Introduction to Metaphysics and Epistemology

University of Chicago, Assistant to Benjamin Callard, Fall 2018

Rate your C.A.'s performance – how well was the C.A. able:

1. to explain the course material?
   a. Not Applicable (0) – 0%
   b. Poorly (0) – 0%
   c. Adequately (0) – 0%
   d. Quite Well (2) – 15.38%
   e. Excellently (11) – 84.62%

2. to conduct discussions?
   a. Not Applicable (0) – 0%
   b. Poorly (0) – 0%
   c. Adequately (1) – 7.69%
   d. Quite Well (5) – 38.46%
   e. Excellently (7) – 53.85%

3. to respond to questions and comments?
   a. Not Applicable (0) – 0%
   b. Poorly (0) – 0%
   c. Adequately (0) – 0%
   d. Quite Well (1) – 7.69%
   e. Excellently (12) – 92.31%

4. to respond to written material?
   a. Not Applicable (0) – 0%
   b. Poorly (0) – 0%
   c. Adequately (0) – 0%
   d. Quite Well (1) – 7.69%
   e. Excellently (12) – 92.31%

What were the special strong points of your course assistant?

1. Great feedback on written assignments, good explanation of material. Was very forthcoming in being a resource for students.

2. Had very cogent answers for any question. Could explain various viewpoints of any question in detail.

3. Lawrence is awesome! Great at leading discussion; laid-back and approachable, and incredibly knowledgeable. Discussion section was always a highlight of the week.

4. His feedback on papers and ability to answer questions.

5. The course assistant was very approachable and was good at fielding questions for this reason. He was also patient and willing to provide context when needed to spur discussion.

6. He was good at responding to emails and at leading discussions even when participation was lagging.

7. He explained the materials very well; speaking with him about the readings always clarified so many concepts for me

8. He knows so much about the topic, even more so than what was presented in class.

9. Very good at explaining arguments and counterarguments. Offered a fresh perspective that differed from the professor.

10. Lawrence was excellent at explaining the background philosophical material (such as characterizing philosophical terms and movements). He was also great at giving off-the-cuff arguments to help us understand what philosophers we read were saying.

11. Lawrence has an incredible capacity for synthesis and can see the philosophical arguments even when I was not aware of what I was exactly saying. He has an amazing theoretical knowledge too and helped with great definitions.

What could your course assistant have done better? Suggestions?

1. The discussions could have been moderated a bit more strictly, but generally it was fine.

2. I think we could've discussed more rather than listen to him essentially lecture through the section.

3. Given how knowledgeable he is, I wish he had lectured more, particularly about bits/topics/etc. that Ben (the primary instructor) and the readings did not touch on.

4. Given the strong discussion aspect of lecture, the section felt a little uncertain.

5. They could have been sterner about discussion expectations, or asked more pointed questions in order for discussion to be more productive.

6. Nope!

7. Nothing!

8. Nothing.

9. Something to make the discussions more fluid and open.

10. Perhaps grade papers more quickly. But Lawrence was a fantastic T.A.

11. I guess talking more about the texts themselves, but also the course in general wasn't very focused on the texts as much as the general themes and arguments so I'm not sure this is really a fault!