

## JHU Department of Philosophy Evaluation Form Teaching Assistant

*Instructions.* Please help improve the quality of teaching in philosophy at Hopkins by taking this opportunity to evaluate this course. Please fill out *all three* sections of the evaluation; note that section III is on the reverse of this form. Your responses are confidential, and this evaluation will not be seen by your instructors until all grades for the course have been turned in. We appreciate the time and effort you spend filling out this form.

### I. Course and Student Information

Instructor's names: <u>Itai Maron, Tammo Lossau</u>
Course name and number: Year and Semester: <u>Wittgenstein and the limits of our world ; 2019 intersession</u>
Your year in school: Your major: <u>Sophomore; Neuroscience &amp; English</u>

### II. Teaching Assistant's Rating by Category

*Instructions.* Where "5" means "excellent" and "1" means "poor," please circle the number your *feel* best describes your TA in the categories below. If a category does not apply, or if you lack relevant information, circle "NA."

	Excellent		Poor			
Overall course quality	(5)	4	3	2	1	NA
Instructor's teaching effectiveness (Itai)	(5)	4	3	2	1	NA
Instructor's teaching effectiveness (Tammo)	(5)	4	3	2	1	NA
The intellectual challenge of this course is	(5)	4	3	2	1	NA
Usefulness of feedback on my work	(5)	4	3	2	1	NA
Compared to other Hopkins courses, the workload is (heavier/lighter)	5	4	(3)	2	1	NA

***"Please see reverse for Section III"***

### III. Student Comments

What are the best aspects of this course?

- Interesting subject matter
- Challenging but doable readings
- Discussion aspect of class
- Effective instructors

What are the worst aspects of this course?

What would most improve this class?

- A more consistent workload throughout the class - <sup>from each student</sup> perhaps requiring shorter preparations for ~~each~~ <sup>every</sup> class but still having students selected to lead discussion or ask questions during two of the classes?

What should prospective students know about this course before enrolling? (You may comment on any aspect of this course such as assumed background, readings, grading systems, and so on.)

~~A background in philosophy~~

prior acquaintance with analytic philosophy  
or philosophy courses could be helpful,  
but is not necessary.

## JHU Department of Philosophy Evaluation Form Teaching Assistant

*Instructions.* Please help improve the quality of teaching in philosophy at Hopkins by taking this opportunity to evaluate this course. Please fill out *all three* sections of the evaluation; note that section III is on the reverse of this form. Your responses are confidential, and this evaluation will not be seen by your instructors until all grades for the course have been turned in. We appreciate the time and effort you spend filling out this form.

### I. Course and Student Information

Instructor's names: Itai, Tammo

Course name and number: Year and Semester: Wittgenstein, Intensions 2019

Your year in school: Your major: JUNIOR, AMS.

### II. Teaching Assistant's Rating by Category

*Instructions.* Where "5" means "excellent" and "1" means "poor," please circle the number your *feel* best describes your TA in the categories below. If a category does not apply, or if you lack relevant information, circle "NA."

	Excellent		Poor			
Overall course quality	5	(4)	3	2	1	NA
Instructor's teaching effectiveness (Itai)	(5)	4	3	2	1	NA
Instructor's teaching effectiveness (Tammo)	(5)	4	3	2	1	NA
The intellectual challenge of this course is	(5)	4	3	2	1	NA
Usefulness of feedback on my work	(5)	4	3	2	1	NA
Compared to other Hopkins courses, the workload is (heavier/lighter)	5	4	(3)	2	1	NA

***"Please see reverse for Section III"***

### III. Student Comments

What are the best aspects of this course?

Diving deep into philosophy with open discussions is fun. Also professors drove the discussion and explained things well.

What are the worst aspects of this course?

I think 1 hour is sufficient for class time.  
2 hours is too much.

What would most improve this class?

Cut it down by an hour.

What should prospective students know about this course before enrolling? (You may comment on any aspect of this course such as assumed background, readings, grading systems, and so on.)

They go in depth, so read the material  
and try to grasp it.

## JHU Department of Philosophy Evaluation Form Teaching Assistant

*Instructions.* Please help improve the quality of teaching in philosophy at Hopkins by taking this opportunity to evaluate this course. Please fill out *all three* sections of the evaluation; note that section III is on the reverse of this form. Your responses are confidential, and this evaluation will not be seen by your instructors until all grades for the course have been turned in. We appreciate the time and effort you spend filling out this form.

### I. Course and Student Information

Instructor's names: Itai Marom & Tammo Lossau

Course name and number: Year and Semester: Interession, Wittgenstein 3

Your year in school: Your major: the limits of Our World

### II. Teaching Assistant's Rating by Category

*Instructions.* Where "5" means "excellent" and "1" means "poor," please circle the number you *feel* best describes your TA in the categories below. If a category does not apply, or if you lack relevant information, circle "NA."

