.

~~PLEASE~~

2. What did you like least about this course? In particular, were there readings which didn't work? Why not?

NOTHING IN PARTICULAR

3. What would like to have changed in this course? In particular, are there any readings you think should be changed? Added? Why?

PHILOSOPHY GRADUATE SEMINAR COURSE EVALUATION

Each quarter we ask students in graduate-level philosophy courses to evaluate the quality of the course's content and instruction. The completed forms are filed in the cabinet in the Anscombe Library and Lounge, Stuart 216, for students to read. *Even if you are not in the Philosophy Department, please fill out and return this double-sided form to the Philosophy Office in Stuart 202.*

Quarter and Year: fall 2016 Instructor: Maite Wilker

Course Number and Title: 53307 Phil

Your Department and Year (specify grad/undergrad): GSA + MAPH

Is this course in one of your fields of concentration: yes If not, why did you take it? _____

I. Please describe the syllabus and requirements of the course: A bunch of POF's
Lewis on convention, and write 1 paper.
Due dates

II. Please answer the following questions on a scale of 1 to 5:

1. How well-conceived and well-organized was the syllabus? (1 = terribly; 5 = very well) 4
2. Did the instructor adhere to the syllabus? (1 = not at all; 5 = like a metronome) 5
3. How demanding were the reading requirements (quality & quantity)?
(1 = understanding; 5 = absurdly difficult) 4
4. Was the class mostly lecture or mostly discussion? (1 = all lecture; 5 = all discussion) 2.5
5. How successful was this format? (1 = not at all; 5 = very) 4
6. How much material was covered? (1 = narrow focus; 5 = broad range) 4
7. How deeply was it covered? (1 = superficial survey; 5 = specialist's depth) 5
8. Did the range and depth match your expectations (from catalog, syllabus, rec.)?
(1 = not at all; 5 = perfect match) 4
9. Did the range and depth match what you needed from this (kind of) course?
(1 = not at all; 5 = perfect match) If imperfect, in what way? _____ 5
10. How well-organized and clear was the instructor? (1 = not very; 5 = very) 3
11. How well did the instructor address questions and arguments offered by students?
(1 = not well; 5 = very well) 3.5

12. How available/accessible was the instructor outside of class? (1 = not at all; 5 = very) 5
13. How helpful were the instructor's comments on written work? ~~4~~ 4
(1 = no work returned; 5 = very helpful)
14. Would you take another course offered by this instructor? (1 = never; 5 = absolutely) 3

III. Please answer the following questions in a few sentences. Well-chosen details are particularly useful.

1. What did you like best about this course? In particular, what readings worked best? Why?

Lewis was great, Orice great, Rothchild too.
In fact, all readings were good. Just less time on scalar implication.

2. What did you like least about this course? In particular, were there readings which didn't work? Why not?

Readings were good, but the course would be better if there were more helpful resources on how to handle the highly technical symbolic language. or a warning before taking the class. Also, maybe less time on scalar implication.

3. What would like to have changed in this course? In particular, are there any readings you think should be changed? Added? Why?

I think the course description needs to put in a pre-req for Logic 2. Having taking basic logic was not enough.

PHILOSOPHY GRADUATE SEMINAR COURSE EVALUATION

Each quarter we ask students in graduate-level philosophy courses to evaluate the quality of the course's content and instruction. The completed forms are filed in the cabinet in the Anscombe Library and Lounge, Stuart 216, for students to read. *Even if you are not in the Philosophy Department, please fill out and return this double-sided form to the Philosophy Office in Stuart 202.*

Quarter and Year: Spring 2016 Instructor: Matte Willer

Course Number and Title: PHIL 52015: Indexicals

Your Department and Year (specify grad/undergrad): Philosophy, PhD, First-Year

Is this course in one of your fields of concentration: No If not, why did you take it? Distribution Requirement, but vaguely related to

interests.

I. Please describe the syllabus and requirements of the course:

Readings on indexicality in Phil Long and Phil mind.

II. Please answer the following questions on a scale of 1 to 5:

1. How well-conceived and well-organized was the syllabus? (1 = terribly; 5 = very well) 5
2. Did the instructor adhere to the syllabus? (1 = not at all; 5 = like a metronome) 5
3. How demanding were the reading requirements (quality & quantity)? 3
(1 = understanding; 5 = absurdly difficult)
4. Was the class mostly lecture or mostly discussion? (1 = all lecture; 5 = all discussion) 2
5. How successful was this format? (1 = not at all; 5 = very) 5
6. How much material was covered? (1 = narrow focus; 5 = broad range) 4
7. How deeply was it covered? (1 = superficial survey; 5 = specialist's depth) 4
8. Did the range and depth match your expectations (from catalog, syllabus, rec.)? 4
(1 = not at all; 5 = perfect match)
9. Did the range and depth match what you needed from this (kind of) course? 5
(1 = not at all; 5 = perfect match) If imperfect, in what way? _____

10. How well-organized and clear was the instructor? (1 = not very; 5 = very) 5

11. How well did the instructor address questions and arguments offered by students? 5

(1 = not well; 5 = very well)

12. How available/accessible was the instructor outside of class? (1 = not at all; 5 = very) 4

13. How helpful were the instructor's comments on written work?

(1 = no work returned; 5 = very helpful)

(Not yet!)
4

14. Would you take another course offered by this instructor? (1 = never; 5 = absolutely) 4

III. Please answer the following questions in a few sentences. Well-chosen details are particularly useful.

1. What did you like best about this course? In particular, what readings worked best? Why?

Matte was very clear and organized, with detailed handouts which offered great summaries and analysis. Organizing final section of class around "Essential Indexical" was great, since it engaged past readings and brought us up to contemporary debates.

2. What did you like least about this course? In particular, were there readings which didn't work? Why not?

Subject matter was dense, sometimes dry, and far outside my background of expertise. The linguistics work in week 5 & 6 were difficult, but I think ultimately helpful and necessary.

3. What would like to have changed in this course? In particular, are there any readings you think should be changed? Added? Why?

