Reappointment Letter
Russell Marcus, Philosophy Department
January 4, 2012

I came to Hamilton College as the Chauncey Truax Post-Doctoral Fellow in Philosophy in the Fall of 2007. After three years, I was pleased to be hired into the tenure-stream line which I now occupy. My job is, in all important respects, a dream come true. My department is collegial and supportive, encouraging me to grow in ways that are exciting and rewarding to me. I have excellent and interesting colleagues across the College, in a variety of disciplines, many of whom I consider to be good friends. Most of my students work hard and appreciate my efforts. They allow me to experiment and grow as a teacher and I learn from them.

I. Research.

My research divides into three areas: philosophy of mathematics and logic, modern philosophy, and philosophical pedagogy.

IA. Research: Philosophy of Mathematics and Logic

My main area of research is the philosophy of mathematics, specifically focusing on the so-called Quine-Putnam indispensability argument. I have published three articles in this area (two in journals, one in the *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*) and I am currently working hard to find a home for a fourth, "The Explanatory Indispensability Argument." I have secured a contract with Lexington Books, the academic imprint of Rowman and Littlefield, for a book, *Autonomy Platonism and the Indispensability Argument*. Writing this book (from scratch) will be the central focus of my upcoming sabbatical year.

I have several more article manuscripts on the philosophy of mathematics in various stages of preparedness, some of which derive from my dissertation. Publication of my dissertation was solicited by two minor presses, but I chose not to pursue this option; the work in my dissertation is too raw and under-developed. There is more work to mine from the dissertation, articles based on ideas I sketched in the original. But my research energy at present is focused on the article on the explanatory argument and the book manuscript which is due in August 2013.

My work in the philosophy of mathematics naturally combines with my interests in logic. Technically speaking, I am not a logician. Toward the end of my coursework as a graduate student, I faced the decision of whether to write a dissertation in logic and become a proper logician or to find a less-technical philosophical topic on which to write. Logic is fun. When I first encountered philosophical logic in my junior year as an undergraduate, I couldn't believe that it was a serious field of study. Philosophers, mathematicians, linguists, and others see logic as a topic of central importance. I started my five-year high school teaching career as a mathematics teacher largely on the strength of my interest in logic. But learning logic for me was like getting college credit for playing games and eating candy. Unfortunately, I believe that the obverse of that sentiment also holds: logic is mainly just a tool for clear thinking. It lacks the substantial content that drew me to philosophy. There's a reason that the young Wittgenstein called logical truths meaningless. I chose to write my dissertation on the philosophy of mathematics rather than become a logician.

My work in logic thus tends to be tied to pedagogy. My research interest in logic is mainly in the philosophy of logic, looking at logical beliefs as paradigmatically *a priori*, a role which is more interestingly played by mathematical beliefs. I published a few historical blurbs in a pedagogical collection, *Key Terms in Logic*. I have presented two papers about teaching logic, mainly on innovations developed at Hamilton, and I have another logic-teaching presentation scheduled for February. Most ambitiously, tired of using other people's logic textbooks and supported by the Class of 1966 Career Development Award managed by Margaret Gentry, I spent last summer writing a draft of a new,

innovative logic text, *What Follows*. I used *What Follows* for the first time this past fall. The students' responses were generally good and I hope it will form the basis of my logic teaching for a long time.

The central purpose of my writing *What Follows* is to give my students some insight into why philosophers study logic and why it is a topic of importance for a variety of other disciplines including physics, mathematics, linguistics, and computer science. The longest, fourth chapter of the book includes a variety of short sections which raise philosophical questions and show how understanding logic can help us work on their answers. Some of these questions are purely logical, like how to think about conditional statements or whether there are two, three, or infinitely many truth values. Some concern science, for example the logic of scientific methodology. Still others concern artificial intelligence and the philosophy of mind; since computers are designed as logical processors, the study of logic is essential to the understanding intelligence itself. The innovation of *What Follows* is the integration of philosophical topics with logical ones.