	Excellent		Poor			
Overall course quality	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Instructor's teaching effectiveness (Itai)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Instructor's teaching effectiveness (Tammo)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
The intellectual challenge of this course is	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Usefulness of feedback on my work	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Compared to other Hopkins courses, the workload is (heavier/lighter)	5	4	3	2	1	NA

***"Please see reverse for Section III"***

### III. Student Comments

What are the best aspects of this course?

This course ~~is~~ is meant as a close reading of Tractatus, & it indeed was — the best part of this course ~~is~~ is breaking down large chunks of content into easily understandable pieces. I no longer feel Wittgenstein ~~is~~ is too difficult for me to understand.

What are the worst aspects of this course?

None.

What would most improve this class?

Sometimes it felt like there was not a set agenda for each class — often we'd have to sort of stop, recollect & see what ~~the~~ other ground we should cover. This is good to make sure class discussions are relevant, ~~but~~ but maybe sometimes there could be a clear end goal & direction for them.

What should prospective students know about this course before enrolling? (You may comment on any aspect of this course such as assumed background, readings, grading systems, and so on.)

Perhaps taking introductory logic will help in understanding Tractatus, but Tarmo & Itai do a fine job explaining what relevant aspects of it you need to know anyway.

## JHU Department of Philosophy Evaluation Form Teaching Assistant

*Instructions.* Please help improve the quality of teaching in philosophy at Hopkins by taking this opportunity to evaluate this course. Please fill out *all three* sections of the evaluation; note that section III is on the reverse of this form. Your responses are confidential, and this evaluation will not be seen by your instructors until all grades for the course have been turned in. We appreciate the time and effort you spend filling out this form.

### I. Course and Student Information

Instructor's names:	Tammo/Lossau      Itai Marom
Course name and number: Year and Semester:	22 Junior, Computer science
Your year in school: Your major:	2019 Intercession

### II. Teaching Assistant's Rating by Category

*Instructions.* Where "5" means "excellent" and "1" means "poor," please circle the number your *feel* best describes your TA in the categories below. If a category does not apply, or if you lack relevant information, circle "NA."

	Excellent		Poor			
	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Overall course quality	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Instructor's teaching effectiveness (Itai)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Instructor's teaching effectiveness (Tammo)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
The intellectual challenge of this course is	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Usefulness of feedback on my work	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Compared to other Hopkins courses, the workload is (heavier/lighter)	5	4	3	2	1	NA

***"Please see reverse for Section III"***

### III. Student Comments

What are the best aspects of this course?

I love the source material, and I really enjoy the style of close reading we are doing. Every day I feel like I learn something new and exciting. There is never a dull moment.

What are the worst aspects of this course?

Nothing!

What would most improve this class?

Maybe more open discussions could be fun? Otherwise, everything is great.

What should prospective students know about this course before enrolling? (You may comment on any aspect of this course such as assumed background, readings, grading systems, and so on.)

This is a great course you will learn a lot.



## JHU Department of Philosophy Evaluation Form Teaching Assistant

*Instructions.* Please help improve the quality of teaching in philosophy at Hopkins by taking this opportunity to evaluate this course. Please fill out *all three* sections of the evaluation; note that section III is on the reverse of this form. Your responses are confidential, and this evaluation will not be seen by your instructors until all grades for the course have been turned in. We appreciate the time and effort you spend filling out this form.

### I. Course and Student Information

Instructor's names: Tammo Lossow, Itai Marom

Course name and number: Year and Semester: "Wittgenstein and the Limits of our World", Intersem 2019

Your year in school: Your major:  
Junior Philosophy, Cognitive Science

### II. Teaching Assistant's Rating by Category

*Instructions.* Where "5" means "excellent" and "1" means "poor," please circle the number your *feel* best describes your TA in the categories below. If a category does not apply, or if you lack relevant information, circle "NA."

	Excellent		Poor			
	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Overall course quality	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Instructor's teaching effectiveness (Itai)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Instructor's teaching effectiveness (Tammo)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
The intellectual challenge of this course is	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Usefulness of feedback on my work	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Compared to other Hopkins courses, the workload is (heavier/lighter)	5	4	3	2	1	NA

***"Please see reverse for Section III"***

### III. Student Comments

What are the best aspects of this course?

- The instructors' engagement with the texts made the exploration much more exciting.
- Great choice of text for close reading; I now understand the importance of the Trajectories as a piece of philosophy
- "Assignments" were directly related to comprehension of the text and helped a discussion

What are the worst aspects of this course?

