

# Dossier d'enseignement de Simon-Pierre Chevarie-Cossette

Le présent dossier d'enseignement inclut :

- I. Le résumé de mon expérience d'enseignement (p. 1);
- II. La compilation de mes évaluations d'enseignement (p. 1-2);
- III. Un exemple de cours dispensé par le passé (p. 3-4);
- IV. Un exemple de plan de cours (huit séances en anglais) (p. 5-10);
- V. Une compilation de quelques évaluations d'étudiants et étudiantes (p. 10-15).

## I. Résumé de mon expérience d'enseignement

Lors de mes études doctorales à Oxford (de l'automne 2014 à l'hiver 2019), j'ai été embauché à plusieurs reprises pour donner six cours différents. Indifféremment de si j'étais chargé de cours (*Lecturer*) dans un collège particulier (*Somerville College* 2018, *Mansfield College* 2017-2018, *St Anne's College* 2016-2017) simple tuteur engagé ponctuellement (*St John's College* 2016, *University College* 2016-2017) ou assistant (*Somerville College* 2015, 2016), j'ai toujours été pleinement responsable de l'enseignement des cours, de la correction des devoirs et des travaux, ainsi que des cours de révisions. J'ai reçu en 2017 le prix du meilleur enseignant gradué (toutes disciplines confondues) de la *Oxford University Student Union*.

J'ai enseigné les cours suivants : *General Philosophy* (à deux reprises), c'est-à-dire introduction à la métaphysique, à la philosophie de l'esprit et à l'épistémologie, *Ethics & Metaethics* (à trois reprises), *Moral Philosophy* (une fois), *Plato's Republic* (à deux reprises), *Free Will* (une fois) et *Introduction to Logic* (à quatre reprises). Chacun de ces cours comprend huit séances. J'ai bâti et peaufiné des plans de cours complets pour chacun d'entre eux, exception faite du cours de logique (lequel suit *The Logic Manual* de Volker Halbach). Les cours étaient tantôt dispensés sous forme de séminaires de sept à dix étudiants (pour les cours de logique et de philosophie générale), tantôt en tutoriels (« *tutorials* »), l'enseignement principal à Oxford. Les étudiants doivent produire un essai par semaine à l'aide d'environ cinq articles chaque fois. Ces essais sont le point de départ des tutoriels.

J'ai également acquis de l'expérience d'enseignement avec un public plus large. À trois occasions, j'ai travaillé comme « *Academic Leader* » pour l'organisation *Teach First*. Le travail consistait chaque année à introduire à la philosophie environ 25 adolescents, dans le cadre d'une école de printemps (pendant les vacances de Pâques). Pendant sept ans (2008-2014), j'ai été ou bien bénévole ou bien employé pour l'organisme de littératie Collège Frontière. J'ai donné des cours de français à des groupes de décrocheurs, j'ai organisé des tentes et des cercles de lecture pour les enfants des quartiers défavorisés ou allophones et j'ai prêté main-forte à de nombreux adolescents pour leurs devoirs.

## II. Évaluation de l'enseignement

À la fin de cette section se trouve un tableau compilant toutes les évaluations reçues lors de mon passage à l'Université d'Oxford, pendant mes études doctorales. Les questions ont un numéro qui correspond à certains questionnaires recueillis entre l'automne 2015 (A2015) et l'automne 2018.

**Valeur des données :** au total, les données recueillies proviennent de 73 évaluations d'une soixantaine d'étudiants différents (j'ai enseigné à certains d'entre eux à deux reprises). Les dix-huit premières évaluations sont plus détaillées et proviennent de ma participation au '*TA scheme*'. J'ai consacré à ces étudiants quinze heures d'enseignement en groupes de dix en plus



### III. Un Exemple de cours: comment enseigner Gettier?

(Publié sur le Portail suisse de la Philosophie : <https://www.philosophie.ch/fr/philosophie-fr/enseigner-gettier-avec-une-horloge>)

