

CONTENTS

1. **Teaching Methodology** 1

2. **Teaching Experience** 3

 2.1 Classes Taught 3

 2.2 Classes Assisted 5

3. **Student Evaluations** 6

 3.1 Quantitative Evaluations 6

 3.2 Qualitative Evaluations 7

4. **Sample Course Material** 9

 4.1 Sample Paper Questions 9

 4.2 Sample Undergraduate Syllabus 10

 4.3 Sample Graduate Syllabus 14

1. TEACHING METHODOLOGY

My teaching methodology reflects my conviction that the primary goal of philosophical instruction is to promote careful, analytical reading, thinking and writing. In my teaching, I have implemented a wide range of strategies to better achieve this goal.

Analytical Reading

In order to help my students better appreciate the structure of philosophical prose, I have them submit weekly reading summaries composed of “what it says” and “what it does” statements. A “what it says” statement attempts to summarise the content of an assigned reading. A “what it does” statement describes what the author seeks to accomplish via the content presented. Having students complete “what it says” and “what it does” statements prior to in-class discussions not only encourages careful reading, but also increases student awareness of the structure of the papers read, which arguments are most central for the author’s goal, and overall significance of the author’s claims. Another effective strategy for the promotion of careful reading is playing the “believing and doubting game”. When playing the “believing game”, students read a text empathetically, attempting to see matters from the author’s perspective, and (if necessary) trying to walk in the author’s historical/cultural shoes. I have found that

describing the exercise as a game makes students more willing to put aside their natural resistance to ideas that differ from their own. When playing the “doubting game”, students adopt the role of devil’s advocate, raising objections to, and looking for weaknesses in, the author’s argument. I have found that when this exercise is undertaken subsequently to the “believing game”, it leads to a more balanced appreciation of the strengths and weaknesses of a class reading.

Critical Thinking

One major obstacle to critical thinking, particularly among undergraduates, is intellectual egocentrism—an inability to imagine alternative views on a given issue. In order to push students past their prejudices and natural mental blocks, I have found it highly effective to organise in-class role-playing exercises in which students briefly debate each other in the persona of an assigned philosopher. For example, in my epistemology course at Carleton College, I had four students debate each other, where two pretended to be the externalists, Alvin Goldman and Fred Dretske, and two others pretended to be the internalists, Richard Feldman and Roderick Chisholm. Students were only allowed to use arguments that were consistent with the positions of the thinkers they were role-playing. This exercise allows students to gain a better appreciation of the positions and motivations of the various readings and thinkers covered in class. Moreover, I found that such role-playing was an effective tool in getting members of the class who were reluctant to voice their personal views on a particular issue to be more active. Defending someone else’s views meant that there was much less at stake. Furthermore, students typically found the role-playing format highly stimulating, and it generated a relaxed and fun in-class atmosphere.

Effective Writing

Philosophical writing, if correctly executed, is almost always a type of persuasive writing. In order to better communicate this fact to my students, I have them engage in the following “before reading / after reading” exercise while planning their papers:

Before reading my paper, my readers will believe: _____.

After reading my paper, my readers will believe: _____.

I have found that this simple exercise helps students to keep in mind that their writing aims to take the reader from one set of beliefs or assumptions to another. It also forces them to think about their target audience at the very beginning of the writing process. Left to their own devices, most undergraduates either fail to consider their audience until the very end of the writing process (if at all), or compose papers with the instructor in mind. Failing to consider their audience, or writing with the instructor in mind, often leads students to be less clear in their writing. Students assume that since the subject matter is already familiar to the instructor, there is no need to define technical terms or clarify central concepts. However, often it is only when a student has tried to clarify an

idea for someone lacking philosophical training that they recognise how tenuous their own grasp of the material may actually be. Moreover, if students are going to be competent members of a scholarly community, they must learn to write for a wide and varied audience. This means students must be encouraged to write, not for their instructor only, but for variety of readers, some hostile, uncharitable or lacking basic background knowledge. In order to promote greater mindfulness of their audience, I have begun including a specification of the target audience in my description of written assignments. In their first written assignment I have students target a naïve reader, a reader with basic philosophical knowledge in the second, and a knowledgeable but hostile reader in the third. Sample paper questions illustrating the preceding format are included in §4.1, below.

