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Epic Questions II: Mind, Meaning and Morality  
A Summer Institute in Philosophy for High School Teachers

Project Summary:

Mitchell Green, the NEH/Horace W. Goldsmith Distinguished Teaching Professor in the Department of Philosophy at the University of Virginia, proposes a four week Summer Institute to be held July 8, 2012, to August 2, 2013, to provide high school teachers the knowledge and skills needed to incorporate Philosophy into their curricula. The Institute will consist in an intensive treatment of some main topics in the field selected with an eye to what teachers can most effectively bring back to their schools to enhance existing curricula. Topics to be covered are Logic and Argumentation (including argument mapping, fallacies, and rudiments of symbolic logic), Metaphysics (including free will, personal identity and ontology), Epistemology (including skepticism, justification, varieties of knowledge, and the nature of explanation), Philosophy of Mind (including the mind-body problem, self-knowledge, and issues pertaining to consciousness), Ethics (including consequentialist, Kantian, and Aristotelian approaches), Social and Political Philosophy (including rights, political obligation, and theories of justice) and Bioethics (including healthcare and research ethics). Throughout, the emphasis will be on enabling teachers to present these materials “Socratically” rather than in a lecture format. All sessions will be held on the Central Grounds of the beautiful and historic University of Virginia, and logistical support will be provided by the University’s Center for Liberal Arts.
Epic Questions II: Mind, Meaning and Morality
A Summer Institute in Philosophy for High School Teachers

II. Narrative Description

A. INTELLECTUAL RATIONALE

I propose a four week Summer Institute to be held July 8, 2012, to August 2, 2013, to provide high school teachers with the knowledge and skills needed to incorporate Philosophy into their curricula. Expanding and enhancing a first such Institute offered in the summer of 2011, Epic Questions II will consist in an intensive treatment of some main topics in the field selected with an eye to what teachers can most effectively bring back to their schools to enhance existing curricula.

Unlike what is the case in Europe, formal instruction in Philosophy in American high schools is the exception rather than the norm. More often than not, students happen upon philosophical questions in the course of studying slavery as depicted by Mark Twain, human rights as appealed to by the American Founders, or freedom of will as contemplated by Hamlet. These and related issues are important topics for discussion in English, Government, History, and many other classes, yet it is my conviction that a large, untapped educational opportunity exists in secondary-level Philosophy instruction.

If you’ve wandered by the Philosophy section at a mainstream bookstore lately, you may have noticed, interspersed among the Plato, Kant, and Kierkegaard, a number of titles having the form X and Philosophy, where X includes such pop-culture topics as Star Wars, Buffy the Vampire Slayer, Hip Hop, The Simpsons, Stephen Colbert, Twilight, and Radiohead. Open Court Publishing, which produces these volumes, evidently finds a market for them among teenagers. Similarly, over the last several years I have been invited to speak at both public and private high schools in Virginia on various topics in Philosophy. In each case I was amazed at both the thirst for philosophical

discussion I found among students in my audiences, and at these students’ ability to engage constructively with the issues presented. Again, I have been a panelist since 2005 for the website, Askphilosophers.org, to which anyone can submit questions about Philosophy to be answered by an international panel of about thirty professional philosophers. My colleagues and I have fielded questions from people of all walks of life, but it is clear that a large portion of such questions are from secondary-level students who are exploring Philosophy on their own but are having difficulty negotiating its complexities without guidance from teachers competent to do so.

The foregoing experiences inspired me in 2009 to conceive Project High-Phi (www.high-phi.org), which is dedicated to the cultivation of philosophical inquiry in American high schools. I have been granted support for this Project from the National Endowment for the Humanities, the University of Virginia’s Teaching Resource Center, the Office of the Provost of the University of Virginia, the American Philosophical Association, and the Squire Foundation. The generosity of these organizations has enabled me to convene groups of high school teachers and college faculty to discuss prospects and challenges of teaching Philosophy at the secondary level. I am also working with staff at the Women’s Center at the University of Virginia to enhance and broaden their Philosophers’ Program, which serves students at the Henry Avenue Learning Center in Charlottesville, VA.² I have sponsored two annual High-Phi Essay Contests for high school students, and have co-taught two Undergraduate Internship courses, in which U.Va. undergraduate Philosophy students work with area teachers to help them incorporate philosophy into their curricula. In addition, I am currently an Associate Fellow at U.Va.’s Institute for the Advanced Technology in the Humanities, and am working with the Institute’s staff to develop a web resource,

²The Henry Avenue Learning Center is a school for at-risk students, many of whom participate in the Philosopher’s Program by meeting weekly with Women’s Center staff and their undergraduate interns to discuss philosophical questions, some of an abstract kind and some with a direct personal significance.
Socratic Method Online, aimed to help students learn Philosophy by engaging with the field argumentatively rather than as a body of settled doctrine.

The NEH has made possible another important component of Project High-Phi, namely the Epic Questions Institute, which took place in July, 2011. I applied to direct this in 2010, because in communicating with teachers about philosophical pedagogy at the secondary level, I learned that many who are interested in teaching more Philosophy lack formal training in the field. Further, because a Philosophy class would be an elective, but not one that is supported with an Advanced Placement exam, many high schools lack incentives to offer full-term courses on this subject.