Le problème de Gettier<sup>1</sup> est un point de départ commun dans les cours d'épistémologie puisqu'il pose la question directement de la définition de la connaissance. Un petit rappel du problème : la connaissance est premièrement une forme de croyance. Elle est deuxièmement *vraie* – on ne peut connaître le faux. Troisièmement, la croyance est justifiée, ce qui la distingue de la simple croyance vraie « chanceuse ». Et pourtant, montre Gettier, il semble y avoir des cas de connaissances vraies justifiées qui ne sont pas des connaissances. Supposons, pour prendre un exemple de Bertrand Russell<sup>2</sup>, que je regarde une horloge qui ne fonctionne pas, mais qui indique l'heure juste – disons, midi – et que je n'ai pas conscience que l'horloge ne fonctionne pas. J'ai donc une croyance vraie et je semble tout à fait justifié de l'avoir formé. Pourtant, je ne *sais pas* qu'il est midi. Si j'avais regardé l'heure un peu plus tôt ou un peu plus tard, j'aurais acquis une fausse croyance. Ma croyance n'était pas fiable.

Souvent, la leçon s'arrête ici : la connaissance n'est pas simplement l'addition de la croyance, de la vérité et de la justification. La croyance doit aussi être fiable. Le problème de Gettier offre pourtant bien davantage. D'abord, il introduit l'étudiant au problème de l'internalisme et de l'externalisme. Ensuite, il présente le problème de l'individuation des contenus de croyance, en particulier *lorsqu'il est enseigné avec une horloge*.

Commençons par le premier point. Les contre-exemples philosophiques, que ce soit celui de Gettier ou d'autres (comme celui de Frankfurt<sup>3</sup>), devraient toujours être accompagnés d'une réflexion : pourquoi est-il possible d'identifier un contre-exemple à la définition ou au principe de départ? Qu'enseigne ce contre-exemple *conceptuellement*? Les contre-exemples proposés par Gettier montrent que parfois nous formons la bonne croyance du point de vue interne, que le monde coopère jusqu'à un certain point, c'est-à-dire que notre croyance est vraie. Pourtant, le monde ne *coopère pas assez*. Cela montre que la connaissance ne peut être décomposée en deux ensembles : ce qui est interne, c'est-à-dire la justification, et ce qui est externe, c'est-à-dire la vérité.

Nous avons alors deux possibilités : ou bien il y a une composante externe manquante, ou bien en fait, *la justification n'est pas interne*, mais *mixte*. Autrement dit, on doit ajouter un élément externe : on peut le faire ou bien en ajoutant un quatrième élément, ou bien en redéfinissant l'un des éléments présents. Il manque clairement un lien entre la vérité et l'agent : quelque chose comme *la fiabilité*. L'internaliste accepte que la justification soit interne, que la vérité soit externe, et y ajoute un lien externe comme la fiabilité. L'externaliste change la donne : et si le lien entre la vérité et l'agent, par exemple la fiabilité, *était* la justification? La justification serait alors mixte. Elle ne serait pas purement interne, mais en partie ou totalement externe. À bien y penser, peut-être qu'il est impossible d'identifier un élément qui soit purement interne<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Edmund Gettier (1963). 'Is Justified True Belief Knowledge?', *Analysis*, Vol. 23, No. 6, p. 121–23.

<sup>2</sup> Bertrand Russell (1948). *Human Knowledge: Its Scope and Limits*, New York: Simon and Schuster.

<sup>3</sup> Harry G. Frankfurt (1969). 'Alternate Possibilities and Moral Responsibility', *The Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. 66, No. 23, p. 829–39.

<sup>4</sup> Timothy Williamson (2002). *Knowledge and its Limits*. Oxford University Press on Demand.

Tournons-nous à présent vers le deuxième point. Les contre-exemples de Gettier peuvent montrer à quel point l'individuation de la croyance pose problème. Le 21 janvier 2016, j'ai apporté avec moi une horloge au Collège St John's à Oxford, où j'enseignais le cours de philosophie générale. Le plan était le suivant : avoir une horloge qui ne fonctionnait pas, mais qui affichait 13h10; attendre à 13h10; montrer l'horloge; demander l'heure aux étudiants. Les étudiants comprirent immédiatement l'astuce : ils avaient été « gettiérisés ». Or, alors qu'ils expliquaient ce qu'ils avaient compris, j'eus une arrière-pensée : « Les avais-je vraiment gettiérisés? Leur croyance était vraie et justifiée, mais ils n'auraient pas pu se tromper aisément puisque j'avais bien fait attention à ce qu'ils forment une croyance vraie! Ils avaient, finalement, une connaissance. »

