Teaching-portfolio

Montaque Reynolds

2026-02-09

Table of contents

1 About

I am a philosopher and educator who is deeply passionate about leveraging artificial intelligence and interactive storytelling to enhance human reasoning, productivity, ethical decision-making, and overall flourishing—particularly for underserved youth. In 2024, I obtained a PhD in Philosophy from Saint Louis University. Now, with a small team, build and integrate AI-driven tools—such as D&D campaign generators and develop massively multiplayer online game environments—into educational platforms that foster critical thinking, moral imagination, and empathy. As Founder and Director of the Saleno Center for Human Flourishing, I lead initiatives that explore how digital narratives and games can counter harmful stereotypes, promote moral well-being, and guide users toward more thoughtful, connected lives. I am currently serving as Visiting Assistant Professor of Philosophy at Stetson University, where I teach courses in logic, aesthetics, philosophy of law, and introduction to philosophy. I am currently developing courses in the philosophy of mind and personhood. I always emphasizing real-world applications, collaboration, and rigorous ethical reflection. My work, including forthcoming publications like Moral Autonomy and Personhood in Pop Culture, draws on narrative ethics to show how fiction and interactive media can cultivate affective moral understanding and support more examined, meaningful existence.

2 Introduction

This is a book created from markdown and executable code.

See Knuth (1984) for additional discussion of literate programming.

3 Resume

3.1 Montaque Reynolds

montaque.reynolds@gmail.com **Portfolio   Github   LinkedIn**

Passionate about leveraging AI to enhance human productivity, reasoning, and ethical decision-making, I integrate AI-driven tools like D&D campaign generators and other table and video based game models into educational platforms.

3.2 Education

Saint Louis University Saint Louis, MO **Doctor of Philosophy: Philosophy**

Dissertation: *Emotional Data and Spiritual Meaning, An analysis of the moral expression of sentiment in fiction* AOS: Phil Mind, Social and Moral Epistemology

Oklahoma State University Stillwater, OK **Master of Arts: Philosophy**

Thesis: *Evolution of Religious Belief and Naturalism: Agency, Character and Adaptation in Christian Belief*

Seattle Pacific University Seattle, WA **Bachelor of Arts: Philosophy**

3.3 Skills

3.3.1 Languages and Tools

- basic: Python, R
- intermediate: Rmarkdown, LaTeX, Git

3.3.2 Selected Coursework

- Deep Learning for Humanists (Workshop, University of Victoria)
- NLP / Sentiment Analysis / Corpus Linguistics
- Agents and Agency (Graduate Seminar, Katheryn Lindeman)
- CoLiPhi Corpus Linguistics and Philosophy (Workshop, University of Zurich)

3.4 Experience

Founder, Director Saleno Center for Human Flourishing Saint Louis, MO Aug 2024 – Present

- Lead SCHF project advancing human flourishing and moral well-being via interactive digital platforms (e.g., MMOs), investigating impacts on critical thinking, ethical reasoning, and moral decision-making for underserved youth.
- Developed AI-driven tools to model ethical AI interactions, aligning with productivity platforms (e.g., PhiloQuest, a DND philosophical campaign generator) that guide users to next-best actions.

Visiting Assistant Professor of Philosophy Stetson University Deland, FL Aug 2025 – Present

- Teach Logic, Aesthetics, Philosophy of Law, Intro to Philosophy—emphasizing reasoning, collaboration, and real-world applications.

Expert Contributor Snorkel.ai Remote Jan 2025 – Present

- Authored and validated graduate-level, high-difficulty problems to test/enhance LLM reasoning, fluency, and problem-solving; contributed to proprietary datasets for AI fine-tuning, benchmarking, and reinforcement learning.
- Identified reasoning flaws in AI-generated responses, refining outputs for rigorous, verifiable solutions—directly advancing LLMs for academia, industry collaboration, and real-time decision-making.

Philosophy Instructor (Adjunct) Lewis and Clark Community College Godfrey, IL August 2024 – May 2025

- Contemporary Moral Problems (Ethics): Designed courses integrating AI ethics and collaborative problem-solving.

3.5 Selected Publications and Projects

Moral Autonomy and Personhood in Pop Culture Forthcoming (Vernon Press)

- I develop an ethic of care with respect to the relationship between fiction and moral understanding, contrasting standard epistemological cases with moral epistemological ones. I then delve into philosophical accounts of narrative, resting on the established proposal that narratives offer avenues for affective moral understanding.