Instead, and as adumbrated above, much philosophical discussion in high school happens by way of treating other subjects. Yet the educators I have polled are eager to deepen and broaden their teaching of Philosophy in such contexts, and I am now approaching the NEH with a proposal for a second Summer Institute in order to help attain this goal.

The Institute I envision is thus quite different from other NEH Institutes typically offered. These tend to be focused on a specific topic—Jazz in America; Literature, Religion and Art of the Himalayas, and so on—whereas I aim to provide brief but intensive exposure to a wide variety of areas within my discipline. My reason for doing so is that since many teachers whom I would like to serve will have little or no formal philosophical training, their first exposure to the field should provide some breadth of coverage. Such breadth is particularly important for Philosophy because many of its sub-fields depend on one another intimately: discussions of justice and rights in Bioethics and Political Philosophy often depend on conceptions of personhood, a topic within Metaphysics; theories in the Philosophy of Science interact not just with the metaphysical issues of space and time, but also with Epistemology; current research in Ethics is even witnessing a quickened interest in Epistemology. As a result, a civics teacher who aspires to bring Political

---

Philosophy into her classroom does well to ground her thought in appropriate areas of Metaphysics; a science teacher wishing to explore with students what is involved in confirming or disconfirming a theory—a core topic in the Philosophy of Science—should be conversant with some main themes in Epistemology, and so on. Narrowing our approach would, I believe, hamper teachers’ efforts. At the same time, the Visiting Lecturers scheduled to present at the Institute are of such a caliber that even teachers who come to the Institute with, say, a primary interest in the Philosophy of Mind or Bioethics may find, to their surprise, exciting opportunities for unexpected areas of philosophical pedagogy.

The potential benefits of the Institute thus conceived are many. While all academic subjects involve criticism, analysis and argumentation, Philosophy is particularly well suited to the cultivation of critical reasoning skills. The thought processes central to this field, involving concepts like time, freedom, justice and truth, depend crucially on precise verbal formulation, sometimes with arguments elucidated in terms of premises and conclusions. Students of Philosophy thus develop the skills of close textual analysis, as well as a sensitivity to fallacies in reasoning that often go unnoticed among educated adults.\(^4\)

Even for secondary-level students who do not continue to college, exposure to Philosophy can have lasting benefits. Because this field encourages attention to clarity of thought and cogency of argument, high school graduates who have been exposed to Philosophy may be better equipped to spot fallacious reasoning in the public sphere. As a result they may well be prepared as adults to cast their votes based on reasoned argument rather than demagoguery, and to make choices as consumers reflectively and with a robust skeptical attitude.

What is more, Philosophy properly taught has an uncanny ability to excite students who are capable but under-motivated. Students who are otherwise apathetic are often the most vigorous contributors to class discussions touching on philosophical issues. As a result, philosophical education at the secondary level has the potential to inspire students who would otherwise plod through the rest of their education, however far it might carry them.

Finally, the cultivation of philosophical education in high school is a long-term investment in the humanities. All too often students taking a Philosophy course in college treat it as one of so many items on a menu—to be sampled before, presumably, moving on to a main course that they expect to provide more sustenance for a dependable career. Such an approach makes it difficult for students to appreciate what Philosophy as a classic humanistic discipline has to offer them even if they do end up with a “practical” major. By contrast, exposure to Philosophy before college increases the likelihood of students coming to appreciate its lasting value. Regardless of the path they later pursue, this early exposure can help our students come alive to the nuances and immediacy of life’s most pressing questions, thereby spurring their critical and active engagement with political, religious, and economic institutions.

B. PROJECT CONTENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

The Summer Institute will enable teachers to deepen their background in Philosophy in order to develop course material that will be used in their classes. The primary goal is not to help teachers develop stand-alone Philosophy courses—although this would be welcome if they have that opportunity—but rather to help them incorporate philosophical content into pre-existing courses in other fields such as Literature, Government, History, Biology, Physics, and Psychology.

One approach to the study of Philosophy is via the theories of the greats of the past such as Plato, Aristotle, Descartes, Leibniz, and Kant. However, in my experience even strong college
students can be overwhelmed by exegetical difficulties in engaging with such figures. As a result, I have learned that at the lower-division undergraduate level, approaching Philosophy via *issues* rather than via *figures* is most effective. Accordingly, over the last ten years I have developed my large Introduction to Philosophy lecture course around central questions in Ethics, Philosophy of Religion, Epistemology, Political Philosophy and Metaphysics. Historical figures are addressed in the course of answering these questions, rather than as ends in themselves. Indeed, I wrote the introductory text, *Engaging Philosophy: A Brief Introduction*, with the express purpose of introducing the field in this “topically” oriented way.

I believe this approach would apply equally well at the secondary level. Rather than treat Philosophy as a repository of ideas under glass, with all the soporific implications one might expect from such an approach, I prefer to help students to see why questions pertaining to right and wrong, freedom, the self, consciousness and personhood are worth caring about. Only then, after they’ve begun to articulate their own views on such questions are they ready to learn about established theories.