I would have benefited from more readings taking up connections w/ Phil. of Mind, but I am unsure if this would be appropriate for the course. (Milikan, Frege, Babb all did this)

PHILOSOPHY GRADUATE SEMINAR COURSE EVALUATION

Each quarter we ask students in graduate-level philosophy courses to evaluate the quality of the course's content and instruction. The completed forms are filed in the cabinet in the Anscombe Library and Lounge, Stuart 216, for students to read. *Even if you are not in the Philosophy Department, please fill out and return this double-sided form to the Philosophy Office in Stuart 202.*

Quarter and Year: Spring 2016 Instructor: Matte Willer

Course Number and Title: LING 52015

Your Department and Year (specify grad/undergrad): Linguistics, 3rd year, grad

Is this course in one of your fields of concentration: If not, why did you take it? _____

I. Please describe the syllabus and requirements of the course:

Course covered early philosophy of language literature on indexicals, moved into treatment of indexicals, de se attitudes, and context-shifting in the linguistics literature, and ended with criticisms of the notion of "essential indexicality" from recent authors. Familiarity w/ classic phil. of lang. literature. One paper presented, 4 term paper.

II. Please answer the following questions on a scale of 1 to 5:

1. How well-conceived and well-organized was the syllabus? (1 = terribly; 5 = very well) 5
2. Did the instructor adhere to the syllabus? (1 = not at all; 5 = like a metronome) 5
3. How demanding were the reading requirements (quality & quantity)? (1 = understanding; 5 = absurdly difficult) 3
4. Was the class mostly lecture or mostly discussion? (1 = all lecture; 5 = all discussion) 4
5. How successful was this format? (1 = not at all; 5 = very) 5
6. How much material was covered? (1 = narrow focus; 5 = broad range) 5
7. How deeply was it covered? (1 = superficial survey; 5 = specialist's depth) 4
8. Did the range and depth match your expectations (from catalog, syllabus, rec.)? (1 = not at all; 5 = perfect match) 5
9. Did the range and depth match what you needed from this (kind of) course? (1 = not at all; 5 = perfect match) If imperfect, in what way? 5
10. How well-organized and clear was the instructor? (1 = not very; 5 = very) 5
11. How well did the instructor address questions and arguments offered by students? (1 = not well; 5 = very well) 5

12. How available/accessible was the instructor outside of class? (1 = not at all; 5 = very) 5

13. How helpful were the instructor's comments on written work? 5

(1 = no work returned; 5 = very helpful)

14. Would you take another course offered by this instructor? (1 = never; 5 = absolutely) 5

III. Please answer the following questions in a few sentences. Well-chosen details are particularly useful.

1. What did you like best about this course? In particular, what readings worked best? Why?

Loved how tightly all the works inter connected, even across disciplines, from Frege to the present there is an intelligible dialectic in both phil. and ling. Liked Kaplan and the stuff on indexical shift best. Fertile ground for concrete phenomena to reflect on high-level issues, room for fun formal stuff.

2. What did you like least about this course? In particular, were there readings which didn't work? Why not?

Because of my ling. bias I can glaze over a little at the more explicitly non-linguistic stuff, like the essentiality of intentionality to action or perception but I understand why it was included. The Babb paper was my least favorite.

3. What would like to have changed in this course? In particular, are there any readings you think should be changed? Added? Why?

A paper about logophors would have been cool to tie in the linguistics with early Castañeda - maybe a Schlenker paper too. In the early stages, maybe dial back Frege a little to make room for Castañeda too.

PHILOSOPHY GRADUATE SEMINAR COURSE EVALUATION

Each quarter we ask students in graduate-level philosophy courses to evaluate the quality of the course's content and instruction. The completed forms are filed in the cabinet in the Anscombe Library and Lounge, Stuart 216, for students to read. *Even if you are not in the Philosophy Department, please fill out and return this double-sided form to the Philosophy Office in Stuart 202.*

Quarter and Year: Spring 2016 Instructor: Matte Willer

Course Number and Title: Phil 52015 - Indexicals

Your Department and Year (specify grad/undergrad): Phil. Ph.D. 7th year

Is this course in one of your fields of concentration: Yes If not, why did you take it? _____

I. Please describe the syllabus and requirements of the course:

Readings on indexicality in phil. language

II. Please answer the following questions on a scale of 1 to 5:

- | | |
|--|------------|
| 1. How well-conceived and well-organized was the syllabus? (1 = terribly; 5 = very well) | <u>5</u> |
| 2. Did the instructor adhere to the syllabus? (1 = not at all; 5 = like a metronome) | <u>5</u> |
| 3. How demanding were the reading requirements (quality & quantity)?
(1 = understanding; 5 = absurdly difficult) | <u>2.5</u> |
| 4. Was the class mostly lecture or mostly discussion? (1 = all lecture; 5 = all discussion) | <u>2.5</u> |
| 5. How successful was this format? (1 = not at all; 5 = very) | <u>5</u> |
| 6. How much material was covered? (1 = narrow focus; 5 = broad range) | <u>2.5</u> |
| 7. How deeply was it covered? (1 = superficial survey; 5 = specialist's depth) | <u>4</u> |
| 8. Did the range and depth match your expectations (from catalog, syllabus, rec.)?
(1 = not at all; 5 = perfect match) | <u>5</u> |
| 9. Did the range and depth match what you needed from this (kind of) course?
(1 = not at all; 5 = perfect match) If imperfect, in what way? _____ | <u>5</u> |
| <hr/> | |
| 10. How well-organized and clear was the instructor? (1 = not very; 5 = very) | <u>5</u> |
| 11. How well did the instructor address questions and arguments offered by students?
(1 = not well; 5 = very well) | <u>5</u> |

12. How available/accessible was the instructor outside of class? (1 = not at all; 5 = very) 5

13. How helpful were the instructor's comments on written work?

(1 = no work returned; 5 = very helpful)

14. Would you take another course offered by this instructor? (1 = never; 5 = absolutely) 5

III. Please answer the following questions in a few sentences. Well-chosen details are particularly useful.

1. What did you like best about this course? In particular, what readings worked best? Why?

I really liked the way it was organized and progressed through the literature. I thought the Cappelen and Dever book worked well at the end of the course. I also really liked the handouts. Super clear and helpful.