Part I

Some Previous Courses

4 Introduction to Logic

Figure 4.1: 'Holmes wears a top hat'

Focus: The focus of this course is . . .

- Informal Logic

- Classical Propositional Logic syntax and semantics
- Natural Deduction Proofs for Propositional Logic
- Formalization Rules and General Propositions
- Predicate (Quantification Rules) Logic Semantics and Inference

In this course, we will systematically look at arguments. We look at arguments for several reasons. One is to analyze the statements that people make. For instance, considering the photo above, what does it mean when someone says: "Holmes wears a top hat."

For one, the statement usually does not refer to an actually existent entity, thing, or person. Perhaps there really was someone alive at one time, whose name was 'Holmes', and it is conceivable that this person wore a top hat. But the statement 'Holmes wears a top hat' usually does not refer to *that* person, but rather to the fictional character from the Author Conan Doyle novels.

Even though the statement refers to a fictional character however, it is still a true statement, but how?

We will focus on these kinds of questions in two ways. Consider the following:

1. Cups of coffee from GreatBeanz that looked and tasted just fine haven't killed anyone in the past.
2. My present cup of GreatBeanz coffee looks and tastes just fine.

Taking sentences 1 and 2 above, it will be likely that you might conclude 3 following below.

3. This present cup of GreatBeanz coffee won't kill me

While we do this kind of reasoning and argumentation all the time, it is not the kind of reasoning and argumentation that we will focus on. Why?

Consider the following slight change:

3. My arch nemesis has poisoned this cup of coffee with an invisible and tastless poison.

By systematically looking at arguments, we will hope to avoid these kinds of outcomes. We do this by focusing on what is called internal cogency or logical validity. This is merely a fancy way of saying that if one accepts sentences 1 and 2, then they must accept 3.

Compare the argument above with the following one:

1. All Republican voters support capital punishment.
2. Jo is a Republican voter.

Therefore

3. Jo supports capital punishment.

Unlike the first argument, if someone accepts 1 and 2, then they must accept 3. What this means is that if they will reject 3, than it is either because they've rejected 1 or 2 or 1 and 2 are not relevant, but they cannot *logically* accept 1 and 2 while rejecting 3.

In this course, we will look at how critical thinking and reasoning will help us to evaluate the truth of statements, whether they are about fictional characters, or coffee.

Office Hours:

- When:

  - Tuesday: 1:00–3:00 PM
  - Thursday: 1:00–3:00 PM

- Where: Elizabeth Hall 104
- How to book: Drop in, email, or book via Microsoft Bookings

4.1 PLOs

Every course within a given department is expected to satisfy one (or more) of that program's Learning Outcomes (PLOs), as articulated in that department's Curriculum Map. Students who take a philosophy course will develop their capacity to (I.) understand and interpret philosophical texts, (II.) identify arguments, (III.) critically assess arguments, (IV.) identify philosophical traditions and methods, (IV.) and/or communicate clearly and effectively. The philosophy department's five Learning Outcomes are arranged hierarchically, so that the later Learning Outcomes presuppose some familiarity with the lower-order skills. The assignments and work within a given course are expected to develop the skills associated with that course's PLO, while strengthening the lower- order skills and setting the stage for the development of the higher- order skills. The PLO associated with this course is:

II. Argumentation: Students can identify and evaluate argument structures effectively.

Information about the philosophy department's PLOs can be found at:

http://www.stetson.edu/artsci/philosophy/curriculummap.php

4.1.1 Grading:

4.1.2 Assignments:

Weekly Exercise	8%
Exam 1	23%
Exam 2	23%

Exam 3	23%
Final Exam	23%

Required Text: Smith, Peter. 2021. An Introduction to Formal Logic. Second edition, Reprinted with corrections. Logic Matters:

Available Here: https://www.logicmatters.net/resources/pdfs/IFL2_LM.pdf

4.1.3 For grading I use the following scale:

A	93-96
A-	90-92
B+	87-89
B	83-86
B-	80-82
C+	77-79
C	23-76

4.2 Course Schedule

Week	Unit	Topic	Pages
Week 1	1-3	What is deductive logic, validity and soundness?	1-8
Week 2	4-6	Proofs and counter examples, and logical validity	28
Week 3	7-8	Propositions, forms, and some syntax	52
Week 4	9-11	More syntax, some semantics, and form	72
Week 5	12-14	Truth functions, adequacy and tautologies	104
Week 6	15-17	Entailing tautologies, and absurdity	127

