

Course-Section: PHIL 100 01
 Title Intro To Philosophy
 Instructor: Thomas,James G
 Enrollment: 46
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1086
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	34	4.94	89/1447	4.59	4.45	4.31	4.18	4.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	35	4.97	34/1447	4.59	4.41	4.27	4.30	4.97
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	35	5.00	1/1241	4.79	4.59	4.33	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	0	5	28	4.66	325/1402	4.51	4.38	4.24	4.15	4.66
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	2	5	3	21	4.09	756/1358	4.29	4.23	4.11	4.03	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	7	25	4.53	372/1316	4.33	4.32	4.14	3.99	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	33	4.89	99/1427	4.47	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	23	12	4.34	1195/1447	4.61	4.54	4.69	4.68	4.34
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1434	4.53	4.33	4.10	4.10	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	5.00	1/1387	4.73	4.58	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	5.00	1/1387	4.94	4.83	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	35	5.00	1/1386	4.61	4.44	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	5.00	1/1380	4.75	4.55	4.32	4.31	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	20	2	0	0	1	12	4.40	376/1193	3.71	3.59	4.02	3.99	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	210/1172	4.53	4.18	4.15	3.95	4.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	261/1182	4.41	4.34	4.35	4.18	4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1170	4.70	4.53	4.38	4.17	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	23	10	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 800	3.55	3.69	4.06	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	29	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	15	Under-grad	36	Non-major	36
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14	F	0	Electives	16	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 100 02
 Title Intro To Philosophy
 Instructor: Thomas,James G
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1087
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	8	29	4.78	276/1447	4.59	4.45	4.31	4.18	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	33	4.89	120/1447	4.59	4.41	4.27	4.30	4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	36	4.97	43/1241	4.79	4.59	4.33	4.25	4.97
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	0	4	30	4.77	196/1402	4.51	4.38	4.24	4.15	4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	1	2	7	22	4.17	690/1358	4.29	4.23	4.11	4.03	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	0	3	30	4.74	173/1316	4.33	4.32	4.14	3.99	4.74
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	4	30	4.72	228/1427	4.47	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	22	15	4.41	1155/1447	4.61	4.54	4.69	4.68	4.41
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	1	29	4.97	35/1434	4.53	4.33	4.10	4.10	4.97
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	5.00	1/1387	4.73	4.58	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	5.00	1/1387	4.94	4.83	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	36	4.97	41/1386	4.61	4.44	4.32	4.32	4.97
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	5.00	1/1380	4.75	4.55	4.32	4.31	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	19	1	1	2	1	12	4.29	447/1193	3.71	3.59	4.02	3.99	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	124/1172	4.53	4.18	4.15	3.95	4.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	198/1182	4.41	4.34	4.35	4.18	4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	134/1170	4.70	4.53	4.38	4.17	4.95
4. Were special techniques successful	17	13	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	****/ 800	3.55	3.69	4.06	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 24	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 7			
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	5	C 0	General 16	Under-grad 37	Non-major 37
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	8	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 12	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 1			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 0			

Course-Section: PHIL 100 03
 Title Intro To Philosophy
 Instructor: Yalowitz, Steven
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1088
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	8	11	8	3.89	1166/1447	4.59	4.45	4.31	4.18	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	10	10	3.96	1088/1447	4.59	4.41	4.27	4.30	3.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	4	18	4.39	666/1241	4.79	4.59	4.33	4.25	4.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	4	2	8	10	3.88	1088/1402	4.51	4.38	4.24	4.15	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	5	10	11	4.00	799/1358	4.29	4.23	4.11	4.03	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	3	10	12	4.11	758/1316	4.33	4.32	4.14	3.99	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	1	4	19	4.32	692/1427	4.47	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	20	8	4.29	1234/1447	4.61	4.54	4.69	4.68	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	1	9	8	3	3.62	1181/1434	4.53	4.33	4.10	4.10	3.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	10	14	4.36	951/1387	4.73	4.58	4.46	4.46	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	4	23	4.75	859/1387	4.94	4.83	4.73	4.71	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	4	3	8	11	4.00	1047/1386	4.61	4.44	4.32	4.32	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	9	13	4.26	887/1380	4.75	4.55	4.32	4.31	4.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	21	2	2	1	2	0	2.43	1164/1193	3.71	3.59	4.02	3.99	2.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	1	2	4	5	3.85	835/1172	4.53	4.18	4.15	3.95	3.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	2	3	3	4	3.54	1070/1182	4.41	4.34	4.35	4.18	3.54
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	1	2	2	7	4.00	864/1170	4.70	4.53	4.38	4.17	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	15	11	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 800	3.55	3.69	4.06	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B 11			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 4	General 15	Under-grad 28	Non-major 28
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F 0	Electives 6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 0			