À la fin du cours, j'ai expliqué ce raisonnement aux étudiants. Les avais-je réellement gettiérisés? Pas tout à fait : leur croyance était fiable, après tout (un terme qu'ils comprenaient bien à présent). Plus précisément, leur croyance avait été formée à partir d'un processus fiable. Mais quel était ce processus de formation de croyance? Ce ne pouvait être « regarder une horloge défectueuse », auquel cas, leur croyance n'aurait pas été fiable. Il aurait été franchement bizarre après tout que je puisse m'assurer de façon fiable que mes étudiants croient la vérité sans qu'ils croient la vérité de façon fiable. Le processus de formation de croyance devait être différent. Par exemple, le processus pouvait être « regarder une horloge tendue par le professeur dans un cours sur Gettier ». Je leur ai fait remarquer que si nous décrivions les processus de formation de croyance de façon trop précise, alors, en un sens, toutes les croyances vraies seraient fiables! Bien sûr, ce serait une erreur. Si je devine correctement cinq ans à l'avance qui sera l'équipe gagnante de la coupe du monde, je n'ai certainement pas une connaissance.

Ainsi, la deuxième leçon du cours sur Gettier était : la description du processus de formation de croyance est cruciale. C'est ce qui fait (en partie peut-être) la différence entre la connaissance et la simple croyance vraie. De plus, cette description n'est pas toujours aisée. Ce problème, c'est ce qu'on appelle en épistémologie « Le problème de la généralité »<sup>5</sup>. Bref, en enseignant Gettier avec une horloge, il est aisé d'enseigner non seulement la différence entre internalisme et externalisme, mais le problème de la généralité.

---

<sup>5</sup> Conee, E., & Feldman, R. (1998). The generality problem for reliabilism. *Philosophical Studies*, Vol. 89, No. 1, p. 1-29.

## IV. Exemple de plan de cours (en anglais)

### GENERAL PHILOSOPHY

Somerville College, MT2018

#### General information on the classes

##### I. Course content

*General philosophy* is an introduction to philosophy and some of its core areas, viz. metaphysics and epistemology. It has two main goals. First, it explores topics, e.g. the problem of personal identity or of free will, which are immediately intellectually intriguing, and which have important existential consequences. Second, the course gives you the occasion to structure your thinking habits, e.g. by making you think about what can count as knowledge and what is a good explanation.

##### II. Assignments

On odd weeks, you will need to read the assigned papers and prepare questions for seminars. I will divide the cohort into two groups of roughly seven people. Please, make sure to have read the mandatory readings for the seminars.

On even weeks, you will write an essay of approximately 1500–2000 words on one of the two essay questions that I give for each topic, below. I recommend that you read the non-mandatory papers associated to the topic of your choice. You must email your essay to me and to your tutorial partner 48 hours before our meeting. During the class, you will quickly present your essay or the essay of your tutorial partner. Make sure you are able to sketch your arguments in less than five minutes.

Here are ten tips to help you writing your essays. (1) Reread your essay at least twice before sending it to me. (2) Use topic sentences, that is reread the first sentence of each of your paragraphs: ideally, this would give you a summary of your essay. (3) Upon rereading a sentence, if you do not immediately understand it, rewrite it. (4) Never write sentences that are longer than three lines. (5) Never use technical vocabulary without defining it. If you feel like there are too many definitions, try to cut down the number of technical words you are using. (6) Always illustrate abstract principles with examples. (7) If you present a counterexample, try not only to make it clear how it is a counterexample, but what structural reason we have for believing that the principle is false. (8) State your conclusions clearly at the beginning and end of the essay, and include plenty of ‘signposts’ throughout the essay so that the intended structure of your argument is easy to discern. (9) Spare us long and literary introductions. (10) Read the following guide and try to apply its lessons:

<http://www.jimpryor.net/teaching/guidelines/writing.html>

It is crucial that you do the readings, especially the mandatory readings (marked with a star (\*)). Without them, tutorials will be much less valuable. There will be times (trust me) when you regret not having read more (both during finals and after, when you’re busy with other things).