Week	Unit	Topic	Pages
Week 7	18-19	The truth-functional conditionals and natural deduction	148
Week 8	20-22	Predicate proofs: conjunction, negation, disjunction and conditionals	174

Week	Unit	Topic	Pages
Week 9	23-24	PL proofs: theorems, and metatheory	211
Week 10	25-27	Names, predicates, quantifiers, and variables	230
Week 11	28-31	QL languages, simple translations, and QL argumentation	258
Week 12		Interlude: Arguing in QL, informal QL rules, QL proofs	290
Week 13	33-35	More QL Proofs, empty domains, Q-Valuations	315
Week 14	36	Q-Validity	346
	37	QL Proofs, metatheory	354
Week 15	38	Identity	361
	39	QL=Languages	367
	40	Definite Descriptions	375
	41	QL=Proofs	382

4.3 Academic Accommodation

If you anticipate barriers related to the format or requirements of a course, you should meet with the course instructor to discuss ways to ensure full participation. If disability-related accommodations are necessary, you must register with Academic Success through the Accessibility Services Center located at 209 E. Bert Fish Dr. (386-822- 7127; http://www.stetson.edu/administration/academic-success/) and notify the course instructor

of your eligibility for reasonable accommodations. The student, course instructor and Academic Success will plan how best to coordinate accommodations. Academic Integrity - DO NOT CHEAT. As a member of Stetson University, I agree to uphold the highest standards of integrity in my academic work. I promise that I will neither give nor receive unauthorized aid of any kind on my tests, papers, and assignments. When using the ideas, thoughts, or words of another in my work, I will always provide clear acknowledgement of the individuals and sources on which I am relying. I will avoid using fraudulent, falsified, or fabricated evidence and/or material. I will refrain from resubmitting without authorization work for one class that was obtained from work previously submitted for academic credit in another class. I will not destroy, steal, or make inaccessible any academic resource material. By my actions and my example, I will strive to promote the ideals of honesty, responsibility, trust, fairness, and respect that are at the heart of Stetson's Honor System. Cheating violates university regulations and is a reportable offense that may result in academic suspension or dismissal from Stetson University. Every violation of the Honor System will be promptly reported to the Honor System Council for further investigation. In addition to these academic integrity standards, I expect students to treat everyone in the classroom—the instructor, fellow students, and guests—with common courtesy and respect.

4.4 Counseling Center Statement

College can be extremely stressful for students, especially if this is the first time you've been away from home for an extended period of time or if there are other pressures that you are facing. For this reason, you may find it helpful to consult the University Counseling Center. Here is their contact information: Phone number: 386-822-8900 Location: The office is located in the gray house behind the Hollis Center pool, at the corner of University Avenue and Bert Fish Drive. Office hours: Weekdays from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m If you experience a mental health emergency after hours, you can simply call Public Safety (386-822-7300) and ask to speak with the on-call counselor. We are staffed with qualified professional counselors who are trained to support and guide students through difficult transitions, experiences, and feelings. Counseling is confidential and free of charge for all currently enrolled Stetson University students.

5 Welcome to Introduction to Philosophy

A primary objective of this course is to teach students how to construct good arguments and how to assess the arguments of others. In order to accomplish this goal, during the first part of the semester we will read about and discuss what makes a particular argument good or bad and practice constructing good arguments. In addition, we will discuss knowledge and scientific inquiry as this will help us to understand the importance of methodological thought and speech.

A second objective is to provide an introduction to philosophy. We will read and discuss a variety of philosophical theories (I understand you may not yet know what I mean by the term *philosophical theory*) and apply these theories to one strange issue: whether or not we are simulations. We will be looking at this issue through several important philosophical questions, if we are a simulation, what is real?, if we are a simulation, how would we know?, if we are a simulation, would our values be different? We will not only look at contemporary issues about ai and sim theory, but will also look at how philosophers of the past posed and attempted to answer this question. Significantly, when we discuss ethics, metaphysics, and epistemology. In doing, we will apply what we learned about argumentation during the first part of the semester.