2. What did you like least about this course? In particular, were there readings which didn't work? Why not?

I liked pretty much all of it. Even the Anand.

3. What would like to have changed in this course? In particular, are there any readings you think should be changed? Added? Why?

I thought the discourse representation perspective was pretty interesting that Roberts was drawing from and I would have liked to read a bit more from that way of thinking.

PHILOSOPHY GRADUATE SEMINAR COURSE EVALUATION

Each quarter we ask students in graduate-level philosophy courses to evaluate the quality of the course's content and instruction. The completed forms are filed in the cabinet in the Anscombe Library and Lounge, Stuart 216, for students to read. *Even if you are not in the Philosophy Department, please fill out and return this double-sided form to the Philosophy Office in Stuart 202.*

Quarter and Year: Spring 2016 Instructor: Melita Wilton

Course Number and Title: Phil 52015 Indexicals

Your Department and Year (specify grad/undergrad): Graduate student / Philosophy

Is this course in one of your fields of concentration: No If not, why did you take it? well, indexicals are relevant to my philosophical inquiries so it seemed useful.

I. Please describe the syllabus and requirements of the course:

extensive readings on indexicality, essential indexicality, inessential indexicality etc.
required term paper

II. Please answer the following questions on a scale of 1 to 5:

1. How well-conceived and well-organized was the syllabus? (1 = terribly; 5 = very well) 5
2. Did the instructor adhere to the syllabus? (1 = not at all; 5 = like a metronome) 5
3. How demanding were the reading requirements (quality & quantity)? 4
(1 = understanding; 5 = absurdly difficult)
4. Was the class mostly lecture or mostly discussion? (1 = all lecture; 5 = all discussion) 3
5. How successful was this format? (1 = not at all; 5 = very) 5
6. How much material was covered? (1 = narrow focus; 5 = broad range) 4
7. How deeply was it covered? (1 = superficial survey; 5 = specialist's depth) 5
8. Did the range and depth match your expectations (from catalog, syllabus, rec.)? 5
(1 = not at all; 5 = perfect match)
9. Did the range and depth match what you needed from this (kind of) course? 4
(1 = not at all; 5 = perfect match) If imperfect, in what way? I was interested in epistemology but had so much I did not know was going up for linguistics/phil lang
10. How well-organized and clear was the instructor? (1 = not very; 5 = very) 5
11. How well did the instructor address questions and arguments offered by students? 5
(1 = not well; 5 = very well)

12. How available/accessible was the instructor outside of class? (1 = not at all; 5 = very) 5

13. How helpful were the instructor's comments on written work? 5

(1 = no work returned; 5 = very helpful)

14. Would you take another course offered by this instructor? (1 = never; 5 = absolutely) 5

III. Please answer the following questions in a few sentences. Well-chosen details are particularly useful.

1. What did you like best about this course? In particular, what readings worked best? Why?

I was most interested in the essential /inessential dialectic, esp. in respect to action. Just personal preferences/interest. Probably the best thing about the course was the instructor — who made a difficult literature that was extremely foreign to me sound and interesting.

2. What did you like least about this course? In particular, were there readings which didn't work? Why not?

In general the course was well designed with thoughtful attention to literature and progression of the story.

3. What would like to have changed in this course? In particular, are there any readings you think should be changed? Added? Why?

PHILOSOPHY GRADUATE SEMINAR COURSE EVALUATION

Each quarter we ask students in graduate-level philosophy courses to evaluate the quality of the course's content and instruction. The completed forms are filed in the cabinet in the Anscombe Library and Lounge, Stuart 216, for students to read. *Even if you are not in the Philosophy Department, please fill out and return this double-sided form to the Philosophy Office in Stuart 202.*

Quarter and Year: SA 2016 Instructor: Matte Willev

Course Number and Title: PHIL 52015 Indexicality

Your Department and Year (specify grad/undergrad): Philosophy Yr 3 (grad)

Is this course in one of your fields of concentration: Yes If not, why did you take it? _____

I. Please describe the syllabus and requirements of the course:

The syllabus involved a survey of the topic of indexicality up to contemporary work on the topic.

II. Please answer the following questions on a scale of 1 to 5:

1. How well-conceived and well-organized was the syllabus? (1 = terribly; 5 = very well) 5
2. Did the instructor adhere to the syllabus? (1 = not at all; 5 = like a metronome) 5
3. How demanding were the reading requirements (quality & quantity)? (1 = understanding; 5 = absurdly difficult) 3
4. Was the class mostly lecture or mostly discussion? (1 = all lecture; 5 = all discussion) 3
5. How successful was this format? (1 = not at all; 5 = very) 5
6. How much material was covered? (1 = narrow focus; 5 = broad range) 3
7. How deeply was it covered? (1 = superficial survey; 5 = specialist's depth) 4
8. Did the range and depth match your expectations (from catalog, syllabus, rec.)? (1 = not at all; 5 = perfect match) 5
9. Did the range and depth match what you needed from this (kind of) course? (1 = not at all; 5 = perfect match) If imperfect, in what way? _____ 5

10. How well-organized and clear was the instructor? (1 = not very; 5 = very) 5
11. How well did the instructor address questions and arguments offered by students? (1 = not well; 5 = very well) 5

12. How available/accessible was the instructor outside of class? (1 = not at all; 5 = very) 5

13. How helpful were the instructor's comments on written work? n/a

(1 = no work returned; 5 = very helpful)

14. Would you take another course offered by this instructor? (1 = never; 5 = absolutely) 5

III. Please answer the following questions in a few sentences. Well-chosen details are particularly useful.

1. What did you like best about this course? In particular, what readings worked best? Why?

I found Prof. Willer's overviews of the readings and his handouts to be exceptionally clear and helpful. I also appreciated that the course gave a good foundation in the history of the topic, but also got into details of the ~~course~~ recent conversations (so, I ~~mostly liked~~ appreciated pretty much all the readings. I especially liked, though, the very beginning - Frege, Kaplan, Perry - and the very end - Cappelen + Dever, Ninan.)