##### III. Marking and late work

If you hand in your essay on time, I will read it and supply written comments, and email it to you in the tutorial or a few hours before. You get to decide whether you want me to give you a general grade (2.2, low-high-mid 2.1, first) or not. If your essay is late, I can’t make any

promises. It is still important that you hand your essay in even if I do not have time to comment on it, as I am required to report to your college how many pieces of work you have completed to a satisfactory standard. Notify me by email as soon as possible, and at any rate before the start of the tutorial, if you will be late handing in your essay, and/or unable to attend one of the tutorials, giving your reasons. If you are experiencing difficulties (academic or otherwise) that are affecting your ability to work at your normal standard, or you are concerned about your level of understanding of this topic, don't suffer in silence. Rather, let me know as soon as possible.

#### IV. Study questions and finals preparation

Finals questions are quite specific. They do not simply say 'write an essay on free will', and you cannot count on the Finals paper containing questions that happen to match your tutorial essay questions. Every single examiners' report complains that many students simply recycle their tutorial essays in response to Finals questions that were asking something quite different. To be well prepared for Finals, you will need to know (at least) two or three topics with enough depth and breadth that you can understand and intelligently discuss almost anything the examiners choose to ask on that topic. Study strategies vary, and only you can discover what works for you, but one sensible strategy would be:

1. As you read for tutorials: write out (in note form) your answers to the 'Study questions' that I have included with each topic. Try to identify other important questions. This will ensure that you are picking up most of the basic material from the readings.
2. During the vacations, when you have more time: choose the two or three topics that interest you most, and do further readings for that topic. Lay down your own views in detail and review your original answers to the study questions. Be critical – is there anything that you think the authors whose work you've read have been missing? Work out what you think each of the listed past finals questions is getting at, what you think about the issue it is raising, how you could structure an essay, answering precisely that question, that you could write in fifty minutes.
3. Read widely around the subject (beyond these reading lists) and keep an eye out for non-core lectures and seminars that interest you.

#### V. General introductory readings

Simon Blackburn, *Think* (Oxford UP, 1999)

Earl Conee and Theodore Sider, *Riddles of Existence* (Oxford UP, 2005)

### Weeks 1 & 2: Scepticism and Knowledge

**Study questions:** What is scepticism? What is the difference between high standard scepticism and radical scepticism? What is contextualism? Is it a good response to scepticism? What is the difference between externalism and internalism? Can one be an internalist and avoid scepticism? Is knowledge closed under known entailment? What is a propositional attitude? Are there different kinds of knowledge? Is it a *reductio* of a theory if it entails scepticism about the external world? What is Moore's argument for the external world? What is a hinge proposition? What is the new evil demon problem? Do you understand what 'knowledge is factive' mean? Is there a difference between rationality and justification? Can we give a satisfactory response to scepticism? Can we give a response to the sceptic that would be acceptable to the sceptic's own terms? Can we transmit knowledge via testimony? If so, what sort? Can knowledge be defined?

**Essay question:**

Can I know that there is an external world? OR

What do Gettier cases teach us?

**Readings:****I. Scepticism**

- (\* Descartes, René. *Meditations on First Philosophy* (trans. John Cottingham), Meditation I.
- (\* Nozick, Robert. 'Knowledge and Skepticism', in Nozick, *Philosophical Explanations* (Oxford UP, 1981), pp. 167–185. Reprinted in: Sven Bernecker and Fred Dretske (eds.) *Knowledge: Readings in Contemporary Epistemology* (Oxford UP 2000), pp. 347–54.
- (\* Russell, Bertrand. *The Problems of Philosophy*, ch. 1-2 (up to p. 27),  
<http://www.llmc.com/docDisplay.aspx?set=09099&volume=0001&part=001>
- Moore, G.E. 1939. 'Proof of an External World'. *Proceedings of the British Academy* 25 (5): 273–300.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. 1974. *On Certainty*. Oxford: Blackwell.

**II. Justification**

- (\* Gettier, Edmund L. 1963. 'Is Justified True Belief Knowledge?' *Analysis* 23 (6): 121–23.
- (\* Armstrong, D. M. 'The Thermometer Model of Knowledge', in Sven Bernecker and Fred Dretske (eds.) *Knowledge: Readings in Contemporary Epistemology* (Oxford UP 2000), pp.72-85. Originally published in Armstrong, *Belief, Truth and Knowledge* (Cambridge UP, 1973), pp.162-175,178-183.
- (\* Bonjour, Laurence. 'Externalist Theories of Empirical Knowledge', *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 5 (1980), pp. 53-73. Reprinted in Sven Bernecker and Fred Dretske (eds.) *Knowledge: Readings in Contemporary Epistemology* (OUP 2000).