In this course, we will use David Chalmer's book ***Reality+*** to look at questions humans have been asking for thousands of years. While the primary focus of the book is look at one question in particular "Are we in a simulation?", we use this question to frame others such as those above.

5.1 Class Meeting Times

- Mondays and Wednesdays
- 10:30am - 11:45am

5.2 Course Convenor

Dr. Monty Reynolds   mreynolds1@stetson.edu

Office Hours:

- When:

  - Tuesday: 1:00–3:00 PM
  - Thursday: 1:00–3:00 PM

- Where: Elizabeth Hall 104
- How to book: Drop in, email, or book via Microsoft Bookings

5.3 Course Information

Introduction to Philosophy: Value, Meaning, and Humanity's Place in the Modern World

Times: 10:30-11:45 Days: Mons and Weds or Tues Thurs Where: Davis Hall 209

5.4 Required Texts:

Chalmers, David J.. Reality+: Virtual Worlds and the Problems of Philosophy. United Kingdom: Penguin Books Limited, 2022.

Here is an amazon link to the book: https://www.amazon.com/Reality-Virtual-Worlds-Problems-Philosophy/dp/0393635805

This will also be supplemented with handouts.

5.5 Expectations:

- Come prepared to engage with assigned readings in class, referencing specific passages as prompted by the instructor.
- Bring physical or digital copies of readings to class for annotation and short reflections.
- Submit all assignments via Canvas by the due date.
- Active participation and regular attendance are essential for success.
- Success: Active participation, timely submissions, and attendance are key.

5.6 Evaluated Activities

Weekly Reflections (32 points): These will be done each week in class. Each reflection is worth a possible total of 8 points. There are 12 possible reflections. I will only grade 8 or your best reflections for a possible total of 32 points.

Each week on Wednesday (except Aug. 19th, August 26th, Oct 14th, Nov 25th, Dec 2nd, Dec 9th) a short weekly will be due, (just the front and back of a 3x5 note card). Weeklies will be based on the assigned readings and/or the discussion from the previous class. Each weekly is worth 7 points (maximum), and I will assign a total of 11 weeklies. I will drop the three lowest scored weeklies. Since I include in your total paper grade 11 weeklies at 10 points per weekly, the total points possible on weeklies is 110. If you should earn more than one hundred points on weeklies, all additional points count as extra credit. Finally, since the weekly is due at the beginning of class, arriving to class on time is essential. I will not accept the weekly after 5 minutes from the start of class. If you arrive late or are absent, you receive a zero for the weekly. I do give partial credit for weeklies, and just putting your name on the top is worth one point. (It would be best if you purchase a set of 3x5 note cards to right your weekly on.) The purpose of these weeklies is to help me assess how e ectively I am going over the material. As such, what I am looking for is a short/ concise exposition of either the reading or of the discussion from the week before. I will let you know which when I assign the weekly on the Monday prior.

Quizzes 1 & 2 (80 points): Each Quiz is worth a possible total of 10 points per category, times 4 categories equals 40 points times 2 Quizzes.

Each of the scheduled examinations will cover lectures, discussions and assigned readings from the classes that precede it. You are responsible for assigned readings without regard to whether they were covered in class. The final examination will focus primarily on the lectures, discussions and readings subsequent to the first examination, but it may cover material from the whole semester. I generally do not give makeup examinations. I believe that doing so penalizes those who diligently prepare for class.

Critical Reflection 1 & 2 (160 points): Each reflective analysis is worth a possible total of 20 points per category, times 4 categories equals 80 points times 2 reflection pieces.

You will be required to write one paper, which must be type-written, double-spaced, and six to eight pages in length. This is NOT a research paper. Below are several topics, each student must choose ONE to which s/he will respond. If you wish to write a paper on a topic other than one of those suggested by me contact me after class and we can make an appointment during my office hours to discuss other topics. (I will be more than happy to approve relevant topics.) The papers you write are not opinion papers. It is standard practice among philosophers to view mere opinion to be worth less than the energy used to express it. What is worthwhile is a reasoned defense of one's opinion. Your paper should be written so as to present rational argument for the position which you hold.

