Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 100 01	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 41
Title: Intro To Philosophy		Questionnaires: 34
Instructor: Thomas,James G		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	6	27	4.82	264/1560	4.18	4.46	4.35	4.17	4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	8	25	4.76	296/1559	4.27	4.42	4.31	4.25	4.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	29	4.85	224/1371	4.55	4.68	4.38	4.27	4.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	0	2	2	25	4.79	216/1519	4.23	4.44	4.27	4.13	4.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	3	5	5	18	4.13	846/1452	4.07	4.27	4.18	4.04	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	8	22	4.59	333/1430	3.94	4.15	4.16	3.98	4.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	4	27	4.81	185/1539	4.04	4.27	4.23	4.18	4.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	5	21	7	4.06	1422/1560	4.18	4.38	4.64	4.57	4.06
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	83/1545	4.16	4.26	4.14	4.07	4.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	32	4.97	91/1496	4.50	4.52	4.49	4.43	4.97
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	32	4.97	223/1498	4.82	4.88	4.75	4.67	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	32	4.97	64/1496	4.35	4.44	4.37	4.31	4.97
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	33	5.00	1/1494	4.62	4.63	4.37	4.28	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	18	1	1	1	2	7	4.08	783/1352	3.36	3.88	4.12	3.98	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	348/1248	4.22	4.30	4.23	3.95	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	381/1250	4.23	4.37	4.39	4.13	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	226/1239	4.60	4.68	4.45	4.18	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	23	6	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/906	3.95	4.20	4.13	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Report Help

Course-Section: PHIL 100 01									Term - Spring 2013					Enrollment: 41	
Title: Intro To Philosophy														Questionnaires: 34	
Instructor: Thomas,James G															

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/206	****	****	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/214	****	****	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/204	****	****	4.52	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/207	****	****	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/199	****	****	4.27	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	32	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/58	****	****	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/52	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/26	****	****	3.89	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/25	****	****	4.01	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	5.00	4.41	4.61	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 100 01	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 41
Title: Intro To Philosophy		Questionnaires: 34
Instructor: Thomas,James G		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	19	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	16	Under-grad	34	Non-major	34
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	8	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	7						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 100 02	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 43
Title:	Intro To Philosophy		Questionnaires: 29
Instructor:	Thomas,James G		

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	1	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1560	4.18	4.46	4.35	4.17	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	131/1559	4.27	4.42	4.31	4.25	4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	27	4.93	119/1371	4.55	4.68	4.38	4.27	4.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	93/1519	4.23	4.44	4.27	4.13	4.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	2	5	1	17	4.19	771/1452	4.07	4.27	4.18	4.04	4.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	3	23	4.68	256/1430	3.94	4.15	4.16	3.98	4.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	27	4.90	121/1539	4.04	4.27	4.23	4.18	4.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	5	19	5	4.00	1445/1560	4.18	4.38	4.64	4.57	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	42/1545	4.16	4.26	4.14	4.07	4.96
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	91/1496	4.50	4.52	4.49	4.43	4.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1498	4.82	4.88	4.75	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	128/1496	4.35	4.44	4.37	4.31	4.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1494	4.62	4.63	4.37	4.28	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	103/1352	3.36	3.88	4.12	3.98	4.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1248	4.22	4.30	4.23	3.95	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1250	4.23	4.37	4.39	4.13	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1239	4.60	4.68	4.45	4.18	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	17	2	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	110/906	3.95	4.20	4.13	3.98	4.80

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 100 02							Term - Spring 2013						Enrollment: 43		
Title: Intro To Philosophy													Questionnaires: 29			
Instructor: Thomas,James G																

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/214	****	****	4.31	4.30	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	****	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/52	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/26	****	****	3.89	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.01	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	5.00	4.41	4.61	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 100 02	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 43
Title: Intro To Philosophy		Questionnaires: 29
Instructor: Thomas,James G		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	12	Under-grad	29	Non-major	29
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	7	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 100 03	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 40
Title: Intro To Philosophy		Questionnaires: 21
Instructor: Smith,Aaron Joh		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	1	0	3	10	7	4.05	1170/1560	4.18	4.46	4.35	4.17	4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	11	4.38	798/1559	4.27	4.42	4.31	4.25	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	381/1371	4.55	4.68	4.38	4.27	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	996/1519	4.23	4.44	4.27	4.13	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	2	16	4.52	412/1452	4.07	4.27	4.18	4.04	4.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	17	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/1430	3.94	4.15	4.16	3.98	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	6	9	4.05	1053/1539	4.04	4.27	4.23	4.18	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	16	2	3.95	1478/1560	4.18	4.38	4.64	4.57	3.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	7	7	5	3.89	1107/1545	4.16	4.26	4.14	4.07	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	6	10	4.37	1047/1496	4.50	4.52	4.49	4.43	4.37
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	585/1498	4.82	4.88	4.75	4.67	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	4	5	9	4.28	972/1496	4.35	4.44	4.37	4.31	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	702/1494	4.62	4.63	4.37	4.28	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	11	3	2	0	2	1	2.50	1326/1352	3.36	3.88	4.12	3.98	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	2	3	4	6	3.75	980/1248	4.22	4.30	4.23	3.95	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	1	2	6	5	3.69	1112/1250	4.23	4.37	4.39	4.13	3.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	1	4	10	4.38	785/1239	4.60	4.68	4.45	4.18	4.38

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 100 03	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 40
Title: Intro To Philosophy		Questionnaires: 21
Instructor: Smith,Aaron Joh		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	5	11	2	0	3	0	0	2.20	****/906	3.95	4.20	4.13	3.98	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	13	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	7	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 100 04	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 40
Title: Intro To Philosophy		Questionnaires: 28
Instructor: Smith,Aaron Joh		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Org 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	1	2	2	10	12	4.11	1127/1560	4.18	4.46	4.35	4.17	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	20	4.57	534/1559	4.27	4.42	4.31	4.25	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	23	4.75	328/1371	4.55	4.68	4.38	4.27	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	20	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	730/1519	4.23	4.44	4.27	4.13	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	7	18	4.50	433/1452	4.07	4.27	4.18	4.04	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	27	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1430	3.94	4.15	4.16	3.98	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	10	6	10	3.82	1233/1539	4.04	4.27	4.23	4.18	3.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	24	2	4.00	1445/1560	4.18	4.38	4.64	4.57	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	3	13	5	4.10	892/1545	4.16	4.26	4.14	4.07	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	6	20	4.64	677/1496	4.50	4.52	4.49	4.43	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	24	4.82	792/1498	4.82	4.88	4.75	4.67	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	10	15	4.43	805/1496	4.35	4.44	4.37	4.31	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	2	22	4.61	609/1494	4.62	4.63	4.37	4.28	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	21	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	1077/1352	3.36	3.88	4.12	3.98	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	2	4	3	12	4.19	723/1248	4.22	4.30	4.23	3.95	4.19
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	2	3	9	7	4.00	945/1250	4.23	4.37	4.39	4.13	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	3	3	14	4.43	747/1239	4.60	4.68	4.45	4.18	4.43