Williamson, Timothy. 2000. 'Introduction', *Knowledge and Its Limits*. Oxford University Press, pp. 1-20.

**Weeks 3 & 4: Free Will**

**Study questions:** What are physical, psychological, social, biological determinisms? Are they all similarly threatening to freedom or responsibility? What is free will? Is it just a sort of will (if so, what is the will)? Is there a difference between acting freely and exercising one's free will? What is the link between free will and moral responsibility? What is the link between moral responsibility and blameworthiness? What are compatibilism and incompatibilism and what are the main arguments for each? What are sourcehood and leeway? Is there a difference between having the ability to do otherwise and having alternate possibilities? What are abilities? What are Frankfurt-type counterexamples? Is free will a moral concept? When Luther said he could not do otherwise but to denounce some of the Catholic Church's faults, did he mean he was unfree to do otherwise? Are *free will* or *moral responsibility* historical or structural concepts? What are the laws of nature? Can they constrain? Is indeterminism conducive to freedom? What is the Consequence Argument? What is the Basic Argument? What is the Mind Argument?

**Essay question:**

If physical determinism is true, does it follow that we lack the ability to do otherwise? OR

Does moral responsibility require the ability to do otherwise?

### Readings:

#### I. Determinism and Free Will

- (\* Hume, David. *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding*, Section VIII.
- (\* A. J. Ayer, 'Freedom and Necessity', in Ayer, *Philosophical Essays* (London: Macmillan, 1954), pp. 271–84. Reprinted in Gary Watson (ed.), *Free Will*, 1st edition (Oxford UP, 1982).
- (\* Vihvelin, Kadri. 2017. 'Arguments for Incompatibilism' (especially §1, §2, §5) in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.
- Chisholm, Roderick. 'Human Freedom and the Self', reprinted in Gary Watson (ed.), *Free Will*, 1st and 2nd editions (Oxford UP, 2003); and in Robert Kane (ed.), *Free Will* (Blackwell, 2002).
- Lewis, David. 1981. 'Are We Free to Break the Laws?' *Theoria* 47 (3): 113–21.
- Van Inwagen, Peter. 'The Power of Rational Beings', in van Inwagen, P., *Metaphysics*, 2014, OUP.

#### II. Free Will and Responsibility

- (\* Frankfurt, Harry. 'Alternate Possibilities and Moral Responsibility', *Journal of Philosophy*, 66 (1969): pp. 829-839. Reprinted in Gary Watson (ed.) *Free Will*, 2nd edition (OUP 2002), pp. 167-176; and in Frankfurt, *The Importance of What We Care About* (Cambridge UP, 1988).
- (\* Strawson, P.F. 2008. *Freedom and Resentment and Other Essays* (ch. 1). Routledge.
- (\* Wolf, Susan. 1993. *Freedom within Reason* (ch. 6). Oxford University Press.
- Alvarez, Maria. 2009. 'Actions, Thought-Experiments and the "Principle of Alternate Possibilities"'. *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 87 (1): 61–81.
- McKenna, Michael. 2005. 'Where Frankfurt and Strawson Meet'. *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 29 (1): 163–80.
- Nelkin, Dana Kay. 2011. *Making Sense of Freedom and Responsibility* (ch. 1 & 6). Oxford University Press.
- Widerker, David. 2000. 'Frankfurt's Attack on the Principle of Alternative Possibilities: A Further Look'. *Philosophical Perspectives* 14: 181–201.

## Weeks 5 & 6: Mind and Body

**Study questions:** What is the knowledge argument? What are naturalism, reductionism, epiphenomenalism, and dualism? What is the open question argument and its main responses? Are there different sorts of knowledge and if so does it help to respond to the knowledge argument? What are eliminativism and epiphenomenalism? What is the difference between Jackson's argument and Nagel's point about the fact that we cannot know what it is like to be a bat? Is Cartesian dualism plausible? Can non-physical facts be explanatorily relevant? Can they have a causal role?

### Essay question:

Is the 'knowledge argument' successful against physicalism? OR



Was Descartes right when he argued that we were thinking things?