The preceding points are not only useful in promoting high quality philosophical work, but provides students with general tools they can employ in a wide range of academic and non-academic domains. This is as it should be since most of the students enrolled in a given philosophy class will not ultimately pursue full-time careers in philosophy. While, as a philosopher, I take myself to be particularly well positioned to encourage high quality analytical reading, thinking and writing, the skills I aim to impart to my students are ones that may be effectively applied in contexts far removed from the philosophy classroom.

2. TEACHING EXPERIENCE

2.1 Classes Taught

Graduate Seminar: Mind and Action, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Fall 2015

Graduate seminar: an in depth investigation of cognitivism about practical rationality and the rational significance of desire, featuring guest lectures by John Brunero, Kieran Setiya, and Nomy Arpaly. Enrolment: 7

Formal Logic, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Spring 2015

Elective open to undergraduates: a basic introduction to sentential and first-order logic. Enrolment: 31

Topics in Philosophy of Mind, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Spring 2015

Elective open to upper-level undergraduates: a careful examination of the concept of intentionality. Enrolment: 19

Formal Logic, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Spring 2015

Elective open to undergraduates: a basic introduction to sentential and first-order logic. Enrolment: 36

Epistemology, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Fall 2014
Elective open to upper-level undergraduates: an advanced introduction to central questions in the theory of knowledge. Enrolment: 16

Desire and Intention, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Fall 2014
Graduate seminar: a survey of contemporary theories of desire and intention.
Enrolment: 19

Topics in Action Theory, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Spring 2014
Elective open to upper-level undergraduates: an advanced introduction to central questions in the theory of knowledge. Enrolment: 8

Formal Logic, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Spring 2014
Elective open to undergraduates: a basic introduction to sentential and first-order logic. Enrolment: 23

Epistemology, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Fall 2013
Elective open to upper-level undergraduates: an advanced introduction to central questions in the theory of knowledge. Enrolment: 10

Formal Logic, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Fall 2013
Elective open to undergraduates: a basic introduction to sentential and first-order logic. Enrolment: 22

Epistemology, Carleton College, Spring 2012
Elective open to upper-level undergraduate: an advanced introduction to central questions in the theory of knowledge. Enrolment: 6.

Symbolic Logic, Carleton College, Fall 2011
Elective open to upper-level undergraduates: an advanced introduction to classical sentential and first-order, predicate logic. Enrolment: 27.

Introduction to the Problems of Philosophy, Bloomfield College, Spring 2003
Core curriculum requirement: an introduction to questions in ethics, epistemology, and metaphysics as they arise in Plato's *Euthyphro*, *Apology*, *Meno*, and *Phaedo*, with analogies and illustrations drawn from contemporary popular culture.
Enrolment: 18.

2.2 Classes Assisted

Methods/Problems of Philosophy (Akeel Bilgrami), Columbia University, Spring 2011

An introduction to the methods and problems of philosophy, the course covers topics such as freedom of the will, scepticism, political liberty and power, and the mind/body problem, through a mix of historical and contemporary readings.

Epistemology (Jeffrey Helzner), Columbia University, Fall 2010

An elective open to upper-level undergraduates, the course serves as an advanced introduction to traditional and formal epistemology with emphasis on the norms governing belief formation.

20th Century Philosophy (David Sidorsky), Columbia University, Fall 2009

An elective open to upper-level undergraduates, the course serves as an advanced introduction to some of the more prominent philosophical schools of the previous century, including logical positivism, ordinary language philosophy, phenomenology, and existentialism.

Symbolic Logic (Achille Varzi), Columbia University, Fall 2008 – Spring 2010

A mixed graduate / upper-level undergraduate course serving as an advanced introduction to concepts and methods of classical propositional and predicate logic.

Moral and Political Philosophy (Mario De Caro), Tufts University, Summer 2005

An elective open to upper-level undergraduates, the course provides an advanced introduction to moral and political philosophy through a mix of historical and contemporary readings.

Introduction to Ethics (Nancy Bauer), Tufts University, Spring 2005

A general introduction to ideas of prominent ethical theorists, including Plato, Aristotle, Immanuel Kant, and John Stuart Mill, along with replies and criticisms from contemporary thinkers.

Religion as a Natural Phenomenon (Daniel Dennett), Tufts University, Fall 2004

A mixed graduate / upper-level undergraduate seminar on Dennett's "Breaking the Spell: Religion as a Natural Phenomenon", taught by the author.