In the spirit of this topically centered approach, the Institute’s main issues to be covered are as follows:

- **Logic and Critical Thinking**, including argument assessment and construction, a survey of major fallacies, methods of conceptual analysis, and the method of argument mapping.
- **Metaphysics**, with a focus on free will and personal identity.
- **Knowledge and Mind**, including consciousness, forms of knowledge, the nature of justification, perception, and the mind-body problem.
- **Aesthetics**, including the possibility of gaining knowledge from fiction, and the relation of emotion to art.
- **Theoretical Ethics**, including both historical and contemporary approaches.
• Practical Ethics, including bioethics.

• Social and Political Philosophy, including the moral status of law, social contract theory, and major conceptions of justice.

Just as the syllabi will be designed in a way that is responsive to the Institute participants’ needs, so too will be its style of instruction. I have explained to all five Visiting Lecturers that in their Institute sessions they are to model the Socratic method as much as possible. To this end the Lecturers will draw the participants into the subject matter not by straight lecture but rather by dialectic: pose a problem, solicit potential answers from the audience, critique those answers, solicit refined answers, adjudicate among competing views, repeat. This methodology will have the dual effect of explaining the subject matter to participants, while at the same time modeling how they might use Socratic methodology in their own classrooms.

C. Project Faculty and Staff

The University of Virginia is its state’s flagship research institution, but has a low enrollment (about 14,300 undergraduates and about 6,500 graduate students) compared with most other such institutions. As a result, in many respects the University has the feel of a four-year liberal arts college, and that sense is well reflected in the culture of the Department of Philosophy. Faculty work closely with both graduate and undergraduate students, and the Department well exemplifies Thomas Jefferson’s vision for his university as an “academical village.” By my count, the Corcoran Department of Philosophy, in spite of its relatively small size of sixteen faculty, contains more teaching award winners than any other department in the entire University. Further, students who earn their Ph.D.’s in our program nearly always carry our vision of an intimate connection of teaching research into their own careers.
Our Visiting Lecturers will likewise exemplify a profound commitment to pedagogy, while providing broad coverage of many core areas in Philosophy. In addition, Professor Jennifer Gurley of Le Moyne College has agreed to be our Full-Time Faculty Member alongside my own role as Project Director. While attending all Institute sessions, Professor Gurley will bring to the table her training and research interests in Rhetoric and the interface of Literature with Philosophy. My invitation to Professor Gurley to join our Institute is inspired by my realization from our first Epic Questions Institute that many teachers are eager to discern philosophical significance in the literature they regularly teach, but seek some guidance in doing so. Professor Gurley also shares my passion for the enhancement of critical thinking at the high school level, and is eager to work with teachers throughout the planned four-week period of the Institute to assist them in building this topic into their courses. Throughout the Institute, Gurley will organize break-out discussion and special-interest groups on topics such as engaging troubled students, finding appropriate reading materials and exercises, and formulating discussion questions to connect philosophical issues with students’ daily lives. Our core teaching staff will thus be as follows:

**Project Director:**

**Mitchell Green,** University of Virginia  
Epistemology, Philosophy of Mind

**Full-Time Faculty:**

**Jennifer Gurley,** Le Moyne College  
Rhetoric, Philosophy through Literature

**Visiting Lecturers (in order of appearance):**

**Mara Harrell,** Carnegie-Mellon University  
Logic and Argumentation

**Trenton Merricks,** University of Virginia  
Metaphysics

**Rebecca Stangl,** University of Virginia  
Ethics

**Alisa Carse,** Georgetown University  
Social and Political Philosophy

**John Arras,** University of Virginia  
Bioethics, Practical Ethics
D. PARTICIPANT SELECTION

In the fall of 2012, Mitch Green will convene a Selection Panel to select the Summer Institute’s participants the following spring. Applications for the Institute will be accepted until early March, 2013, and selection will commence soon after that date with final decisions to be made by April 15. The Selection Panel will include: Corin Fox, an advanced graduate student in the Department of Philosophy who has extensive experience teaching Philosophy and Critical Thinking; Mitch Green, whose curriculum vitae is contained in the Appendix; Lisa Marshall, who has over two decades’ experience teaching a Philosophy course at Western Albemarle High School in Crozet, Virginia, and thirty years of secondary-level teaching experience overall.

In selecting participants, we will seek a balance of teachers from private, public, charter, religiously-affiliated and home-school environments, as well as a balance of geographical and demographic representation nationwide including rural, urban, and under-resourced schools. First consideration will be given to applicants who have not participated in an NEH-supported seminar or institute in the last three years. Furthermore, we will reserve up to three spaces for applicants who are full-time graduate students (in Philosophy) who intend to teach at the secondary level after receiving their degree. We will also consider applications from school administrators wishing to consider the incorporation of philosophical pedagogy on a large scale in their schools or districts.

Prior formal training in Philosophy will not be a factor in selection. Instead, demonstrated interest in and commitment to philosophical pedagogy will be the central criterion. Examples of such demonstrated interest or commitment will include: a teacher’s involvement in extra-curricular activities at his or her school such as a debate team or a Philosophy club, or a compelling explanation of how the teacher’s current pedagogical aims could be enhanced by incorporation of Philosophy into their courses. Moreover, we will ask applicants to include a proposal discussing the unit or units in their current curriculum they would like to enhance through their work in the
Institute. This will not only help the Selection Committee assess the candidate’s ability to benefit from the Institute; it will also help that Committee make recommendations to Visiting Lecturers as they finalize the details of their syllabi.

E. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR PARTICIPANTS

The Center for the Liberal Arts will provide a detailed letter describing the content of the program for each participant to assist teachers in re-certification, tenure, and promotion processes. In addition, the lesson plans that the teachers will have developed during the Institute will be posted online at the Project High-Phi website (www.high-phi.org). Moreover, Project High-Phi is committed to working with teachers well after they have left the Summer Institute to support their philosophical pedagogy: with the aid of a “wiki” to which these participants can post comments, questions or concerns as they try out their new material, we can provide feedback as well as support a community of teachers helping one another in this enterprise. In addition, one result of the first Epic Questions Institute was the creation of the High-Phi Forum, on which are posted essays by high school teachers, college faculty and others on various aspects of philosophical engagement at the secondary level. We will encourage alumni of Epic Questions II to contribute to this Forum.

F. INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT

1. Corcoran Department of Philosophy, University of Virginia

The Corcoran Department, housed in Cocke Hall on the Central Grounds of the University of Virginia, is a collegial environment for intensive philosophical discussion and research. A faculty of sixteen covers the main areas in the field, and our approximately thirty-five graduate students and 150+ undergraduate majors work on a similarly broad range of topics. Unlike larger departments which often splinter into areas, the Corcoran Department prides itself on the absence of boundaries:
ethicists sit in on epistemologists’ talks; logicians team-teach courses with historians of Philosophy; metaphysicians collaborate with aestheticians. Moreover, and sometimes to the surprise of outsiders, the Department is a hotbed of controversy: we are incessantly challenging one another’s ideas, sometimes in the form of complex arguments or counter-arguments. To outsiders this may appear rude or aggressive, whereas to philosophers the highest compliment one can pay to a colleague is controversy.

In this spirit, both I and all lecturers in the Institute will attempt to convey to participants that they best way to master Philosophy is to jump into the fray and argue about it. For this reason, ample time each day will be set aside for debates with the lecturer leading discussion, notwithstanding the fact that each lecturer is a recognized authority in his or her field. Our hope is that not only will this approach help the teachers learn the material more intimately, but that it will also equip them with skills to make Philosophy come alive for their own students.

2. Center for the Liberal Arts, University of Virginia

The University of Virginia is a respected American site for the education of teachers, and through the efforts of the Center for the Liberal Arts has also been a leader in content preparation for K-12 teachers. Since its founding by the Arts and Sciences faculty in 1984, over 10,000 teachers have attended CLA programs in a variety of disciplines that have drawn on the contributions of hundreds of scholars, among them the university’s most distinguished researchers. CLA’s mission is to offer quality content support to teachers throughout the Commonwealth of Virginia and to provide a national model which demonstrates that universities have the capacity and the responsibility to re-establish the central premise on which schools must be based—knowledge of history, politics, philosophy, language, art, literature, mathematics, and the sciences.
For over twenty years, the Center for the Liberal Arts has run hundreds of programs for teachers from one-day Saturday workshops to three-week summer seminars, and has enjoyed a successful tradition of attracting teachers to these programs. In recent years CLA has often had to cap enrollments, create waitlists, and even offer the same program again because of high demand. In addition to its depth of experience in administering numerous programs and attracting highly-qualified teacher applicants, CLA also disseminates results of its programs widely—not only at the programs CLA runs throughout the year, but also on its website (http://www.virginia.edu/cla/), which in 2000 was recognized by the NEH for inclusion on EDSITEment as “one of the best online resources for education in the humanities.” Teachers from Virginia and elsewhere regularly consult the site for resources relating to research and pedagogy. Cooperation with education specialists, most often from the respected Curry School of Education, ensures that pedagogical approaches are consistent with the most recent research findings.

3. Libraries

Institute participants will have full access to Alderman Library, which houses the University of Virginia’s general library collections in the social sciences and humanities. Teachers will also have access to the University of Virginia’s Scholars’ Lab, and will be assisted in their research by Bethany Nowviskie, Assistant Librarian and Director of Digital Research and Scholarship at the University of Virginia’s Scholars’ Lab, and her staff. The Lab is well-suited to assist teachers’ engagement with a high level of digital scholarship to help them develop their own tools and resources. The Scholars’ Lab was designed for both collaborative and solo work, with room for small, collaborative groups and independent work.
Cocke Hall, home of the Philosophy Department, also houses a small but excellent collection of Philosophy volumes, many of which are from the private collections of former faculty reaching back over a century. Institute participants will have full access to this collection.

4. Housing

The Center for the Liberal Arts will arrange for housing for workshop participants at Brown Dormitory on the grounds of the University of Virginia. Brown College is a two-minute walk from Cocke Hall, home of the Department of Philosophy and the location of our planned workshops. A parking garage is also nearby, so participants will have convenient access to their vehicles at all times.

CLA will also make arrangements for on-campus meals and parking. All participants will need to make their own travel arrangements to and from Charlottesville, and they will be responsible for these costs out of their stipends. Those wishing to stay off campus will be responsible for paying the costs associated with room, board, and parking.