What Follows remains nascent. I want to expand the fourth chapter with more philosophical topics. I have already written drafts of some new sections. There are more technical topics to add, including proofs of completeness for the logical systems I use in the text. Still, I posted the draft to my website and have received (unsolicited) two encouraging emails from instructors who have stumbled on it, one of whom used it in a class last term. I plan to continue to refine the draft over the next few years so that it might become ready for publication and broader consumption within the next decade.

Lastly in my main area of research, I have been working since graduate school with a colleague on an edited, historical reader in the philosophy of mathematics. I have used the material for this reader in my philosophy of mathematics seminar and my colleague has done similarly; nearly all of the conceptual work preparing the manuscript is complete. We have had some encouragement in our attempts to get the collection published. Broadview Press passed on the reader this summer; the editor liked it but the small press worried that it wouldn't have enough of a market. When I got the contract for my monograph, we put the project to the side. I plan to return to both *What Follows* and the historical reader after I complete my monograph.

IB. Research: Modern Philosophy

In addition to my central area of research, I have worked in modern philosophy and in philosophical pedagogy. My work in modern is connected, thematically, to my work in the philosophy of mathematics. The platonistic view I hold about mathematical objects is a descendant of Descartes's Fifth-Meditation argument that mathematical objects, being neither created by humans nor discovered by the senses, must have transcendent, abstract existence. My interest in mathematical intuition as a method of justifying our mathematical beliefs derives directly from Descartes's claims about our knowledge of mathematics.

I published a book review of Kevin J. Harrelson's *The Ontological Argument from Descartes to Hegel* and I am working on a substantial draft of the full version of the paper on which my job talk was based, "Embracing the Cartesian Circle." My most ambitious project in modern philosophy, though, is a source of some frustration. A proposal for *Themes in the Objections and Replies*, a re-organization of the objections and replies to Descartes's *Meditations*, integrating selections from Descartes's correspondence, drew significant interest from several publishers. Cambridge University Press, Wiley, and Prometheus all sent it for review. But the project appears to have insuperable difficulties with copyright permissions. I am hoping to re-cast the work in a blog format. This is a project in which an interested undergraduate could participate.

IC. Research: Philosophical Pedagogy and Other

My work in philosophical pedagogy is connected largely to my affiliation with the American Association of Philosophy Teachers (AAPT), an organization in which I am playing an increasingly prominent role. I have published articles on teaching modern philosophy and on cooperative learning exercises in philosophy classes. I have presented reflections on my work in the classroom in a variety of settings, including the AAPT's biennial meetings. In February, I will present two more talks at the AAPT group session at the Central Division meeting of the APA: on teaching logic ("Three In-Class Logic Problems") and on types of philosophy students ("The Bully, the Solipsist, and the Sponge").

I gave one general-audience, public lecture, the Waldman Lecture, with an auxiliary workshop, at Temples Emanu-El and Beth El, in Utica: "God or Reason? Case Studies in Jewish and Secular Ethics" and "Looking Forward, Backward, and Inward: Three Approaches to the Good."

ID. Research: Summary

Among my reappointment materials, I am including my published articles, drafts of three more papers, one of which is under consideration at *Metaphilosophy* and two which are awaiting some further work, and the proposal for *Autonomy Platonism and the Indispensability Argument*. I am also attaching, as appendices, the current versions of *What Follows* and *Themes in the Objections and Replies*.

As I hope you can tell, I have a lot of projects in various stages of completion. My immediate research goal is to get my book written during my sabbatical. I then hope to get my three most-current articles into print. I continue to be frustrated in my attempts to get my longer articles into print and the energy I use in my teaching tends to distract me, during the semester, from making as much progress as I would like. Last summer's detour into writing *What Follows* was fulfilling, though it took all summer and into the fall. I had to put off other work. I must find ways to focus on a manageable number of research projects at any one time.