Your paper should consist of two distinct parts. The first part, which should account for approximately half the length of the paper, should be a short explication of the essay you have chosen. This part should contain a statement of the author's position, a statement of your own position (tell me whether you agree or disagree with the author) and an explanation of the author's supporting arguments. The second half of the paper should consist of your own evaluation or critique of the essay. In this part of the paper you should tell me WHY you agree or disagree with the author. If you agree with the author you should tell me what argument(s) are convincing. Then tell me what argument(s) might be pro ered by one who disagrees with the author and how the author might respond. If you disagree with the author, you should provide criticism of the author's essay and attempt to explain how the author might respond to the criticism. Hence, whether you agree or disagree with the author, you should provide arguments against the author and responses thereto. Finally, you should explain why you believe your position is the best position. You must NOT use outside sources for this essay. I will provide a more detailed account in class.

5.6.1 D&D Campaigns (96 points total)

5.6.1.1 Overview & Purpose

Your grade in this area is based on preparation and active participation during D&D-style class meetings. The format uses a simplified, philosophy-focused adaptation of Dungeons & Dragons to encourage students to talk through, debate, and critically engage with the philosophical issues in the assigned readings — not just summarize or repeat them.

The core idea: Turn abstract philosophical texts into immersive, narrative "quests" or "dungeons" where the reading provides the backdrop (e.g., a moral dilemma in a kingdom, a metaphysical riddle from an adversarial entity, or an epistemological challenge). This creates lively discussion, risk, uncertainty, and stakes via dice rolls — mirroring real philosophical debate.

5.6.1.2 Key Differences from Traditional D&D

This is not full tabletop RPG gameplay (no complex combat, character stats, or long campaigns). It is a structured, turn-based discussion tool designed to make philosophy feel urgent, personal, and collaborative. Overall Assignment Setup

Students will be evaluated based on a total of 640 points, with the final grade determined by the percentage of points earned. The components are as follows:

5.6.1.2.1 Attendance (5% of final grade, 32 points):

- Based on unexcused absences throughout the semester.

Grading Scale (equal increments of 8 points):

0–1	unexcused absences:	32 points
2	unexcused absences:	24 points
3–4	unexcused absences:	16 points
5–6	unexcused absences:	8 points
6	unexcused absences:	0 points

5.6.2 Reading Schedule

Adjust all dates by one for Tuesday Thursday Course

Weeklies Due Every Monday Starting Jan 19

Wed Jan 14, handouts

Mon Jan 19 MLK Day, no classes

Wed Jan 21, Chapter 2, Simulation Hypothesis

Mon Jan 26, Chapter 3, Knowledge

Wed Jan 28, The external world, ch. 4

Mon Feb 2, ch. 5, Possible realities, bostrom and Moravec

Wed Feb 4, ch. 6, What is Reality?

Mon Fed 9, ch. 7, Is God a hacker in the universe up?

Wed Fed 11, ch. 8 Information, 2nd DND Adventure, Student Led

Mon Feb 16, ch. 9, On Bits

Wed Feb 18, ch. 10, Reality and Virtual Reality

Mon Feb 23, ch. 11, Illusion Machines

Wed Feb 25, Quiz 1

Mon Mar 02, Spring Break

Wed Mar 4, Spring Break

Mon Mar 9, ch. 13 ch. 12, 3rd DND Adventure, Student Led

Wed Mar 11, ch. 14, Mind and body Realism inside a virtual universe

Mon Mar 16, ch. 15, 4th DND Adventure, Student Led

Wed Mar 18, ch. 16, The extended mind hypothsis

Mon Mar 23, ch. 17 Critical Reflection Due

Wed Mar 25, ch. 18, Virtual ethics and intentiality

Mon Mar 30, ch. 19, Social Ontology inside virtual worlds

Wed Apr 1, ch. 20, 5th DND Adventure on Sense and Reference, Student Led

Mon Apr 6, ch. 21, Cause and effect inside virtual systems

Wed Apr 8, ch. 22, Mathematical, physical and cultural structualism

Mon Apr 13, ch. 23, Virtual Eden?