Course-Section: PHIL 100 04
 Title Intro To Philosophy
 Instructor: Ealick,Greg
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1089
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	4	13	19	4.24	889/1447	4.59	4.45	4.31	4.18	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	3	16	17	4.21	892/1447	4.59	4.41	4.27	4.30	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	8	28	4.63	415/1241	4.79	4.59	4.33	4.25	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	4	0	11	17	4.28	735/1402	4.51	4.38	4.24	4.15	4.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	5	12	16	4.03	788/1358	4.29	4.23	4.11	4.03	4.03
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	2	1	7	8	9	3.78	985/1316	4.33	4.32	4.14	3.99	3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	3	2	10	10	12	3.70	1184/1427	4.47	4.24	4.19	4.24	3.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	37	4.97	146/1447	4.61	4.54	4.69	4.68	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	3	15	11	4.28	611/1434	4.53	4.33	4.10	4.10	4.28
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	3	14	18	4.33	970/1387	4.73	4.58	4.46	4.46	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	6	30	4.83	707/1387	4.94	4.83	4.73	4.71	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	6	8	21	4.33	811/1386	4.61	4.44	4.32	4.32	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	6	28	4.67	463/1380	4.75	4.55	4.32	4.31	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	27	2	2	1	2	2	3.00	****/1193	3.71	3.59	4.02	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	1	2	1	7	4.00	710/1172	4.53	4.18	4.15	3.95	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	0	1	4	2	5	3.92	932/1182	4.41	4.34	4.35	4.18	3.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	390/1170	4.70	4.53	4.38	4.17	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	26	11	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 800	3.55	3.69	4.06	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99 0	B 21		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 6	C 2	General 21	Under-grad 38 Non-major 38
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives 9	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	20	4.64	430/1447	4.59	4.45	4.31	4.18	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	10	17	4.57	457/1447	4.59	4.41	4.27	4.30	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	20	4.71	323/1241	4.79	4.59	4.33	4.25	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	9	17	4.46	542/1402	4.51	4.38	4.24	4.15	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	6	21	4.78	158/1358	4.29	4.23	4.11	4.03	4.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	13	12	4.29	590/1316	4.33	4.32	4.14	3.99	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	8	14	4.25	775/1427	4.47	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	194/1447	4.61	4.54	4.69	4.68	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	12	7	4.30	578/1434	4.53	4.33	4.10	4.10	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	7	19	4.67	566/1387	4.73	4.58	4.46	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	211/1387	4.94	4.83	4.73	4.71	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	4	8	14	4.30	847/1386	4.61	4.44	4.32	4.32	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	8	18	4.63	520/1380	4.75	4.55	4.32	4.31	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	14	2	2	3	1	2	2.90	1117/1193	3.71	3.59	4.02	3.99	2.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	360/1172	4.53	4.18	4.15	3.95	4.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	490/1182	4.41	4.34	4.35	4.18	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	327/1170	4.70	4.53	4.38	4.17	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	13	4	1	3	0	3	4	3.55	645/ 800	3.55	3.69	4.06	3.95	3.55
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: PHIL 100 05
 Title Intro To Philosophy
 Instructor: Smith, Aaron Joh
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1090
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	20	Under-grad	28	Non-major	27
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PHIL 100 06
 Title Intro To Philosophy
 Instructor: Thomas, James G
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1091
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	59/1447	4.59	4.45	4.31	4.18	4.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	23	4.85	162/1447	4.59	4.41	4.27	4.30	4.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1241	4.79	4.59	4.33	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	83/1402	4.51	4.38	4.24	4.15	4.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	5	4	13	4.08	756/1358	4.29	4.23	4.11	4.03	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	3	6	14	4.38	519/1316	4.33	4.32	4.14	3.99	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	23	4.88	99/1427	4.47	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	18	7	4.28	1234/1447	4.61	4.54	4.69	4.68	4.28
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	35/1434	4.53	4.33	4.10	4.10	4.96
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1387	4.73	4.58	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1387	4.94	4.83	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1386	4.61	4.44	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	64/1380	4.75	4.55	4.32	4.31	4.96
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	16	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	243/1193	3.71	3.59	4.02	3.99	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1172	4.53	4.18	4.15	3.95	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	400/1182	4.41	4.34	4.35	4.18	4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1170	4.70	4.53	4.38	4.17	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	16	7	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 800	3.55	3.69	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: PHIL 100 06
 Title Intro To Philosophy
 Instructor: Thomas, James G
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1091
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	18	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	14	Under-grad	26	Non-major	26
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	7	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PHIL 100 07
 Title Intro To Philosophy
 Instructor: Smith, Aaron Joh
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1092
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	17	4.65	419/1447	4.59	4.45	4.31	4.18	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	18	4.65	364/1447	4.59	4.41	4.27	4.30	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	222/1241	4.79	4.59	4.33	4.25	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	1	3	17	4.59	391/1402	4.51	4.38	4.24	4.15	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	20	4.86	107/1358	4.29	4.23	4.11	4.03	4.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	2	4	14	4.48	423/1316	4.33	4.32	4.14	3.99	4.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	2	6	14	4.55	410/1427	4.47	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1447	4.61	4.54	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	278/1434	4.53	4.33	4.10	4.10	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	398/1387	4.73	4.58	4.46	4.46	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1387	4.94	4.83	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	470/1386	4.61	4.44	4.32	4.32	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	18	4.73	379/1380	4.75	4.55	4.32	4.31	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	16	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	895/1193	3.71	3.59	4.02	3.99	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	295/1172	4.53	4.18	4.15	3.95	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	676/1182	4.41	4.34	4.35	4.18	4.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	640/1170	4.70	4.53	4.38	4.17	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	9	9	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	****/ 800	3.55	3.69	4.06	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 1	B 10		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General 13	Under-grad 23 Non-major 23
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 2	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHIL 146 01
 Title Critical Thinking
 Instructor: Templeton,Roye
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1093
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	4	4	3.92	1138/1447	4.09	4.45	4.31	4.18	3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	947/1447	4.33	4.41	4.27	4.30	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	798/1241	4.44	4.59	4.33	4.25	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	2	0	3	1	3.14	1349/1402	3.72	4.38	4.24	4.15	3.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	5	3	2	3.31	1240/1358	3.47	4.23	4.11	4.03	3.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1316	****	4.32	4.14	3.99	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	799/1427	4.45	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	4	4.31	1223/1447	4.22	4.54	4.69	4.68	4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	4	7	1	3.75	1088/1434	3.88	4.33	4.10	4.10	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	1039/1387	4.50	4.58	4.46	4.46	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	844/1387	4.63	4.83	4.73	4.71	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	5	4	4.00	1047/1386	4.06	4.44	4.32	4.32	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	4	3	3.46	1255/1380	3.80	4.55	4.32	4.31	3.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1193	****	3.59	4.02	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	3	1	1	3.00	1090/1172	3.39	4.18	4.15	3.95	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	968/1182	3.72	4.34	4.35	4.18	3.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	2	1	2	1	3.00	1137/1170	3.42	4.53	4.38	4.17	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 800	****	3.69	4.06	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors		2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4							
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General		7	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives		4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	2							