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 100 04	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 40
Title: Intro To Philosophy		Questionnaires: 28
Instructor: Smith,Aaron Joh		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	7	10	1	4	2	1	3	3.09	848/906	3.95	4.20	4.13	3.98	3.09

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	19	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	21	Under-grad	28	Non-major	28
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 100 05	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 40
Title: Intro To Philosophy		Questionnaires: 23
Instructor: Smith,Aaron Joh		

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	2	3	9	9	4.09	1147/1560	4.18	4.46	4.35	4.17	4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	5	13	4.30	892/1559	4.27	4.42	4.31	4.25	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	3	17	4.52	609/1371	4.55	4.68	4.38	4.27	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	1	0	2	2	7	4.17	952/1519	4.23	4.44	4.27	4.13	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	3	4	13	4.18	782/1452	4.07	4.27	4.18	4.04	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	15	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	795/1430	3.94	4.15	4.16	3.98	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	3	7	11	4.23	890/1539	4.04	4.27	4.23	4.18	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	19	2	4.00	1445/1560	4.18	4.38	4.64	4.57	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	13	5	4.15	837/1545	4.16	4.26	4.14	4.07	4.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	610/1496	4.50	4.52	4.49	4.43	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	556/1498	4.82	4.88	4.75	4.67	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	677/1496	4.35	4.44	4.37	4.31	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	2	18	4.76	391/1494	4.62	4.63	4.37	4.28	4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	16	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/1352	3.36	3.88	4.12	3.98	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	2	0	6	4.11	785/1248	4.22	4.30	4.23	3.95	4.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	945/1250	4.23	4.37	4.39	4.13	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	528/1239	4.60	4.68	4.45	4.18	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	13	7	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/906	3.95	4.20	4.13	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 100 05	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment:	40
Title:	Intro To Philosophy		Questionnaires:	23
Instructor:	Smith,Aaron Joh			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/206	****	****	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/214	****	****	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/204	****	****	4.52	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/207	****	****	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/199	****	****	4.27	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/58	****	****	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/52	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/26	****	****	3.89	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/25	****	****	4.01	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	5.00	4.41	4.61	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 100 05	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 40
Title: Intro To Philosophy		Questionnaires: 23
Instructor: Smith,Aaron Joh		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	16	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 100 06	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 40
Title:	Intro To Philosophy		Questionnaires: 24
Instructor:	Gibson,Joel Eva		

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	3	9	5	7	3.67	1424/1560	4.18	4.46	4.35	4.17	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	11	7	5	3.67	1395/1559	4.27	4.42	4.31	4.25	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	5	11	4.04	1045/1371	4.55	4.68	4.38	4.27	4.04
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	8	7	5	3.57	1387/1519	4.23	4.44	4.27	4.13	3.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	8	9	3.96	1002/1452	4.07	4.27	4.18	4.04	3.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	8	6	7	3.67	1154/1430	3.94	4.15	4.16	3.98	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	6	8	6	2	3.00	1474/1539	4.04	4.27	4.23	4.18	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	227/1560	4.18	4.38	4.64	4.57	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	1	12	4	2	3.37	1407/1545	4.16	4.26	4.14	4.07	3.37
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	5	7	11	4.26	1136/1496	4.50	4.52	4.49	4.43	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	10	11	4.39	1323/1498	4.82	4.88	4.75	4.67	4.39
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	10	4	7	3.77	1304/1496	4.35	4.44	4.37	4.31	3.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	8	6	8	3.91	1223/1494	4.62	4.63	4.37	4.28	3.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	13	3	2	3	0	1	2.33	1335/1352	3.36	3.88	4.12	3.98	2.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	1	4	2	3	3.45	1099/1248	4.22	4.30	4.23	3.95	3.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	2	3	1	5	3.82	1068/1250	4.23	4.37	4.39	4.13	3.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	900/1239	4.60	4.68	4.45	4.18	4.18
4. Were special techniques successful	13	7	1	2	0	1	0	2.25	****/906	3.95	4.20	4.13	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 100 06	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 40
Title: Intro To Philosophy		Questionnaires: 24
Instructor: Gibson,Joel Eva		

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/214	****	****	4.31	4.30	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	15	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 100 07	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 40
Title: Intro To Philosophy		Questionnaires: 30
Instructor: Ealick,Greg		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	8	13	8	3.93	1252/1560	4.18	4.46	4.35	4.17	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	6	12	9	3.90	1263/1559	4.27	4.42	4.31	4.25	3.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	9	17	4.43	713/1371	4.55	4.68	4.38	4.27	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	4	13	8	4.04	1043/1519	4.23	4.44	4.27	4.13	4.04
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	6	7	6	9	3.47	1306/1452	4.07	4.27	4.18	4.04	3.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	2	0	12	7	2	3.30	1332/1430	3.94	4.15	4.16	3.98	3.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	5	5	9	11	3.87	1207/1539	4.04	4.27	4.23	4.18	3.87
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	17	13	4.43	1134/1560	4.18	4.38	4.64	4.57	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	8	9	6	3.91	1084/1545	4.16	4.26	4.14	4.07	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	5	12	13	4.27	1136/1496	4.50	4.52	4.49	4.43	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	389/1498	4.82	4.88	4.75	4.67	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	6	13	10	4.14	1096/1496	4.35	4.44	4.37	4.31	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	7	23	4.77	391/1494	4.62	4.63	4.37	4.28	4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	25	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/1352	3.36	3.88	4.12	3.98	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	580/1248	4.22	4.30	4.23	3.95	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	0	0	1	11	4.62	531/1250	4.23	4.37	4.39	4.13	4.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	201/1239	4.60	4.68	4.45	4.18	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	17	12	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/906	3.95	4.20	4.13	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 100 07		Term - Spring 2013		Enrollment: 40
Title: Intro To Philosophy				Questionnaires: 30
Instructor: Ealick,Greg				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/214	****	****	4.31	4.30	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	1	B	20						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C	4	General	22	Under-grad	30	Non-major	30
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	PHIL 100 08	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 41
Title:	Intro To Philosophy		Questionnaires: 32
Instructor:	Ealick,Greg		