G. Evaluation and Dissemination

Our aim throughout the Institute will be to be as responsive as possible to teachers’ input. We will ask the teachers to respond to a mid-institute questionnaire about the aspects most valuable to their learning and to alert us to any areas of concern. These evaluations will signal if any changes are necessary. At the Institute’s completion, we will request that participants complete the NEH’s standard evaluation form. Both kinds of evaluations will be vitally important to the Institute’s success.

We will also continue to support teachers’ efforts after the formal program is completed. As mentioned in section IA above, I will work with the University of Virginia’s Institute for the Advanced Technology in the Humanities during AY 2012-13 to develop the High-Phi Interactive
Website to be used for both students and teachers. This website will contain a “wiki” on which teachers can share observations about philosophical pedagogy: one teacher, for instance, might comment about a difficult passage in the work of David Hume; another might respond with some suggestions about how to elucidate that passage and perhaps also ideas about how to help students connect those points with other main themes in Hume’s work and that of other figures of the Scottish Enlightenment. We will encourage teachers who have attended our Institute to share their experiences about their newly revised courses. We will also ask them to post their lesson plans for the benefit of other participants and other teachers. Our hope, then, is that the Summer Institute will catalyze cooperation for the benefit of teachers and their students over many years.
IV. Appendices

APPENDIX A. SCHEDULE OF ACTIVITIES

Each day of the Institute will divide into morning (9 am to noon) and afternoon (1:30 to 5 pm) sessions. On Mondays through Thursdays, the morning session will be broken into two parts, the first of which will be an hour-long discussion led by Mitch Green on some core topic in philosophy: definitions, fallacies, conceptual analysis, paradoxes, the method of counterexamples, varieties of meaning, etc. The second part of the morning session (10 am to noon) will be led by a Visiting Lecturer who will speak for two hours on a topic in his or her area of expertise. We will break for ninety minutes each day for lunch, and this will be followed by a second presentation by the Visiting Lecturer (1:30-3:30 pm). After a half-hour break (3:30-4 pm), we will break up into working groups of approximately five persons each to discuss issues raised in the earlier part of the day; or to develop answers to study questions that may have been provided by either Green or the day’s lecturer.

Fridays will be devoted to curricular development. In the mornings of these days (9 am to noon), teachers will use the resources of the Scholar’s Lab in Alderman Library, or whatever other milieu they prefer, to develop curricula reflecting what they have learned from the previous four days. After a lunch break, participants will divide into groups of five in order to present their results and receive comments from others. Visiting Lecturers who have taught earlier in that week will make themselves available that day to review newly drafted syllabi, and to answer any questions that the teachers may have.

On the next page, Figure 1: Schedule for Epic Questions Institute, describes this schedule graphically.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>WEEK 1 (07/08-07/12) 9AM-10AM</th>
<th>WEEK 2 (07/15-7/19) 9AM-9:45AM</th>
<th>WEEK 3 (07/22-07/26) 9AM-9:45AM</th>
<th>WEEK 4 (07/29-08/02) 9AM-9:45AM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MON</td>
<td><strong>INTRODUCTION:</strong> MATERIALS &amp; METHODS: GREEN</td>
<td><strong>BASICS:</strong> DEFINITIONS: GREEN</td>
<td><strong>MEANING &amp; TRUTH:</strong> GREEN</td>
<td><strong>RUSSELL’S PARADOX:</strong> GREEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUES</td>
<td><strong>ARGUMENT DUG-KAMING:</strong> HARRELL</td>
<td><strong>METAPHYSICS:</strong> FREEDOM OF THE WILL I: MERRICKS</td>
<td><strong>PHILOSOPHY THROUGH LITERATURE I:</strong> GURLEY</td>
<td><strong>MOORE’S PARADOX:</strong> GREEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WED</td>
<td><strong>BASICS:</strong> THE QUESTIONS OF PHILOSOPHY: GREEN</td>
<td><strong>METAPHYSICS:</strong> PERSONAL IDENTITY I: MERRICKS</td>
<td><strong>LITERARY EXAMPLES I:</strong> ETHICS, EPistemology: GURLEY</td>
<td><strong>THE LEAR PARADOX:</strong> GREEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THUR</td>
<td><strong>BASICS:</strong> CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS I: GREEN</td>
<td><strong>EPistemology:</strong> MIND BODY PROBLEM I: GREEN</td>
<td><strong>LITERARY EXAMPLES II:</strong> METAPHYSICS, KNOWLEDGE, MIND: GURLEY</td>
<td><strong>THE SORITES PARADOX:</strong> GREEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRI</td>
<td><strong>BASICS:</strong> CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS II: GREEN</td>
<td><strong>PHILOSOPHY OF MIND: CONSCIOUSNESS I:</strong> GREEN</td>
<td><strong>DEONTOLOGY AND ITS PROBLEMS: STANGL</strong></td>
<td><strong>SYLLABUS DEVELOPMENT</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 10AM-12PM | **SYLLABUS DEVELOPMENT** | **SYLLABUS DEVELOPMENT** | **COURSE Workshop/Consultation with Lecturers** | **SYLLABUS DEVELOPMENT** |
| 1:30PM-3:30PM | **SOFTWARE USING THE BLOCK TOOL:** HARRELL | **METAPHYSICS:** PERSONAL IDENTITY II: MERRICKS | **DEONTOLOGY AND ITS PROBLEMS: STANGL** | **SYLLABUS DEVELOPMENT** |
| 3:30PM-5PM | **WORK GROUPS/Office Hours (GREEN, GURLEY, HARRELL)** | **WORK GROUPS/Office Hours (GREEN, GURLEY, MERRICKS)** | **WORK GROUPS/Office Hours (GREEN, GURLEY)** | **WORK GROUPS/Office Hours (GREEN, GURLEY)** |
| 3:30PM-5PM | **WORK GROUPS/Office Hours (GREEN, GURLEY)** | **WORK GROUPS/Office Hours (GREEN, GURLEY)** | **WORK GROUPS/Office Hours (GREEN, GURLEY)** | **WORK GROUPS/Office Hours (GREEN, GURLEY)** |
| 3:30PM-5PM | **WORK GROUPS/Office Hours (GREEN, GURLEY)** | **WORK GROUPS/Office Hours (GREEN, GURLEY)** | **WORK GROUPS/Office Hours (GREEN, GURLEY)** | **WORK GROUPS/Office Hours (GREEN, GURLEY)** |
| WEEK 1 | **WORK GROUPS/Office Hours (GREEN, GURLEY, HARRELL)** | **WORK GROUPS/Office Hours (GREEN, GURLEY, HARRELL)** | **WORK GROUPS/Office Hours (GREEN, GURLEY, MERRICKS)** | **WORK GROUPS/Office Hours (GREEN, GURLEY, MERRICKS)** |