### Readings:

#### I. Qualia, Knowledge, and Physicalism

- (\* Jackson, Frank. 1982. 'Epiphenomenal Qualia', *Philosophical Quarterly* 32, 127–136; reprinted in Peter Ludlow, Yujin Nagasawa and Daniel Stoljar, eds. *There's Something About Mary* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2004).
- (\* Moore, G. E. 1903. *Principia Ethica*, ch. 1.
- (\* Nida-Rümelin, Martine. 2015. 'Qualia: The Knowledge Argument'. In *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, edited by Edward N. Zalta, Summer 2015. Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University.  
<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2015/entries/qualia-knowledge/>.
- Long, Alex. 2010. 'Phaedo'. In *Plato*, by Alex Long, edited by David Sedley, 42–116. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lewis, David. 'What Experience Teaches', in William G. Lycan (ed.), *Mind and Cognition* (Blackwell: 1990); reprinted in Lewis, *Papers in Metaphysics and Epistemology* (Cambridge UP, 1999), 262–90.

#### II. The Self

- (\* Descartes, René. *Meditations on First Philosophy* (trans. John Cottingham), Meditations II and VI.
- (\* Kenny, Anthony. 1992. *The Metaphysics of Mind* (ch. 1 & 2). Oxford University Press.
- (\* Strawson, P. F. 1964. 'Persons' in *Individuals*. London, Kingdom: Routledge.
- Princess Elisabeth of Bohemia and René Descartes, 2007, *The Correspondence between Princess Elisabeth of Bohemia and René Descartes*, Lisa Shapiro (ed. and transl.), Chicago: University of Chicago Press, p. 61-73.
- Anscombe, Gertrude Elizabeth Margaret. 1975. *The First Person*. Clarendon Press.

### Weeks 7 & 8: Personal Identity

**Study questions:** What is personal identity? Is there a difference between what is necessary for our persistence and what constitutes our essence? What is the difference between numerical and qualitative identity? What are Leibniz's laws? Does personal identity matter? What is the difference between psychological continuity and psychological connectedness? What is the obvious problem with Locke's point about the child and the general? Do people exist as substances or are we just bundles of sensations? What is the problem of Theseus ship? What are some of the troubling teleportation and transplant cases?

#### Essay question:

What is the criterion of persistence? OR

Does personal identity matter?

#### Readings:

## I. Persistence and Identity

- (\*) Locke, John. *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, Book II, Chapter XXVII.
- (\*) Shoemaker, Sydney, ed. 1984. 'Personal Identity'. In *Personal Identity: A Materialist's Account*, 89–97. Oxford: Blackwell.
- (\*) Thomson, Judith Jarvis. 2008. 'People and Their Bodies'. In *Contemporary Debates in Metaphysics*, edited by Theodore Sider, John Hawthorne, and Dean W. Zimmerman. Blackwell.
- Olson, Eric T. 2015. 'Personal Identity', *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/identity-personal/>
- Schechtman, Marya. 2011. 'The Narrative Self'. *The Oxford Handbook of the Self*, February.

## II. The Importance of Personal Identity

- (\*) Korsgaard, Christine. 1989. 'Personal Identity and the Unity of Agency: A Kantian Response to Parfit' ([read Parfit first](#))
- (\*) Parfit, Derek. 'Why Our Identity is Not What Matters', in Parfit, *Reasons and Persons* (Oxford UP, 1984), Chapter 12, pp. 245-280. Reprinted in Raymond Martin and John Barresi (eds.) *Personal Identity* (Blackwell, 2003), pp. 115-143.
- (\*) Whiting, Jennifer. 1986. 'Friends and Future Selves'. *Philosophical Review* 95 (4): 547–80.
- Sosa, Ernest. 1990. 'Surviving Matters'. *Noûs* 25 (1): 297–322.
- Williams, Bernard. 1970. 'The Self and the Future', *Philosophical Review* 79, pp. 161–180. Reprinted in Williams, *Problems of the Self* (Cambridge UP, 1973); in John Perry (ed.), *Personal Identity* (University of California Press, 1975); and in Raymond Martin and John Barresi (eds.) *Personal Identity* (Blackwell, 2003).

## V. Sélection d'évaluations d'enseignement

Les pages suivantes contiennent des exemples de formulaires d'évaluation de l'enseignement.

## Tutorial Evaluation

### Course details

---

Please fill in this section.