Course-Section: PHIL 146 02
 Title Critical Thinking
 Instructor: Templeton,Roye
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1094
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	3	6	13	4.25	869/1447	4.09	4.45	4.31	4.18	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	5	16	4.50	532/1447	4.33	4.41	4.27	4.30	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	6	16	4.65	392/1241	4.44	4.59	4.33	4.25	4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	13	0	2	0	1	7	4.30	715/1402	3.72	4.38	4.24	4.15	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	3	2	8	8	3.63	1111/1358	3.47	4.23	4.11	4.03	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	20	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1316	****	4.32	4.14	3.99	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	3	19	4.67	283/1427	4.45	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	19	4	4.13	1321/1447	4.22	4.54	4.69	4.68	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	6	9	6	4.00	849/1434	3.88	4.33	4.10	4.10	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	429/1387	4.50	4.58	4.46	4.46	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	3	3	17	4.50	1143/1387	4.63	4.83	4.73	4.71	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	3	8	11	4.13	988/1386	4.06	4.44	4.32	4.32	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	5	7	10	4.13	978/1380	3.80	4.55	4.32	4.31	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	21	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1193	****	3.59	4.02	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	3	3	4	8	3.79	868/1172	3.39	4.18	4.15	3.95	3.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	3	1	4	4	7	3.58	1060/1182	3.72	4.34	4.35	4.18	3.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	7	1	9	3.84	962/1170	3.42	4.53	4.38	4.17	3.84
4. Were special techniques successful	6	18	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 800	****	3.69	4.06	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		Major 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 4	C 4	General 11	Non-major 25
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 3	D 3		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives 8	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 2	
			? 1		

Course-Section: PHIL 150 02
 Title Contemporary Moral Iss
 Instructor: Ealick,Greg
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1095
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	6	8	4.11	998/1447	4.48	4.45	4.31	4.18	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	5	10	4.22	882/1447	4.44	4.41	4.27	4.30	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	923/1241	4.59	4.59	4.33	4.25	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	725/1402	4.42	4.38	4.24	4.15	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	5	8	4.11	736/1358	4.15	4.23	4.11	4.03	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	7	8	4.28	599/1316	4.43	4.32	4.14	3.99	4.28
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	0	4	2	9	3.78	1156/1427	3.98	4.24	4.19	4.24	3.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	538/1447	4.91	4.54	4.69	4.68	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	1	6	7	4.20	701/1434	4.44	4.33	4.10	4.10	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	727/1387	4.65	4.58	4.46	4.46	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	579/1387	4.91	4.83	4.73	4.71	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	691/1386	4.51	4.44	4.32	4.32	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	463/1380	4.74	4.55	4.32	4.31	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	17	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1193	2.60	3.59	4.02	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	7	7	4	3.83	841/1172	4.19	4.18	4.15	3.95	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	553/1182	4.39	4.34	4.35	4.18	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	295/1170	4.85	4.53	4.38	4.17	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	0	16	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 800	3.55	3.69	4.06	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B 9			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 10	Under-grad 18	Non-major 18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 1			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5							
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	4	15	4.39	732/1447	4.48	4.45	4.31	4.18	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	18	4.65	364/1447	4.44	4.41	4.27	4.30	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	2	0	10	4.67	380/1241	4.59	4.59	4.33	4.25	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	3	16	4.39	625/1402	4.42	4.38	4.24	4.15	4.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	3	8	9	4.00	799/1358	4.15	4.23	4.11	4.03	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	4	14	4.39	504/1316	4.43	4.32	4.14	3.99	4.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	3	4	12	4.00	971/1427	3.98	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1447	4.91	4.54	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	2	6	10	4.26	623/1434	4.44	4.33	4.10	4.10	4.26
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	5	15	4.52	769/1387	4.65	4.58	4.46	4.46	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	732/1387	4.91	4.83	4.73	4.71	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	4	15	4.43	705/1386	4.51	4.44	4.32	4.32	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	15	4.48	689/1380	4.74	4.55	4.32	4.31	4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	20	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/1193	2.60	3.59	4.02	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	5	13	4.17	631/1172	4.19	4.18	4.15	3.95	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	4	2	15	4.41	638/1182	4.39	4.34	4.35	4.18	4.41
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	352/1170	4.85	4.53	4.38	4.17	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	0	17	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	655/ 800	3.55	3.69	4.06	3.95	3.50
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.88	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B 9			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 2	General 16	Under-grad 23	Non-major 23
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 1			

Course-Section: PHIL 150 04
 Title Contemporary Moral Iss
 Instructor: Ealick,Greg
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1097
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	201/1447	4.48	4.45	4.31	4.18	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	376/1447	4.44	4.41	4.27	4.30	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	231/1241	4.59	4.59	4.33	4.25	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	494/1402	4.42	4.38	4.24	4.15	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	1	8	4.23	626/1358	4.15	4.23	4.11	4.03	4.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	392/1316	4.43	4.32	4.14	3.99	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	2	1	3	6	3.85	1117/1427	3.98	4.24	4.19	4.24	3.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	819/1447	4.91	4.54	4.69	4.68	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	158/1434	4.44	4.33	4.10	4.10	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	160/1387	4.65	4.58	4.46	4.46	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	422/1387	4.91	4.83	4.73	4.71	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	303/1386	4.51	4.44	4.32	4.32	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	127/1380	4.74	4.55	4.32	4.31	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	2	0	1	2	0	2.60	1151/1193	2.60	3.59	4.02	3.99	2.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	504/1172	4.19	4.18	4.15	3.95	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	4	1	8	4.14	803/1182	4.39	4.34	4.35	4.18	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	275/1170	4.85	4.53	4.38	4.17	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	0	9	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	630/ 800	3.55	3.69	4.06	3.95	3.60

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 2	General 5	Under-grad 14	Non-major 14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: PHIL 150 05
 Title Contemporary Moral Iss
 Instructor: Ealick,Greg
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1098
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	518/1447	4.48	4.45	4.31	4.18	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	6	8	4.25	853/1447	4.44	4.41	4.27	4.30	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	159/1241	4.59	4.59	4.33	4.25	4.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	10	4.50	494/1402	4.42	4.38	4.24	4.15	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	3	10	4.25	608/1358	4.15	4.23	4.11	4.03	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	332/1316	4.43	4.32	4.14	3.99	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	704/1427	3.98	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1447	4.91	4.54	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	322/1434	4.44	4.33	4.10	4.10	4.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	656/1387	4.65	4.58	4.46	4.46	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1387	4.91	4.83	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	748/1386	4.51	4.44	4.32	4.32	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	193/1380	4.74	4.55	4.32	4.31	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	15	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1193	2.60	3.59	4.02	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	3	10	4.40	463/1172	4.19	4.18	4.15	3.95	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	1	2	12	4.50	553/1182	4.39	4.34	4.35	4.18	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	156/1170	4.85	4.53	4.38	4.17	4.94
4. Were special techniques successful	0	14	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 800	3.55	3.69	4.06	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 3	C 2	General 11	Under-grad 16 Non-major 15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHIL 152 01
 Title Intro To Moral Theory
 Instructor: Ealick,Greg
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1099
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	7	15	4.38	742/1447	4.56	4.45	4.31	4.18	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	9	14	4.42	648/1447	4.58	4.41	4.27	4.30	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	23	4.85	195/1241	4.73	4.59	4.33	4.25	4.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	425/1402	4.54	4.38	4.24	4.15	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	0	3	9	9	3.76	1015/1358	4.47	4.23	4.11	4.03	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	2	3	6	10	4.14	719/1316	4.31	4.32	4.14	3.99	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	5	8	10	4.04	948/1427	4.38	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.04
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1447	4.38	4.54	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	9	10	4.38	478/1434	4.42	4.33	4.10	4.10	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	8	15	4.46	839/1387	4.61	4.58	4.46	4.46	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	681/1387	4.91	4.83	4.73	4.71	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	8	15	4.46	663/1386	4.61	4.44	4.32	4.32	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	22	4.81	273/1380	4.78	4.55	4.32	4.31	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	19	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	****/1193	3.93	3.59	4.02	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	445/1172	4.63	4.18	4.15	3.95	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	508/1182	4.67	4.34	4.35	4.18	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	1	0	1	12	4.71	440/1170	4.85	4.53	4.38	4.17	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	12	13	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 800	4.10	3.69	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: PHIL 152 01
 Title Intro To Moral Theory
 Instructor: Ealick,Greg
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1099
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	11	Under-grad	26	Non-major	26
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	8	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	9	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PHIL 152 03
 Title Intro To Moral Theory
 Instructor: Thomas,James G
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1100
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	35	5.00	1/1447	4.56	4.45	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	33	4.94	67/1447	4.58	4.41	4.27	4.30	4.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	35	5.00	1/1241	4.73	4.59	4.33	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	0	0	2	29	4.94	65/1402	4.54	4.38	4.24	4.15	4.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	0	3	4	24	4.45	398/1358	4.47	4.23	4.11	4.03	4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	32	4.91	68/1316	4.31	4.32	4.14	3.99	4.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	30	4.83	140/1427	4.38	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	22	12	4.35	1189/1447	4.38	4.54	4.69	4.68	4.35
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	35/1434	4.42	4.33	4.10	4.10	4.96
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	35	5.00	1/1387	4.61	4.58	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	35	5.00	1/1387	4.91	4.83	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	33	4.97	41/1386	4.61	4.44	4.32	4.32	4.97
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	34	4.97	48/1380	4.78	4.55	4.32	4.31	4.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	0	1	2	5	18	4.54	268/1193	3.93	3.59	4.02	3.99	4.54
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	175/1172	4.63	4.18	4.15	3.95	4.81
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	292/1182	4.67	4.34	4.35	4.18	4.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1170	4.85	4.53	4.38	4.17	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	20	8	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	****/ 800	4.10	3.69	4.06	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 27	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 4	C 0	General 14	Under-grad 36 Non-major 36
84-150	11	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 12	F 0	Electives 10	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 2	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHIL 152 04
 Title Intro To Moral Theory
 Instructor: Seng,Phillip S
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1101
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	8	13	4.55	540/1447	4.56	4.45	4.31	4.18	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	436/1447	4.58	4.41	4.27	4.30	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	17	4.64	415/1241	4.73	4.59	4.33	4.25	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	380/1402	4.54	4.38	4.24	4.15	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	158/1358	4.47	4.23	4.11	4.03	4.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	8	5	8	3.86	933/1316	4.31	4.32	4.14	3.99	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	4	16	4.55	410/1427	4.38	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	7	13	1	3.71	1423/1447	4.38	4.54	4.69	4.68	3.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	491/1434	4.42	4.33	4.10	4.10	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	641/1387	4.61	4.58	4.46	4.46	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	317/1387	4.91	4.83	4.73	4.71	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	9	12	4.57	539/1386	4.61	4.44	4.32	4.32	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	216/1380	4.78	4.55	4.32	4.31	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	14	2	0	3	0	2	3.00	1087/1193	3.93	3.59	4.02	3.99	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/1172	4.63	4.18	4.15	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1182	4.67	4.34	4.35	4.18	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1170	4.85	4.53	4.38	4.17	****
4. Were special techniques successful	17	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	4.10	3.69	4.06	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 0	C 2	General 14	Under-grad 22 Non-major 22
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHIL 152 05
 Title Intro To Moral Theory
 Instructor: Hitz,Zena N
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1102
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	5	13	4.30	820/1447	4.56	4.45	4.31	4.18	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	5	13	4.17	929/1447	4.58	4.41	4.27	4.30	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	1	0	2	14	4.50	541/1241	4.73	4.59	4.33	4.25	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	9	9	4.14	882/1402	4.54	4.38	4.24	4.15	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	19	4.65	244/1358	4.47	4.23	4.11	4.03	4.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	6	12	4.22	653/1316	4.31	4.32	4.14	3.99	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	6	1	3	12	3.83	1130/1427	4.38	4.24	4.19	4.24	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	786/1447	4.38	4.54	4.69	4.68	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	3	10	3	3.88	996/1434	4.42	4.33	4.10	4.10	3.88

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	9	8	4.32	990/1387	4.61	4.58	4.46	4.46	4.32
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	814/1387	4.91	4.83	4.73	4.71	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	0	3	3	11	4.28	863/1386	4.61	4.44	4.32	4.32	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	0	4	13	4.42	739/1380	4.78	4.55	4.32	4.31	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	11	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	652/1193	3.93	3.59	4.02	3.99	4.00

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	360/1172	4.63	4.18	4.15	3.95	4.54
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	338/1182	4.67	4.34	4.35	4.18	4.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	459/1170	4.85	4.53	4.38	4.17	4.69
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	2	1	1	6	4.10	407/ 800	4.10	3.69	4.06	3.95	4.10

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A 3	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 12			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 3	General 13	Under-grad 23	Non-major 23
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 1			

Course-Section: PHIL 152 06
 Title Intro To Moral Theory
 Instructor: Seng,Phillip S
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1103
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	529/1447	4.56	4.45	4.31	4.18	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	228/1447	4.58	4.41	4.27	4.30	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	380/1241	4.73	4.59	4.33	4.25	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	2	12	4.47	530/1402	4.54	4.38	4.24	4.15	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	15	4.72	194/1358	4.47	4.23	4.11	4.03	4.72
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	2	12	4.41	486/1316	4.31	4.32	4.14	3.99	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	301/1427	4.38	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	4	9	5	4.06	1346/1447	4.38	4.54	4.69	4.68	4.06
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	0	3	10	4.50	341/1434	4.42	4.33	4.10	4.10	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	3	14	4.67	566/1387	4.61	4.58	4.46	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	317/1387	4.91	4.83	4.73	4.71	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	1	15	4.76	303/1386	4.61	4.44	4.32	4.32	4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	238/1380	4.78	4.55	4.32	4.31	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	13	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	526/1193	3.93	3.59	4.02	3.99	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	240/1172	4.63	4.18	4.15	3.95	4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	527/1182	4.67	4.34	4.35	4.18	4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1170	4.85	4.53	4.38	4.17	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	9	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 800	4.10	3.69	4.06	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B 5			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 4	General 8	Under-grad 18	Non-major 18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 1			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 0			

Course-Section: PHIL 251 02
 Title Ethical Issues in Sci
 Instructor: Wilson,Richard
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1104
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	12	14	4.43	695/1447	4.35	4.45	4.31	4.31	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	11	12	4.21	892/1447	4.27	4.41	4.27	4.23	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	4	6	14	4.23	798/1241	4.00	4.59	4.33	4.35	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	8	18	4.69	281/1402	4.65	4.38	4.24	4.24	4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	3	5	9	7	3.83	966/1358	3.67	4.23	4.11	4.12	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	7	19	4.67	239/1316	4.47	4.32	4.14	4.08	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	14	11	4.21	823/1427	4.08	4.24	4.19	4.14	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	16	11	4.41	1155/1447	4.56	4.54	4.69	4.70	4.41
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	14	8	4.25	634/1434	4.26	4.33	4.10	3.97	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	11	13	4.32	980/1387	4.33	4.58	4.46	4.42	4.32
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	211/1387	4.82	4.83	4.73	4.71	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	13	11	4.30	847/1386	4.20	4.44	4.32	4.24	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	12	11	4.26	887/1380	4.24	4.55	4.32	4.30	4.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	13	1	0	6	6	2	3.53	950/1193	3.63	3.59	4.02	4.04	3.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	2	5	10	4	3.52	990/1172	3.76	4.18	4.15	4.12	3.52
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	5	8	9	4.09	836/1182	3.99	4.34	4.35	4.30	4.09
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	8	13	4.48	600/1170	4.39	4.53	4.38	4.32	4.48
4. Were special techniques successful	5	16	0	1	3	3	0	3.29	714/ 800	3.29	3.69	4.06	4.01	3.29
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.70	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 22	Required for Majors	17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5	Graduate	0
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	C 0	Under-grad	28
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0	Non-major	28
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0	Other	0
			I 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHIL 251 03
 Title Ethical Issues in Sci
 Instructor: Wilson, Richard
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1105
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	9	7	4.28	849/1447	4.35	4.45	4.31	4.31	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	9	4.33	766/1447	4.27	4.41	4.27	4.23	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	8	2	7	3.78	1062/1241	4.00	4.59	4.33	4.35	3.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	369/1402	4.65	4.38	4.24	4.24	4.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	4	6	3	3.50	1170/1358	3.67	4.23	4.11	4.12	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	6	9	4.28	599/1316	4.47	4.32	4.14	4.08	4.28
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	5	3	8	3.94	1034/1427	4.08	4.24	4.19	4.14	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	885/1447	4.56	4.54	4.69	4.70	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	9	5	4.27	623/1434	4.26	4.33	4.10	3.97	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	8	8	4.33	970/1387	4.33	4.58	4.46	4.42	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	1	15	4.67	982/1387	4.82	4.83	4.73	4.71	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	8	6	4.11	997/1386	4.20	4.44	4.32	4.24	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	5	9	4.22	915/1380	4.24	4.55	4.32	4.30	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	1	2	1	2	5	3.73	861/1193	3.63	3.59	4.02	4.04	3.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	710/1172	3.76	4.18	4.15	4.12	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	4	0	5	3.90	941/1182	3.99	4.34	4.35	4.30	3.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	733/1170	4.39	4.53	4.38	4.32	4.30
4. Were special techniques successful	8	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 800	3.29	3.69	4.06	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 322 01
 Title Hist Of Phil:Modern
 Instructor: Braude,Stephen
 Enrollment: 51
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1106
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	5	13	12	4.16	954/1447	4.16	4.45	4.31	4.32	4.16
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	4	9	15	4.16	938/1447	4.16	4.41	4.27	4.23	4.16
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	9	18	4.45	599/1241	4.45	4.59	4.33	4.33	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	2	1	4	2	12	4.00	976/1402	4.00	4.38	4.24	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	6	9	13	3.97	846/1358	3.97	4.23	4.11	4.10	3.97
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	12	1	1	5	4	7	3.83	950/1316	3.83	4.32	4.14	4.13	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	2	2	9	7	9	3.66	1206/1427	3.66	4.24	4.19	4.15	3.66
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	3	21	7	4.13	1321/1447	4.13	4.54	4.69	4.65	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	2	0	1	2	12	8	4.17	722/1434	4.17	4.33	4.10	4.09	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	0	10	18	4.55	727/1387	4.55	4.58	4.46	4.44	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	5	24	4.83	732/1387	4.83	4.83	4.73	4.71	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	4	9	14	4.21	919/1386	4.21	4.44	4.32	4.30	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	6	20	4.55	604/1380	4.55	4.55	4.32	4.32	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	21	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	****/1193	****	3.59	4.02	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	1	5	5	3	3.53	986/1172	3.53	4.18	4.15	4.24	3.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	732/1182	4.27	4.34	4.35	4.42	4.27
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	657/1170	4.40	4.53	4.38	4.49	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	17	11	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 800	****	3.69	4.06	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	14
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 18	Graduate	0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	4
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 1	Under-grad	32
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	7
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	2
			? 3		

Course-Section: PHIL 346 01
 Title Deductive Systems
 Instructor: Wilson, Richard
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1107
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	9	24	4.58	496/1447	4.58	4.45	4.31	4.32	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	7	7	22	4.42	662/1447	4.42	4.41	4.27	4.23	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	26	4.64	415/1241	4.64	4.59	4.33	4.33	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	26	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	380/1402	4.60	4.38	4.24	4.24	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	2	11	7	9	3.79	994/1358	3.79	4.23	4.11	4.10	3.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	28	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	****/1316	****	4.32	4.14	4.13	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	1	2	11	6	13	3.85	1117/1427	3.85	4.24	4.19	4.15	3.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	12	23	4.58	1030/1447	4.58	4.54	4.69	4.65	4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	4	14	12	4.19	701/1434	4.19	4.33	4.10	4.09	4.19
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	4	6	23	4.47	829/1387	4.47	4.58	4.46	4.44	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	2	2	29	4.71	934/1387	4.71	4.83	4.73	4.71	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	7	8	17	4.24	887/1386	4.24	4.44	4.32	4.30	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	3	4	25	4.50	659/1380	4.50	4.55	4.32	4.32	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	24	1	0	3	1	5	3.90	759/1193	3.90	3.59	4.02	4.05	3.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	1	1	3	7	4.08	683/1172	4.08	4.18	4.15	4.24	4.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	0	4	1	8	4.31	714/1182	4.31	4.34	4.35	4.42	4.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	1	0	3	2	6	4.00	864/1170	4.00	4.53	4.38	4.49	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	23	9	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 800	****	3.69	4.06	4.12	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	35	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.73	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 18	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 13						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0	Under-grad	36	Non-major	28
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	2				
			? 1						

Course-Section: PHIL 350 01
 Title Ethical Theory
 Instructor: Seng, Phillip S
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1108
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	742/1447	4.39	4.45	4.31	4.32	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	5	7	3.89	1154/1447	3.89	4.41	4.27	4.23	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	2	3	10	4.31	734/1241	4.31	4.59	4.33	4.33	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	3	1	6	6	3.94	1046/1402	3.94	4.38	4.24	4.24	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	237/1358	4.67	4.23	4.11	4.10	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	6	7	4.18	690/1316	4.18	4.32	4.14	4.13	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	541/1427	4.44	4.24	4.19	4.15	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	16	1	4.00	1361/1447	4.00	4.54	4.69	4.65	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	9	6	4.24	657/1434	4.24	4.33	4.10	4.09	4.24
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	891/1387	4.41	4.58	4.46	4.44	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	707/1387	4.83	4.83	4.73	4.71	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	8	6	4.18	945/1386	4.18	4.44	4.32	4.30	4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	8	8	4.35	799/1380	4.35	4.55	4.32	4.32	4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	13	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1193	****	3.59	4.02	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	261/1172	4.70	4.18	4.15	4.24	4.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	329/1182	4.78	4.34	4.35	4.42	4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	459/1170	4.70	4.53	4.38	4.49	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	423/ 800	4.00	3.69	4.06	4.12	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 0	Major 7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 6			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 4	General 1	Under-grad 18	Non-major 11
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 2			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	309/1447	4.75	4.45	4.31	4.32	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	154/1447	4.85	4.41	4.27	4.23	4.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	141/1241	4.90	4.59	4.33	4.33	4.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	56/1402	4.95	4.38	4.24	4.24	4.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	345/1358	4.50	4.23	4.11	4.10	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	212/1316	4.70	4.32	4.14	4.13	4.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	200/1427	4.75	4.24	4.19	4.15	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	15	4	4.21	1275/1447	4.21	4.54	4.69	4.65	4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	158/1434	4.75	4.33	4.10	4.09	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	276/1387	4.85	4.58	4.46	4.44	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	317/1387	4.95	4.83	4.73	4.71	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	253/1386	4.80	4.44	4.32	4.30	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	216/1380	4.85	4.55	4.32	4.32	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	16	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1193	****	3.59	4.02	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	316/1172	4.62	4.18	4.15	4.24	4.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	261/1182	4.85	4.34	4.35	4.42	4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	178/1170	4.92	4.53	4.38	4.49	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	195/ 800	4.50	3.69	4.06	4.12	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.02	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.46	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	20	Non-major	15
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	9	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	3	4	4	3.57	1318/1447	3.57	4.45	4.31	4.32	3.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	4	4	3.92	1123/1447	3.92	4.41	4.27	4.23	3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	0	3	4	4	3.43	1161/1241	3.43	4.59	4.33	4.33	3.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	3	4	3	3.29	1322/1402	3.29	4.38	4.24	4.24	3.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	761/1358	4.08	4.23	4.11	4.10	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	2	3	2	3	3.36	1188/1316	3.36	4.32	4.14	4.13	3.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	1	2	1	6	3.67	1201/1427	3.67	4.24	4.19	4.15	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	1079/1447	4.50	4.54	4.69	4.65	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	3	2	4	2	3.45	1257/1434	3.45	4.33	4.10	4.09	3.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	970/1387	4.33	4.58	4.46	4.44	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	2	2	1	6	3.75	1348/1387	3.75	4.83	4.73	4.71	3.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	3	1	3	5	3.83	1160/1386	3.83	4.44	4.32	4.30	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	2	2	5	3.67	1198/1380	3.67	4.55	4.32	4.32	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	0	5	1	4	3.64	911/1193	3.64	3.59	4.02	4.05	3.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	2	1	4	1	3.00	1090/1172	3.00	4.18	4.15	4.24	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	1	3	2	2	3.10	1135/1182	3.10	4.34	4.35	4.42	3.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	2	2	0	4	2	3.20	1124/1170	3.20	4.53	4.38	4.49	3.20
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	2	0	0	2	1	3.00	742/ 800	3.00	3.69	4.06	4.12	3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.02	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	5.00	****

Course-Section: PHIL 390 01
 Title Philosophy Of Sport
 Instructor: Templeton, Roye
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1110
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	3	General	4	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 420 01
 Title Continental Philosophy
 Instructor: Wilson, Richard
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1111
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	869/1447	4.25	4.45	4.31	4.43	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	1228/1447	3.75	4.41	4.27	4.31	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.59	4.33	4.41	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	735/1402	4.29	4.38	4.24	4.34	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	345/1358	4.50	4.23	4.11	4.15	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	102/1316	4.86	4.32	4.14	4.27	4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	882/1427	4.14	4.24	4.19	4.20	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	565/1447	4.88	4.54	4.69	4.72	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	600/1434	4.29	4.33	4.10	4.17	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	1118/1387	4.14	4.58	4.46	4.48	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.83	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	1047/1386	4.00	4.44	4.32	4.34	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	984/1380	4.13	4.55	4.32	4.34	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1087/1193	3.00	3.59	4.02	4.00	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	1	3	1	3.14	1076/1172	3.14	4.18	4.15	4.25	3.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	968/1182	3.86	4.34	4.35	4.49	3.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	640/1170	4.43	4.53	4.38	4.51	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 800	****	3.69	4.06	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	4.87	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors		3	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General		2	Under-grad	8	Non-major	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives		2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		1				
				?	0							

Course-Section: PHIL 445 01
 Title Philosophy of Language
 Instructor: Ealick,Greg
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1112
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	430/1447	4.64	4.45	4.31	4.43	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	5	7	4.21	892/1447	4.21	4.41	4.27	4.31	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1241	****	4.59	4.33	4.41	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	6	7	4.29	735/1402	4.29	4.38	4.24	4.34	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	345/1358	4.50	4.23	4.11	4.15	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	534/1316	4.36	4.32	4.14	4.27	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	931/1427	4.07	4.24	4.19	4.20	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.54	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	386/1434	4.46	4.33	4.10	4.17	4.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	596/1387	4.64	4.58	4.46	4.48	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	656/1387	4.86	4.83	4.73	4.76	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	607/1386	4.50	4.44	4.32	4.34	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	582/1380	4.57	4.55	4.32	4.34	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	927/1193	3.60	3.59	4.02	4.00	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	2	0	5	4.00	710/1172	4.00	4.18	4.15	4.25	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	470/1182	4.63	4.34	4.35	4.49	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	508/1170	4.63	4.53	4.38	4.51	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	6	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	****	3.69	4.06	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0	Major 5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 14	Non-major 9
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 1			

Course-Section: PHIL 471 01
 Title Freedom, Determinism, Re
 Instructor: Yalowitz, Steven
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1113
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	507/1447	4.57	4.45	4.31	4.43	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	292/1447	4.71	4.41	4.27	4.31	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	323/1241	4.71	4.59	4.33	4.41	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	494/1402	4.50	4.38	4.24	4.34	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	201/1358	4.71	4.23	4.11	4.15	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	939/1316	3.86	4.32	4.14	4.27	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	739/1427	4.29	4.24	4.19	4.20	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	1234/1447	4.29	4.54	4.69	4.72	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	634/1434	4.25	4.33	4.10	4.17	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	276/1387	4.86	4.58	4.46	4.48	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	656/1387	4.86	4.83	4.73	4.76	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	194/1386	4.86	4.44	4.32	4.34	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	392/1380	4.71	4.55	4.32	4.34	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	710/1172	4.00	4.18	4.15	4.25	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	638/1182	4.40	4.34	4.35	4.49	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	522/1170	4.60	4.53	4.38	4.51	4.60

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 481 01
 Title Ancient Philosophy
 Instructor: Hitz,Zena N
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1114
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	585/1447	4.50	4.45	4.31	4.43	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	974/1447	4.13	4.41	4.27	4.31	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1241	****	4.59	4.33	4.41	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	414/1402	4.57	4.38	4.24	4.34	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	265/1358	4.63	4.23	4.11	4.15	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	322/1316	4.57	4.32	4.14	4.27	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1110/1427	3.86	4.24	4.19	4.20	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	836/1447	4.75	4.54	4.69	4.72	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1017/1434	3.86	4.33	4.10	4.17	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	1039/1387	4.25	4.58	4.46	4.48	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1030/1387	4.63	4.83	4.73	4.76	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	879/1386	4.25	4.44	4.32	4.34	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	659/1380	4.50	4.55	4.32	4.34	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1146/1193	2.67	3.59	4.02	4.00	2.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	247/1172	4.71	4.18	4.15	4.25	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	250/1182	4.86	4.34	4.35	4.49	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	440/1170	4.71	4.53	4.38	4.51	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 800	****	3.69	4.06	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	4.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	4.43	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 1	General 0	Under-grad 8	Non-major 6
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 2			
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0			
				P 0			
				I 0			
				? 1			