*All 2 hour course blocks will allow a 10 minute break after hour 1.*
## APPENDIX B: READING LIST

### WEEK 1:
**Monday July 8th**

**First Short Session:** Introduction: Materials, Concepts, and Methods  
Prof. Mitch Green (University of Virginia)

**2 Hour AM Session:** Argument Diagramming  
Prof. Mara Harrell (Carnegie Mellon University)

**2 Hour PM Session:** Using the iLogos Tool  
Prof. Mara Harrell (Carnegie Mellon University)

**Final Exercises:** Work Groups/Office Hours  
Prof. Mitch Green (University of Virginia), Prof. Jennifer Gurley (Le Moyne College), Prof. Mara Harrell (Carnegie Mellon)

**Daily Reading:**  
*Mara Harrell’s Online Course Modules 1 & 2.*

---

**Tuesday July 9th**

**First Short Session:** Basics: The Questions of Philosophy  
Prof. Mitch Green (University of Virginia)

**2 Hour AM Session:** Types of Arguments  
Prof. Mara Harrell (Carnegie Mellon University)

**2 Hour PM Session:** Validity and Cogency  
Prof. Mara Harrell (Carnegie Mellon University)

**Final Exercises:** Work Groups/Office Hours  
Prof. Mitch Green (University of Virginia), Prof. Jennifer Gurley (Le Moyne College), Prof. Mara Harrell (Carnegie Mellon)

**Daily Reading:**  
*Mara Harrell’s Online Course Module 3.*

---

**Wednesday July 10th**

**First Short Session:** Basics: Conceptual Analysis I  
Prof. Mitch Green (University of Virginia)

**2 Hour AM Session:** Fallacies I  
Prof. Mara Harrell (Carnegie Mellon University)

**2 Hour PM Session:** Fallacies II  
Prof. Mara Harrell (Carnegie Mellon University)
Final Exercises: **Work Groups/Office Hours**  
Prof. Mitch Green (University of Virginia), Prof. Jennifer Gurley (Le Moyne College), Prof. Mara Harrell (Carnegie Mellon)

Daily Reading:  
* Mara Harrell's Handout 1.  
* Mara Harrell's Handout 2.

**Thursday July 11**th  
First Short Session: **Basics: Conceptual Analysis II**  
Prof. Mitch Green (University of Virginia)

2 Hour AM Session: **Tests for Validity**  
Prof. Mara Harrell (Carnegie Mellon University)

2 Hour PM Session: **Tests for Cogency**  
Prof. Mara Harrell (Carnegie Mellon University)

Final Exercises: **Work Groups/Office Hours**  
Prof. Mitch Green (University of Virginia), Prof. Jennifer Gurley (Le Moyne College), Prof. Mara Harrell (Carnegie Mellon)

Daily Reading:  
* Mara Harrell's Handout 3.  
* Mara Harrell's Handout 4.

**Friday July 12**th  
First Short Session: **Syllabus Development**

2 Hour AM Session: **Syllabus Development**

2 Hour PM Session: **Course Workshop/Consultation with Lecturers**

Final Exercises: **Roundtable Discussion**  
Prof. Mitch Green (University of Virginia), Prof. Mara Harrell (Carnegie Mellon)

WEEK 2:  
**Monday July 15**th  
First Short Session: **Basics: Definitions**  
Prof. Mitch Green (University of Virginia)

2 Hour AM Session: **Metaphysics: Freedom of the Will I**  
Prof. Trenton Merricks (University of Virginia)

2 Hour PM Session: **Metaphysics: Freedom of the Will II**  
Prof. Trenton Merricks (University of Virginia)

Final Exercises: **Work Groups/Office Hours**  
Prof. Mitch Green (University of Virginia), Prof. Jennifer Gurley (Le Moyne College), Prof. Trenton Merricks (University of Virginia)
*David Lewis, ‘Are We Free to Break the Laws?’ Theoria 47: 113-121.