Course: Ethics

Finals Paper/~~Mods~~/~~Prelims~~  
[delete as applicable]

Tutor: Simon - Pierre Chevance - Cossatta

Year and Term: Michaelmas 2017

### Do you agree with the following statements?

---

Circle one letter for each statement.

1. The tutorials improved my understanding of the subject.  
 a. Strongly agree   b. Agree   c. Neither agree nor disagree   d. Disagree   e. Strongly disagree
2. The suggested readings helped me write the essays.  
 a. Strongly agree   b. Agree   c. Neither agree nor disagree   d. Disagree   e. Strongly disagree
3. The tutor gave me useful feedback on my work.  
 a. Strongly agree   b. Agree   c. Neither agree nor disagree   d. Disagree   e. Strongly disagree
4. The tutor explained things clearly.  
 a. Strongly agree   b. Agree   c. Neither agree nor disagree   d. Disagree   e. Strongly disagree
5. I felt able to ask questions.  
 a. Strongly agree   b. Agree   c. Neither agree nor disagree   d. Disagree   e. Strongly disagree
6. I would be pleased to have this tutor again.  
 a. Strongly agree   b. Agree   c. Neither agree nor disagree   d. Disagree   e. Strongly disagree
7. My tutor gave me a good idea of how well I was doing.  
 a. Strongly agree   b. Agree   c. Neither agree nor disagree   d. Disagree   e. Strongly disagree

### Further comments

---

<sup>if not</sup>  
Friendly and approachable. Able to ask for help and explain problems that I had related to the work (and less related to the work).

The feedback on essays was very helpful and detailed.

The tutorials which were less focused on one person's essay I think I preferred when more general or specific points were explained. Or when a point from an essay was taken and expanded on.

Helped me to understand what arguments

were really getting at.

Reading suggestions helped a team  
of ways of reading. Approaches to  
reading.

## Tutorial Evaluation

### Course details

---

Please fill in this section.

Course: PPE

Finals Paper/ ~~Notes~~ / ~~Prep~~ / ~~Pris~~  
[delete as applicable]

Tutor: Simon - Pierre Chevarie - Cossette

Year and Term: MT17

### Do you agree with the following statements?

---

Circle one letter for each statement.

1. The tutorials improved my understanding of the subject.  
a. Strongly agree  b. Agree  c. Neither agree nor disagree  d. Disagree  e. Strongly disagree
2. The suggested readings helped me write the essays.  
a. Strongly agree  b. Agree  c. Neither agree nor disagree  d. Disagree  e. Strongly disagree
3. The tutor gave me useful feedback on my work.  
a. Strongly agree  b. Agree  c. Neither agree nor disagree  d. Disagree  e. Strongly disagree
4. The tutor explained things clearly.  
a. Strongly agree  b. Agree  c. Neither agree nor disagree  d. Disagree  e. Strongly disagree
5. I felt able to ask questions.  
a. Strongly agree  b. Agree  c. Neither agree nor disagree  d. Disagree  e. Strongly disagree
6. I would be pleased to have this tutor again.  
a. Strongly agree  b. Agree  c. Neither agree nor disagree  d. Disagree  e. Strongly disagree
7. My tutor gave me a good idea of how well I was doing.  
a. Strongly agree  b. Agree  c. Neither agree nor disagree  d. Disagree  e. Strongly disagree

### Further comments

---

Really good thorough essay feedback  
Good tutorials, comfortable asking questions

## Tutorial Evaluation

### Course details

---

Please fill in this section.

Course: Ethics

Finals Paper/Mods/Prelims

[delete as applicable]

Tutor: Simon

Year and Term: 17 MT

### Do you agree with the following statements?

---

Circle one letter for each statement.

1. The tutorials improved my understanding of the subject.  
 a. Strongly agree   b. Agree   c. Neither agree nor disagree   d. Disagree   e. Strongly disagree
2. The suggested readings helped me write the essays.  
 a. Strongly agree   b. Agree   c. Neither agree nor disagree   d. Disagree   e. Strongly disagree
3. The tutor gave me useful feedback on my work.  
 a. Strongly agree   b. Agree   c. Neither agree nor disagree   d. Disagree   e. Strongly disagree
4. The tutor explained things clearly.  
 a. Strongly agree   b. Agree   c. Neither agree nor disagree   d. Disagree   e. Strongly disagree
5. I felt able to ask questions.  
 a. Strongly agree   b. Agree   c. Neither agree nor disagree   d. Disagree   e. Strongly disagree
6. I would be pleased to have this tutor again.  
 a. Strongly agree   b. Agree   c. Neither agree nor disagree   d. Disagree   e. Strongly disagree
7. My tutor gave me a good idea of how well I was doing.  
 a. Strongly agree   b. Agree   c. Neither agree nor disagree   d. Disagree   e. Strongly disagree