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	8	12	9	3.81	1341/1560	4.18	4.46	4.35	4.17	3.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	7	15	6	3.69	1386/1559	4.27	4.42	4.31	4.25	3.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	3	13	14	4.16	975/1371	4.55	4.68	4.38	4.27	4.16
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	2	4	13	7	3.85	1220/1519	4.23	4.44	4.27	4.13	3.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	4	6	10	8	3.60	1252/1452	4.07	4.27	4.18	4.04	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	2	3	8	9	2	3.25	1340/1430	3.94	4.15	4.16	3.98	3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	9	15	5	3.69	1318/1539	4.04	4.27	4.23	4.18	3.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	1	27	2	4.03	1433/1560	4.18	4.38	4.64	4.57	4.03
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	2	18	6	4.00	952/1545	4.16	4.26	4.14	4.07	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	1	6	15	8	3.81	1371/1496	4.50	4.52	4.49	4.43	3.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	0	5	25	4.66	1091/1498	4.82	4.88	4.75	4.67	4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	10	10	9	3.75	1312/1496	4.35	4.44	4.37	4.31	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	11	18	4.38	880/1494	4.62	4.63	4.37	4.28	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	22	2	1	4	2	0	2.67	1318/1352	3.36	3.88	4.12	3.98	2.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	3	8	7	4.22	701/1248	4.22	4.30	4.23	3.95	4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	2	3	7	6	3.94	988/1250	4.23	4.37	4.39	4.13	3.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	2	6	9	4.28	849/1239	4.60	4.68	4.45	4.18	4.28
4. Were special techniques successful	14	11	1	0	4	2	0	3.00	****/906	3.95	4.20	4.13	3.98	****

Run Date: 7/9/2013 3:50:41 PM

Page 18 of 70

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 100 08	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 41
Title: Intro To Philosophy		Questionnaires: 32
Instructor: Ealick,Greg		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/206	****	****	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/214	****	****	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/204	****	****	4.52	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/207	****	****	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/199	****	****	4.27	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/58	****	****	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/52	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/29	****	****	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/29	****	****	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/26	****	****	3.89	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/25	****	****	4.01	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	5.00	4.41	4.61	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 100 08	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 41
Title: Intro To Philosophy		Questionnaires: 32
Instructor: Ealick,Greg		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	20	Under-grad	32	Non-major	32
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 146 01	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 41
Title: Critical Thinking		Questionnaires: 40
Instructor: Taggart,James C		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	9	19	11	4.00	1193/1560	4.20	4.46	4.35	4.17	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	9	13	17	4.13	1068/1559	4.26	4.42	4.31	4.25	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	1	4	10	21	4.32	819/1371	4.56	4.68	4.38	4.27	4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	22	2	1	2	7	6	3.78	1281/1519	3.78	4.44	4.27	4.13	3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	0	4	10	22	4.41	555/1452	4.20	4.27	4.18	4.04	4.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	25	1	1	2	6	4	3.79	1075/1430	3.89	4.15	4.16	3.98	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	6	5	26	4.38	701/1539	4.49	4.27	4.23	4.18	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	26	11	4.30	1262/1560	4.25	4.38	4.64	4.57	4.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	9	22	5	3.81	1172/1545	4.03	4.26	4.14	4.07	3.81
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	3	5	16	14	4.00	1281/1496	4.50	4.52	4.49	4.43	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	8	29	4.69	1036/1498	4.75	4.88	4.75	4.67	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	10	14	13	4.00	1175/1496	4.25	4.44	4.37	4.31	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	3	19	15	4.24	1009/1494	4.52	4.63	4.37	4.28	4.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	3	6	10	5	7	3.23	1250/1352	4.11	3.88	4.12	3.98	3.23
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	1	5	8	3	3.76	974/1248	4.38	4.30	4.23	3.95	3.76
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	1	0	3	6	7	4.06	932/1250	4.53	4.37	4.39	4.13	4.06
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	0	4	3	10	4.35	799/1239	4.68	4.68	4.45	4.18	4.35

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 146 01		Term - Spring 2013		Enrollment:	41
Title:	Critical Thinking				Questionnaires:	40
Instructor:	Taggart,James C					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	23	14	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/906	5.00	4.20	4.13	3.98	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	21	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	6	C	6	General	24	Under-grad	40	Non-major	40
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	10	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 146 02	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 40
Title: Critical Thinking		Questionnaires: 5
Instructor: Taggart,James C		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	808/1560	4.20	4.46	4.35	4.17	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	775/1559	4.26	4.42	4.31	4.25	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	261/1371	4.56	4.68	4.38	4.27	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	948/1452	4.20	4.27	4.18	4.04	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	889/1430	3.89	4.15	4.16	3.98	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	435/1539	4.49	4.27	4.23	4.18	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	1336/1560	4.25	4.38	4.64	4.57	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	733/1545	4.03	4.26	4.14	4.07	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1496	4.50	4.52	4.49	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	852/1498	4.75	4.88	4.75	4.67	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	700/1496	4.25	4.44	4.37	4.31	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	332/1494	4.52	4.63	4.37	4.28	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1352	4.11	3.88	4.12	3.98	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1248	4.38	4.30	4.23	3.95	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1250	4.53	4.37	4.39	4.13	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1239	4.68	4.68	4.45	4.18	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/906	5.00	4.20	4.13	3.98	5.00
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/214	****	****	4.31	4.30	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 146 02
Title:	Critical Thinking
Instructor:	Taggart,James C