- Maybe more discussion could be useful? But also I would much rather hear Itai and Tammo speak than have a superficial discussion

What would most improve this class?

- Perhaps a slower pace for readings  
(which or not available as an option to an intersession course)

What should prospective students know about this course before enrolling? (You may comment on any aspect of this course such as assumed background, readings, grading systems, and so on.)

- very interesting and engaging
- you get a lot out of it
- none of the work / discussion seems tedious
- do the readings so you can participate in great discussion!

## JHU Department of Philosophy Evaluation Form Teaching Assistant

*Instructions.* Please help improve the quality of teaching in philosophy at Hopkins by taking this opportunity to evaluate this course. Please fill out *all three* sections of the evaluation; note that section III is on the reverse of this form. Your responses are confidential, and this evaluation will not be seen by your instructors until all grades for the course have been turned in. We appreciate the time and effort you spend filling out this form.

### I. Course and Student Information

Instructor's names:	Itai Marom & Tammo Lossau
Course name and number: Year and Semester:	Wittgenstein & Limits of our world Interession 2019
Your year in school: Your major:	2019 Computer Science

### II. Teaching Assistant's Rating by Category

*Instructions.* Where "5" means "excellent" and "1" means "poor," please circle the number your *feel* best describes your TA in the categories below. If a category does not apply, or if you lack relevant information, circle "NA."

		Excellent		Poor		
Overall course quality	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Instructor's teaching effectiveness (Itai)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Instructor's teaching effectiveness (Tammo)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
The intellectual challenge of this course is	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Usefulness of feedback on my work	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Compared to other Hopkins courses, the workload is (heavier/lighter)	5	4	3	2	1	NA

*Lighter coursework,  
but offset with  
lots of class  
discussion, which  
I prefer.*

**"Please see reverse for Section III"**

### III. Student Comments

What are the best aspects of this course?

Hai and Tammo are great instructors! They very thoughtfully planned out the readings and made sure to answer any and all questions we had in class. I like the small size of the course because we were able to get to know each other and share thoughts as friends.

What are the worst aspects of this course?

Nothing really comes to mind. The TLP is quite dense, so reading was sometimes difficult, but the class discussions really helped.

What would most improve this class?

It may be helpful to give a high level overview of the next class's readings before students do it themselves. It would help guide the reading.

Also, I know this can't be helped sometimes, but a room with windows is always nice for longer classes :)

What should prospective students know about this course before enrolling? (You may comment on any aspect of this course such as assumed background, readings, grading systems, and so on.)

You don't need a philosophy background to take this class. The instructors are very helpful and will guide you through understanding the text. Be prepared to do some serious thinking and to partake in in-class discussions.

## JHU Department of Philosophy Evaluation Form Teaching Assistant

*Instructions.* Please help improve the quality of teaching in philosophy at Hopkins by taking this opportunity to evaluate this course. Please fill out *all three* sections of the evaluation; note that section III is on the reverse of this form. Your responses are confidential, and this evaluation will not be seen by your instructors until all grades for the course have been turned in. We appreciate the time and effort you spend filling out this form.

### I. Course and Student Information

Instructor's names:	Tammo Lossau, Itai Marom		
Course name and number: Year and Semester:	Wittgenstein and the Limits of Our World; 2019 Inter-session		
Your year in school: Your major:	Freshman Molecular/Cellular Biology/Philosophy		

### II. Teaching Assistant's Rating by Category

*Instructions.* Where "5" means "excellent" and "1" means "poor," please circle the number your *feel* best describes your TA in the categories below. If a category does not apply, or if you lack relevant information, circle "NA."

	Excellent			Poor		
	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Overall course quality	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Instructor's teaching effectiveness (Itai)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Instructor's teaching effectiveness (Tammo)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
The intellectual challenge of this course is	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Usefulness of feedback on my work	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Compared to other Hopkins courses, the workload is (heavier/lighter)	5	4	3	2	1	NA

***"Please see reverse for Section III"***

### III. Student Comments

What are the best aspects of this course?

The best aspects of this course were the interesting class discussions of Wittgenstein's work and the professor's use of illustrations and diagrams to explain certain complex concepts.

What are the worst aspects of this course?

Certain points during the class felt like long lectures which was ok, but sometimes in these long explanations it would be difficult to fully understand the ideas that Wittgenstein describes.

What would most improve this class?

Some of the long lectures being broken down into smaller parts followed by class discussion.

What should prospective students know about this course before enrolling? (You may comment on any aspect of this course such as assumed background, readings, grading systems, and so on.)

This is a philosophy class that is very logic based. It is different from other philosophy classes in this way as it is not as abstract but highly structured and mathematical.