Tuesday July 16th
First Short Session: Basics: Counterexamples, Intuitions
Prof. Mitch Green (University of Virginia)

2 Hour AM Session: Metaphysics: Personal Identity I
Prof. Trenton Merricks (University of Virginia)

2 Hour PM Session: Metaphysics: Personal Identity II
Prof. Trenton Merricks (University of Virginia)

Final Exercises: Work Groups/Office Hours
Prof. Mitch Green (University of Virginia), Prof. Jennifer Gurley (Le Moyne College), Prof. Trenton Merricks (University of Virginia)

*Perry, A Dialogue on Personal Identity and Immortality (Hackett).

Wednesday July 17th
First Short Session: Basics: Conceivability & Possibility I
Prof. Mitch Green (University of Virginia)

2 Hour AM Session: Epistemology: Mind Body Problem I
Prof. Mitch Green (University of Virginia)

2 Hour PM Session: Epistemology: Mind Body Problem II
Prof. Mitch Green (University of Virginia)

Final Exercises: Work Groups/Office Hours
Prof. Mitch Green (University of Virginia), Prof. Jennifer Gurley (Le Moyne College)

*Rene Descartes, Meditations on First Philosophy (Hackett).

Thursday July 18th
First Short Session: Basics: Conceivability & Possibility II
Prof. Mitch Green (University of Virginia)

2 Hour AM Session: Philosophy of Mind: Consciousness I
Prof. Mitch Green (University of Virginia)

2 Hour PM Session: Philosophy of Mind: Consciousness II
Final Exercises:  Work Groups/Office Hours  
Prof. Mitch Green (University of Virginia), Prof. Jennifer Gurley (Le Moyne College)

Daily Reading:  
*Gilbert Ryle, The Concept of Mind (selections) (Chicago).  

Friday July 19th  
First Short Session:  Syllabus Development
2 Hour AM Session:  Syllabus Development
2 Hour PM Session:  Course Workshop/Consultation with Lecturers
Final Exercises:  Roundtable Discussion  
Prof. Mitch Green (University of Virginia), Prof. Trenton Merricks (University of Virginia)

WEEK 3:  
Monday July 22nd  
First Short Session:  Meaning and Truth  
Prof. Mitch Green (University of Virginia)
2 Hour AM Session:  Philosophy through Literature: Approaches I  
Prof. Jennifer Gurley (Le Moyne College)
2 Hour PM Session:  Literary Examples I: Epistemology, Theoretical Ethics, Applied Ethics  
Prof. Jennifer Gurley (Le Moyne College)
Final Exercises:  Work Groups/Office Hours  
Prof. Mitch Green (University of Virginia), Prof. Jennifer Gurley (Le Moyne College)

Daily Reading:  
*Iris Murdoch, "Literature and Philosophy: A Conversation with Bryan Magee";  
"The Novelist as Metaphysician"; "The Fire and the Sun: Why Plato Banished the Artists"
*Kenneth Burke, Rhetoric of Motives: "Four Master Tropes"  
*William Faulkner, “The Sound and the Fury”  
*Aldous Huxley, “Brave New World”

Tuesday July 23rd  
First Short Session:  Presupposition  
Prof. Mitch Green (University of Virginia)
2 Hour AM Session:  Philosophy through Literature: Approaches II  
Prof. Jennifer Gurley (Le Moyne College)
2 Hour PM Session:  Literary Examples II: Metaphysics, Knowledge, and Mind
Final Exercises:

Work Groups/Office Hours  
Prof. Mitch Green (University of Virginia), Prof. Jennifer Gurley (Le Moyne College)  

Daily Reading:
* Ralph Waldo Emerson, "The Poet"  
* Edgar Allan Poe, "The Philosophy of Composition"  
* Martha Nussbaum, Poetic Justice: preface; Chapter One, "Rational Emotions"; Chapter Four, "Poets as Judges"; Upheavals of Thought: "Introduction"  
* Charles Altieri, The Particulars of Rapture: "Martha Nussbaum's Upheavals of Thought and the Limits of Normative Theory"  
* William Shakespeare, Macbeth (selections)  
* Emily Dickinson, "I'll tell you how the sun rose"; "Perception of an Object Costs"; "I felt a Cleaving in my Mind"; "There's a Certain Slant of Light"; "Essential Oils – are rung"; "Renunciation is a Piercing Virtue"  
* Toni Morrison, "Beloved" (selections)  
* Sapphire, "Push"

Wednesday July 24th
First Short Session: Implicature  
Prof. Mitch Green (University of Virginia)  

2 Hour AM Session: Virtue Theory I  
Prof. Rebecca Stangl (University of Virginia)  

2 Hour PM Session: Virtue Theory II  
Prof. Rebecca Stangl (University of Virginia)  

Final Exercises: Work Groups/Office Hours  
Prof. Mitch Green (University of Virginia), Prof. Jennifer Gurley (Le Moyne College), Prof. Rebecca Stangl (University of Virginia)  