2. What did you like least about this course? In particular, were there readings which didn't work? Why not?

Pretty much all the readings were helpful.

3. What would like to have changed in this course? In particular, are there any readings you think should be changed? Added? Why?

I can't think of anything in particular. Greater diversity on the syllabus would be nice, but that might be somewhat limited by the current status of the literature.

PHILOSOPHY GRADUATE SEMINAR COURSE EVALUATION

Each quarter we ask students in graduate-level philosophy courses to evaluate the quality of the course's content and instruction. The completed forms are filed in the cabinet in the Anscombe Library and Lounge, Stuart 216, for students to read. *Even if you are not in the Philosophy Department, please fill out and return this double-sided form to the Philosophy Office in Stuart 202.*

Quarter and Year: Spring 2016 Instructor: Matte Willer

Course Number and Title: LING 34015 / Modality

Your Department and Year (specify grad/undergrad): Linguistics / First year Grad

Is this course in one of your fields of concentration: Possibly if not, why did you take it? _____

I. Please describe the syllabus and requirements of the course:

- 4 HW assignments
- 1 midterm paper (~5 pages)
- 1 term paper (~15 pages)

II. Please answer the following questions on a scale of 1 to 5:

1. How well-conceived and well-organized was the syllabus? (1 = terribly; 5 = very well) 5

2. Did the instructor adhere to the syllabus? (1 = not at all; 5 = like a metronome) 5

3. How demanding were the reading requirements (quality & quantity)? 2

(1 = understanding; 5 = absurdly difficult)

4. Was the class mostly lecture or mostly discussion? (1 = all lecture; 5 = all discussion) 2

5. How successful was this format? (1 = not at all; 5 = very) 5

6. How much material was covered? (1 = narrow focus; 5 = broad range) 5

7. How deeply was it covered? (1 = superficial survey; 5 = specialist's depth) 4 for the main material / 3 other

8. Did the range and depth match your expectations (from catalog, syllabus, rec.)? 5

(1 = not at all; 5 = perfect match)

9. Did the range and depth match what you needed from this (kind of) course? 5

(1 = not at all; 5 = perfect match) If imperfect, in what way? _____

10. How well-organized and clear was the instructor? (1 = not very; 5 = very) 5

11. How well did the instructor address questions and arguments offered by students? 5

(1 = not well; 5 = very well)

(did an awesome job!)

12. How available/accessible was the instructor outside of class? (1 = not at all; 5 = very) 5

13. How helpful were the instructor's comments on written work?

(1 = no work returned; 5 = very helpful)

14. Would you take another course offered by this instructor? (1 = never; 5 = absolutely) 5

(the most detailed
comments I've ever
received on a paper)

III. Please answer the following questions in a few sentences. Well-chosen details are particularly useful.

1. What did you like best about this course? In particular, what readings worked best? Why?

It was demanding but not impossible. The course focused on the main ideas/questions regarding the topic while giving some tools to use. I really appreciated the combination of concept and application.

2. What did you like least about this course? In particular, were there readings which didn't work? Why not?

N/A ----- only one comment

The homeworks were more geared towards the philosophical understanding and less concerned with the linguistics. This didn't bother me, but for some it may not be appealing.

3. What would like to have changed in this course? In particular, are there any readings you think should be changed? Added? Why?

Loved the course!

PHILOSOPHY GRADUATE SEMINAR COURSE EVALUATION

Each quarter we ask students in graduate-level philosophy courses to evaluate the quality of the course's content and instruction. The completed forms are filed in the cabinet in the Anscombe Library and Lounge, Stuart 216, for students to read. *Even if you are not in the Philosophy Department, please fill out and return this double-sided form to the Philosophy Office in Stuart 202.*

Quarter and Year: Spring 2016 Instructor: Malte Willer

Course Number and Title: LING 34015 Modality

Your Department and Year (specify grad/undergrad): grad - Linguistics, 1st year PhD

Is this course in one of your fields of concentration: Yes If not, why did you take it? _____

I. Please describe the syllabus and requirements of the course:

- Readings for every week
- Four homework assignments, one midterm paper, one final term paper
(4-5 pages) (15+ pages)

II. Please answer the following questions on a scale of 1 to 5:

1. How well-conceived and well-organized was the syllabus? (1 = terribly; 5 = very well) 5
2. Did the instructor adhere to the syllabus? (1 = not at all; 5 = like a metronome) 5
3. How demanding were the reading requirements (quality & quantity)? 4
(1 = understanding; 5 = absurdly difficult)
4. Was the class mostly lecture or mostly discussion? (1 = all lecture; 5 = all discussion) 3
5. How successful was this format? (1 = not at all; 5 = very) 5
6. How much material was covered? (1 = narrow focus; 5 = broad range) 4
7. How deeply was it covered? (1 = superficial survey; 5 = specialist's depth) 3
8. Did the range and depth match your expectations (from catalog, syllabus, rec.)? 4
(1 = not at all; 5 = perfect match)
9. Did the range and depth match what you needed from this (kind of) course? 5
(1 = not at all; 5 = perfect match) If imperfect, in what way? _____
10. How well-organized and clear was the instructor? (1 = not very; 5 = very) 4
11. How well did the instructor address questions and arguments offered by students? 5
(1 = not well; 5 = very well)

12. How available/accessible was the instructor outside of class? (1 = not at all; 5 = very) 5

13. How helpful were the instructor's comments on written work? 5

(1 = no work returned; 5 = very helpful)

14. Would you take another course offered by this instructor? (1 = never; 5 = absolutely) 4

III. Please answer the following questions in a few sentences. Well-chosen details are particularly useful.

1. What did you like best about this course? In particular, what readings worked best? Why?

I liked that it was rigorous and the assignments helped in understanding the material.

The Kratzer papers we read at the beginning were especially good because they were quite clear.

2. What did you like least about this course? In particular, were there readings which didn't work? Why not?

Parts of the homework assignments were frustrating, and I felt like they tested on logical details rather than concepts more relevant to the topics covered in class.

3. What would like to have changed in this course? In particular, are there any readings you think should be changed? Added? Why?