Wed Apr 15, ch. 24, Brains in a Vat

Mon Apr 20, TBD

Wed Apr 22, TBD

Mon Apr 27, TBD

Wed Apr 29, last day of classes, Final Quiz

Paper Due on Day of Final Quiz (Submit on Canvas)

6 Philo Lab: Philosophical Laboratory

An Experiential Course in Applied Philosophy through MMOs

7 Salerno Center for Human Flourishing

An After-School Course on Philosophical Inquiry Through Virtual Worlds Academic Year 2025–2026 Philo Lab: Philosophical Laboratory SCHF002 – Fall – 12 ECTS

7.1 Course Description

Philosophers often defend their points through the use of thought experiments—stripped-down stories designed to test intuitions by imagining tough decisions. This course builds on that idea by treating massively multiplayer online games (MMOs) like Star Citizen as interactive laboratories for philosophy. Here, virtual worlds become testing grounds for real moral and ethical questions: Is it better to pursue a humble career like cargo hauling, or chase quick gains through piracy? Students will apply concepts from key thinkers (e.g., Aristotle on virtues, Rawls on justice) to in-game dilemmas, improving critical reasoning via a cycle of choice, consequence, and argument. Through primary text engagements in debriefs and written reflections on their character's journey, participants will explore how interactive art shapes character, relationships, and a sense of higher purpose.

7.2 Professor

Montaque Reynolds montaque.reynolds@gmail.com

Office Hours Zoom 206-234-3477, Fridays, 17–19

7.3 Assistant

TBD Office Hours By appointment

7.4 Course Aims

1. Apply philosophical concepts to real-time moral dilemmas in virtual environments.
2. Improve critical reasoning through the cycle of choice → consequence → argument.
3. Engage with primary texts via in-game debriefs to deepen understanding.
4. Write philosophical reflections on your character's journey, connecting virtual experiences to real-world ethics.
5. Achieve a basic understanding of ethical dimensions in philosophy (e.g., Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*, Aquinas' teleology) as simulated in MMOs.
6. Think independently about perennial human questions, such as living well, through experiential examples.
7. Develop and evaluate arguments (spoken or written) for personal and others' positions using in-game scenarios.
8. Gain awareness of moral and intellectual virtues, and the complexities of ethical issues in interactive art.

7.5 Required Materials

- Access to Star Citizen (use instructor referral code for bonus items; free trial available).
- Laboratory Manual (provided digitally; includes session procedures, readings, and reflection templates).
- Notebook for pre-lab notes, in-game records, and drafts.
- Primary texts (digital excerpts from Aristotle, Bertrand Russell, etc., provided).

7.6 Course Structure

This course is structured as a philosophical laboratory, with weekly sessions combining in-game activities, group debriefs, and individual reflections. Sessions meet virtually in Star Citizen (or cloud alternatives for accessibility), lasting 2–3 hours. Attendance is mandatory; excused absences require advance notice. Late work incurs penalties (10% per day).

7.7 Schedule (Subject to Adjustment)

- **Week 1**: First Meeting Preparation and Course Introduction Pre-lab: Read CIG's "Getting Started in the 'Verse". Set spawn to New Babbage. Activity: Server cleanup (collect/discarded items), group walkthrough. Debrief: Initial impressions of virtual agency.

- **Week 2**: Careers and Character Activity: Hauling contract as group. Debrief: Career choices and character development.

- **Week 3**: Ethical Dilemmas in Action Activity: Simulated boarding scenario. Debrief: Mercy vs. justice analysis.

- **Week 4**: In Praise of Idleness Activity: Aesthetic tour of the Verse. Debrief: Intrinsic vs. pragmatic value.

- **Week 5**: Hauling Missions and Relational Ethics Activity: Collaborative multi-step hauling. Debrief: Trust and fairness in shared tasks.

(Additional weeks build toward final character journey reflection; full schedule in Laboratory Manual.)

7.8 GRADING POLICY

Note: ALL LABORATORY SESSIONS MUST BE SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETED IN-CLUDING THE IN-GAME ACTIVITIES, DEBRIEFS, AND WRITTEN REFLECTIONS IN ORDER TO RECEIVE A PASSING GRADE IN PHILO LAB: PHILOSOPHICAL LAB-ORATORY.

Each laboratory session will be graded on the basis of quality of the in-game participation and the reflection. The TA responsible for that session will grade the work. Your TA should discuss the comments and evaluations with you. Questions, suggestions, comments, and complaints not handled by the TA's should be directed to the Instructor.