II. Teaching

My teaching is the most satisfying aspect of my career. I started teaching, mathematics in New York City public schools, the semester after graduation from Swarthmore. I spent five years teaching in high schools in New York City and Costa Rica before graduate school. I taught mathematics at Queensborough Community College early in my graduate career and then I started teaching philosophy.

I have always enjoyed designing and teaching new courses. At Hamilton, I continue to seek ways to challenge both my students and myself. The students continue to impress me with their abilities to meet these challenges. My interactions with students, both in class and out, are rewarding. I was honored to receive the John R. Hatch Excellence in Teaching Award last May. I love my work.

I have taught seven different courses at Hamilton and led a variety of independent studies. I teach two courses annually which are central to the philosophy curriculum. Modern Philosophy is required of all our majors and most of our minors. Symbolic logic is one of two ways to fulfill the department's logic requirement. Both of these courses are consistently well-enrolled and my feedback from these courses is generally strongly positive.

IIA. Teaching: Logic

After my first year at Hamilton, I implemented a mostly standard, though slightly ambitious, logic course. I extended the technical material to include work on functions and second-order quantification. More creatively, I added Philosophy Fridays, biweekly discussions of philosophical topics related to logic, and asked students to write an expository essay on some aspect of the connection between logic and philosophy. Since logic fulfills Hamilton's QSR requirement, the class tends to have more non-philosophy students than concentrators and it can serve, to some small extent, as an

introduction to philosophy. I believe that my approach to teaching logic, integrating discussions of the relevance of formal logic outside of the class, outside even of philosophy, is original and importantly innovative. I received enthusiastically supportive responses when I presented my approach at the last AAPT conference. After the presentation, several seasoned logic teachers said some variation of, "Well, now I have to rethink all of my logic teaching."

In teaching logic, I draw on my experiences as a mathematics instructor. Logic classes, like many mathematics classes, tend to have bimodal grade distributions: some students get the material rather easily and do well while other students (even some very bright students) struggle to master the abstract, symbolic manipulation. Using clear and careful-lesson planning, targeted, specific homework assignments, and transparent, yet challenging, assessment strategies, I have been able to keep the lower-end of my logic classes successful without boring the more naturally-gifted logicians. As my course evaluations show, integrating serious discussions of philosophy with the technical work has also helped keep the more talented students interested.

IIB. Teaching: Modern Philosophy (and My Uses of Presentations)

While my research interests in modern philosophy are mainly focused on Descartes's work, I have happily developed my Modern course into a broad survey of the work of the canonical figures of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries: Descartes, Hobbes, Spinoza, Leibniz, Locke, Berkeley, Hume, and Kant. I'm proud of my ability to cover the central topics in metaphysics and epistemology in all of these philosophers, including Kant. Kant's work is often neglected in standard Modern courses due to the wealth of earlier material; often instructors never even get to Kant. Despite my ability to cover a lot of ground and keep on track during the term, we do not study the work in political philosophy of the era. I believe that this is not a problem because the political material is covered in other courses at Hamilton, including the Government department's Introduction to Political Theory and our ethical theory classes. In contrast, I would like to find a way to tweak the content of the course to include some women philosophers of the era. While the gender politics of Europe in the modern era prevented women from entering the canon, some women, like Elizabeth of Bohemia and Margaret Cavendish, did correspond with the central figures to produce sophisticated insights. Still, the course is working nicely as it is and the philosopher whom I would most like to cut from the syllabus to make room (Spinoza) tends to be the most interesting to many of the students.

My course evaluations in Modern last year, while strong, were the weakest I have had here. I believe that the thread of dissatisfaction mainly resulted from an interaction between two factors: an extra-large class size and my interest in having students make presentations to the class. I'll take a moment to explain how I use presentations, and how I came to use them, and then return to the discussion of my Modern course.