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	5

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.50	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	4.21	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.35	4.54	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 150 01	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 79
Title: Contemporary Moral Iss		Questionnaires: 44
Instructor: Ealick,Greg		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	3	2	21	18	4.23	1021/1560	4.23	4.46	4.35	4.17	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	13	16	14	3.95	1210/1559	3.95	4.42	4.31	4.25	3.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	30	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	724/1371	4.43	4.68	4.38	4.27	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	18	21	4.32	804/1519	4.32	4.44	4.27	4.13	4.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	12	25	4.32	638/1452	4.32	4.27	4.18	4.04	4.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	5	6	14	18	4.05	864/1430	4.05	4.15	4.16	3.98	4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	2	7	15	17	4.00	1077/1539	4.00	4.27	4.23	4.18	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	4	22	16	4.29	1270/1560	4.29	4.38	4.64	4.57	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	0	7	20	10	4.00	952/1545	4.00	4.26	4.14	4.07	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	4	11	27	4.49	898/1496	4.49	4.52	4.49	4.43	4.49
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	40	4.93	389/1498	4.93	4.88	4.75	4.67	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	8	12	23	4.35	900/1496	4.35	4.44	4.37	4.31	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	9	34	4.79	346/1494	4.79	4.63	4.37	4.28	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	33	0	4	0	1	4	3.56	****/1352	****	3.88	4.12	3.98	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	6	11	21	4.25	679/1248	4.25	4.30	4.23	3.95	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	4	8	6	21	4.05	932/1250	4.05	4.37	4.39	4.13	4.05
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	3	11	26	4.58	634/1239	4.58	4.68	4.45	4.18	4.58
4. Were special techniques successful	5	32	3	0	0	2	2	3.00	****/906	****	4.20	4.13	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 150 01
Title:	Contemporary Moral Iss
Instructor:	Ealick,Greg

Term - Spring 2013

| Enrollment: | 79 |
| Questionnaires: | 44 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	39	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/206	****	****	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/214	****	****	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/204	****	****	4.52	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	41	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/207	****	****	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	41	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/199	****	****	4.27	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	41	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/58	****	****	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	41	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/52	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/63	****	****	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/26	****	****	3.89	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/25	****	****	4.01	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	41	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/29	****	5.00	4.41	4.61	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 150 01	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 79
Title: Contemporary Moral Iss		Questionnaires: 44
Instructor: Ealick,Greg		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	20	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	1	B	16						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	24	Under-grad	44	Non-major	44
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	9	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 152 01	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 40
Title: Intro To Moral Theory		Questionnaires: 20
Instructor: Wilson,Richard		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	6	3	10	4.21	1034/1560	4.41	4.46	4.35	4.17	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	2	13	4.47	671/1559	4.40	4.42	4.31	4.25	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	287/1371	4.54	4.68	4.38	4.27	4.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	1	2	1	10	4.43	664/1519	4.25	4.44	4.27	4.13	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	0	3	14	4.53	412/1452	4.00	4.27	4.18	4.04	4.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	427/1430	4.06	4.15	4.16	3.98	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	3	13	4.47	581/1539	4.16	4.27	4.23	4.18	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	808/1560	4.06	4.38	4.64	4.57	4.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	6	8	4.22	766/1545	4.17	4.26	4.14	4.07	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	4	14	4.55	807/1496	4.38	4.52	4.49	4.43	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	1	17	4.75	937/1498	4.84	4.88	4.75	4.67	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	5	2	11	4.21	1026/1496	4.42	4.44	4.37	4.31	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	3	13	4.35	901/1494	4.54	4.63	4.37	4.28	4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	3	2	4	8	4.00	823/1352	4.06	3.88	4.12	3.98	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	3	1	6	4.00	822/1248	4.14	4.30	4.23	3.95	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	1	1	2	6	4.00	945/1250	4.40	4.37	4.39	4.13	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	721/1239	4.66	4.68	4.45	4.18	4.45
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	472/906	4.16	4.20	4.13	3.98	4.13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 152 01	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 40
Title:	Intro To Moral Theory		Questionnaires: 20
Instructor:	Wilson,Richard		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	5.00	4.41	4.61	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	12	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 152 02	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 41
Title: Intro To Moral Theory		Questionnaires: 33
Instructor: Thomas,James G		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	4	27	4.87	195/1560	4.41	4.46	4.35	4.17	4.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	31	4.94	84/1559	4.40	4.42	4.31	4.25	4.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	32	5.00	1/1371	4.54	4.68	4.38	4.27	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	32	5.00	1/1519	4.25	4.44	4.27	4.13	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	0	4	8	16	4.20	761/1452	4.00	4.27	4.18	4.04	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	6	23	4.68	256/1430	4.06	4.15	4.16	3.98	4.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	29	4.85	161/1539	4.16	4.27	4.23	4.18	4.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	5	21	7	4.06	1422/1560	4.06	4.38	4.64	4.57	4.06
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	127/1545	4.17	4.26	4.14	4.07	4.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	30	4.94	159/1496	4.38	4.52	4.49	4.43	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	29	4.94	389/1498	4.84	4.88	4.75	4.67	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	64/1496	4.42	4.44	4.37	4.31	4.97
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	31	5.00	1/1494	4.54	4.63	4.37	4.28	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	15	1	0	1	2	9	4.38	494/1352	4.06	3.88	4.12	3.98	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	****/1248	4.14	4.30	4.23	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	****/1250	4.40	4.37	4.39	4.13	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/1239	4.66	4.68	4.45	4.18	****
4. Were special techniques successful	27	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	****/906	4.16	4.20	4.13	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Report Help

