

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. H. 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 sentential & predicate 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 Litter is an excellent instructor, and discussion sections with him were very helpful in understanding the material. Ability to solve 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 actual lecture 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?

M/A - 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 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: Matthias 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 taken 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)

1
(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) 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) 2.5
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) 5
6. How much material was covered? (1 = narrow focus; 5 = broad range) 2.5
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?

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 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 Avard.

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:

~~This~~ 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.