3. STUDENT EVALUATIONS

3.1 Quantitative Evaluations

The following includes *all* responses to *all* quantitative questions for the course evaluations for Methods and Problems in Philosophy, Spring 2011.

Questions:

1. Ability to raise challenging questions:
2. Ability to help clarify course material:
3. Ability to encourage student participation effectively:
4. Responsiveness to student questions, opinions and criticisms:
5. Feedback on assignments and examinations:
6. Ability to communicate effectively with students:
7. Overall effectiveness:

Out of 25 respondents:

Question	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A
1	40% (10)	36% (9)	12% (3)	4% (1)	0% (0)	8% (2)
2	52% (13)	32% (8)	16% (4)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
3	48% (12)	24% (6)	24% (6)	4% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)
4	48% (12)	36% (9)	16% (4)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
5	44% (11)	24% (6)	16% (4)	0% (0)	0% (0)	16% (4)
6	48% (12)	36% (9)	12% (3)	4% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)
7	48% (12)	28% (7)	24% (6)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)

The following includes all responses to all quantitative questions for the course evaluations for Epistemology, Fall 2010.

Questions:

1. Ability to raise challenging questions:
2. Ability to help clarify course material:
3. Ability to encourage student participation effectively:
4. Responsiveness to student questions, opinions and criticisms:
5. Feedback on assignments and examinations:
6. Ability to communicate effectively with students:
7. Overall effectiveness:

Out of 9 respondents:

Question	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A
1	67% (6)	11% (1)	11% (1)	11% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)
2	67% (6)	11% (1)	11% (1)	11% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)
3	56% (5)	11% (1)	11% (1)	22% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)
4	56% (5)	22% (2)	11% (1)	11% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)
5	78% (7)	0% (0)	0% (0)	22% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)
6	78% (7)	0% (0)	0% (0)	22% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)
7	56% (5)	22% (2)	11% (1)	11% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)

3.2 Qualitative Evaluations

The following includes *all* qualitative responses for the course Methods and Problems in Philosophy, Spring 2011.

1. Effective and approachable TA with firm grasp of subject matter knowledge.
2. Always available to explain the complex topics covered in class.
3. He was good, but listened to students less than Bilgrami.
4. Avery did a good job in review sessions and office hours going over course material and answering other questions. I feel though that he needed a bit more time for review sessions because the reviews were often rushed. His grading was appropriate and he provided clear and useful comments.
5. Avery ran the majority of the TA review sessions and he clearly presented summaries of the main points in class and the readings. I cannot say anything about his grading as he did not grade my midterm.
6. Avery was an excellent TA! The only reason the ratings are not all 5's is because of limitations on his ability to do things like "raise challenging questions," due to limited discussion segment time and the need to work quickly through clarification of course material. Always flexible with office hours and willing to help, highly knowledgeable with regard to course materials, and very gifted at teaching that knowledge to others.
7. Avery was an absolutely fantastic TA. His review sessions were very helpful; concise and informative. I was able to meet with him before an exam, and his advice was certainly helpful in allowing me to better prepare; he was clearly passionate about being

a teacher and passionate about philosophy. It was great to have a TA as dedicated and helpful as Avery in a class when the material was sometimes difficult to comprehend.

8. Avery is very quick to respond with e-mail and very good at quickly digesting many lectures worth of material into a condensed overview.

9. Avery is one sharp guy. He carried with him a high degree of confidence and preparedness in his portion of lectures. At the same time, he was extremely approachable and welcome to any questions.

10. Avery was a great TA. He knew the material quite well and was integral in my understanding of the course.

The following includes *all* qualitative responses for the course Epistemology, Fall 2010.

1. Avery led wonderfully productive recitation sessions and was outstandingly helpful in understanding the readings. His guidelines and feedback for the assignments was clear and thorough. A great TA!

2. Avery was extremely helpful. His weekly discussion sections helped me understand the readings much better, and I feel that I got a lot more out of Thursdays with Prof. Helzner because the readings were clarified during the discussion section. We also had interesting debates and discussions in Avery section. His willingness to help you write papers was very helpful as well, and his comments on the writing assignments were always fair, constructive, and helped my writing in general.

3. Wonderful TA. Always available and very clear.

4. Coolest TA ever.

SAMPLE PAPER QUESTIONS

EPISTEMOLOGY (AVERY ARCHER)

DIRECTIONS: This assignment will assess (i) the quality of your reasoning as reflected in the organisation, clarity and cogency of your reply to one of the questions below, and (ii) your ability to communicate your ideas to a specific audience. In addition to your paper, you are *required* to include a short description (in two or three sentences) of how you have tailored your paper in order to better reach the target audience specified.

QUESTION 1: What do you take to be the most significant difference between A. J. Ayer's account of knowledge and the traditional JTB analysis? Provide textual and argumentative support in favour of your answer. Which of the two analyses do you believe to be superior? Why?

Audience: This paper should target a philosophically unsophisticated reader who has never taken an epistemology class. Your goal is to explain the significance of the relevant concepts and why you have adopted the position you have.

QUESTION 2: According to Nozick, why can't I know that I am not a brain in a tank on Alpha Centauri? Does this, according to Nozick, entail that I do not know that I am now sitting and typing on my computer? Why or why not? Do you agree with Nozick's assessment? Why or why not?

Audience: This paper should target an audience with a very basic knowledge of philosophy (e.g., an undergraduate who has taken an introductory class in philosophy) who has not read Nozick's paper. Your goal is to explain the significance of the relevant concepts and why you have adopted the position you have.

QUESTION 3: Do you think that Feldman's and Conee's reply to the objection that internalism cannot preserve the intuition that we may know that p even if we have forgotten the initial source of our justification for believing that p succeeds? Why or why not?

Audience: This paper should target a hostile reader (i.e., someone who holds the opposite of whatever position you ultimately choose to defend) with a very basic knowledge of the debate between internalist and externalist (e.g., an undergraduate currently enrolled in an Epistemology class). Your goal is to persuade them to accept your view.

SAMPLE SYLLABUS II

EPISTEMOLOGY (UNDERGRADUATE)

Course Description

Epistemology is the study of knowledge. In this class we will think about how the term knowledge should be defined, the structure of epistemic justification, putative sources of knowledge, and whether knowledge is even possible. We will explore these questions via a close reading of contemporary texts that have played an important role in shaping the contours of the field. One of the primary goals of this course will be to hone your ability to closely read philosophical texts. Consequently, classes will be largely devoted to the careful analysis and discussion of the assigned readings.

Learning Outcomes

By the end of this course, students should be able to:

- Identify, describe and critically evaluate the dominant theories of knowledge.
- Articulate why it is difficult to offer a conceptual analysis of knowledge.
- Distinguish between different sources of knowledge and identify the unique issues, problems and questions that relate to each.

Coursework

The grade for the course will be broken down as follows:

1. *Class Participation* (10%): Regular class attendance and participation is expected. This includes coming to class prepared, having done the required reading, asking questions, answering questions, and engaging in a constructive way in class discussion.
2. *Weekly Blog Posts* (10%): I will be posting discussion questions based on the weekly readings on Blackboard, at the “Epistemology Blog” link. Students are asked to either respond to discussion questions, or critically engage other student’s responses, in the comments section of each blog post.
3. *Midterm Exam* (20%): There will be an in-class midterm exam in essay question format. The midterm will assess your grasp of key concepts and distinctions discussed in the first half of the course. **Date:** October 14th.
4. *Term Paper* (30%): Minimum length = 850 words/Maximum length = 1,000 words. The final paper is due before midnight on Tuesday, December 2nd. A list of topics will be

distributed on Tuesday, November 4th. You may also write on a topic of your own choosing with my prior approval.

5. *Final Exam* (30%): The final exam will be in essay question format. It will be comprehensive, but will primarily focus on concepts and distinctions relating to the sources of knowledge. **Date:** December 8th, 10:15am-12:15pm.

Grade Scale:

A = 95 ↑	C = 70 ↑
A- = 90 ↑	C- = 65 ↑
B+ = 87 ↑	D+ = 60 ↑
B = 83 ↑	D = 55 ↑
B- = 80 ↑	D- = 50 ↑
C+ = 75 ↑	F = Anything below 50

Policy on Late Assignments:

Late papers will only be accepted in extenuating circumstances (e.g., serious illness). Appropriate documentation must be provided (e.g., note from doctor).

Required Reading:

All the required readings for this course are available electronically in the “Course materials” section of the course’s Blackboard website. You have three main goals when reading assigned material: (1) *Identify* the main claims the author is arguing for (“What are the author’s main conclusions?”); (2) *Understand* how the author argues for those claims (“What arguments does the author offer to support her/his main conclusions? How, exactly, are those arguments supposed to go?”); and (3) *Evaluate* the author’s arguments (“How strong are the author’s arguments for her/his main conclusions?”). I have included a pair of essays by Jim Pryor entitled “Guidelines on Reading Philosophy” and “Guidelines on Writing Philosophy” in the “Assignments” section of the course Blackboard website. As we begin our course, please have a look at these essays.

Reading Schedule:

Topic	Readings (available on Blackboard)
1. Introduction	(No Readings)
2. The JTB Account	Ayer, "Knowing as Having the Right to be Sure"
3. The Gettier Problem I	Gettier, "Is Justified True Belief Knowledge?"
4. The Gettier Problem II	Clark, "Knowledge and Grounds"
5. Responses to Gettier I	Goldman, "A Causal Theory of knowing"
6. Responses to Gettier II	Lehrer, "Knowledge: Undefeated Justified True Belief"
7. Responses to Gettier III	Zagzebski, "The Inescapability of Gettier Problems"
8. Externalist Theories I	Nozick, "Knowledge"
9. Externalist Theories II	Dretske, "Knowledge and the Flow of Information"
10. Internalist Theories I	Feldman, "Internalism Defended"
11. Internalist Theories II	Chisholm, "The Indispensability of Internal Justification"
12. Knowledge Attribution I	Dretske, "The Pragmatic Dimension of Knowledge"
13. Knowledge Attribution II	Chisholm, "The Problem of Criterion"
MIDTERM EXAM	(No Readings)
FALL BREAK	(No Class)
14. Contextualism	DeRose, "Contextualism and Knowledge Attribution"
15. Relevant Alternatives	Stine, "Scepticism, Relevant Alternatives, and Closure"
16. Perception I	Russell, "The Problems of Philosophy"
17. Perception II	Austin, "Sense and Sensibilia"
18. Memory I	Malcolm, "A Definition of Factual Memory"

19. Memory II	Huemer, "The Problem of Memory Knowledge"
20. Testimony I	Coady, "Testimony and Observation"
21. Testimony II	Fricker, "Against Gullibility"
22. Induction I	Russell, "On Induction"
23. Induction II	Goodman, "The New Riddle of Induction"
24. Pulling it all together	Lewis, "Elusive Knowledge"

Resources

The Philosophy Department's UT website (<http://philosophy.utk.edu>) and Blackboard site (<http://online.utk.edu>; access restricted to current majors) offer a variety of resources helpful to those studying Philosophy as well as information about our degree programs and other opportunities for undergraduates—including our scholarships (applications considered, and awards announced, this semester), essay contest (competition takes place this semester), and Philosophy Club. All of these are open to students not in a Philosophy degree program.

Academic Integrity

"An essential feature of the University of Tennessee, Knoxville is a commitment to maintaining an atmosphere of intellectual integrity and academic honesty. As a student of the university, I pledge that I will neither knowingly give nor receive any inappropriate assistance in academic work, thus affirming my own personal commitment to honour and integrity." – Provost Susan Martin

Disabilities

If you have a disability that requires accommodation, please contact the Office of Disability Services (865-974-6087) to discuss your needs, and then schedule an appointment to meet with me during my office hours.

SAMPLE SYLLABUS II

MIND AND ACTION (GRADUATE)

Course Description

What is the relationship between what we think and how we act? This seminar will explore this question. Drawing on the work of contemporary theorists like John Brunero, Kieran Setiya, and Nomy Arpaly, the course will focus on the requirements for rationally and/or morally permissible belief and action. Special attention will be paid to the similarities and differences between deliberation about what to believe and deliberation about what to do. The seminar will include visits from the three aforementioned contemporary theorists—Brunero, Setiya, and Arpaly—each of whom will lead a class discussion of their work and deliver a departmental colloquium talk. Students are strongly encouraged to attend the colloquium talks by the guest lecturers.

Coursework

The grade for the course will be broken down as follows:

1. *Class Participation* (10%): Regular class attendance and participation is expected. This includes coming to class prepared, having done the required reading, asking questions, answering questions, engaging in a constructive way in class discussion, and serving as class scribe on at least one occasion.

The discussion card system: each student will be issued four colour-coded discussion cards at the beginning of each class session: Orange, Yellow, Purple, and Blue. Students are asked to submit one of the cards whenever they ask a question or make a comment. Orange cards will be given first priority, Yellow cards second, Purple cards third, and Blue cards will have the lowest priority. Once you have used all three of your cards, you may ask questions or comment by simply raising your hand. However, priority will be given to the student with the highest priority discussion card. The card system will allow me to keep track of who has been participating and how much, and will also ensure that no one student dominates the discussion. You should aim to use at least three of your cards by the end of each class session. Students are encouraged to prepare questions in advance, based on the readings, especially on days with a visiting guest lecturer.

2. *Weekly Reading Response* (40%): You will submit (via email) a total of 10 weekly reading reports (approximately 250 words each) based on readings from the course. Reports must be submitted by **midnight on the Tuesday** before the date the reading appears on the syllabus. Each report must provide a sustained objection, argument, or

analysis of the weekly reading. Reading reports will be graded as “Satisfactory” or “Unsatisfactory”.

3. *Term Paper* (50%): Maximum length = 4,000 words. The term paper is due before midnight on Tuesday, December 1st. You will need to provide me with a proposed paper topic (in the form of a thesis statement) by Thursday, October 29th.

Grade Scale:

A = 95 ↑	C = 70 ↑
A- = 90 ↑	C- = 65 ↑
B+ = 87 ↑	D+ = 60 ↑
B = 83 ↑	D = 55 ↑
B- = 80 ↑	D- = 50 ↑
C+ = 75 ↑	F = Anything below 50

Policy on Late Assignments:

Late papers will only be accepted in extenuating circumstances (e.g., serious illness). Appropriate documentation must be provided (e.g., note from doctor).

Textbook:

The textbook for the course is Nomy Arpaly’s *In Praise of Desire*, published by Oxford University Press, 2014. Readings from the text are indicated by the acronym, IPD.

Required Reading:

All the required readings for this course will be either taken from the course textbook or be made available electronically (via Blackboard). You have three main goals when reading assigned material: (1) *Identify* the main claims the author is arguing for (“What are the author’s main conclusions?”); (2) *Understand* how the author argues for those claims (“What arguments does the author offer to support her/his main conclusions? How, exactly, are those arguments supposed to go?”); and (3) *Evaluate* the author’s arguments (“How strong are the author’s arguments for her/his main conclusions?”). I have included a pair of essays by Jim Pryor entitled “Guidelines on Reading Philosophy” and “Guidelines on Writing Philosophy” in the “Assignments” section of

the course Blackboard website. As we begin our course, please have a look at these essays.

Reading Schedule:

The following reading schedule is tentative. As the class progresses, and I get a better sense of the needs and interests of the participants, I may need to make changes to the reading schedule. However, students who read ahead and decide to submit a reading assignment based on the present reading schedule will be allowed to do so, irrespective of any changes made to the schedule in the future.

DATE	READINGS
SECTION I	The Nature of Practical Reasons
August 20	"Introduction" IPD pp. 1-16 (Arpaly)
August 27	"Intention, Belief, and Instrumental Rationality" (Bratman)
September 3	"The Unity of Reasoning?" (Broome)
September 10	"Against Cognitivism about Practical Reasons" (Brunero)*
September 17	"Cognitivism about Practical Rationality (Brunero)*
September 24*	"Cognitivism about Instrumental Reasons" (Setiya)*
SECTION II	The Nature of Practical Rationality
October 1	"Reasons: Explanation or Evidence?" (Kearns & Star)
October 8	MIDTERM EXAM – No Class
October 15	"Responding Correctly to Reasons?" (Broome)
October 22	"What is a Reason to Act?" (Setiya)*
October 29*	"Broome on Reasons to Act" (Setiya)
SECTION III	The Nature of Practical Deliberation
November 5	"Deliberation" IPD pp. 19-42 (Arpaly)
November 12	"How Deliberation Works" IPD pp. 43-52 (Arpaly)
November 19*	"Thinking and Acting for Reasons" IPD pp. 53-89 (Arpaly)
November 26	"What Desires Are (Not)" IPD pp. 110-156 (Arpaly)
December 9	FINAL EXAM (5pm-7pm)