Course-Section: PHIL 152 02	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 41
Title: Intro To Moral Theory		Questionnaires: 33
Instructor: Thomas,James G		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/206	****	****	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/214	****	****	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/204	****	****	4.52	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/207	****	****	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/199	****	****	4.27	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	****	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/52	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/26	****	****	3.89	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.01	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	5.00	4.41	4.61	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 152 02	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 41
Title: Intro To Moral Theory		Questionnaires: 33
Instructor: Thomas,James G		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	25	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	12	Under-grad	33	Non-major	33
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	12	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 152 03	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 40
Title: Intro To Moral Theory		Questionnaires: 33
Instructor: Ealick,Greg		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	3	13	14	4.29	932/1560	4.41	4.46	4.35	4.17	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	12	15	4.22	982/1559	4.40	4.42	4.31	4.25	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	4	6	20	4.45	690/1371	4.54	4.68	4.38	4.27	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	4	4	8	12	3.90	1185/1519	4.25	4.44	4.27	4.13	3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	5	6	10	7	3.50	1290/1452	4.00	4.27	4.18	4.04	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	3	4	9	8	3	3.15	1358/1430	4.06	4.15	4.16	3.98	3.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	4	10	5	11	3.59	1360/1539	4.16	4.27	4.23	4.18	3.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	19	13	4.41	1170/1560	4.06	4.38	4.64	4.57	4.41
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	4	17	6	4.07	905/1545	4.17	4.26	4.14	4.07	4.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	5	11	15	4.25	1144/1496	4.38	4.52	4.49	4.43	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	28	4.88	644/1498	4.84	4.88	4.75	4.67	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	5	7	17	4.16	1079/1496	4.42	4.44	4.37	4.31	4.16
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	27	4.78	361/1494	4.54	4.63	4.37	4.28	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	25	2	2	0	1	2	2.86	****/1352	4.06	3.88	4.12	3.98	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	603/1248	4.14	4.30	4.23	3.95	4.35
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	0	4	12	4.59	556/1250	4.40	4.37	4.39	4.13	4.59
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	360/1239	4.66	4.68	4.45	4.18	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	16	15	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/906	4.16	4.20	4.13	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 152 03	Term - Spring 2013		Enrollment: 40
Title:	Intro To Moral Theory			Questionnaires: 33
Instructor:	Ealick,Greg			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/214	****	****	4.31	4.30	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/207	****	****	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/199	****	****	4.27	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.50	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	21	Under-grad	33	Non-major	33
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 152 04	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 40
Title: Intro To Moral Theory		Questionnaires: 25
Instructor: Picciuto,Elizab		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			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	2	2	6	15	4.36	852/1560	4.41	4.46	4.35	4.17	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	8	12	4.16	1030/1559	4.40	4.42	4.31	4.25	4.16
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	4	3	15	4.39	756/1371	4.54	4.68	4.38	4.27	4.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	7	7	11	4.16	952/1519	4.25	4.44	4.27	4.13	4.16
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	9	10	4.00	948/1452	4.00	4.27	4.18	4.04	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	6	7	9	3.88	1023/1430	4.06	4.15	4.16	3.98	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	3	6	12	4.04	1053/1539	4.16	4.27	4.23	4.18	4.04
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	3	6	8	7	3.79	1525/1560	4.06	4.38	4.64	4.57	3.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	3	13	2	3.84	1148/1545	4.17	4.26	4.14	4.07	3.84
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	2	13	9	4.16	1210/1496	4.38	4.52	4.49	4.43	4.16
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	733/1498	4.84	4.88	4.75	4.67	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	7	16	4.52	677/1496	4.42	4.44	4.37	4.31	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	8	15	4.52	702/1494	4.54	4.63	4.37	4.28	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	2	1	3	6	7	3.79	1031/1352	4.06	3.88	4.12	3.98	3.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	2	2	9	4.29	656/1248	4.14	4.30	4.23	3.95	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	564/1250	4.40	4.37	4.39	4.13	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	514/1239	4.66	4.68	4.45	4.18	4.71

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 152 04		Term - Spring 2013		Enrollment:	40
Title:	Intro To Moral Theory				Questionnaires:	25
Instructor:	Picciuto,Elizab					

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	403/906	4.16	4.20	4.13	3.98	4.25

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	11	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 152 05		Term - Spring 2013						Enrollment: 39
Title:	Intro To Moral Theory								Questionnaires: 18
Instructor:	Picciuto,Elizab								

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	4	4	10	4.33	886/1560	4.41	4.46	4.35	4.17	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	8	4.22	972/1559	4.40	4.42	4.31	4.25	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	7	2	8	4.06	1040/1371	4.54	4.68	4.38	4.27	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	2	6	2	6	3.75	1294/1519	4.25	4.44	4.27	4.13	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	5	4	6	3.76	1148/1452	4.00	4.27	4.18	4.04	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	819/1430	4.06	4.15	4.16	3.98	4.12
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	5	3	7	3.82	1233/1539	4.16	4.27	4.23	4.18	3.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	10	6	0	3.29	1554/1560	4.06	4.38	4.64	4.57	3.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	5	4	5	3.87	1131/1545	4.17	4.26	4.14	4.07	3.87
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	3	3	7	4.00	1281/1496	4.38	4.52	4.49	4.43	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	852/1498	4.84	4.88	4.75	4.67	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	4	3	8	4.27	981/1496	4.42	4.44	4.37	4.31	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	2	4	7	4.07	1122/1494	4.54	4.63	4.37	4.28	4.07
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	1	0	2	5	6	4.07	788/1352	4.06	3.88	4.12	3.98	4.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	4	1	5	3.91	916/1248	4.14	4.30	4.23	3.95	3.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	658/1250	4.40	4.37	4.39	4.13	4.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	589/1239	4.66	4.68	4.45	4.18	4.64

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 152 05		Term - Spring 2013		Enrollment:	39
Title:	Intro To Moral Theory				Questionnaires:	18
Instructor:	Picciuto,Elizab					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	487/906	4.16	4.20	4.13	3.98	4.09

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	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	7	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	6	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 152H 01		Term - Spring 2013			Enrollment:	14
Title:	Honors Intro To Moral Th					Questionnaires:	14
Instructor:	Nance,Jerome M						

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	1	3	10	4.64	486/1560	4.64	4.46	4.35	4.17	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	833/1559	4.36	4.42	4.31	4.25	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1371	****	4.68	4.38	4.27	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	549/1519	4.50	4.44	4.27	4.13	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	670/1452	4.29	4.27	4.18	4.04	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	607/1430	4.36	4.15	4.16	3.98	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	1	7	4	4.08	1035/1539	4.08	4.27	4.23	4.18	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.38	4.64	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	462/1545	4.46	4.26	4.14	4.07	4.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	182/1496	4.93	4.52	4.49	4.43	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	445/1498	4.93	4.88	4.75	4.67	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	889/1496	4.36	4.44	4.37	4.31	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	11	4.57	644/1494	4.57	4.63	4.37	4.28	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1352	****	3.88	4.12	3.98	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1248	5.00	4.30	4.23	3.95	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	616/1250	4.50	4.37	4.39	4.13	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1239	5.00	4.68	4.45	4.18	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	126/906	4.75	4.20	4.13	3.98	4.75