In my first term at Hamilton, I discovered that the tools I had previously developed for teaching philosophy, mainly clear expositions of difficult assigned readings peppered with some criticisms and topics for discussion, were insufficient for keeping Hamilton students fully engaged. I had felt a lack of connection with my intro class in the early part of the term and, following a suggestion from some colleagues, I asked the students to complete mid-term course evaluations. My suspicion was confirmed and I found that the students gave candid, thoughtful responses. (Subsequently, I used mid-term evaluations in other classes, especially new ones. I also often use my own course evaluations to supplement the College's generic forms, asking specific questions about my classes: which readings are good or bad, which assignments are useful, what they think about particular class policies. I include samples among my teaching materials.)

In the second half of my first semester, I started experimenting with having students conduct in-class presentations. I was pleased with the results, as were the students. I now use student presentations in all of my classes, from Introduction to Philosophy to my senior seminars, with the sole exception of

Logic. In the introductory class, presentations usually run twenty minutes to half an hour. In the seminars, students distribute an original essay to everyone in the class a day in advance and then take a full 75-minute block for their presentation. In 200-level classes, the lengths of presentations vary and I have begun allowing paired presentations. Seminar students do two or three presentations during the term. In other classes, students normally do just one.

Students generally enjoy preparing and giving their presentations. Indeed, they find it among the more rewarding of their experiences in my classes. I find the presentations to be often excellent and almost-always fruitful. Students come to the material on which they are presenting without prior conceptions and I often learn quite a bit about the material by listening to their interpretations. They provide fresh eyes where I have jaundiced lenses.

To help students prepare for their presentations, I ordinarily send them notes that I've prepared on the relevant material; I'm including a full set of my class notes for Modern. I also offer the students the opportunity to meet with me before their presentations, an option most students take. Meeting individually (or in pairs) with students allows us to get to know each other better and fosters more confident and competent work. During presentations, I let the students run the class, though I ask questions, fill in spaces when I feel the need, and generally ensure that the class period is used well. After presentations, I send typed comments to students, discussing both the content of their presentations and their delivery. It's a lot of work for me, both before and after class, but the classes tend to run productively and enjoyably.

While students almost universally appreciate preparing and presenting their own work, their experiences sitting through other students' presentations are mixed. When a presentation is at least good, the classroom atmosphere is excellent and we cover appropriate amounts of material. When a presentation is less than good, maybe fifteen to twenty percent of the time, students can get impatient and feel as if they are wasting their time.

In Modern last spring, we started with forty-eight students. I always lead the class during the first couple of weeks of the term, on Descartes's work, to provide a model, and at the end of the semester, when we are studying the difficult work of Kant. The structure and size of the course thus entailed that we had two student presentations in nearly every class between those on Descartes and those on Kant. These presentations were often paired, so four students were presenting on most days. I think that some of the students felt that since I wasn't leading each class, the classes were less worthwhile. I disagree, of course. Given my level of interaction with the presenters in advance, the quality of most presentations, and my work guiding the class from the back of the room, class periods were usually very productive. But I'm not sure that all students felt that way.

In the coming semester, given that Modern is enrolled to over 40 again, I'm planning reduce the number of presentations by asking students to combine into four-to-five-person panels to lead class discussions of specific themes, mainly toward the end of the term. (Marianne Janack gave me this promising idea.) I will thus take the lead for nearly all of the classes. I am eager to see if this change will improve the students' experiences in the course.

IIB. Teaching: Introduction to Philosophy

In addition to the core courses of Logic and Modern, I have been teaching a writing-intensive, introductory survey course. Last year I thoroughly revised the syllabus. In the current version, I cover a variety of themes: appearance and reality, space and time, personal identity, consciousness and the nature of mind, and ethics. I now eschew a single text or reader, gathering readings mainly from historical and contemporary philosophers but also from fiction (H.G. Wells, Kafka) and film (*Inception*, *Blade Runner*). I introduced peer review of one paper in the course last year; it worked well and I will continue to use it. Over half of the first-year students (14/25) in my intro courses last year, the first year of my new design, went on to take another philosophy course this year.