### Further comments

---

I really like the tutor. For the various reasons:

- ① The readings are great for essay writing. I didn't feel like without doing additional research, I won't be able to write (Research as supplement not essential?)
- ② Love all the detailed comments & feedbacks
- ③ Long tutorials, I love that. All my questions will be answered and he doesn't let us leave with confusions (at least before I develop further though). Lots interactions.

Improvement?

Philosophy is difficult for me to understand, given that I had zero background. Maybe suggest even "simpler" intro reading during the summer / or before the term. (E.g. Background knowledge check?)

## Tutorial Evaluation

### Course details

---

Please fill in this section.

Course: Ethics

Finals Paper/~~Meds/Prelims~~  
[delete as applicable]

Tutor: Simon - Pierre Chararie - Cossette

Year and Term: MT17

### Do you agree with the following statements?

---

Circle one letter for each statement.

1. The tutorials improved my understanding of the subject.

a. Strongly agree   b. Agree   c. Neither agree nor disagree   d. Disagree   e. Strongly disagree

2. The suggested readings helped me write the essays.

a. Strongly agree   b. Agree   c. Neither agree nor disagree   d. Disagree   e. Strongly disagree

3. The tutor gave me useful feedback on my work.

a. Strongly agree   b. Agree   c. Neither agree nor disagree   d. Disagree   e. Strongly disagree

4. The tutor explained things clearly.

a. Strongly agree   b. Agree   c. Neither agree nor disagree   d. Disagree   e. Strongly disagree

5. I felt able to ask questions.

a. Strongly agree   b. Agree   c. Neither agree nor disagree   d. Disagree   e. Strongly disagree

6. I would be pleased to have this tutor again.

a. Strongly agree   b. Agree   c. Neither agree nor disagree   d. Disagree   e. Strongly disagree

7. My tutor gave me a good idea of how well I was doing.

a. Strongly agree   b. Agree   c. Neither agree nor disagree   d. Disagree   e. Strongly disagree

### Further comments

---

\* Teen in tutorials - ✓

\* Really like the marking format

\* I think giving people option to be graded is a good idea because it is good motivation.

\* I think it would be good to get an idea of what you think are the essential points to address in each essay, as well as discussing the points that we raise → might help with writing down essay length / prioritising revision.

## Tutorial Evaluation

### Course details

---

Please fill in this section.

Course: ETHICS

Finals Paper/Mods/Prelims  
[delete as applicable]

Tutor: Simon-Pierre Chevarie-Cossette

Year and Term: MT 2017

### Do you agree with the following statements?

---

Circle one letter for each statement.

1. The tutorials improved my understanding of the subject.

a. Strongly agree     b. Agree     c. Neither agree nor disagree     d. Disagree     e. Strongly disagree

2. The suggested readings helped me write the essays.

a. Strongly agree     b. Agree     c. Neither agree nor disagree     d. Disagree     e. Strongly disagree

3. The tutor gave me useful feedback on my work.

a. Strongly agree     b. Agree     c. Neither agree nor disagree     d. Disagree     e. Strongly disagree

4. The tutor explained things clearly.

a. Strongly agree     b. Agree     c. Neither agree nor disagree     d. Disagree     e. Strongly disagree

5. I felt able to ask questions.

a. Strongly agree     b. Agree     c. Neither agree nor disagree     d. Disagree     e. Strongly disagree

6. I would be pleased to have this tutor again.

a. Strongly agree     b. Agree     c. Neither agree nor disagree     d. Disagree     e. Strongly disagree

7. My tutor gave me a good idea of how well I was doing.

a. Strongly agree     b. Agree     c. Neither agree nor disagree     d. Disagree     e. Strongly disagree

### Further comments

---

This tutorial was fantastic. I really enjoyed every tutorial as well as the readings. I felt challenged but not discouraged. Overall, my experience with Simon this term has been outstanding and has piqued a renewed interest in ethics and philosophy in me.