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 152H 01	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment:	14
Title:	Honors Intro To Moral Th		Questionnaires:	14
Instructor:	Nance,Jerome M			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 251 01	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 61
Title: Ethical Issues in Sci &		Questionnaires: 33
Instructor: Wilson,Richard		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	2	1	7	14	9	3.82	1341/1560	3.82	4.46	4.35	4.37	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	6	11	12	3.91	1263/1559	3.91	4.42	4.31	4.33	3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	26	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	****/1371	****	4.68	4.38	4.40	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	13	15	4.27	847/1519	4.27	4.44	4.27	4.29	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	11	1	2	6	2	10	3.86	1088/1452	3.86	4.27	4.18	4.22	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	4	10	15	4.30	655/1430	4.30	4.15	4.16	4.15	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	3	6	7	13	3.84	1227/1539	3.84	4.27	4.23	4.25	3.84
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	11	20	4.65	919/1560	4.65	4.38	4.64	4.61	4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	7	16	3	3.78	1199/1545	3.78	4.26	4.14	4.09	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	2	7	13	7	3.68	1406/1496	3.68	4.52	4.49	4.52	3.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	28	4.90	556/1498	4.90	4.88	4.75	4.78	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	2	9	9	8	3.82	1285/1496	3.82	4.44	4.37	4.36	3.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	3	7	11	7	3.69	1337/1494	3.69	4.63	4.37	4.41	3.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	1	4	10	11	4.19	688/1352	4.19	3.88	4.12	4.14	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	3	8	3	9	0	2.78	1219/1248	2.78	4.30	4.23	4.25	2.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	2	8	2	9	2	3.04	1219/1250	3.04	4.37	4.39	4.40	3.04
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	2	8	8	4	3.52	1159/1239	3.52	4.68	4.45	4.45	3.52

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 251 01	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 61
Title: Ethical Issues in Sci &		Questionnaires: 33
Instructor: Wilson,Richard		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	10	9	1	1	5	4	3	3.50	778/906	3.50	4.20	4.13	4.19	3.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	27	Required for Majors	27	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	12	2.00-2.99	6	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	33	Non-major	33
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 322 01		Term - Spring 2013			Enrollment:	26
Title:	Hist Of Phil:Modern					Questionnaires:	25
Instructor:	Nance,Jerome M						

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			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	0	7	18	4.72	376/1560	4.50	4.46	4.35	4.42	4.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	19	4.76	284/1559	4.63	4.42	4.31	4.35	4.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	22	4.88	197/1371	4.76	4.68	4.38	4.41	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	2	0	0	2	15	4.47	592/1519	4.46	4.44	4.27	4.33	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	4	17	4.36	592/1452	4.32	4.27	4.18	4.21	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	2	1	1	5	9	4.00	889/1430	3.78	4.15	4.16	4.20	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	21	4.76	233/1539	4.56	4.27	4.23	4.27	4.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	502/1560	4.90	4.38	4.64	4.66	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	11	11	4.50	406/1545	4.25	4.26	4.14	4.19	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	262/1496	4.80	4.52	4.49	4.54	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1498	4.96	4.88	4.75	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	186/1496	4.79	4.44	4.37	4.43	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	77/1494	4.75	4.63	4.37	4.43	4.96
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	5	17	4.63	249/1352	4.40	3.88	4.12	4.23	4.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	634/1248	4.57	4.30	4.23	4.33	4.31
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	1	3	11	4.44	675/1250	4.55	4.37	4.39	4.47	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	458/1239	4.88	4.68	4.45	4.53	4.75

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 322 01	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 26
Title: Hist Of Phil:Modern		Questionnaires: 25
Instructor: Nance,Jerome M		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	9	13	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/906	****	4.20	4.13	4.14	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	25	Non-major	17
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 322 02	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 25
Title: Hist Of Phil:Modern		Questionnaires: 16
Instructor: Nance,Jerome M		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	945/1560	4.50	4.46	4.35	4.42	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	627/1559	4.63	4.42	4.31	4.35	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	465/1371	4.76	4.68	4.38	4.41	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	621/1519	4.46	4.44	4.27	4.33	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	670/1452	4.32	4.27	4.18	4.21	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	1	1	2	2	3	3.56	1217/1430	3.78	4.15	4.16	4.20	3.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	4	1	9	4.36	737/1539	4.56	4.27	4.23	4.27	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	363/1560	4.90	4.38	4.64	4.66	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	952/1545	4.25	4.26	4.14	4.19	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	559/1496	4.80	4.52	4.49	4.54	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	445/1498	4.96	4.88	4.75	4.79	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	462/1496	4.79	4.44	4.37	4.43	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	690/1494	4.75	4.63	4.37	4.43	4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	5	0	7	4.17	716/1352	4.40	3.88	4.12	4.23	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	205/1248	4.57	4.30	4.23	4.33	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	479/1250	4.55	4.37	4.39	4.47	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1239	4.88	4.68	4.45	4.53	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	10	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/906	****	4.20	4.13	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 322 02	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 25
Title: Hist Of Phil:Modern		Questionnaires: 16
Instructor: Nance,Jerome M		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/206	****	****	4.25	4.22	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/214	****	****	4.31	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/204	****	****	4.52	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/207	****	****	4.44	4.42	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/199	****	****	4.27	4.17	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.60	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/58	****	****	4.37	4.51	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/52	****	****	4.41	4.27	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.54	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	4.19	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	3.98	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/26	****	****	3.89	3.58	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/25	****	****	4.01	3.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.35	4.13	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.87	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	5.00	4.41	4.78	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 322 02	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 25
Title: Hist Of Phil:Modern		Questionnaires: 16
Instructor: Nance,Jerome M		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 322H 01	Term - Spring 2013		Enrollment:	2
Title:	Hist Of Phil:Modern			Questionnaires:	2
Instructor:	Nance,Jerome M				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.46	4.35	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.42	4.31	4.35	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1371	5.00	4.68	4.38	4.41	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.44	4.27	4.33	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	433/1452	4.50	4.27	4.18	4.21	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1422/1430	2.50	4.15	4.16	4.20	2.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1077/1539	4.00	4.27	4.23	4.27	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.38	4.64	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1545	5.00	4.26	4.14	4.19	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1496	5.00	4.52	4.49	4.54	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1498	5.00	4.88	4.75	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1496	5.00	4.44	4.37	4.43	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1494	5.00	4.63	4.37	4.43	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 322H 01	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment:	2
Title:	Hist Of Phil:Modern		Questionnaires:	2
Instructor:	Nance,Jerome M			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Lecture														
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	353/1352	4.50	3.88	4.12	4.23	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 334 01	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 35
Title: Asian Philosophy		Questionnaires: 26
Instructor: Miller,Bryan		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	3	21	4.76	326/1560	4.76	4.46	4.35	4.42	4.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	19	4.69	370/1559	4.69	4.42	4.31	4.35	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	68/1371	4.96	4.68	4.38	4.41	4.96
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	4	18	4.63	408/1519	4.63	4.44	4.27	4.33	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	21	4.69	243/1452	4.69	4.27	4.18	4.21	4.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	5	15	4.42	545/1430	4.42	4.15	4.16	4.20	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	5	17	4.56	477/1539	4.56	4.27	4.23	4.27	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	13	11	4.36	1203/1560	4.36	4.38	4.64	4.66	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	236/1545	4.69	4.26	4.14	4.19	4.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	1	6	16	4.44	953/1496	4.44	4.52	4.49	4.54	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	223/1498	4.96	4.88	4.75	4.79	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	5	18	4.64	532/1496	4.64	4.44	4.37	4.43	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	3	21	4.76	391/1494	4.76	4.63	4.37	4.43	4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	19	0	2	1	0	2	3.40	****/1352	****	3.88	4.12	4.23	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	262/1248	4.77	4.30	4.23	4.33	4.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	180/1250	4.92	4.37	4.39	4.47	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1239	5.00	4.68	4.45	4.53	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 334 01		Term - Spring 2013			Enrollment:	35
Title:	Asian Philosophy					Questionnaires:	26
Instructor:	Miller,Bryan						