IIC. Teaching: Senior Seminars

At the other end of the curriculum, I have settled on two recurring seminars. Intuitions and Philosophy is an epistemology and methodology course in which we engage recent controversial work in experimental philosophy and psychology within a more traditional epistemological framework. We study philosophy of language, philosophy of science, ethics, action theory, philosophy of mind, and other areas, examining both the philosophical content of the work we read and the so-called armchair methods that philosophers use to generate their theories, invoking intuitions in response to thought experiments. We read about human cognitive deficits and irrationality and think about whether, as some contemporary philosophers believe, there is something erroneous and deeply problematic about the ways in which philosophers do their work. The design of this course will allow me to continue to use a consistent framework while switching some of the specific readings, especially in the experimental-philosophy portion of the class. This year, we were able to look at some literature about sexism and gender discrimination in philosophy, which holds steady at twenty-to-twenty-five percent women, and think about whether the ways in which philosophy is practiced might contribute to gender inequity. I brought to campus Emily Esch, a philosopher familiar with the experimental philosophy movement. She met with my class, giving them excellent suggestions, and gave a public talk which two advanced students described as the best they had ever attended. (It was indeed very good, engaging and perfectly pitched.) The Intuitions course is a unique design of my own creation and I am proud of it.

Knowledge, Truth, and Mathematics is an opportunity for me to teach in my main research area. Again, I have designed the course to be consistent yet flexible. We start the term using a core of readings, many historical, from my philosophy of mathematics collection in progress. These readings give students a background in the central problems. Then, I treat different contemporary philosophical questions at the end of the term each time I teach the course. Last year, I spent the final month preparing the students to read my most recent paper on the explanatory indispensability argument. During the last week of the course, we read and discussed my work. That was useful to me and satisfying, even exciting, for the students.

I also taught a senior seminar in the philosophy of language, The Language Revolution. After teaching it, I realized that there might be a market for a slightly-more-accessible version. I ratcheted the material down just a little and offered it this fall as a 200-level course. As I had hoped, I got some of Bonnie Urciuoli's linguistics students and some of Jeremy Skipper's psychology students, as well as some computer science students, creating a neat, interdisciplinary group of twenty-three. I was amazed at how well the students, many of whom had little prior work in philosophy, were able to manage some sophisticated material in twentieth-century philosophy of language. I plan to continue to offer The Language Revolution, if not every year, then every other.

IID. Teaching: Other Courses, Thesis Supervision, and Independent Studies

I always get a few students out of Logic who are interested in doing further work. Twice, I have agreed to run independent studies in advanced logic (for four different students total): on metalogic, modal logic, and Gödel's theorems. I would be interested in developing any of these topics, especially the modal logic, into a proper course. When Katheryn Doran was on leave, I taught Contemporary Philosophy by soliciting (over the summer) the registered students' opinions on which of twelve recent articles we should read in the fall. I chose the two most popular (and a third that I wanted to read) and designed the syllabus to work the students up to the articles: one in philosophy and neuroscience, one on the nature of physical laws, and one on a paradox. In addition to the unique course design, I brought to campus the author of the neurophilosophy article, Pete Mandik. He's a young and engaging philosopher, and Doug Weldon's neuroscience class joined us for his excellent presentation. Our dinner, with Pete and the Contemporary class in my home, was a highlight of the course for many of the students.

In addition to these courses, I have supervised three honors theses, with a fourth coming this

spring. Given that our department has had only one or two each year, this is a respectable load. Last year, I supervised another independent study, by Sam McNerney. I used the product of that independent study, McNerney's substantial term paper, in my Intuitions seminar this fall and I plan to continue using it.

IIE. Reflections on My Teaching Style and My Attendance Policy

I bring a variety of teaching techniques to the classroom, including standard lecture and discussion, cooperative-learning lessons, and seminar-style conversations. I use a jigsaw lesson (a cooperative-learning structure) every year to teach identity theory in Logic. I use my *Themes in the Objections and Replies* for a small-group lesson in Modern in which students take on roles (Descartes and the Objectors) and adjudicate controversies arising in the *Meditations*. Such creative lessons require forethought and preparation and I find that some students, often the strongest ones, don't love group work. But one or two carefully-placed cooperative-learning lessons during a semester creates a nice atmosphere; some students find these classes to be the best of the term.

I prepare syllabi carefully, attending especially to pacing and sequencing. Aided by our students' abilities to work independently and by their interest in maintaining a schedule, my syllabi now contain detailed assignments for each day of class and specific deadlines for all graded work. I sometimes tweak due dates, but ordinarily I don't change anything about our schedule. Students repeatedly remark on this organization as giving them a good sense of my structure and expectations for the term.

One moderately controversial aspect of my teaching, one on which students often comment in their course evaluations, is my lack of a strict attendance policy. Here is what I write in some of my syllabi:

> *Logic*: Classes are for your edification. It will be useful for you to attend class. There is no direct penalty for missing class. Some students pick up on the technical material quickly. If you do miss a class, you should arrange to drop off your homework, if you have homework due to be handed in.
>
> *Modern* and *The Language Revolution*: While there is no direct reward or penalty for attendance, I expect students to come to class prepared to discuss the assigned reading.

Most students appreciate my attendance policy even if it may not be in all of their interests. A stricter, paternalistic attendance policy would probably help students come to class more often, especially for the courses I teach at 9am: Logic and Modern; this year I taught The Language Revolution at 9am as well. But the policy has benefits which I believe outweigh the problems. First, it frees me from having to argue with students about whether an absence is excused or not and whether particular medical conditions are legitimate reasons for missing class. My conversations about missed classes can focus on the content of the course rather than on whether or not some criterion for legitimacy has been met. Second, I avoid having to give some portion of students' grades to their attendance. I don't believe that merely showing up has, in itself, academic merit. Third, the policy helps me to affirm, immediately at the beginning of the term, my respect for my students' autonomy and their decisions, even if they are poor decisions.

Still, I expect students to come to class and I make it clear that I do. I spend time in each course discussing my attendance policy and how it is not an expression of indifference to their presence. I know who is in class and who is not. I email students when they miss classes without notifying me. As I say to my classes, I don't grade students on their attendance, I just judge them personally when they fail to come to class. I impose behavioral penalties for behavioral infractions and leave academic assessment for academic work.

I work hard to prepare interesting and edifying classes. If the students do not find the classes to be compelling experiences, then they are free to express their disinterest in the class by not attending. But attendance in my classes is pretty good. In my seminar this year, we didn't have a single absence until the very end of the term when one student had to be off campus for a graduate-school interview. Students do miss my early-morning classes; some students sometimes choose short-term benefits (like more sleep) at the sacrifice of their medium-term benefits (like engaging the content of the course). I believe that the long-term benefits of my attendance policy, allowing students the freedom to make mistakes about their time management and encouraging them to learn from those mistakes, are substantial enough to justify it.

I have long enjoyed designing and teaching new courses. I taught 23 different courses in my five years as a high-school teacher. Before this year, I either taught a new course or thoroughly renovated a previously-taught course every term at Hamilton. I have considered separating the historical and contemporary portions of my math seminar, teaching the former as a 200-level survey and freeing-up the seminar to do more advanced work. I have talked with several different colleagues outside philosophy about the possibilities for team-teaching interdisciplinary courses. I would love to participate in the revival of a lower-level course on infinity, for example, or in a course on scientific methods. But I'm not sure when these would fit into my already-full teaching schedule. I am hoping to find ways to make my teaching work more efficient and to leave more time during the semester for my own research. I prepare a lot for all of my classes: thorough sets of lecture notes; slides for class discussion; lists of questions for assigned readings. I write my own course websites. This preparation pays off when I teach courses I have taught before, which will happen, I expect, with increasing frequency.

One goal for my teaching, going forward, is to work harder on being more aware of the errant unhappy student. While I understand that not everyone is going to love my classes, it seems from my course evaluations that every once in a while I miss the fact that there is an unsatisfied student. This was especially apparent from a single, vitriolic evaluation from this fall's Logic class. I have to find ways to manage student expectations, especially about low grades, better. The most recurrent pattern of dissatisfaction in my course evaluations concerns my clarity in class. This response puzzles me a little and I'm tempted to blame the difficulty of the material we engage. Sometimes I know that I have been unclear in class and I will email students after class with an attempt to clear up confusions. But, sometimes the issues themselves are difficult and there are no clear answers. Perhaps I have to do a better job explaining that a lack of clarity in philosophy can just be evidence that we have reached the cutting edge of a problem.

Most importantly, I want to find ways to reduce the amount of work I do preparing for my classes while improving the results of my courses. Students respond well, for example, to the speed with which I return assignments. I usually return papers within a week; I nearly always return logic exams in the first class after the test. Students also appreciate the depth of analysis I give to their papers. For most papers and for presentations, I type up comments (usually 300-500 words) in addition to writing notes on the papers themselves. (Saving my typed comments has the added advantage of helping me when it comes time to write recommendation letters!) But perhaps there are ways for me to become more efficient without sacrificing results.

My teaching materials include syllabi from the courses I intend to teach regularly here with a few sample handouts or lessons. I am also uploading a full set of materials for my Modern course, including lecture notes, which I distribute to the students by posting on my website, slides from my in-class presentations, handouts, and assignments. I hope that my preparation for each course is apparent from this example. I am also uploading *What Follows*, the logic textbook I wrote last summer.

III. Service.

My ability to serve the College as a tenure-stream instructor was augmented by my prior presence for three years as a Truax Post-Doctoral Fellow. As a post-doc, my service was limited. Once I accepted the tenure-track position, in Spring 2010, the phone started ringing. I was elected to the Honor Court (through 2013). I joined the Humanities Series Planning Committee and started working on the Translation series; I worked hard bringing David Rosenthal to campus for his talk on Translation and Understanding. I served on the *ad hoc* Library of the Future Committee, 2010-11. I have worked on the New Faculty Orientation committee for two years, re-writing the Beginner's Guide to Clinton and helping Rebecca Murtaugh make substantial, well-received revisions to the orientation schedule. I took a one-semester replacement place on the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board, Fall 2010. I participate in Junior Faculty Caucus meetings and email discussions and I have attended Admissions Saturdays in the Fall of each of the past two years. I enjoy first-year and sophomore advising, which I have been doing since I was appointed to a tenure-track position.

Less-formally, I devised and run the Hamilton College Logic Puzzles, which have earned me a pleasant reputation for annoying puzzles. The puzzles were on hiatus in the fall as I struggled to keep up with my work, but I will revive them in the spring. I also do a radio show on WHCL each semester. I have given two Friday Think-Tank talks and led a Spirituality on Tap discussion.

In the Philosophy Department, I have advised majors and supervised and examined theses. I have fostered a nascent philosophy club, holding a couple of movie nights, organizing a day trip to a lecture on consciousness by Ned Block at NYU and a weekend at an experimental philosophy conference at Buffalo, and leading an irregular philosophy lunch in our new seminar room. I worked on the hiring of the new Truax post-doc, Martin Shuster, and am currently organizing the hire of a one-year sabbatical replacement for me.

Outside the College, my service to the philosophical community has mainly focused on work for the American Association of Philosophy Teachers (AAPT). I am currently the co-chair of the organizing committee for our next biennial conference, this summer in Austin, Texas. I devised and constructed the AAPT Repository of Philosophy Teaching Materials, a website collecting syllabi and other teaching materials for our younger members. I am also currently serving on the committee which awards their Lenssen Prize for an outstanding article on philosophical pedagogy.

IV. Conclusion

From my perspective, Hamilton College is a perfect fit for me. My family and I are happy in Clinton. We like the pace of life, the beautiful summers and the snow-filled winters, the proximity to accessible nature all year around. My children are happy in school and are maturing nicely. Since discovering the virtues of the liberal arts college as an undergraduate at Swarthmore, I have hoped to make a career working and learning in a place like Hamilton. I have every hope of spending my full career here.