Daily Reading:  
* Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics (selections)  
* Louden, "On Some Vices of Virtue Ethics"  
* Hursthouse, "Right Action"

Thursday July 25th
First Short Session: Speech Acts  
Prof. Mitch Green (University of Virginia)  

2 Hour AM Session: Utilitarianism and its Problems  
Prof. Rebecca Stangl (University of Virginia)  

2 Hour PM Session: Deontology and its Problems  
Prof. Rebecca Stangl (University of Virginia)  

Final Exercises: Work Groups/Office Hours  
Prof. Mitch Green (University of Virginia), Prof. Jennifer Gurley (Le Moyne College), Prof. Rebecca Stangl (University of Virginia)  

Daily Reading:  
* Mill, “Utilitarianism”
*Williams, "A Critique of Utilitarianism"
*Railton, "Alienation, Consequentialism, and the Demands of Morality"
*Kant, “The Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals” (selections)
*Scheffler, "Agent-Centered Restrictions, Rationality, and the Virtues"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friday July 26th</th>
<th>Syllabus Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Short Session:</td>
<td>Syllabus Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Hour AM Session:</td>
<td>Course Workshop/Consultation with Lecturers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Exercises:</td>
<td>Roundtable Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof. Jennifer Gurley (Le Moyne College), Prof. Rebecca Stangl (University of Virginia)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WEEK 4:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday July 29th</th>
<th>Russell's Paradox</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Short Session:</td>
<td>Social &amp; Political Philosophy: Why Have States?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Hour AM Session:</td>
<td>Social &amp; Political Philosophy: Political Obligation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Hour PM Session:</td>
<td>Work Groups/Office Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Exercises:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Reading:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuesday July 30th</th>
<th>Moore’s Paradox</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Short Session:</td>
<td>Social &amp; Political Philosophy: Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Hour AM Session:</td>
<td>Social &amp; Political Philosophy: States in the World: Legitimacy, Secession, and Intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Hour PM Session:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Exercises:</td>
<td>Work Groups/Office Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Reading:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**References:**
*Simmons, “Political Philosophy”, chapters 1-3
*Plato, “Crito”

*Simmons, “Political Philosophy”, chapters 4 and 6
*Rawls, “A Theory of Justice” (selections)
Wednesday July 31st
First Short Session: \textbf{The Liar Paradox}
Prof. Mitch Green (University of Virginia)

2 Hour AM Session: \textbf{Practical Ethics: Obligations to Distant Needy}
Prof. John Arras (University of Virginia)

2 Hour PM Session: \textbf{Bioethics: Morality of Abortion}
Prof. John Arras (University of Virginia)

Final Exercises: \textbf{Work Groups/Office Hours}
Prof. Mitch Green (University of Virginia), Prof. Jennifer Gurley (Le Moyne College), Prof. John Arras (University of Virginia)

Daily Reading: *Peter Singer, “Rich and Poor” (from Practical Ethics)
*James Fishkin, from The Limits of Obligation, 20-24, 70-79
*Onora O’Neill, “Ending World Hunger”
*Lief Wenar, “Responsibility and Severe Poverty”
*John Noonan, “An (Almost) Absolute Value in History”
*L.W. Sumner, “A Defense of the Moderate Position”
*Judith Jarvis Thomson, “A Defense of Abortion”
*Naomi Wolf, “Our Bodies, Our Souls”

Thursday August 1st
First Short Session: \textbf{The Sorites Paradox}
Prof. Mitch Green (University of Virginia)

2 Hour AM Session: \textbf{Bioethics: Euthanasia and Physician-Assisted Suicide}
Prof. John Arras (University of Virginia)

2 Hour PM Session: \textbf{Bioethics: Enhancing Human Beings}
Prof. John Arras (University of Virginia)

Final Exercises: \textbf{Work Groups/Office Hours}
Prof. Mitch Green (University of Virginia), Prof. Jennifer Gurley (Le Moyne College), Prof. John Arras (University of Virginia)

Daily Reading: *President’s Council on Bioethics, “Beyond Therapy—General Reflections” (ch. 6 of Beyond Therapy)
*Michael Sandel, “The Case against Perfection”
*Allen Buchanan, “Human Nature and Enhancement”
*Frances Kamm, “Is There a Problem with Enhancement?”
*James Rachels, “Active and Passive Euthanasia”
*Thomas Sullivan, “Active and Passive Euthanasia: An Impertinent Distinction?”
*Timothy Quill, Rebecca Dresser, Dan Brock, “The Rule of Double Effect – A Critique of Its Role in End-of-Life Decision Making”
*Timothy E. Quill, “Death and Dignity: A Case of Individualized Decision Making”
*John D. Arras, “Physician-Assisted Suicide: A Tragic View”
*Timothy E. Quill, “Palliative Options of Last Resort”

Friday August 2nd
First Short Session: Syllabus Development

2 Hour AM Session: Syllabus Development

2 Hour PM Session: Course Workshop/Consultation with Lecturers

Final Exercises: Closing Remarks

Prof. Mitch Green (University of Virginia), Prof. Jennifer Gurley (Le Moyne College)