Some of the readings went into ^{way} greater detail than what we really had to know for the class, although I guess that is understandable, but it would be nice if we could have a memo on which bits to focus on. For example, ~~there~~ most of the Veltman paper was on stuff we didn't actually discuss.

PHILOSOPHY GRADUATE SEMINAR COURSE EVALUATION

Each quarter we ask students in graduate-level philosophy courses to evaluate the quality of the course's content and instruction. The completed forms are filed in the cabinet in the Anscombe Library and Lounge, Stuart 216, for students to read. *Even if you are not in the Philosophy Department, please fill out and return this double-sided form to the Philosophy Office in Stuart 202.*

Quarter and Year: Spring 2016 Instructor: Matte Willer

Course Number and Title: Modality, CING 34015

Your Department and Year (specify grad/undergrad): Linguistics, 3rd year grad.

Is this course in one of your fields of concentration: Y If not, why did you take it? _____

I. Please describe the syllabus and requirements of the course:

Overview of contemporary approaches to modality in linguistic semantics and phil. language. Beginning w/ intro to modal logic, going on into Kratzer's relative modality, trad. accounts of conditionals by Lewis, Stalnaker et al., then more modern log + phil concerns having to do with tense, relativism, etc.

II. Please answer the following questions on a scale of 1 to 5:

1. How well-conceived and well-organized was the syllabus? (1 = terribly; 5 = very well) 5
2. Did the instructor adhere to the syllabus? (1 = not at all; 5 = like a metronome) 5
3. How demanding were the reading requirements (quality & quantity)?
(1 = understanding; 5 = absurdly difficult) 3
4. Was the class mostly lecture or mostly discussion? (1 = all lecture; 5 = all discussion) 2
5. How successful was this format? (1 = not at all; 5 = very) 5
6. How much material was covered? (1 = narrow focus; 5 = broad range) 5
7. How deeply was it covered? (1 = superficial survey; 5 = specialist's depth) 3
8. Did the range and depth match your expectations (from catalog, syllabus, rec.)?
(1 = not at all; 5 = perfect match) 5
9. Did the range and depth match what you needed from this (kind of) course?
(1 = not at all; 5 = perfect match) If imperfect, in what way? _____ 5
10. How well-organized and clear was the instructor? (1 = not very; 5 = very) 5
11. How well did the instructor address questions and arguments offered by students?
(1 = not well; 5 = very well) 5

12. How available/accessible was the instructor outside of class? (1 = not at all; 5 = very) 5

13. How helpful were the instructor's comments on written work? 5

(1 = no work returned; 5 = very helpful)

14. Would you take another course offered by this instructor? (1 = never; 5 = absolutely) 5

III. Please answer the following questions in a few sentences. Well-chosen details are particularly useful.

1. What did you like best about this course? In particular, what readings worked best? Why?

Liked the formalisms and the way the HW focused on manipulating them rather than more open-ended issues which were left to mid-term/final. There is a lot of formal stuff to get through & help with learning it is needed to acquire the "trade skill" since most semanticists can't ~~be~~ engage with the literatures without it. In that respect a more hard-nosed approach is far more useful than a more open "seminar" environment.

2. What did you like least about this course? In particular, were there readings which didn't work? Why not?

The readings were good. Some of the Lewis and Cardorandi were tough, but parts of them felt like "extra," so that's okay, and some of the Portner textbook was thin in areas that aren't well-researched, which is unavoidable.

3. What would like to have changed in this course? In particular, are there any readings you think should be changed? Added? Why?

Maybe just a brief intro to the notion of the lambda calculus and basic compositional semantics in the intro week, with less review of propositional logic - former was more relevant for the literature.

PHILOSOPHY GRADUATE SEMINAR COURSE EVALUATION

Each quarter we ask students in graduate-level philosophy courses to evaluate the quality of the course's content and instruction. The completed forms are filed in the cabinet in the Anscombe Library and Lounge, Stuart 216, for students to read. *Even if you are not in the Philosophy Department, please fill out and return this double-sided form to the Philosophy Office in Stuart 202.*

Quarter and Year: Spring 2016 Instructor: Matte Wilber

Course Number and Title: LING 34015

Your Department and Year (specify grad/undergrad): MAPH student, grad

Is this course in one of your fields of concentration: If not, why did you take it? _____

I. Please describe the syllabus and requirements of the course:

several homework assignments
weekly readings from textbook + articles
1 short paper
term paper

II. Please answer the following questions on a scale of 1 to 5:

1. How well-conceived and well-organized was the syllabus? (1 = terribly; 5 = very well) 5
2. Did the instructor adhere to the syllabus? (1 = not at all; 5 = like a metronome) 5
3. How demanding were the reading requirements (quality & quantity)? 4
(1 = understanding; 5 = absurdly difficult)
4. Was the class mostly lecture or mostly discussion? (1 = all lecture; 5 = all discussion) 2
5. How successful was this format? (1 = not at all; 5 = very) 4
6. How much material was covered? (1 = narrow focus; 5 = broad range) 5
7. How deeply was it covered? (1 = superficial survey; 5 = specialist's depth) 3
8. Did the range and depth match your expectations (from catalog, syllabus, rec.)? 4
(1 = not at all; 5 = perfect match)
9. Did the range and depth match what you needed from this (kind of) course? 3
(1 = not at all; 5 = perfect match) If imperfect, in what way? I didn't have enough background for this kind of depth
10. How well-organized and clear was the instructor? (1 = not very; 5 = very) 5
11. How well did the instructor address questions and arguments offered by students? 5
(1 = not well; 5 = very well)

12. How available/accessible was the instructor outside of class? (1 = not at all; 5 = very) 5

13. How helpful were the instructor's comments on written work? 4

(1 = no work returned; 5 = very helpful)

14. Would you take another course offered by this instructor? (1 = never; 5 = absolutely) 5

III. Please answer the following questions in a few sentences. Well-chosen details are particularly useful.

1. What did you like best about this course? In particular, what readings worked best? Why?

lecture was great, discussion was encouraged
Portner textbook was an excellent background ~~text~~/overview
the dynamic remanters at the end was so interesting
Read. readings all seemed well chosen

2. What did you like least about this course? In particular, were there readings which didn't work? Why not?

I think the scope may have been too big - but maybe
this is my own lack of background. I would've learned
more if the scope was narrower and more time was
spent on fewer topics.