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	13	8	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/906	****	4.20	4.13	4.14	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	26	Non-major	22
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	1			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 346 01		Term - Spring 2013						Enrollment: 42	
Title:	Deductive Systems								Questionnaires: 23	
Instructor:	Wilson,Richard									

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	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	1	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	264/1560	4.82	4.46	4.35	4.42	4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	384/1559	4.68	4.42	4.31	4.35	4.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	301/1371	4.77	4.68	4.38	4.41	4.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	284/1519	4.73	4.44	4.27	4.33	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	141/1452	4.84	4.27	4.18	4.21	4.84
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	168/1430	4.78	4.15	4.16	4.20	4.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	2	5	14	4.41	677/1539	4.41	4.27	4.23	4.27	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	695/1560	4.81	4.38	4.64	4.66	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	1	3	8	6	4.06	919/1545	4.06	4.26	4.14	4.19	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	1	17	4.75	489/1496	4.75	4.52	4.49	4.54	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	278/1498	4.95	4.88	4.75	4.79	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	2	15	4.55	644/1496	4.55	4.44	4.37	4.43	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	1	17	4.70	481/1494	4.70	4.63	4.37	4.43	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	10	1	2	0	0	6	3.89	955/1352	3.89	3.88	4.12	4.23	3.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	205/1248	4.83	4.30	4.23	4.33	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	295/1250	4.83	4.37	4.39	4.47	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1239	5.00	4.68	4.45	4.53	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	17	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/906	****	4.20	4.13	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 346 01	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 42
Title: Deductive Systems		Questionnaires: 23
Instructor: Wilson,Richard		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/214	****	****	4.31	4.33	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.60	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	****	4.37	4.51	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/52	****	****	4.41	4.27	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.54	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	4.19	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	3.98	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/26	****	****	3.89	3.58	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.01	3.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.35	4.13	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.87	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	5.00	4.41	4.78	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 346 01	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 42
Title: Deductive Systems		Questionnaires: 23
Instructor: Wilson,Richard		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	23	Non-major	22
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Report Help

Course-Section: PHIL 358 01	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 32
Title: Bioethics		Questionnaires: 15
Instructor: Taggart,James C		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	721/1560	4.47	4.46	4.35	4.42	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	587/1559	4.53	4.42	4.31	4.35	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	261/1371	4.80	4.68	4.38	4.41	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	274/1519	4.73	4.44	4.27	4.33	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	2	11	4.40	555/1452	4.40	4.27	4.18	4.21	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	479/1430	4.47	4.15	4.16	4.20	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	2	7	4.00	1077/1539	4.00	4.27	4.23	4.27	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	898/1560	4.67	4.38	4.64	4.66	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	5	7	2	3.79	1193/1545	3.79	4.26	4.14	4.19	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	1184/1496	4.20	4.52	4.49	4.54	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	674/1498	4.87	4.88	4.75	4.79	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	832/1496	4.40	4.44	4.37	4.43	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	690/1494	4.53	4.63	4.37	4.43	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	292/1352	4.57	3.88	4.12	4.23	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	822/1248	4.00	4.30	4.23	4.33	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	3	0	8	4.45	658/1250	4.45	4.37	4.39	4.47	4.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	252/1239	4.91	4.68	4.45	4.53	4.91
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	417/906	4.22	4.20	4.13	4.14	4.22

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 358 01	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 32
Title: Bioethics		Questionnaires: 15
Instructor: Taggart,James C		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/206	****	****	4.25	4.22	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/214	****	****	4.31	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/204	****	****	4.52	4.57	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/199	****	****	4.27	4.17	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.60	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	****	4.37	4.51	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/52	****	****	4.41	4.27	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.54	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	4.19	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	3.98	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/26	****	****	3.89	3.58	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.01	3.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.35	4.13	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.87	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	5.00	4.41	4.78	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 358 01	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 32
Title: Bioethics		Questionnaires: 15
Instructor: Taggart,James C		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	15	Non-major	13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 373 01					Term - Spring 2013						Enrollment: 36

Title:	Metaphysics

Questionnaires: 20

Instructor:	Thomas,James G

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	2	16	4.60	542/1560	4.60	4.46	4.35	4.42	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	3	15	4.55	561/1559	4.55	4.42	4.31	4.35	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1371	5.00	4.68	4.38	4.41	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	134/1519	4.88	4.44	4.27	4.33	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	4	14	4.45	494/1452	4.45	4.27	4.18	4.21	4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	16	4.65	275/1430	4.65	4.15	4.16	4.20	4.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	608/1539	4.45	4.27	4.23	4.27	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	5	11	3	3.80	1524/1560	3.80	4.38	4.64	4.66	3.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	0	1	15	4.71	217/1545	4.71	4.26	4.14	4.19	4.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	4	14	4.58	782/1496	4.58	4.52	4.49	4.54	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	18	4.89	585/1498	4.89	4.88	4.75	4.79	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	4	14	4.63	546/1496	4.63	4.44	4.37	4.43	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	2	16	4.68	506/1494	4.68	4.63	4.37	4.43	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	3	0	0	1	5	3.56	1139/1352	3.56	3.88	4.12	4.23	3.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	0	0	1	4	3.71	1002/1248	3.71	4.30	4.23	4.33	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	564/1250	4.57	4.37	4.39	4.47	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1239	5.00	4.68	4.45	4.53	5.00
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/214	****	****	4.31	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 373 01
Title:	Metaphysics
Instructor:	Thomas,James G