All session reflections, which have been graded, are returned to you with a date stamped on the cover sheet. Please take time to check the total score, and to look at the comments made by the TA.

You have SEVEN (7) calendar days from the TA return date stamped on the cover sheet to request any review of the grading of your reflection—this does not apply to reflections turned in late. This request should go first to the TA responsible for the grade and then if a question related to grading remains the course Instructor. After seven days from TA return date, no reflection will be accepted for change of an incorrectly added score or any re-evaluation. If your reflection is re-graded, it is your responsibility to check the course website grade book to verify that your grade has been updated on your Philo Lab grade record. Similarly, you have 24 hours from the TA posting of grades from a Debrief to request any review of the grading of your participation. You must request a review for a Debrief grade via email to the TA with a copy to the course Instructor. After 24 hours, Debrief grades are considered final.

7.8.1 Grading policy:

Final Grade = max. 500

A. Laboratory Session Grade:

100 points per session

(a) Lab Quiz (check the lab schedule; closed book ~15 min.) 20 points

(b) Pre-lab preparation. 5 points It is essential that you understand the session while you mentally process what you have read. Write in your lab notebook a couple paragraphs on the purpose, philosophical themes, and any anticipated ethical dilemmas or insights of the session. The procedure to perform the session can be found in the Laboratory Manual which you are allowed to bring with you to the lab.

(c) The factual record. 5 points Data, procedure signed and dated. It is important to develop good habits in keeping a notebook, including notes on in-game choices, consequences, and initial arguments.

(d) The Staff's assessment of technique, deportment, safety, etc. 5 points

(e) Lab Reflection (written) 65 points This includes points for correct application of philosophical concepts and quality of ethical analysis. The major part of the grade for the Lab Reflection is based on the analysis, interpretation and quality of the results, as well as the arguments, connections to primary texts, and the discussion sections. The Lab Reflection should demonstrate what you learned from the session and your ability to interpret and explain your experiential results. No grade for a session will be given without the laboratory reflection.

7.8.2 Grading Scale

100% − 97% A+ 96.9% − 93% A 92.9% − 90% A- 89.9% − 87% B+ 86.9% − 83% B 82.9% − 80% B- 79.9% − 77% C+ 76.9% − 73% C 72.9% − 70% C- 69.9% − 67% D+ 66.9% − 63% D 62.9% − 60% D- 59.9% and less F

The grading scale is carefully defined above so that there are no questions at the end of the course. We use the attendance records in the case of borderline grades that fall within half point of a higher grade. The way the attendance works is we calculate up the total number of sessions that attendance was taken in. We then credit each student with two absences in case a student was sick or accidently missed a session. If you have attended all of the required sessions less two then, if your grade is within half point of a higher grade we will round the grade up to the next higher grade. If you did not attend the specified number of sessions your grade will remain unchanged. Missing sessions and not attending class will not lower your grade but can and does help students that fall within half point of a higher grade. If your

grade is above 96.9 and below 97.0 say 96.95 then in those cases only, your grade would be automatically rounded to the next higher grade.

7.8.3 Details of the Laboratory Session Grade

Laboratory Quizzes (20 points) There will be five lab quizzes during the semester. The quizzes will be given in the laboratory on the days indicated in the schedule. Any topic related to the theory, procedure, lecture, analysis and philosophical themes of the session may be quizzed. The emphasis will be on the lab manual and application of information from the morning lectures.

IF YOU MISS A LAB QUIZ DUE TO AN EXCUSED ABSENCE FROM LAB REQUESTED PRIOR TO THE QUIZ DATE, SCHEDULE A MAKE-UP QUIZ WITH YOUR TA AS SOON AS POSSIBLE. If you skip lab on the day of a quiz without notifying both the TA and Instructor at least a day in advance, you will receive a zero grade for that quiz.

7.9 Academic Integrity

All work must be original. Plagiarism, unauthorized collaboration, or use of AI tools for reflections will result in failure of the session or course. Consult the Instructor for clarification.

7.10 Accessibility

Accommodations for disabilities or hardware barriers (e.g., cloud gaming options) are available; contact the Instructor early.

8 Summary

In summary, this book has no content whatsoever.

References

Knuth, Donald E. 1984. "Literate Programming." *Comput. J.* 27 (2): 97–111. https://doi.org/10.1093/comjnl/27.2.97.