3. What would like to have changed in this course? In particular, are there any readings you think should be changed? Added? Why?

it moved a little fast - I know time was limited
but I would've liked to spend a little more
time on MLT and Kratzer before moving into others,
since everything built on what came before

PHILOSOPHY GRADUATE SEMINAR COURSE EVALUATION

Each quarter we ask students in graduate-level philosophy courses to evaluate the quality of the course's content and instruction. The completed forms are filed in the cabinet in the Anscombe Library and Lounge, Stuart 216, for students to read. *Even if you are not in the Philosophy Department, please fill out and return this double-sided form to the Philosophy Office in Stuart 202.*

Quarter and Year: Winter 2016 Instructor: Malte Wille

Course Number and Title: Meaning and Reference PHIL 34010

Your Department and Year (specify grad/undergrad): Philosophy - Graduate

Is this course in one of your fields of concentration: Yes If not, why did you take it? _____

I. Please describe the syllabus and requirements of the course:

The syllabus was relatively straightforward. Every class was focused on one reading, though there was often overlap due to extended discussion. Readings were occasionally a bit long & we ended up tackling on only a small section of the reading. Papers were manageable & topics available were diverse.

II. Please answer the following questions on a scale of 1 to 5:

1. How well-conceived and well-organized was the syllabus? (1 = terribly; 5 = very well) 4
2. Did the instructor adhere to the syllabus? (1 = not at all; 5 = like a metronome) 4
3. How demanding were the reading requirements (quality & quantity)?
(1 = understanding; 5 = absurdly difficult) 2
4. Was the class mostly lecture or mostly discussion? (1 = all lecture; 5 = all discussion) 2
5. How successful was this format? (1 = not at all; 5 = very) 4
6. How much material was covered? (1 = narrow focus; 5 = broad range) 3
7. How deeply was it covered? (1 = superficial survey; 5 = specialist's depth) 3
8. Did the range and depth match your expectations (from catalog, syllabus, rec.)?
(1 = not at all; 5 = perfect match) 4
9. Did the range and depth match what you needed from this (kind of) course?
(1 = not at all; 5 = perfect match) If imperfect, in what way? _____ 4
10. How well-organized and clear was the instructor? (1 = not very; 5 = very) 5
11. How well did the instructor address questions and arguments offered by students?
(1 = not well; 5 = very well) 5

12. How available/accessible was the instructor outside of class? (1 = not at all; 5 = very) 5

13. How helpful were the instructor's comments on written work?

(1 = no work returned; 5 = very helpful)

5
by great feedback

14. Would you take another course offered by this instructor? (1 = never; 5 = absolutely) 4

III. Please answer the following questions in a few sentences. Well-chosen details are particularly useful.

1. What did you like best about this course? In particular, what readings worked best? Why?

I enjoyed the progression the course took from Mill to Kaplan. The readings worked well together & often addressed the questions we had been discussing in the class prior.

Matte has a strong background in formal logic which was useful in understanding the structure of the arguments presented.

The Kripke was a great reading to include.

2. What did you like least about this course? In particular, were there readings which didn't work? Why not?

I occasionally felt behind as I was not familiar with formal logic to the extent that would have been helpful. Russell was the most difficult for this reason, I think. I would not remove these readings though.

3. What would like to have changed in this course? In particular, are there any readings you think should be changed? Added? Why?

I would have liked to focus on particular debates between philosophers more. I often felt that as soon as we were getting into the finer details of a debate, we would have to move on.

PHILOSOPHY GRADUATE SEMINAR COURSE EVALUATION

Each quarter we ask students in graduate-level philosophy courses to evaluate the quality of the course's content and instruction. The completed forms are filed in the cabinet in the Anscombe Library and Lounge, Stuart 216, for students to read. *Even if you are not in the Philosophy Department, please fill out and return this double-sided form to the Philosophy Office in Stuart 202.*

Quarter and Year: Winter 2016 Instructor: Halte Weller

Course Number and Title: PHIL 34010 Meaning and Reference

Your Department and Year (specify grad/undergrad): MAPH grad

Is this course in one of your fields of concentration: No If not, why did you take it? it still seemed relevant since I study narrative

I. Please describe the syllabus and requirements of the course:

Reading major theoretical contributions every week (about 60 pages) and three papers.

II. Please answer the following questions on a scale of 1 to 5:

1. How well-conceived and well-organized was the syllabus? (1 = terribly; 5 = very well) 5
2. Did the instructor adhere to the syllabus? (1 = not at all; 5 = like a metronome) 5
3. How demanding were the reading requirements (quality & quantity)? 3
(1 = understanding; 5 = absurdly difficult)
4. Was the class mostly lecture or mostly discussion? (1 = all lecture; 5 = all discussion) 2
5. How successful was this format? (1 = not at all; 5 = very) 3
6. How much material was covered? (1 = narrow focus; 5 = broad range) 4
7. How deeply was it covered? (1 = superficial survey; 5 = specialist's depth) 3
8. Did the range and depth match your expectations (from catalog, syllabus, rec.)? 3
(1 = not at all; 5 = perfect match)
9. Did the range and depth match what you needed from this (kind of) course? 3
(1 = not at all; 5 = perfect match) If imperfect, in what way? the range was really wide, which meant we did not go too much into depth
10. How well-organized and clear was the instructor? (1 = not very; 5 = very) 5
11. How well did the instructor address questions and arguments offered by students? 5
(1 = not well; 5 = very well)

12. How available/accessible was the instructor outside of class? (1 = not at all; 5 = very) 5
13. How helpful were the instructor's comments on written work? 4
(1 = no work returned; 5 = very helpful)
14. Would you take another course offered by this instructor? (1 = never; 5 = absolutely) 5

III. Please answer the following questions in a few sentences. Well-chosen details are particularly useful.

1. What did you like best about this course? In particular, what readings worked best? Why?

I liked the amount of work, it was a very reasonable load. The weekly handouts were immensely helpful. I liked the Kaplan and Fara pieces since my thinking was more altered to the type of learning.

2. What did you like least about this course? In particular, were there readings which didn't work? Why not?

The course moved rather quickly so I found it difficult to keep up sometimes as we moved through theorists.

3. What would like to have changed in this course? In particular, are there any readings you think should be changed? Added? Why?

I thought the readings were useful, but again, the course moved very quickly.

PHILOSOPHY GRADUATE SEMINAR COURSE EVALUATION

Each quarter we ask students in graduate-level philosophy courses to evaluate the quality of the course's content and instruction. The completed forms are filed in the cabinet in the Anscombe Library and Lounge, Stuart 216, for students to read. *Even if you are not in the Philosophy Department, please fill out and return this double-sided form to the Philosophy Office in Stuart 202.*

Quarter and Year: Winter 2016 Instructor: Matt Miller

Course Number and Title: PHIL 34010 Meaning and Reference

Your Department and Year (specify grad/undergrad): Craed, MAPH,

Is this course in one of your fields of concentration: yes If not, why did you take it? _____

I. Please describe the syllabus and requirements of the course:

The course covered key work on the issue of reference and the nature of names, including papers authored by Frege, Russell, Strawson, Kripke and Miller - two short (5 page) papers and one full term paper were required.

II. Please answer the following questions on a scale of 1 to 5:

1. How well-conceived and well-organized was the syllabus? (1 = terribly; 5 = very well) 5
2. Did the instructor adhere to the syllabus? (1 = not at all; 5 = like a metronome) 4
3. How demanding were the reading requirements (quality & quantity)? 3
(1 = understanding; 5 = absurdly difficult)
4. Was the class mostly lecture or mostly discussion? (1 = all lecture; 5 = all discussion) 3
5. How successful was this format? (1 = not at all; 5 = very) 5
6. How much material was covered? (1 = narrow focus; 5 = broad range) 4
7. How deeply was it covered? (1 = superficial survey; 5 = specialist's depth) 3
8. Did the range and depth match your expectations (from catalog, syllabus, rec.)? 4
(1 = not at all; 5 = perfect match)
9. Did the range and depth match what you needed from this (kind of) course? 3
(1 = not at all; 5 = perfect match) If imperfect, in what way? I expected the focus to fall more on the problem of reference - what was (P)
10. How well-organized and clear was the instructor? (1 = not very; 5 = very) 5
11. How well did the instructor address questions and arguments offered by students? 5
(1 = not well; 5 = very well)

(P) Frustrating philosophically speaking about it and why we should be interested in it, whereas the delivery focused more on the virtues and pitfalls of successive theories dealing with reference.

12. How available/accessible was the instructor outside of class? (1 = not at all; 5 = very) 4
13. How helpful were the instructor's comments on written work? 4
- (1 = no work returned; 5 = very helpful)
14. Would you take another course offered by this instructor? (1 = never; 5 = absolutely) 5

III. Please answer the following questions in a few sentences. Well-chosen details are particularly useful.

1. What did you like best about this course? In particular, what readings worked best? Why?

I liked best the way in which the class was organized. There was a lot of room for discussion and the approach to mastering the material centered discussing it and exploring it. The readings from Kripke, Strawson and

Dummett, Kaplan I felt worked best - I felt the mix of the toughness of the ideas in each and the way each provoked their interest

2. What did you like least about this course? In particular, were there readings which didn't work? Why not?

I didn't, at times, feel there was enough background detail - in particular explaining what was problematic about say reference and what motivated the investigator into it - in particular Russell. For me the most interesting figure on the syllabus was tough to work with without a more general sense of his place

3. What would like to have changed in this course? In particular, are there any readings you think should be changed? Added? Why?

I think the course is well structured - the only changes I would recommend would be better grounding the Russell-Frege dispute / relationship because of its importance for the whole tradition, esp. Kripke.

⊗ place in the tradition and his own motivations - but perhaps this falls under the category of 'background reading' and is more the responsibility of the student

PHILOSOPHY GRADUATE SEMINAR COURSE EVALUATION

Each quarter we ask students in graduate-level philosophy courses to evaluate the quality of the course's content and instruction. The completed forms are filed in the cabinet in the Anscombe Library and Lounge, Stuart 216, for students to read. *Even if you are not in the Philosophy Department, please fill out and return this double-sided form to the Philosophy Office in Stuart 202.*

Quarter and Year: Winter 2016 Instructor: Malte Wille
Course Number and Title: PHIL 34010 Meaning and Reference
Your Department and Year (specify grad/undergrad): GRAD in MARSS 2016

Is this course in one of your fields of concentration: Yes If not, why did you take it? _____

I. Please describe the syllabus and requirements of the course:

The syllabus was extremely well put together, each week building up very nicely with the earlier ones - allowed for systematic thinking of one continuous problem across history of philosophy. Requirements were both reasonable and helpful.

II. Please answer the following questions on a scale of 1 to 5:

1. How well-conceived and well-organized was the syllabus? (1 = terribly; 5 = very well) 5
 2. Did the instructor adhere to the syllabus? (1 = not at all; 5 = like a metronome) 5
 3. How demanding were the reading requirements (quality & quantity)? 3
(1 = understanding; 5 = absurdly difficult)
 4. Was the class mostly lecture or mostly discussion? (1 = all lecture; 5 = all discussion) 3
 5. How successful was this format? (1 = not at all; 5 = very) 5
 6. How much material was covered? (1 = narrow focus; 5 = broad range) 2
 7. How deeply was it covered? (1 = superficial survey; 5 = specialist's depth) 5
 8. Did the range and depth match your expectations (from catalog, syllabus, rec.)? 5
(1 = not at all; 5 = perfect match)
 9. Did the range and depth match what you needed from this (kind of) course? 5
(1 = not at all; 5 = perfect match) If imperfect, in what way? _____
-
10. How well-organized and clear was the instructor? (1 = not very; 5 = very) 5
 11. How well did the instructor address questions and arguments offered by students? 5
(1 = not well; 5 = very well)

12. How available/accessible was the instructor outside of class? (1 = not at all; 5 = very) 5

13. How helpful were the instructor's comments on written work? 5

(1 = no work returned; 5 = very helpful)

14. Would you take another course offered by this instructor? (1 = never; 5 = absolutely) 5

III. Please answer the following questions in a few sentences. Well-chosen details are particularly useful.

1. What did you like best about this course? In particular, what readings worked best? Why?

The readings can hardly be distinguished separated from one another as they form a continuous discussion in the history of philosophy and as such all were very interesting and essential. Keine was a personal favorite

2. What did you like least about this course? In particular, were there readings which didn't work? Why not?

Readings less stimulating. NAPLAN

3. What would like to have changed in this course? In particular, are there any readings you think should be changed? Added? Why?

Absolutely nothing! This course provided a great overview of one topic and in-depth discussion ~~about~~

I wouldn't change anything.

PHILOSOPHY GRADUATE SEMINAR COURSE EVALUATION

Each quarter we ask students in graduate-level philosophy courses to evaluate the quality of the course's content and instruction. The completed forms are filed in the cabinet in the Anscombe Library and Lounge, Stuart 216, for students to read. *Even if you are not in the Philosophy Department, please fill out and return this double-sided form to the Philosophy Office in Stuart 202.*

Quarter and Year: Winter 2015 Instructor: Malte Willer

Course Number and Title: PHIL 39425

Your Department and Year (specify grad/undergrad): Grad 1st year

Is this course in one of your fields of concentration: yes If not, why did you take it? _____

I. Please describe the syllabus and requirements of the course:

II. Please answer the following questions on a scale of 1 to 5:

1. How well-conceived and well-organized was the syllabus? (1 = terribly; 5 = very well) 5
2. Did the instructor adhere to the syllabus? (1 = not at all; 5 = like a metronome) 5
3. How demanding were the reading requirements (quality & quantity)? 3
(1 = understanding; 5 = absurdly difficult)
4. Was the class mostly lecture or mostly discussion? (1 = all lecture; 5 = all discussion) 4
5. How successful was this format? (1 = not at all; 5 = very) 5
6. How much material was covered? (1 = narrow focus; 5 = broad range) 5
7. How deeply was it covered? (1 = superficial survey; 5 = specialist's depth) 4
8. Did the range and depth match your expectations (from catalog, syllabus, rec.)? 5
(1 = not at all; 5 = perfect match)
9. Did the range and depth match what you needed from this (kind of) course? 5
(1 = not at all; 5 = perfect match) If imperfect, in what way? _____

10. How well-organized and clear was the instructor? (1 = not very; 5 = very) 5
11. How well did the instructor address questions and arguments offered by students? 5
(1 = not well; 5 = very well)

12. How available/accessible was the instructor outside of class? (1 = not at all; 5 = very) 5
13. How helpful were the instructor's comments on written work?
(1 = no work returned; 5 = very helpful) 5
14. Would you take another course offered by this instructor? (1 = never; 5 = absolutely) 5

III. Please answer the following questions in a few sentences. Well-chosen details are particularly useful.

1. What did you like best about this course? In particular, what readings worked best? Why?

*It was very clear and progressed nicely.
We covered a lot of material*

2. What did you like least about this course? In particular, were there readings which didn't work? Why not? —

3. What would like to have changed in this course? In particular, are there any readings you think should be changed? Added? Why? —

PHILOSOPHY GRADUATE SEMINAR COURSE EVALUATION

Each quarter we ask students in graduate-level philosophy courses to evaluate the quality of the course's content and instruction. The completed forms are filed in the cabinet in the Anscombe Library and Lounge, Stuart 216, for students to read. *Even if you are not in the Philosophy Department, please fill out and return this double-sided form to the Philosophy Office in Stuart 202.*

Quarter and Year: Winter 2015 Instructor: Matte Willer

Course Number and Title: PHIL 39425

Your Department and Year (specify grad/undergrad): grad, 2nd yr, Linguistics

Is this course in one of your fields of concentration: ☒ If not, why did you take it? _____

I. Please describe the syllabus and requirements of the course:

This is a course in logical literacy. It assumes knowledge of propositional and predicate logic, and introduces some non-classical extensions of both, along with some metalogical results for both. There's also an introduction to modal logic, and some applications of it (counterfactuals, two-dimensional logic).

II. Please answer the following questions on a scale of 1 to 5:

1. How well-conceived and well-organized was the syllabus? (1 = terribly; 5 = very well) 5
2. Did the instructor adhere to the syllabus? (1 = not at all; 5 = like a metronome) 5
3. How demanding were the reading requirements (quality & quantity)? 3
(1 = understanding; 5 = absurdly difficult)
4. Was the class mostly lecture or mostly discussion? (1 = all lecture; 5 = all discussion) 2
5. How successful was this format? (1 = not at all; 5 = very) 4
6. How much material was covered? (1 = narrow focus; 5 = broad range) 5
7. How deeply was it covered? (1 = superficial survey; 5 = specialist's depth) 3
8. Did the range and depth match your expectations (from catalog, syllabus, rec.)? 5
(1 = not at all; 5 = perfect match)
9. Did the range and depth match what you needed from this (kind of) course? 5
(1 = not at all; 5 = perfect match) If imperfect, in what way? _____

10. How well-organized and clear was the instructor? (1 = not very; 5 = very) 5
11. How well did the instructor address questions and arguments offered by students? 5
(1 = not well; 5 = very well)

12. How available/accessible was the instructor outside of class? (1 = not at all; 5 = very) 5
13. How helpful were the instructor's comments on written work?
(1 = no work returned; 5 = very helpful) 5
14. Would you take another course offered by this instructor? (1 = never; 5 = absolutely) 5

III. Please answer the following questions in a few sentences. Well-chosen details are particularly useful.

1. What did you like best about this course? In particular, what readings worked best? Why?

2. What did you like least about this course? In particular, were there readings which didn't work? Why not?

3. What would like to have changed in this course? In particular, are there any readings you think should be changed? Added? Why?