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 36
Questionnaires: 20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	3.98	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/26	****	****	3.89	3.58	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/25	****	****	4.01	3.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.35	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	5.00	4.41	4.78	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	20	Non-major	18
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	12				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 400 05
Title:	Indep Study in Philosoph
Instructor:	Ealick,Greg

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 3
Questionnaires: 2

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.46	4.35	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	627/1559	4.50	4.42	4.31	4.34	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	540/1539	4.50	4.27	4.23	4.21	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1051/1560	4.50	4.38	4.64	4.68	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1545	5.00	4.26	4.14	4.21	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 406 08		Term - Spring 2013					Enrollment:	1
Title:	Honors Indep Study in Ph							Questionnaires:	1
Instructor:	Pfeifer,Jessica								

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions	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	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.46	4.35	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.42	4.31	4.34	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1371	5.00	4.68	4.38	4.46	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.44	4.27	4.33	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1452	5.00	4.27	4.18	4.25	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1430	5.00	4.15	4.16	4.25	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1539	5.00	4.27	4.23	4.21	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.38	4.64	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1545	5.00	4.26	4.14	4.21	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1248	5.00	4.30	4.23	4.39	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1239	5.00	4.68	4.45	4.61	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/31	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.64	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 406 08	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 1
Title: Honors Indep Study in Ph		Questionnaires: 1
Instructor: Pfeifer,Jessica		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/29	5.00	5.00	4.41	4.52	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 445 01	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment:	20

	Title:	Philosophy of Language		Questionnaires:	12

Instructor:	Ealick,Greg

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	0	2	10	4.83	241/1560	4.83	4.46	4.35	4.45	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	521/1559	4.58	4.42	4.31	4.34	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1371	5.00	4.68	4.38	4.46	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.44	4.27	4.33	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	88/1452	4.92	4.27	4.18	4.25	4.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	83/1430	4.92	4.15	4.16	4.25	4.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	349/1539	4.67	4.27	4.23	4.21	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	979/1560	4.58	4.38	4.64	4.68	4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	711/1545	4.27	4.26	4.14	4.21	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	769/1496	4.58	4.52	4.49	4.50	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1498	5.00	4.88	4.75	4.77	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	911/1496	4.33	4.44	4.37	4.40	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	289/1494	4.83	4.63	4.37	4.41	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	1335/1352	2.33	3.88	4.12	4.16	2.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	441/1248	4.55	4.30	4.23	4.39	4.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	1	1	7	4.09	921/1250	4.09	4.37	4.39	4.55	4.09
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	589/1239	4.64	4.68	4.45	4.61	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	1	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/906	****	4.20	4.13	4.28	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 445 01	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment:	20
Title:	Philosophy of Language		Questionnaires:	12
Instructor:	Ealick,Greg			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/214	****	****	4.31	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/204	****	****	4.52	4.39	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/207	****	****	4.44	4.49	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/199	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	****	4.37	4.40	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/52	****	****	4.41	4.57	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	4.18	****
Field Work														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	4.35	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	4.40	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/26	****	****	3.89	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.01	4.34	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.35	4.64	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	3.97	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	5.00	4.41	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.47	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 445 01			Term - Spring 2013										Enrollment: 20	
Title:	Philosophy of Language													Questionnaires: 12	
Instructor:	Ealick,Greg														

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	7
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 471 01	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 11
Title:	Freedom,Determimism,Resp		Questionnaires: 7
Instructor:	Yalowitz,Steven		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.46	4.35	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	178/1559	4.86	4.42	4.31	4.34	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	215/1371	4.86	4.68	4.38	4.46	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.44	4.27	4.33	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	134/1452	4.86	4.27	4.18	4.25	4.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	323/1430	4.60	4.15	4.16	4.25	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1539	5.00	4.27	4.23	4.21	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	574/1560	4.86	4.38	4.64	4.68	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	952/1545	4.00	4.26	4.14	4.21	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1496	5.00	4.52	4.49	4.50	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1498	5.00	4.88	4.75	4.77	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	432/1496	4.71	4.44	4.37	4.40	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1494	5.00	4.63	4.37	4.41	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1352	5.00	3.88	4.12	4.16	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	470/1248	4.50	4.30	4.23	4.39	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	616/1250	4.50	4.37	4.39	4.55	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	861/1239	4.25	4.68	4.45	4.61	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/906	****	4.20	4.13	4.28	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 471 01	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 11
Title: Freedom,Determimism,Resp		Questionnaires: 7
Instructor: Yalowitz,Steven		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/214	****	****	4.31	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/204	****	****	4.52	4.39	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/207	****	****	4.44	4.49	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/199	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.65	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/58	****	****	4.37	4.40	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/52	****	****	4.41	4.57	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	4.18	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	4.50	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	4.35	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	4.40	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/26	****	****	3.89	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/25	****	****	4.01	4.34	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.35	4.64	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	3.97	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	5.00	4.41	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.47	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 471 01	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 11
Title: Freedom,Determimism,Resp		Questionnaires: 7
Instructor: Yalowitz,Steven		

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	4.17	****

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	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	7	Non-major	6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 481 01			Term - Spring 2013					Enrollment: 18			
Title:	Ancient Philosophy								**Questionnaires: 12**			
Instructor:	Smith,Aaron Joh											

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	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	0	3	9	4.75	339/1560	4.75	4.46	4.35	4.45	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	1030/1559	4.17	4.42	4.31	4.34	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	328/1371	4.75	4.68	4.38	4.46	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	678/1519	4.42	4.44	4.27	4.33	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	704/1452	4.25	4.27	4.18	4.25	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	138/1430	4.82	4.15	4.16	4.25	4.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	855/1539	4.25	4.27	4.23	4.21	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	4.00	1445/1560	4.00	4.38	4.64	4.68	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	518/1545	4.43	4.26	4.14	4.21	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	1075/1496	4.33	4.52	4.49	4.50	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1498	5.00	4.88	4.75	4.77	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	818/1496	4.42	4.44	4.37	4.40	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	317/1494	4.82	4.63	4.37	4.41	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1352	****	3.88	4.12	4.16	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	419/1248	4.57	4.30	4.23	4.39	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1250	5.00	4.37	4.39	4.55	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 481 01	Term - Spring 2013		Enrollment: 18
Title: Ancient Philosophy			Questionnaires: 12
Instructor: Smith,Aaron Joh			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	320/1239	4.86	4.68	4.45	4.61	4.86

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	7
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	4				
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	2						

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant