Course Section: PHIL 100 0201 University of Maryland Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY Instructor: YALOWITZ, STEVE

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1278

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	28			
Questionnaires:	16	Student Cours	e Evaluation	Questionnaire

							Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 I															
1 Did vo	u gain ne	General w insights,skil	=	thia gourgo	0	0	0	0	_	8	2	2 00	1307/1669	4.45	4.48	4.23	4.02	3.88
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	3	3	8	2		1445/1666		4.40	4.19	4.11	3.56
		estions reflect			0	0	0	2	7	2	5		1181/1421		4.63	4.24	4.11	3.63
		ations reflect			1	12	0	0	2	1	0		****/1617		4.36	4.15	3.99	****
			_	what you learned	0	1	1	2	6	3	-		1326/1555		4.29	4.00	3.92	3.33
	_	_		what you learned what you learned	-	12	0	0	0	3	1		659/1543		4.16	4.06	3.86	4.25
		system clearly		-	. 0	0	0	3	5	2	_		1310/1647		4.38	4.12	4.06	3.69
		was class cance		incu	0	0	0	0	0	16			1530/1668		4.56	4.67	4.62	4.00
				ning effectiveness	-	0	0	0	9	4			1343/1605			4.07		3.53
J. 110W WO	ara you s	jiaac che overa.	LI CCACI	iing circuiveness	, _	O	U	U		-		3.33	1313/1003	1.55	1.27	1.07	3.70	3.33
		Lecture	_															
1 Were t	he instr	actor's lectures		prepared	0	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	984/1514	4.62	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.38
		ctor seem intere			1	0	0	0	1	4	10		1111/1551		4.82	4.66	4.55	4.60
					0	0	0	2	6	3	5		1269/1503		4.49	4.24	4.17	3.69
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly Did the lectures contribute to what you learned							0	5	5	6		1042/1506		4.57		4.17	4.06
			-	our understanding	0	0 12	0 1	0	1	0	2		939/1311				3.68	
J. Dia aa	alovibaai	cccinitqueb em	iance j	our underbeamaring	Ü		-	Ü	_	0	_	3.30	JJJ/ IJII	3.01	3.03	3.03	3.00	3.30
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contribu	ite to v	what you learned	10	0	0	1	2	3	0	3.33	1233/1490	4.46	4.24	4.05	3.85	3.33
				d to participate	10	0	1	0	1	2	2		1253/1502		4.42	4.26	4.06	3.67
		-	_	d open discussion	10	0	1	0	1	1	3		1155/1489		4.52	4.29	4.07	3.83
		chniques succes			10	4	0	1	1	0	0		****/1006		3.99	4.00	3.81	****
	F	10000											,					
				Freq	quency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	5			Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	27 1 0 00 0 00 0 7 4						guir		 or M			9	 Graduat		0	Majc		0
28-55						r.e.	quil	=u L(JT IM	a jui	o	J	Graduat	C	U	Majc) <u>T</u>	U
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C 2		Ce	nera	1				4	Under-q	rad 1	6	Non-	-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1 D 0				Ge	пета.	т				T	onder-9	rau I	. 0	NOII-	iia jui	10
Grad.						E1	ecti	ves.				1	#### -	Means +	here a	re not	enous	rh
oraa.	J	3.30 1.00	_	P 0		111	CCCI	v CD			<pre>1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant</pre>)++			
				I 0		O+1	her					0	I CBPOIIB		,c bigi	ıııcaı		
	1 U ? 1					OC.	1101					J						
				· ±														

Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY

Instructor: THOMAS, JAMES

= 11 ··· 20

Enrollment: 39
Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1279 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	22	4.70	345/1669	4.45	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	27	4.90	103/1666	4.42	4.40	4.19	4.11	4.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1421		4.63	4.24	4.11	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	2	24	4.85	137/1617	4.19	4.36	4.15	3.99	4.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	1	9	3	12	3.92	905/1555	3.91	4.29	4.00	3.92	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	3	4	6		4.18	747/1543	4.09	4.16	4.06	3.86	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	25	4.83	156/1647	4.40	4.38	4.12	4.06	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	23	6	4.21	1412/1668	4.30	4.56	4.67	4.62	4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	0	3	21	4.72	194/1605	4.35	4.29	4.07	3.96	4.72
Lecture														
 Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 	0	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	132/1514			4.39	4.32	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1551	4.86	4.82	4.66	4.55	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	88/1503		4.49	4.24	4.17	4.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1506		4.57	4.26	4.17	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	19	1	0	1	0	7	4.33	389/1311	3.61	3.65	3.85	3.68	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1		4.93	113/1490		4.24	4.05	3.85	4.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	189/1502	4.56	4.42	4.26	4.06	4.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1489	4.74	4.52	4.29	4.07	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	16	9	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1006	****	3.99	4.00	3.81	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	1	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 112	****	4.86	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.86	4.36	4.19	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 92	****	4.93	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 105 ****/ 98	****	4.92	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	U	U	U	U	U	2	5.00	^^^^/ 98	****	4.61	3.95	3.90	^ ^ ^ ^
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.00	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY

Instructor: THOMAS, JAMES

Enrollment: 39
Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1279 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	23	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	С	0	General	4	Under-grad	30	Non-major	30
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	12	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	1			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY

Instructor: THOMAS, JAMES

Enrollment: 45
Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1280 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	-	0	0	0	-	_	0.5	4 50	206/2660	4 45	4 40	4 00	4 00	4 50
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1 2	5	25	4.73	306/1669	4.45	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	_	26	4.73	281/1666		4.40	4.19	4.11	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	-	-	0		5.00	1/1421		4.63		4.11	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	3 6	4	23	4.67	323/1617	4.19	4.36	4.15	3.99	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	1	2	-	2	17	4.14	,	3.91	4.29	4.00	3.92	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	-	0	4	7	20	4.52	380/1543	4.09	4.16	4.06	3.86	4.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	4	25	4.61	, -	4.40	4.38	4.12		4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	1	1	25	5		1498/1668	4.30	4.56	4.67		4.06
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	28	4.90	99/1605	4.35	4.29	4.07	3.96	4.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	28	4.90	189/1514	4.62	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	205/1551	4.86	4.82	4.66	4.55	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	28	4.90	126/1503	4.54	4.49	4.24	4.17	4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	66/1506		4.57		4.17	4.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	15	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	373/1311				3.68	4.36
Discussion	0.0	0	0	0	0	_	1.0	4 06	100/1400	4 46	4 0 4	4 05	2 05	4 06
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	177/1490		4.24	4.05	3.85	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	286/1502		4.42	4.26	4.06	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	224/1489	4.74	4.52	4.29	4.07	4.93
4. Were special techniques successful	20	6	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	****/1006	****	3.99	4.00	3.81	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.86	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 97	****	4.86	4.36	4.19	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 105	****	4.92	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 98		4.61	3.95	3.90	****
3. Were effected for grading made effect	33	O	O	O	O	O	_	3.00	, ,		1.01	3.75	3.70	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	4.26	***
Frequ	ıency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Quadity Barrad Qua QD3 Break 3 Quadity									_					
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades			Reasons					Туре				Majors		

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	24	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	0	
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	4							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	С	0	General	7	Under-grad	34	Non-major	34	
84-150	17	3.00-3.49	12	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n	
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	3	-				
				2	1							

Course Section: PHIL 100 0501 University of Maryland Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY

Instructor: SENG, PHILLIP Enrollment: 32

Questionnaires: 27

Baltimore	County	JAN	18,	2007
Fall	2006	Job	IRBR	3029

Page 1281

Student Course Evaluati	on Ouestionnaire
-------------------------	------------------

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	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	1	0	8	17	4.58	511/1669	4.45	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	7	17	4.58	472/1666	4.42	4.40	4.19	4.11	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	7	17	4.58	493/1421	4.62	4.63	4.24	4.11	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	16	0	2	2	2	4	3.80	1224/1617	4.19	4.36	4.15	3.99	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	2	21	4.56	301/1555	3.91	4.29	4.00	3.92	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	23	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/1543	4.09	4.16	4.06	3.86	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	3	20	4.52	469/1647	4.40	4.38	4.12	4.06	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	19	7	4.19	1425/1668	4.30	4.56	4.67	4.62	4.19
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	9	10	4.45	448/1605	4.35	4.29	4.07	3.96	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	Λ	2	2	20	4.58	715/1514	4.62	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	7	19	4.73	917/1551	4.86	4.82	4.66	4.55	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	9	14	4.42	686/1503		4.49	4.24	4.17	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	4	19	4.58	575/1506		4.57	4.26	4.17	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	2	3	7	5	4		1048/1311		3.65	3.85	3.68	3.29
5. Fix audiovipual deciminques cimanos four anacistanding			_		•		-	3.27	1010, 1011	3.01	3.03	5.05	3.00	3.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	546/1490	4.46	4.24	4.05	3.85	4.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate		0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	632/1502	4.56	4.42	4.26	4.06	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	434/1489	4.74	4.52	4.29	4.07	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	15	9	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/1006	****	3.99	4.00	3.81	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	3	General	6	Under-grad	27	Non-major	26
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5	_			
				?	0						

Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY

Instructor: PFEIFER, JESSIC

Enrollment: 36 Questionnaires: 25

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 1282 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equei	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ns		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 Did wo	ı gəin no	Genera w insights,ski		om this sourse	0	0	0	1	5	8	11	1 16	1026/1669	4.45	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.16
_	_	tor make clear			0	0	0	1	4	6	14	4.10	789/1666		4.40	4.19	4.02	4.10
		estions reflec			0	0	0	1	2	3	19	4.60			4.63	4.24		4.60
	_	ations reflect			0	15	1	1	3	4	1		1459/1617		4.36	4.15	3.99	3.30
				what you learned	1	0	3	1	6	10	4		1265/1555		4.29	4.13	3.92	3.46
				to what you learned	1	18	1	1	1	3	0		****/1543		4.16	4.06	3.86	****
		signments contr system clearl			1	0	0	2	2	4	16		634/1647		4.38	4.12	4.06	4.42
		was class cand		zinea	0	0	1	1	6	15	2		1630/1668		4.56	4.67		3.64
				ching effectiveness	2	3	1	1	2	13			1172/1605		4.29	4.07	3.96	
J. 110W WOO	iid you g	jidae ene overe	iii ccac	silling clicculveness		,	_	_	2	13	,	3.00	11/2/1005	1.55	1.20	1.07	3.70	3.00
		Lectur	re															
1. Were th	ne instru	ctor's lecture	es well	prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	17	4.64	616/1514	4.62	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.64
2. Did the	e instruc	tor seem inter	rested i	in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	567/1551	4.86	4.82	4.66	4.55	4.88
3. Was led	cture mat	erial presente	ed and e	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	7	15	4.48	588/1503	4.54	4.49	4.24	4.17	4.48
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	18	4.60	547/1506	4.68	4.57	4.26	4.17	4.60
5. Did aud	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi						3	1	6	4	4	3.28	1051/1311	3.61	3.65	3.85	3.68	3.28
		Discus																
				what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50			4.24	4.05	3.85	4.50
				ed to participate	11	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	859/1502		4.42	4.26	4.06	4.29
				nd open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64			4.52	4.29	4.07	4.64
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succe	essful		11	12	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1006	****	3.99	4.00	3.81	****
		Labora	+0227															
2 Were vo	nı provid		-	ground information	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****
Z. Were ye	ou provio	ica wich dacque	ree baer	igiodia ililoimacioli		Ü	Ü	Ü	O	Ü	_	3.00	, 233			1.17	1.05	
		Self	Paced															
1. Did sel	Lf-paced	system contrib	oute to	what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did stu	ıdy quest	ions make clea	ar the e	expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were yo	our conta	acts with the i	nstruct	or helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	4.26	***
4. Was the	e feedbac	k/tutoring by	proctor	rs helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	***
5. Were th	nere enou	igh proctors fo	r all t	the students	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****
Fre						Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade								Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	}
00-27	00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 17					Re	 quir	ed fo	 or M	aior	 g 1	7	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo		0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 6		1/6/	7 a T T	-u -(ا ٠ ١٠ ـــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــ	۱۰ ۲	2 I	•	Graduat	_	0	1.100) (J
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	4	C 0		Co	nera	1				5	IInder-a	rad ?	5	Non-	major	25
04_150	1	2.00-2.99	6	D 0	General						. 5			5 Under-grad 25			ilia JOI	43

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55 56-83	2 6	1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99	0 4	B C	6 0	General	5	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0			are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY

Instructor: EALICK, GREG E.

Enrollment: 26
Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1283 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	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	4	7	12	4.35	804/1669	4.45	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	15		4.17	975/1666			4.19	4.11	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	305/1421		4.63	4.24	4.11	4.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	3	7	11	4.23	831/1617	4.19	4.36	4.15	3.99	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	8	4	8	3.74	1079/1555	3.91	4.29	4.00	3.92	3.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	3	4	8	4	3.32	1328/1543	4.09	4.16	4.06	3.86	3.32
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	9	12	4.43	600/1647	4.40	4.38	4.12	4.06	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1668	4.30	4.56	4.67	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	8	9	4.37	551/1605	4.35	4.29	4.07	3.96	4.37
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	Λ	0	0	0	2	12	9	1 20	1052/1514	1 62	1 57	4.39	4.32	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	460/1551		4.82	4.66	4.55	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	6	13	4.45	637/1503			4.24	4.17	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	-	19	4.83	,		4.57	4.26	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	-	3	0	0	1	2.		1178/1311				3.68	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	389/1490	4.46	4.24	4.05	3.85	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	237/1502	4.56	4.42	4.26	4.06	4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1489		4.52	4.29	4.07	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	13	7	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1006	***	3.99	4.00	3.81	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	***	****	4.19	4.09	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3 00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 42		5.00	4.34		***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 46		5.00	4.45	4.26	****
J. Here your concaces with the instructor herpful	22	U	U	U	J	_	U	1.00	, 40		5.00	1.15	1.20	
Errom	0000	Diat	mib.	.+										

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	 А	12	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				2	1						

Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY

Instructor: EALICK, GREG E.

Enrollment: 33
Questionnaires: 23

Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1284 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

	Overtions					Fre	eque	ncies	S		Ins	tructor	Cours	se Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mear	n Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General															
1. Did yo	u gain ne		s from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	293/166	9 4.45	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.74
			ne expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	16	4.65	372/166			4.19	4.11	4.65
			the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	242/142			4.24	4.11	4.78
	_	ations reflect th		1	0	0	0	2	11	9	4.32				4.15	3.99	4.32
			to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	10	9	4.22				4.00	3.92	4.22
			ite to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	9	9	4.17	747/154			4.06	3.86	4.17
		system clearly	_	0	0	0	0	3		10	4.30				4.12		4.30
		was class cancell		0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/166				4.62	
	-		teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	7	13	4.65					3.96	
		Lecture															
1 Were t	he instru	ctor's lectures w	well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	3	16	4.59	691/151	4 4.62	2 4.57	4.39	4.32	4.59
			ted in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95				4.66	4.55	4.95
			and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0			4.86				4.24		4.86
		_		1	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73				4.26		4.73
		s contribute to v	_														
5. Did au	ıdıovisual	techniques enhar	nce your understanding	1	16	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	846/131	1 3.6	3.65	3.85	3.68	3.67
1 5' 3 3		on	_	_	^	^	4	_	1.0	4	200/4/2	0 4 4		4 05	2 25	4 67	
			e to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1			4.61					3.85	4.61
		_	raged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78				4.26	4.06	4.78
		_	r and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/148			4.29	4.07	5.00
4. Were s	special te	ful	5	13	2	1	0	0	2	2.80	****/100	6 ***	3.99	4.00	3.81	****	
		cy .															
2. Were y	ou provid	ed with adequate	background information	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 23	3 ****	* ***	4.19	4.09	****
		Seminar															
1. Were a	ıssigned t	opics relevant to	the announced theme	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 11	2 ****	4.86	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was th	ne instruc	tor available for	r individual attention	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 9	7 ****	4.86	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did re	search pr	ojects contribute	e to what you learned	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 9	2 ****	4.93	4.22	3.79	****
5. Were c	riteria f	or grading made o	clear	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 9	8 ***	4.61	3.95	3.90	****
		Field Wor	rk														
1. Did fi	eld exper	ience contribute	to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 5	8 ****	****	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did yo	ou clearly	understand your	evaluation criteria	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 5	2 ***	****	4.06	3.81	****
		tor available for		22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 3	9 ***	****	4.39	4.30	****
			your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 4		****	3.97		****
		Self Pac	ced														
1. Did se	elf-paced	system contribute	e to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 5	5 ****	5.00	4.34	4.17	****
		Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n										
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	S			Т	ype			Majors	3
00-27	2	0.00-0.99) A 7		Red	 anir	 ed f	or Ma	aior		9	 Gradua	 te	0	 Мајо	 nr	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99			1000	-1 ~ T T ,	-u -	OT 1.10	⊥∪ر ہ	~	-	Siddua		J	1.101		_
26-33 56-83	1		C 1		000	nerai	1				7	IIndo:-	arad	23	Mos	-major	22
	1				Gel	nera.	т				1	Under-	grad	43	MOU-	-ıııa Jor	22
84-150											1	шшш	Mann:	-1			-la
Grad.	P 0					ecti	ves				1			there a		_][1
						1					-	respon	ses to	be sign	ıııcar	IL	
	I 0				Otl	her					5						
? 0																	

Course Section: PHIL 100Y 0101 University of Maryland Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY Baltimore County

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Instructor: EALICK, GREG E.
Enrollment: 18

Enrollment: 18
Ouestionnaires: 10

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1285

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 5 4.20 988/1669 4.20 4.48 4.23 4.02 4.20 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 0 00 1 5 4 4.30 814/1666 4.30 4.40 4.19 4.11 4.30 0 0 2 8 4.80 217/1421 4.80 4.63 4.24 4.11 4.80 1 1 2 5 4.22 831/1617 4.22 4.36 4.15 3.99 4.22 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 0 0 5 4 4.10 709/1555 4.10 4.29 4.00 3.92 4.10 0 3 3 4 4.10 832/1543 4.10 4.16 4.06 3.86 4.10 7. Was the grading system clearly explained
8 How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 1 2 7 4.60 367/1647 4.60 4.38 4.12 4.06 4.60 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 0 9 5.00 1/1668 5.00 4.56 4.67 4.62 5.00 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 Ω 0 3 6 4.67 584/1514 4.67 4.57 4.39 4.32 4.67 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 10 5.00 1/1551 5.00 4.82 4.66 4.55 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 4 6 4.60 464/1503 4.60 4.49 4.24 4.17 4.60 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 2 8 4.80 286/1506 4.80 4.57 4.26 4.17 4.80 0 0 0 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 6 1 0 2 0 1 3.00 1115/1311 3.00 3.65 3.85 3.68 3.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 2 0 0 1 6 4.00 849/1490 4.00 4.24 4.05 3.85 4.00 0 0 7 4.22 900/1502 4.22 4.42 4.26 4.06 4.22 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 1 1 0 2 1 6 4.44 753/1489 4.44 4.52 4.29 4.07 4.44 4. Were special techniques successful 1 7 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/1006 **** 3.99 4.00 3.81 **** Seminar 8 0 0 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 112 **** 4.86 4.38 4.04 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 9 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.86 4.36 4.19 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.93 4.22 3.79 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 105 **** 4.92 4.20 3.94 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Majors Reasons 00 - 276 0.00-0.99 1 5 Required for Majors 8 Graduate Major Α 28-55 1.00-1.99 0 в 3 1 56-83 2.00-2.99 0 C 2 General 1 Under-grad 10 Non-major 10 D 0 84-150 3.00-3.49 0 Ω F 0 3.50-4.00 1 Grad. Ω Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough Ω responses to be significant I 0 Other

University of Maryland Page 1286
Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007
Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 33
Questionnaires: 16 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course Section: PHIL 146 0101

CRITICAL THINKING

TEMPLETON, ROYE

Title

Instructor:

						1			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
		Questions	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1 Did won	anin na	Genera. ew insights,ski:	_	m this source	0	0	1	1	2	2	۵	1 06	1131/1669	4.17	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.06
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	2	0	3	11	4.44	648/1666	4.41	4.40	4.19	4.11	4.44
		uestions reflect			0	2	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	657/1421	4.52	4.63	4.24	4.11	4.43
		uations reflect			0	12	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	801/1617	4.25	4.36	4.15	3.99	4.25
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	461/1555	4.30	4.29	4.13	3.92	4.38
				o what you learned	0	12	1	0	0	1	2		1138/1543	3.96	4.16	4.06	3.86	3.75
		g system clearly			0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	78/1647	4.80	4.10	4.12	4.06	4.94
		was class cance		Inea	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1668	4.00	4.56	4.12	4.62	5.00
_	•			hing effectiveness	2	0	1	0	4	5			,					
9. HOW WOUL	ıa you g	grade the overa.	II teac	ning effectiveness	2	U	Τ	U	4	5	4	3.79	1187/1605	3.75	4.29	4.07	3.96	3.79
		Lecture	е															
1. Were the	e instru	actor's lectures	s well	orepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	727/1514	4.64	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.56
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	358/1551	4.77	4.82	4.66	4.55	4.94
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	879/1503	4.32	4.49	4.24	4.17	4.25
		es contribute to			0	0	1	1	3	3	8		1069/1506	4.06	4.57	4.26	4.17	4.00
			our understanding	1	5	2	0	7	0	1		1186/1311		3.65	3.85	3.68	2.80	
J. Dia aaai	101104	our understanding	_	3	_	Ü	,	Ü	_	2.00	1100/1311	2.50	3.03	3.03	3.00	2.00		
		Discus																
				what you learned	2	0	4	0	6	1	3	2.93	1372/1490	3.05	4.24	4.05	3.85	2.93
2. Were all	l studer	nts actively end	courage	d to participate	1	0	3	1	4	3	4	3.27	1370/1502	3.40	4.42	4.26	4.06	3.27
3. Did the	instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	2	0	3	1	5	1	4	3.14	1384/1489	3.39	4.52	4.29	4.07	3.14
		Labora	torv															
2 Were voi	ı provid			ground information	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1 00	****/ 233	****	****	4 19	4 09	****
a. Were you	a provid	aca with aacqua	cc back	ground informacion		Ü	_	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	1.00	, 233			1.17	1.05	
		Semina																
l. Were ass	signed t	topics relevant	to the	announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.86	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the	instruc	ctor available :	for ind	ividual attention	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	4.86	4.36	4.19	****
	1							utio	า									
			11040	101107	210	0112	u0101											
Credits Ear	rned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	}		
00-27	 7	0.00-0.99	0	 A 4		Re	anir	ed f	or Ma	ior	·	8	Graduat	 _	0	Majo		0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	В 4		1,6,	2u11	cu I	J. 1·10	. ,	٥	-	Graduat	_	J	1.101) (/_	0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 5		Co	nera	1				3	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non	-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 3		Ge.	пета	Т				٥	under-g	rau 1	. 0	MOI1-	-ma Jor	Τ0
84-150 Grad.	0	3.50-3.49	2	Б 3 F 0		177.7	ecti [.]					5	#### - 1	Moona +	homo -	n-+		.h
Grad.	U	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		ET.	ectl.	ves				5					_	İTT
				1 0								0	respons	es to r	e sign	ııııcar	16	
	I 0			- *		Ot1	her					0						
	? 0																	

Course Section: PHIL 146 0201 University of Maryland Title CRITICAL THINKING

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Instructor: TEMPLETON, ROYE

Enrollment: 34 Questionnaires: 18

Page 1287 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Ctudent	COURCE	Evaluation	$\Omega_{11} \triangle c + i \triangle r$	naira

				equer					ructor	Course	_		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	1	4	2	11	4.28	889/1669	4.17	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	715/1666		4.40	4.19	4.11	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	453/1421	4.52	4.63	4.24	4.11	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	1	1	2		****/1617	4.25	4.36	4.15	3.99	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1.4	0	1	3	5	9	4.22	584/1555		4.29	4.13	3.92	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	0	1	3	-	4.17	759/1543	3.96	4.16	4.06	3.86	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	_	13	4.67	302/1647	4.80	4.38	4.12	4.06	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	428/1668		4.56	4.67	4.62	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	1	5	5			1241/1605		4.29	4.07	3.96	3.71
J. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	U		5	J	J	3.71	1241/1003	3.73	1.29	1.07	3.90	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	489/1514	4.64	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	1	1	15	4.61	1097/1551	4.77	4.82	4.66	4.55	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	742/1503	4.32	4.49	4.24	4.17	4.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	4	10	4.11	1017/1506	4.06	4.57	4.26	4.17	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	2	1	4	5	1	3.15	1088/1311	2.98	3.65	3.85	3.68	3.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	4	2	3	5	3.18	1296/1490	3.05	4.24	4.05	3.85	3.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	4	2	5	5	3.53	1296/1502	3.40	4.42	4.26	4.06	3.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	2	2	2	5	6	3.65	1227/1489	3.39	4.52	4.29	4.07	3.65
4. Were special techniques successful	1	15	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1006	****	3.99	4.00	3.81	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	1	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****
z. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	U		U		U	U	2.00	/ 233			4.19	4.00	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.86	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.86	4.36	4.19	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.61	3.95	3.90	***
Field Work							_		= 0					
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	4.26	****
_														
Frequ	lency	Dist	tribu	ution	ı									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	8	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F P	0 0	Electives	3	#### - Means responses to		are not enougl gnificant	h

I 1 Other 0 ? 0

Title INTRO TO MORAL THEORY

Instructor: DIXON, BEN

Enrollment: 38
Questionnaires: 25

38

Baltimore County Fall 2006

University of Maryland

Page 1288 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Questions						Fre	equei 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General																
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,skil	ls from	this course	1	0	0	0	2	7	15	4.54	545/1669	4.64	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.54
2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the expe	ected goals	1	0	0	0	2	10	12	4.42	676/1666	4.70	4.40	4.19	4.11	4.42
	_	uestions reflect	_	_	1	0	0	0	1	2	21	4.83	197/1421	4.84	4.63	4.24	4.11	4.83
		uations reflect	_	_	1	4	0	0	2	8	10	4.40	641/1617		4.36	4.15	3.99	4.40
	-	eadings contribu		_	1	0	0	0	2	5	17	4.63	249/1555		4.29	4.00	3.92	4.63
				what you learned	1	5	1	1	2	7	8	4.05			4.16	4.06	3.86	4.05
		g system clearly		ned	1	0	0	0	0	10	14		389/1647		4.38	4.12	4.06	4.58
	_	was class cance			1	0	0	0	1	18	5		1438/1668		4.56	4.67	4.62	4.17
9. How wou	uld you	grade the overal	.l teach:	ing effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	288/1605	4.72	4.29	4.07	3.96	4.61
		Lecture																
		uctor's lectures	_	4	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	663/1514		4.57	4.39	4.32	4.62	
		the subject	5	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	512/1551		4.82	4.66	4.55	4.90		
		olained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	-,		4.49	4.24	4.17	4.85		
		es contribute to		5	0	0	0	0	3		4.85	-,		4.57	4.26	4.17	4.85	
5. Did aud	diovisua	l techniques enh	ır understanding	6	8	0	1	5	3	2	3.55	919/1311	3.48	3.65	3.85	3.68	3.55	
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contribu	ite to wh	nat you learned	8	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	251/1490	4.78	4.24	4.05	3.85	4.76
2. Were al	ll stude	nts actively end	couraged	to participate	8	0	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	668/1502	4.69	4.42	4.26	4.06	4.47
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage f	air and	open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	299/1489	4.85	4.52	4.29	4.07	4.88
4. Were sp	pecial to	echniques succes	sful		8	11	2	0	1	2	1	3.00	****/1006	****	3.99	4.00	3.81	****
		Laborat	ory															
2. Were yo	ou provi	ded with adequat	e backg	cound information	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	***	****	4.19	4.09	****
		Field W	Jork															
1. Did fie	eld expe	rience contribut		at vou learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.00	****
		y understand you			24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****
		-											,					
1. Did sel	lf-paced	Self F system contribu		nat vou learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.17	****
1. 214 201	II Pacca	5,500 00H01120		-		-	Ü	ŭ	ŭ	Ü	_	3.00	, 33		3.00			
				Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	ution	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	;	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 15		Red	mire	ed fo	 or M.	 aior	 s 1	1	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 4		1.00)		-	or adda c	-	-		-	-
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Ger	nera:	l				3	Under-q	rad 2	25	Non-	-major	24
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		001						-	2		-	-1011		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enou	ŗh
				P 0									respons				_	
				I 0		Otl	ner					6	-					
	? 1																	

Course Section: PHIL 152 0301 University of Maryland
Title INTRO TO MORAL THEORY Baltimore County

MORAL THEORY Baltimore County Fall 2006

Instructor: DIXON, BEN

Enrollment: 22 Ouestionnaires: 21

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1289

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions 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 5 13 4.48 633/1669 4.64 4.48 4.23 4.02 4.48 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 4 16 4.71 293/1666 4.70 4.40 4.19 4.11 4.71 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 3 18 4.86 184/1421 4.84 4.63 4.24 4.11 4.86 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 7 0 0 1 2 11 4.71 265/1617 4.69 4.36 4.15 3.99 4.71 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 2 19 4.90 100/1555 4.32 4.29 4.00 3.92 4.90 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 6 1 0 1 2 11 4.47 440/1543 4.33 4.16 4.06 3.86 4.477. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 1 4 16 4.71 250/1647 4.70 4.38 4.12 4.06 4.71 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 5 16 4.76 952/1668 4.40 4.56 4.67 4.62 4.76 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 5 15 4.75 441/1514 4.75 4.57 4.39 4.32 4.75 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 1 19 4.95 307/1551 4.89 4.82 4.66 4.55 4.95 1 0 0 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 5 15 4.75 277/1503 4.80 4.49 4.24 4.17 4.75 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 3 17 4.85 225/1506 4.84 4.57 4.26 4.17 4.85 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 7 2 0 1 1 8 4.08 547/1311 3.48 3.65 3.85 3.68 4.08 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 1 10 4.91 141/1490 4.78 4.24 4.05 3.85 4.91 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0 0 0 0 1 10 4.91 237/1502 4.69 4.42 4.26 4.06 4.91 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 0 0 0 0 11 5.00 1/1489 4.85 4.52 4.29 4.07 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 10 7 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 ****/1006 **** 3.99 4.00 3.81 **** Frequency Distribution

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected G	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 15	5	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В 5	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 1	L	General	5	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	6	D 0)						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0)	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P 0)			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I O)	Other	3	_			
				? 0)						

Title INTRO TO MORAL THEORY

Instructor: SENG, PHILLIP

Enrollment: 38
Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1290 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

				_	ncie	S			ructor	Course	_			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	2	4	15	4.62	463/1669	4.64	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	527/1666		4.40	4.19	4.11	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	392/1421		4.63	4.24	4.11	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	242/1617	4.69	4.36	4.15	3.99	4.74
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	225/1555		4.29	4.00	3.92	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	7	9	4.00	895/1543	4.33	4.16	4.06	3.86	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	17		167/1647		4.38	4.12	4.06	4.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	8		1289/1668	4.40	4.56	4.67	4.62	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	358/1605			4.07	3.96	
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	-	U	U	U		0	10	4.55	336/1003	4.72	4.23	4.07	3.90	4.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	553/1514	4.75	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	825/1551	4.89	4.82	4.66	4.55	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	8	11	4.58	491/1503	4.80	4.49	4.24	4.17	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	446/1506	4.84	4.57	4.26	4.17	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	3	3	2	0	3	2.73	1201/1311	3.48	3.65	3.85	3.68	2.73
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1									, -					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	2	0	9	4.42	546/1490	4.78	4.24	4.05	3.85	4.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	880/1502	4.69	4.42	4.26	4.06	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	613/1489	4.85	4.52	4.29	4.07	4.58
4. Were special techniques successful	9	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	****	3.99	4.00	3.81	****
T - hh														
Laboratory	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2 00	++++/ 022	****	****	4 10	4 00	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	^^^		4.50	4.42	^ ^ ^ ^
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.86	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	4.86	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	4.92	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	4.61	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work		_	_											
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 42		5.00	4.31	4.08	****
2. 214 2044, quebetono mane oteat one expected gout	20	J	J	_	J	J	J	2.00	, 12		3.00	1.51	1.00	
Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	8	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	2	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	e are not enough	1

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 4 ? 2

INTRO TO MORAL THEORY

Title Instructor: THOMAS, JAMES

42

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1291 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eaner	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_	Mean		Mean

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	21	4.74	281/1669	4.64	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	82/1666	4.70	4.40	4.19	4.11	4.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	25	4.89	164/1421	4.84	4.63	4.24	4.11	4.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	22	4.74	230/1617	4.69	4.36	4.15	3.99	4.74
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	2	1	7	5	8	3.70	1111/1555	4.32	4.29	4.00	3.92	3.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	3	8	12	4.39	525/1543	4.33	4.16	4.06	3.86	4.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	167/1647	4.70	4.38	4.12	4.06	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	14	10	4.36	1305/1668	4.40	4.56	4.67	4.62	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	50/1605	4.72	4.29	4.07	3.96	4.96
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	1	25	4.85	274/1514	4.75	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	24	4.85	650/1551	4.89	4.82	4.66	4.55	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	144/1503	4.80	4.49	4.24	4.17	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	25	4.89	188/1506	4.84	4.57	4.26	4.17	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	17	1	1	2	1	5	3.80	764/1311	3.48	3.65	3.85	3.68	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	184/1490	4.78	4.24	4.05	3.85	4.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	296/1502	4.69	4.42	4.26	4.06	4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	338/1489	4.85	4.52	4.29	4.07	4.85
4. Were special techniques successful	14	8	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/1006	****	3.99	4.00	3.81	****
- ,														
Laboratory	0.5	-	-	0	0	_	•	1 00	****	ate ate ate ate	ale ale ale ale	4 00	2 00	****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	1	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 226	****	****	4.20	3.98	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26 26	0	0	0	1 1	0	0		****/ 223 ****/ 206	****	****	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	U	U	U	Т	U	U	3.00	***/ 206			4.15	4.01	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 112	****	4.86	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	4.86	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 105	****	4.92	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 98	****	4.61	3.95	3.90	****
5. Were directed for grading made drear	20	Ü	O	_	Ü	J	Ü	2.00	, 50		1.01	3.75	3.70	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

Title INTRO TO MORAL THEORY

Instructor: THOMAS, JAMES

Enrollment: 42
Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1291 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	21	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	27	Non-major	27
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

University of Maryland INTRO TO MORAL THEORY Baltimore County

Ρ

I

0

Title Instructor: THOMAS, JAMES

Enrollment: 48 Questionnaires: 36

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

Page 1292 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

responses to be significant

							LIC	-quci	CIC	5		TILD	Luccor	COULDC	DCPC	OLIDC	TC A CT	DCCC
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 al														,	
1. Did vo	nı gain ne			om this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	30	4.83	191/1669	4.64	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.83
		tor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	3	32	4.91	92/1666		4.40	4.19	4.11	4.91
				expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	33	4.94	91/1421	4.84	4.63	4.24	4.11	4.94
	_	ations reflect		_	2	3	0	0	1	3	27		146/1617		4.36	4.15	3.99	4.84
				what you learned	2	2	5	3	5	_	16		1118/1555		4.29	4.00	3.92	3.69
				to what you learned	3	2	0	0	2	4		4.74	-,		4.16	4.06	3.86	4.74
		system clear			1	0	0	2	1	6		4.60	- ,		4.38	4.12	4.06	4.60
		was class cand			1	0	0	0	0		12		1321/1668		4.56	4.67		4.34
	-			ching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	1	0	26	4.93	79/1605			4.07	3.96	
				3									.,					
		Lectur	ce															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture	es well	prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	29	4.85	274/1514	4.75	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.85
				in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	33	4.97	154/1551		4.82	4.66	4.55	4.97
				explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2		4.94	76/1503		4.49	4.24	4.17	
		s contribute t			2	0	0	0	0	2		4.94	98/1506			4.26	4.17	
				your understanding	2		3	2	1	1			1057/1311			3.85	3.68	
		1											, -					
		Discus	ssion															
1. Did cl	lass discu	ssions contrib	oute to	what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	71/1490	4.78	4.24	4.05	3.85	4.96
2. Were a	all studen	ts actively er	ncourage	ed to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	119/1502	4.69	4.42	4.26	4.06	4.96
3. Did th	ne instruc	tor encourage	fair a	nd open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	252/1489	4.85	4.52	4.29	4.07	4.92
4. Were s	special te	chniques succe	essful	_	12	16	1	0	1	0	6	4.25	****/1006	****	3.99	4.00	3.81	****
	_	-																
		Labora	atory															
1. Did th	ne lab inc	rease understa	anding (of the material	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were y	ou provid	ed with adequa	ate bac	kground information	35	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	utior	1									
Credits E	Tarned	Cum. GPA	\	Expected Grades				Pos	son	c			Туу	20			Majors	
credits i	sarneu 			Expected Grades														,
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 29		Red	quire	ed fo	or M	aior	s 1	.6	Graduate	e	0	Majo	r	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 4						,	_	-	- 3.3.3.3.3.3	-	-			_
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Gei	nera:	L			1	.0	Under-gr	rad 3	6	Non-	-major	34
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	11	D 0							_		5-					-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				3	#### - I	Means t	here a	re not	enouc	ıh
	-	2.22 2.00		- 0								-						

Other

Course Section: PHIL 152H 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County INTRO TO MORAL THEORY

Instructor: SENG, PHILLIP

Enrollment: 7 Questionnaires: 4

JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Page 1293

			Ease		ncies	_		Tnat	ructor	Course	Dont	IIMDC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2 2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	590/1669	4.50	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	4.40	4.19	4.11	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.63	4.24	4.11	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	219/1617	4.75	4.36	4.15	3.99	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1555	5.00	4.29	4.00	3.92	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1497/1543	2.67	4.16	4.06	3.86	2.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	213/1647	4.75	4.38	4.12	4.06	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1382/1668	4.25	4.56	4.67	4.62	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1210/1605	3.75	4.29	4.07	3.96	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	799/1514	4.50	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.82	4.66	4.55	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.49	4.24	4.17	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.57	4.26	4.17	5.00
Discussion	_					_	_		0.40./4.400					
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	Τ	0	U	U	U	1	2	4.67	340/1490		4.24	4.05	3.85	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	486/1502	4.67	4.42	4.26	4.06	4.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 532/1489 4.67 4.52 4.29 4.07 4.67

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

Course Section: PHIL 152Y 0101 University of Maryland
Title INTRO TO MORAL THEORY Baltimore County

Instructor: DIXON, BEN

Enrollment: 17

Ouestionnaires: 10

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Fall 2006

Page 1294

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 1 2 3 4 4.00 1173/1669 4.00 4.48 4.23 4.02 4.00 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 0 1 4 4 4.33 777/1666 4.33 4.40 4.19 4.11 4.33 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 1 3 5 4.44 632/1421 4.44 4.63 4.24 4.11 4.44 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 3 0 0 1 3 3 4.29 770/1617 4.29 4.36 4.15 3.99 4.29 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 2 1 1 6 4.10 709/1555 4.10 4.29 4.00 3.92 4.10 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 0 0 3 3 2 3.88 1043/1543 3.88 4.16 4.06 3.86 3.88 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 1 5 4 4.30 806/1647 4.30 4.38 4.12 4.06 4.30 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 5 5 4.50 1190/1668 4.50 4.56 4.67 4.62 4.50 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 139/1605 4.80 4.29 4.07 3.96 4.80 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 3 6 4.67 584/1514 4.67 4.57 4.39 4.32 4.67 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 2 7 4.78 843/1551 4.78 4.82 4.66 4.55 4.78 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 3 6 4.67 386/1503 4.67 4.49 4.24 4.17 4.67 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 1 0 8 4.78 326/1506 4.78 4.57 4.26 4.17 4.78 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 2 0 1 1 1 3 4.00 587/1311 4.00 3.65 3.85 3.68 4.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 1 5 4.67 340/1490 4.67 4.24 4.05 3.85 4.67 0 2 4 4.67 486/1502 4.67 4.42 4.26 4.06 4.67 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 348/1489 4.83 4.52 4.29 4.07 4.83 4. Were special techniques successful 4 4 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/1006 **** 3.99 4.00 3.81 **** 0 Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: PHIL 210 0101 University of Maryland PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION Baltimore County

Title Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD Fall 2006

Enrollment: 50 Questionnaires: 31

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1295

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equer	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did v	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski		om this course	0	0	2	1	4	8	16	4.13	1077/1669	4.13	4.48	4.23	4.34	4.13
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	2	1	6	8	14	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	4.40	4.19	4.29	4.00
		uestions reflec			0	18	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	356/1421	4.69	4.63	4.24	4.35	4.69
		uations reflect			0	2	1	1	3	7	17	4.31	739/1617	4.31	4.36	4.15	4.24	4.31
				what you learned	0	0	1	2	0	5	23	4.52	332/1555	4.52	4.29	4.00	3.96	4.52
	_	_		to what you learned	0	1	2	1	1	6	20	4.37	552/1543	4.37	4.16	4.06	4.10	4.37
		g system clearl		_	0	1	3	5	7	6	9	3.43	1425/1647	3.43	4.38	4.12	4.19	3.43
	-	was class canc			1	0	0	0	0	7	23	4.77	952/1668	4.77	4.56	4.67	4.59	4.77
9. How w	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	5	8	14	4.17	779/1605	4.17	4.29	4.07	4.15	4.17
		Lectur	e															
1. Were	the instru	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	1	4	3	8	13	3.97	1227/1514	3.97	4.57	4.39	4.39	3.97
2. Did t	he instru	ctor seem inter	ested :	in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	4	24	4.79	806/1551	4.79	4.82	4.66	4.72	4.79
3. Was 1	ecture mat	terial presente	d and e	explained clearly	2	0	2	3	5	8	11	3.79	1215/1503	3.79	4.49	4.24	4.29	3.79
4. Did t	he lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	2	0	4	0	6	4	15	3.90	1179/1506	3.90	4.57	4.26	4.33	3.90
5. Did a	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	your understanding	5	23	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1311	****	3.65	3.85	3.96	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did c	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	13	0	3	3	1	3	8	3.56	1135/1490	3.56	4.24	4.05	4.11	3.56
2. Were	all studer	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	12	0	3	0	3	4	9	3.84	1154/1502	3.84	4.42	4.26	4.31	3.84
3. Did t	he instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	13	0	2	1	0	5	10		1006/1489		4.52	4.29	4.36	4.11
4. Were	special te	echniques succe	ssful		14	14	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1006	****	3.99	4.00	3.99	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	ıtior	ı									
Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	:			Ту	pe			Majors	}
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 A 17			 mir		or Ma	ior	 g 1	4	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo		3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B 12		1000	2411		10	. , 🗆	~ 1	-	Gradade	_	-	110000	-	3
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	3	C 0		Ger	nera:	ı				7	Under-q	rad 3	1	Non-	-major	28
30 03		2.00 2.00		0 0		CCI	u.	-				•	onaci 9	_ ~ ~ ~	-	14011		20

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	17	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	В	12						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	31	Non-major	28
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9	_			
				?	0						

Course Section: PHIL 248 0101 University of Maryland Page 1296 Title INTRO SCIENTIF REASONI Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007

Instructor: SENG, PHILLIP

Enrollment: 30 Questionnaires: 19

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eque:	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	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	1	0	1	4	13	4.47	633/1669	4.47	4.48	4.23	4.34	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	15	4.63	399/1666	4.63	4.40	4.19	4.29	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	392/1421	4.67	4.63	4.24	4.35	4.6
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	2	16	4.68	300/1617	4.68	4.36	4.15	4.24	4.6
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	13	4.47	369/1555	4.47	4.29	4.00	3.96	4.4
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	478/1543	4.44	4.16	4.06	4.10	4.4
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	123/1647	4.89	4.38	4.12	4.19	4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	6	4.32	1345/1668	4.32	4.56	4.67	4.59	4.32
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	201/1605	4.71	4.29	4.07	4.15	4.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	291/1514	4.84	4.57	4.39	4.39	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	307/1551	4.95	4.82	4.66	4.72	4.9
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	182/1503	4.84	4.49	4.24	4.29	4.8
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	3	14	4.61	534/1506	4.61	4.57	4.26	4.33	4.6
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	13	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	890/1311	3.60	3.65	3.85	3.96	3.6
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	1	10	4.58	400/1490	4.58	4.24	4.05	4.11	4.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.42	4.26	4.31	5.0
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.52	4.29	4.36	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	7	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	810/1006	3.40	3.99	4.00	3.99	3.40
Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	ıs			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 10		Re	auir	ed f	 or №	 Ia ior		3	Graduat	 e	0	 Maio	 r	0

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	 10	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15	_			
				2	Λ						

Course Section: PHIL 251 0101 University of Maryland Title ETH ISS SCI ENG&INF TE

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD

Enrollment: 39 Questionnaires: 21

Page 1297 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	n Questionnaire	e
---------	--------	------------	-----------------	---

							Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 L															
1. Did you	gain ne	ew insights,skil	lls from	this course	0	0	0	2	2	8	9	4.14	1052/1669	4.04	4.48	4.23	4.34	4.14
2. Did the	instru	ctor make clear	the exp	ected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	10	4.24	908/1666	4.10	4.40	4.19	4.29	4.24
3. Did the	exam q	uestions reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	1	0	0	2	8	10	4.40	683/1421	4.34	4.63	4.24	4.35	4.40
l. Did oth	er evalı	uations reflect	the exp	ected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	11	4.29	770/1617	4.28	4.36	4.15	4.24	4.29
. Did ass	igned re	eadings contribu	ite to w	hat you learned	0	2	3	2	5	5	4	3.26	1354/1555	3.49	4.29	4.00	3.96	3.26
				what you learned	1	0	1	0	4	5	10	4.15	771/1543	4.25	4.16	4.06	4.10	4.15
		g system clearly	_	ned	0	0	0	2	5	9	5	3.81	1250/1647	3.73	4.38	4.12	4.19	3.81
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76			4.56	4.67	4.59	4.76
. How wou	ld you	grade the overal	ll teach	ing effectiveness	4	1	0	0	3	9	4	4.06	877/1605	3.84	4.29	4.07	4.15	4.06
		Lecture	2															
. Were th	e instr	uctor's lectures	well p	repared	0	0	0	1	4	9	7	4.05	1188/1514	3.66	4.57	4.39	4.39	4.05
. Did the	instru	ctor seem intere	ested in	the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	862/1551	4.63	4.82	4.66	4.72	4.76
				plained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	12	4	3.90	1168/1503	3.69	4.49	4.24	4.29	3.90
		es contribute to			0	0	0	2	2	12	5	3.95	1121/1506	3.72	4.57	4.26	4.33	3.95
. Did aud	iovisua:	l techniques enh	nance yo	ur understanding	1	3	1	1	7	6	2	3.41	989/1311	3.42	3.65	3.85	3.96	3.43
		Discuss	sion															
Did cla	ss disc			hat you learned	1	0	0	1	5	9	5	3.90	956/1490	3.91	4.24	4.05	4.11	3.90
				to participate	1	0	1	1	3	5	10	4.10			4.42	4.26	4.31	4.10
				open discussion	1	0	0	1	3	8	8	4.15	980/1489		4.52	4.29	4.36	4.15
		echniques succes		open arboabbien	1	4	1	2	2	7		3.69			3.99	4.00	3.99	3.69
		Field W	Jork															
. Did fie	ld expe	rience contribut		at you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.20	***
		0-15																
. Did stu	dy quest	Self I tions make clear		pected goal	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	5.00	****
				-														
				Frequ	ency	Dist	crib	utioi	1									
Credits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	4	A 11		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	 ajor	 s	9	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r •	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 9			-			-						3 -		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Ger	nera	l				4	Under-g	rad 2	21	Non-	major	21
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0													3	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enou	gh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sigr	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	ner					8						

Title ETH ISS SCI ENG&INF TE

WILSON, RICHARD

Instructor:

Enrollment: 29 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1298 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	6	12	9	3.93	1253/1669	4.04	4.48	4.23	4.34	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	12	10	3.97	1150/1666	4.10	4.40	4.19	4.29	3.97
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	9	15	4.28	797/1421	4.34	4.63	4.24	4.35	4.28
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	8	5	16	4.28	780/1617	4.28	4.36	4.15	4.24	4.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	0	7	10	6	3.72	1087/1555	3.49	4.29	4.00	3.96	3.72
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	11	14	4.34	571/1543	4.25	4.16	4.06	4.10	4.34
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	9	8	8	3.66	1326/1647	3.73	4.38	4.12	4.19	3.66
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	8	20	4.66	1077/1668	4.71	4.56	4.67	4.59	4.66
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	1	3	6	8	6	3.63	1299/1605	3.84	4.29	4.07	4.15	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	3	5	3	10	4	3.28	1426/1514	3.66	4.57	4.39	4.39	3.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	3	6	15		1193/1551	4.63	4.82	4.66	4.72	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	3	1	6	11	4		1337/1503	3.69	4.49	4.24	4.29	3.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	4	3	8	7		1324/1506		4.57	4.26		3.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	11	2	1	4	3	4		983/1311			3.85	3.96	
5. Dia dadiovidadi teelimiqueb elimanee jour anacibtanaring	-		-	-	-	3	-	3.13	203/1311	3.12	3.03	3.03	3.30	3.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	5	9	7	3.91	945/1490	3.91	4.24	4.05	4.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	1	11	10	4.30	846/1502	4.20	4.42	4.26	4.31	4.30
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	14	7	4.22	941/1489	4.18	4.52	4.29	4.36	4.22
4. Were special techniques successful	6	9	0	1	1	9	3	4.00	479/1006	3.84	3.99	4.00	3.99	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	1	0	0	0	2	Ο	4.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.42	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	0	0	2	0		****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.71	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.59	****
J. Were requirements for tab reports creatly specified	2,	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	_	Ü	3.30	, 200			1.13	1.35	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.86	4.38	4.59	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.86	4.36	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 92	****	4.93	4.22	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.92	4.20	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 98	****	4.61	3.95	4.20	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	,	****	****	4.33	5.00	****
			-	-		-	-		,					

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0		16	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	6	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	29	Non-major	29
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	

I 0 Other 12 ? 0

ETHICAL RESP IN COMP/I

Title Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD

Enrollment: 16

Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1299 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	389/1669	4.67	4.48	4.23	4.34	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	8	6	4.27	868/1666	4.27	4.40	4.19	4.29	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	863/1421	4.20	4.63	4.24	4.35	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	5	8	4.27	790/1617	4.27	4.36	4.15	4.24	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	0	2	3	4	3.64	1155/1555	3.64	4.29	4.00	3.96	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	580/1543	4.33	4.16	4.06	4.10	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	5	5	3		1295/1647	3.71	4.38	4.12	4.19	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	3			1125/1668	4.60	4.56	4.67		4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	666/1605	4.27	4.29	4.07	4.15	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	923/1514		4.57	4.39	4.39	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	10		1055/1551	4.64	4.82	4.66	4.72	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1			4.50	556/1503	4.50	4.49	4.24	4.29	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	496/1506	4.64	4.57	4.26	4.33	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	587/1311	4.00	3.65	3.85	3.96	4.00
Discussion					_		_							
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	501/1490	4.45	4.24	4.05	4.11	4.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	513/1502	4.64	4.42	4.26	4.31	4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1		4.91	280/1489	4.91	4.52	4.29		4.91
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	344/1006	4.33	3.99	4.00	3.99	4.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.42	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.74	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.71	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.59	****
Seminar		_												
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	3	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 112	***	4.86	4.38	4.59	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 97	****	4.86	4.36	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	1 0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 92	****	4.93	4.22	4.50	****
 Did presentations contribute to what you learned Were criteria for grading made clear 	12 12	0	0	0	0	2	1 1		****/ 105 ****/ 98	****	4.92 4.61	4.20 3.95	4.63 4.20	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	U	U	U	U	۷	Τ	4.33	***/ 98		4.01	3.95	4.20	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	2	0		****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.67	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	1	0	0	0	1	1	1.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	* * * *
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****

Title ETHICAL RESP IN COMP/I

Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD

Enrollment: 16
Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1299 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	3	 А	7	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	С	0	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course Section: PHIL 321 0101 University of Maryland Title

HIST OF PHIL: ANCIENT Baltimore County

HITZ, ZENA Instructor:

Enrollment: 54 Questionnaires: 33

JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Page 1300

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	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	Λ	-	0	10	1.0	2 76	1371/1669	3.76	4.48	4.23	4.28	3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	13	10	6		1462/1666		4.40	4.19	4.20	3.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	13	1	1	2	8	7	4.00	. ,	4.00	4.63	4.19	4.25	4.00
		2	7	4		11	,		1419/1617		4.36	4.15	4.23	3.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	9		5 15	4.24	,	3.42	4.36			
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	-	0	Ţ	5	12			567/1555	4.24		4.00	4.03	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	7	12	10		1115/1543	3.79	4.16	4.06	4.14	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	4	7	11	8		1389/1647	3.52	4.38	4.12	4.14	3.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	21	12		1305/1668	4.36	4.56	4.67	4.68	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	2	2	13	8	2	3.22	1464/1605	3.22	4.29	4.07	4.09	3.22
Lecture														
	_	0	^	4	4	1.0	1.0	4 02	1100/1514	4 02	4 57	4 20	1 10	4 02
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	4	4	10	13		1190/1514		4.57	4.39	4.46	4.03
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	Τ.	5	25	4.77	843/1551	4.77	4.82	4.66	4.70	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	4	5	13	6		1337/1503	3.48	4.49	4.24	4.28	3.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	3	6	9	11		1236/1506		4.57	4.26	4.30	3.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	28	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/1311	****	3.65	3.85	3.97	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	3	4	4	6	5	3 27	1255/1490	3.27	4.24	4.05	4.11	3.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	2	5	5	2	Ω		1338/1502	3.41	4.42	4.26	4.28	3.41
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	2	4	Ω	1	7		1348/1489	3.32	4.52	4.29	4.35	3.32
4. Were special techniques successful	11	21	1	0	٥	U T	, 0		****/1006		3.99	4.00	4.10	****
1. Were apecial techniques adocessiul	т.т	4		U	U	U	U	1.00	/1000		3.33	4.00	T.10	

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	В	17						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	2	С	2	General	3	Under-grad	33	Non-major	20
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	12	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	15	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	27				
				?	2						

Course Section: PHIL 321H 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County Fall 2006

Instructor: HITZ, ZENA

Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 4

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1301

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	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	2	1	4.00	1173/1669	4.00	4.48	4.23	4.28	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1466/1666	3.50	4.40	4.19	4.20	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	0		1166/1421	3.67	4.63	4.24	4.25	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1251/1617	3.75	4.36	4.15	4.22	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	340/1555	4.50	4.29	4.00	4.03	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	895/1543	4.00	4.16	4.06	4.14	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1526/1647	3.00	4.38	4.12	4.14	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1329/1668	4.33	4.56	4.67	4.68	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1561/1605	2.50	4.29	4.07	4.09	2.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	Λ	0	0	0	Λ	2	1	4 25	1082/1514	4.25	4.57	4.39	4.46	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	1		1338/1551	4.25	4.82	4.66	4.70	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	879/1503	4.25	4.49	4.24	4.28	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	909/1506	4.25	4.57	4.26	4.30	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	0		1328/1490	3.00	4.24	4.05	4.11	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	1		1013/1502	4.00	4.42	4.26	4.28	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	1	0	0	1		1454/1489	2.67	4.52	4.29	4.35	2.67
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	923/1006	3.00	3.99	4.00	4.10	3.00
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	utior	า									

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

I

0

1

Course Section: PHIL 327 0101

25

BRAUDE, STEPHEN

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 14

Page 1302 AMERICAN PRAGMATISM JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

							Fr	equei	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	.lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	2	1	5	6	4.07	1124/1669	4.07	4.48	4.23	4.28	4.07
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	841/1666		4.40	4.19	4.20	4.29
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	493/1421	4.57	4.63	4.24	4.25	4.57
4. Did ot	her evalı	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	9	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	496/1617	4.50	4.36	4.15	4.22	4.50
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	195/1555	4.71	4.29	4.00	4.03	4.71
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	9	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	895/1543	4.00	4.16	4.06	4.14	4.00
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	962/1647	4.14	4.38	4.12	4.14	4.14
8. How ma	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	1	1	10	2	3.93	1581/1668	3.93	4.56	4.67	4.68	3.93
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	631/1605	4.31	4.29	4.07	4.09	4.31
		Lectur	·e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	_	prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	616/1514	4.64	4.57	4.39	4.46	4.64
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85			4.82	4.66	4.70	4.85
				xplained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	5	7	4.38	. ,		4.49	4.24	4.28	4.38
		es contribute t			1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62			4.57	4.26	4.30	4.62
				our understanding	1	11	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1311	****	3.65	3.85	3.97	****
		Discus	ugion															
1 Did al	acc dica			what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	816/1490	4.08	4.24	4.05	4.11	4.08
				d to participate	2	0	1	0	3	3	5		1106/1502		4.42	4.26	4.28	3.92
				d open discussion	2	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33			4.52	4.29	4.35	4.33
		echniques succe		a open arscussion	2	11	1	0	0	0	0		****/1006		3.99	4.00	4.10	****
				F		- D	d la.											
				Frequ	lency	DIS	Crib	utioi	:1									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Re	guir	ed fo	or M	ajor	s	3	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r or	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 3			-			-						J -		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C 7		Ger	nera	1				5	Under-g	rad 1	.4	Non-	major	10
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		El	ecti [.]	ves				2	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ıh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				_									_					

Other

4

Course Section: PHIL 332 0101 University of Maryland Title PHIL OF ASIAN MART ART

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1303

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: TEMPLETON, ROYE

Enrollment: 28 Questionnaires: 21

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1					Instructor		Course Dept		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	3	0	0	5	12	4.15	1039/1669	4.15	4.48	4.23	4.28	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	5	9	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	4.40	4.19	4.20	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	1	3	7	7	3.80	1118/1421	3.80	4.63	4.24	4.25	3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals		1	2	3	2	8	4	3.47	1387/1617	3.47	4.36	4.15	4.22	3.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	1	2	14	4.30	516/1555	4.30	4.29	4.00	4.03	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	3	8	2	3	3.06	1401/1543	3.06	4.16	4.06	4.14	3.06
 Was the grading system clearly explained 	1	0	1	0	2	1	16	4.55	424/1647	4.55	4.38	4.12	4.14	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled		0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	807/1668	4.85	4.56	4.67	4.68	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	1	7	8	4.11	840/1605	4.11	4.29	4.07	4.09	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	2	16	4.65	600/1514	4.65	4.57	4.39	4.46	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	2	17	4.75	880/1551	4.75	4.82	4.66	4.70	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	8	11	4.40	719/1503	4.40	4.49	4.24	4.28	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	3	12	4.20	958/1506	4.20	4.57	4.26	4.30	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	3	4	6	6	3.65	854/1311	3.65	3.65	3.85	3.97	3.65
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	4	4	4	1	1	2 36	1453/1490	2.36	4.24	4.05	4.11	2.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	2	2	3	3	4		1352/1502	3.36	4.42	4.26	4.28	3.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	4	5	2	2		1398/1489	3.00	4.52	4.29	4.35	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	13	0	0	0	0	1		****/1006	****	3.99	4.00	4.10	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	0	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	15						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	8	C	5	General	7	Under-grad	21	Non-major	18
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4	-			
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course Section: PHIL 346 0101

63

DEDUCTIVE SYSTEMS

WILSON, RICHARD

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 46

Fall 2006

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1304 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

				Frequencies		Instructor		Course	Dept	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	3	7	36	4.72	318/1669	4.72	4.48	4.23	4.28	4.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	35	4.67	345/1666	4.67	4.40	4.19	4.20	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	5	5	34	4.66	405/1421	4.66	4.63	4.24	4.25	4.66
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	35	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	****/1617	****	4.36	4.15	4.22	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	3	8	10	18	4.10	709/1555	4.10	4.29	4.00	4.03	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	39	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	****/1543	****	4.16	4.06	4.14	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	9	12	24	4.28	828/1647	4.28	4.38	4.12	4.14	4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	37	4.80	901/1668	4.80	4.56	4.67	4.68	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	5	11	23	4.46	423/1605	4.46	4.29	4.07	4.09	4.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	5	10	28	4.42	923/1514	4.42	4.57	4.39	4.46	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	1	41	4.84	677/1551	4.84	4.82	4.66	4.70	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	5	11	27	4.45	637/1503	4.45	4.49	4.24	4.28	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	5	7	31	4.47	693/1506	4.47	4.57	4.26	4.30	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	33	1	0	5	1	3	3.50	****/1311	****	3.65	3.85	3.97	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	3	0	3	5	12	4.00	849/1490	4.00	4.24	4.05	4.11	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	2	0	2	7	12	4.17	932/1502		4.42	4.26	4.28	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	1	1	4	4	13	4.17	966/1489		4.52	4.29	4.35	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	23	18	0	0	0	3	2		****/1006		3.99	4.00	4.10	****
midd wed														
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	45	Ο	1	Ω	Ω	Λ	Ω	1 00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****
1. Did lield experience conclidite to what you learned	-10	U	_	J	U	U	U	1.00	/ 56			7.44	4.43	

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GP	A	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	32	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	13	2.00-2.99	10	C	3	General	9	Under-grad	46	Non-major	37
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	12	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0	Hiccolves		responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	33				
				2	Λ						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Page 1305

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Course Section: PHIL 358 0101 Title BIOETHICS Instructor: DIXON, BEN Fall 2006 Enrollment: 32

Questionnaires:	22	Student Co	ourse	Evaluation	Questionnaire
-----------------	----	------------	-------	------------	---------------

I

?

0

0

					-						tructor	Course	-		Level			
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	1	6	4	11	4.14	1064/1669	4.14	4.48	4.23	4.28	4.14
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	4	7	11	4.32	801/1666	4.32	4.40	4.19	4.20	4.32
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	17	4.64	429/1421	4.64	4.63	4.24	4.25	4.64
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	12	0	0	5	1	4	3.90	1168/1617	3.90	4.36	4.15	4.22	3.90
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	2	16	4.50	340/1555	4.50	4.29	4.00	4.03	4.50
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	8	1	0	7	1	5	3.64	1205/1543	3.64	4.16	4.06	4.14	3.64
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	2	6	14	4.55	435/1647	4.55	4.38	4.12	4.14	4.55
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	8	14	4.64	1096/1668	4.64	4.56	4.67	4.68	4.64
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	4	0	0	0	6	10	2	3.78	1195/1605	3.78	4.29	4.07	4.09	3.78
		Lectur	•															
1 Were t	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	2	q	10	4.38	974/1514	4.38	4.57	4.39	4.46	4.38
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	880/1551		4.82	4.66	4.70	4.75
	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject . Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	2	7		4.48			4.49	4.24	4.28	4.48
		es contribute t		-	1	0	0	0	4	4		4.43	,		4.57	4.26	4.30	4.43
				our understanding	3		1	1	1	1					3.65	3.85		3.57
		Discus			_			_	_	_			400/4400					
				what you learned	-7	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	490/1490		4.24	4.05	4.11	4.47
				d to participate	7	-	0	0	Τ	3	11	4.67	486/1502		4.42	4.26	4.28	4.67
		_		d open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	Τ	14	4.93	,		4.52	4.29	4.35	4.93
4. Were s	special t	echniques succe	ssiul		8	12	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1006	****	3.99	4.00	4.10	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27 28-55						Red	quir	ed fo	or M	ajor	s	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	4
28-55 56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Gei	nera	1				8	Under-g	rad 2	22	Non-	-major	18
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	5	D 0								-	3				5	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				2	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enou	_f h
	D 0												respons				_	,
	P 0														-			

Other

8

Course Section: PHIL 358H 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County

Page 1306 JAN 18, 2007 Instructor: DIXON, BEN Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:

Grad.

0

3.50-4.00

Ρ

I

?

0

0

Questionnaires: 6

6

					1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1					Inst	ructor			t UMBC Level		Sect		
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did	vou gain n	ew insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.48	4.23	4.28	5.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	359/1666	4.67	4.40	4.19	4.20	4.67
		uestions reflec		_	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.63	4.24	4.25	5.00
	_	uations reflect			0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	496/1617	4.50	4.36	4.15	4.22	4.50
5. Did	assigned re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	128/1555	4.83	4.29	4.00	4.03	4.83
6. Did	written as:	signments contr	ibute 1	to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	298/1543	4.60	4.16	4.06	4.14	4.60
7. Was	the grading	g system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	481/1647	4.50	4.38	4.12	4.14	4.50
8. How	many times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1125/1668	4.60	4.56	4.67	4.68	4.60
9. How	would you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	139/1605	4.80	4.29	4.07	4.09	4.80
		Lectur	<u> </u>															
1. Were	the instr	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	308/1514	4.83	4.57	4.39	4.46	4.83		
	 Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 						0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.82	4.66	4.70	5.00
				explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	386/1503	4.67	4.49	4.24	4.28	4.67
		es contribute t		-	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.57	4.26	4.30	5.00
5. Did	audiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	your understanding	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1311	5.00	3.65	3.85	3.97	5.00
		Discus	gion															
1 Did	class disc			what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	389/1490	4.60	4.24	4.05	4.11	4.60
				ed to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	5		1/1502	5.00	4.42	4.26	4.28	5.00
				nd open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.52	4.29	4.35	5.00
		echniques succe		ia open arboabbien	1	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	759/1006		3.99	4.00	4.10	3.50
		Frequ		. Dia	- m i bı	.+ : 0.	-											
	riequ	lency	DIS	LIID	JC TOI	1												
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А б		Red	 quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	;	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0			-			-								
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	l				2	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	major	6
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														

Electives

Other

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Title PHIL AND PARAPSYCHOLOG

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful

Instructor: BRAUDE, STEPHEN

Enrollment: 31
Ouestionnaires: 19

LUDE, STEPHEN Fall 2006

Page 1307 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	:		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Gamana 1														
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	5	10	4.26	901/1669	4.26	4.48	4.23	4.28	4.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	Ω	9	4.37	740/1666	4.37	4.40	4.19	4.20	4.37
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	368/1421	4.68	4.63	4.24	4.25	4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	1	2	0	4		1029/1617	4.00	4.36	4.15	4.22	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	104/1555	4.89	4.29	4.00	4.03	4.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	1	2	2	2		1167/1543	3.71	4.16	4.06		3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	15	4.68	281/1647	4.68	4.38	4.12		4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	1030/1668	4.71	4.56	4.67	4.68	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	565/1605	4.35	4.29	4.07	4.09	4.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	663/1514	4.61	4.57	4.39	4.46	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.82	4.66	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	5	10	4.33	800/1503	4.33	4.49	4.24	4.28	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	471/1506	4.67	4.57	4.26	4.30	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	2	2	5	7	4.06	557/1311	4.06	3.65	3.85	3.97	4.06
Discussion	_	_	_	_		_								
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	3	1	1	9	4.14	778/1490	4.14	4.24	4.05	4.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	1	1	1	10	4.29	859/1502	4.29	4.42	4.26	4.28	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	478/1489	4.71	4.52	4.29	4.35	4.71
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.17	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.13	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	Ο	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.03	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 42		5.00	4.31		****
2. Dia bead, questions make cital the expected goal	10	-	-	-	-	-	_	5.00	, 12		5.00	1.51	1.13	

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

18 0 0 0 Frequency Distribution

0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 46 **** 5.00 4.45 4.13 ****

Credits E	its Earned Cum. GF		m. GPA Expected Gr			Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	7	Under-grad	19	Non-major	15
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0	EICCEIVCS		responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8	-		-	
				2	1						

Course Section: PHIL 394 0101 University of Maryland

PHILOSOPHY OF BIOLOGY

Title Instructor: EALICK, GREG E.

Enrollment: 27 Questionnaires: 13 Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1308 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

			Fr	eque	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	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	1	1	1	10	4.54	556/1669	4.54	4.48	4.23	4.28	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	5		1054/1666	4.08	4.40	4.19	4.20	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1421	****	4.63	4.24	4.25	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	465/1617	4.54	4.36	4.15	4.22	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	243/1555	4.64	4.29	4.00	4.03	4.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	534/1543	4.38	4.16	4.06	4.14	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	682/1647	4.38	4.38	4.12	4.14	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.56	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	725/1605	4.22	4.29	4.07	4.09	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	2	a	4.38	974/1514	4.38	4.57	4.39	4.46	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	677/1551	4.85	4.82	4.66	4.70	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	621/1503	4.46	4.49	4.24	4.28	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	534/1506	4.62	4.57	4.26	4.30	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	0	0	0	1	2		****/1311	****	3.65	3.85	3.97	****
Discussion	_			_	_		_							
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	709/1490	4.23	4.24	4.05	4.11	4.23
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	381/1502	4.77	4.42	4.26	4.28	4.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.52	4.29	4.35	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	11	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1006	****	3.99	4.00	4.10	***
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	n 11	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.13	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.86	4.38	4.53	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 97	****	4.86	4.36	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.22	4.47	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.92	4.20	4.45	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.61	3.95	4.15	****
Fre	quency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
	-													
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade	5			Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	

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

Course Section: PHIL 400 0110 INDEP STUDY IN PHIL Baltimore County

University of Maryland Page 1309 Title JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: THOMAS, JAMES (Instr. A)

Enrollment:	1	
Questionnaires:	1	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

General Did you gain new insights, skills from this course Did you gain new insights, skills from this course Did the instructor make clear the expected goals Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals Did on 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1666 4.75 4.40 4.19 4.22 5. Did dassigned readings contribute to what you learned Did on 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1617 4.67 4.36 4.15 4.22 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned Did what you learned Did what you learned Did would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness Did writer assignments contribute to what you learned Did would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness Did writer what you grade the overall teaching effectiveness Did would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness Did the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor's lectures will prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Did the instructor's lectures will prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Did the instructor's lectures will prepared Did the instructor's								Fr	_	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1669 5.00 4.48 4.23 4.39 5 1. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1664 4.75 4.40 4.19 4.22 5 1. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1421 5.00 4.63 4.24 4.38 5 1. Did cher evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1421 5.00 4.63 4.24 4.38 5 1. Did cher evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1451 5.07 4.63 4.24 4.38 5 1. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1555 4.75 4.29 4.00 4.08 5 1. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1555 4.75 4.29 4.00 4.08 5 1. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1669 4.75 4.38 4.12 4.14 5 1. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1669 4.75 4.56 4.38 4.12 4.14 5 1. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1669 4.75 4.59 4.67 4.70 5 1. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1669 4.75 4.29 4.07 4.16 5 1. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1669 4.75 4.29 4.07 4.16 5 1. Did the instructor's eam interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1551 4.67 4.82 4.66 4.73 4. Did the instructor's eam interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1551 4.67 4.82 4.66 4.73 4. Did the instructor's eam interested and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1551 4.67 4.82 4.66 4.73 4. Did the instructor seem interested and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1551 4.67 4.82 4.66 4.73 4. Did the instructor seem interested and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1551 4.67 4.82 4.66 4.73 4.80 4.80 4.80 4.80 4.80 4.80 4.80 4.80			Questions	\$		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1669 5.00 4.48 4.23 4.39 5 1. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1664 4.75 4.40 4.19 4.22 5 1. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1421 5.00 4.63 4.24 4.38 5 1. Did cher evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1421 5.00 4.63 4.24 4.38 5 1. Did cher evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1451 5.07 4.63 4.24 4.38 5 1. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1555 4.75 4.29 4.00 4.08 5 1. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1555 4.75 4.29 4.00 4.08 5 1. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1669 4.75 4.38 4.12 4.14 5 1. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1669 4.75 4.56 4.38 4.12 4.14 5 1. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1669 4.75 4.59 4.67 4.70 5 1. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1669 4.75 4.29 4.07 4.16 5 1. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1669 4.75 4.29 4.07 4.16 5 1. Did the instructor's eam interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1551 4.67 4.82 4.66 4.73 4. Did the instructor's eam interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1551 4.67 4.82 4.66 4.73 4. Did the instructor's eam interested and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1551 4.67 4.82 4.66 4.73 4. Did the instructor seem interested and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1551 4.67 4.82 4.66 4.73 4. Did the instructor seem interested and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1551 4.67 4.82 4.66 4.73 4.80 4.80 4.80 4.80 4.80 4.80 4.80 4.80			 General																
Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00	1. Did yo	u gain ne		=	this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.48	4.23	4.39	5.00
Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals						0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	4.75	4.40	4.19	4.22	5.00
Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1555 4.75 4.29 4.00 4.08 5	3. Did th	e exam qu	uestions reflect	the exp	ected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.63	4.24	4.38	5.00
Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4. Did ot	her evalı	uations reflect	the expe	cted goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1617	4.67	4.36	4.15	4.22	5.00
Mas the grading system clearly explained	5. Did as	signed re	eadings contribu	ite to wh	at you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1555	4.75	4.29	4.00	4.08	5.00
How many times was class cancelled	5. Did wr	itten ass	signments contri	bute to	what you learned	0	•	-	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1543	5.00	4.16	4.06	4.18	5.0
Lecture . Were the instructor's lectures well prepared . Did the instructor seem interested in the subject . Did the instructor seem interested in the subject . Did the instructor seem interested in the subject . Did the instructor seem interested in the subject . Did the instructor seem interested in the subject . Did the instructor seem interested in the subject . Did the instructor seem interested in the subject . Did class lecture material presented and explained clearly . Did the cletures contribute to what you learned . Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding . Discussion . Did class discussions contribute to what you learned . Did class discussions contribute to what you learned . Did class discussions contribute to what you learned . Were all students actively encouraged to participate . Were all students actively encouraged to participate . Were special techniques successful . Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned . Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned . Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned . Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned . Did study questions make clear the expected goal . Did study questions make clear the expected goal . Did study questions make clear the expected goal . Did study questions make clear the expected goal . Did study questions make clear the expected goal . Did study questions make clear the expected Grades Frequency Distribution Frequency Distribution Frequency Distribution Gradius . Did non-major . Were your contacts with the instructor helpful . Did general . Did non-major . Wajors . Did non-major . Did non-majo	7. Was th	e grading	g system clearly	explair	ied	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1647	4.50	4.38	4.12	4.14	5.00
Lecture . Were the instructor's lectures well prepared . Were the instructor's lectures well prepared . Did the instructor seem interested in the subject . Did the instructor seem interested in the subject . Did the instructor seem interested in the subject . Did the instructor seem interested and explained clearly . Did the lecture material presented and explained clearly . Did the lectures contribute to what you learned . Did the lectures contribute to what you learned . Did the lectures contribute to what you learned . Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding . Discussion . Discussion . Did class discussions contribute to what you learned . Did class discussions contribute to what you learned . Did class discussions contribute to what you learned . Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion . Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion . Were all students actively encouraged to participate . Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion . Were special techniques successful . Were special techniques successful . Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned . Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned . Did study questions make clear the expected goal . Did study questions make clear the expected goal . Did study questions make clear the expected goal . Did study questions make clear the expected Grades Frequency Distribution Trequency Distribution Trequen						-	-	-		-	-			1/1668	4.75		4.67	4.70	5.00
. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1514 5.00 4.57 4.39 4.45 5 . Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1513 5.00 4.78 4.82 4.66 4.73 4 . Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1503 5.00 4.49 4.24 4.27 5 . Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1503 5.00 4.57 4.26 4.29 5 . Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1503 5.00 4.57 4.26 4.29 5 . Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1503 5.00 4.57 4.26 4.29 5 . Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1503 5.00 4.57 4.26 4.29 5 . Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1409 4.75 4.24 4.05 4.26 5 . Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1502 4.67 4.42 4.26 4.46 5 . Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1502 4.67 4.42 4.26 4.46 5 . Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1505 5.00 3.99 4.00 4.21 5 . Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1006 5.00 3.99 4.00 4.21 5 . Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/150 5.00 5.00 4.34 5.00 5 . Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/150 5.00 5.00 4.35 5.00 5 . Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/150 5.00 5.00 4.35 5.00 5 . Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/150 5.00 5.00 4.35 5.00 5 . Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/150 5.00 5.00 4.35 5.00 5 . Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/150 5.00 5.00 4.35 5.00 5 . Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/150 5 5.00 5.00 4.35 5.00 5 . Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/150 5	9. How wo	uld you	grade the overal	l teachi	ng effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1605	4.67	4.29	4.07	4.16	5.00
1. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1551 4.67 4.82 4.66 4.73 4.1 2. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1503 5.00 4.49 4.24 4.27 5 3. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1506 5.00 4.57 4.26 4.29 5 3. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1506 5.00 4.57 4.26 4.29 5 3. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1311 5.00 3.65 3.85 3.88 5 3. Discussion Discussion Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1502 4.67 4.24 4.05 4.26 5 3. Did the instructor encouraged for participate 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1502 4.67 4.42 4.26 4.46 5 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1489 5.00 4.52 4.29 4.52 5 3. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1606 5.00 3.99 4.00 4.21 5 3. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1006 5.00 3.99 4.00 4.21 5 3. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 55 5.00 5.00 4.34 5.00 5 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 46 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 46 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5 3. Did self-paced System contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0																			
Nas lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1503 5.00 4.49 4.24 4.27 5.	1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures	well pr	epared	0	0	0	0	0	0			1/1514	5.00	4.57	4.39	4.45	5.00
Discussion Discussion Discussion Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Discussion Discussion Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learned Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion Self Paced Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion Did the instructor encourage fair and open d						0	0				0	1	5.00	1/1551	4.67	4.82	4.66	4.73	4.5
Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1311 5.00 3.65 3.85 3.88 5 Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1502 4.67 4.24 4.05 4.26 5 Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1502 4.67 4.42 4.26 4.46 5 Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1606 5.00 3.99 4.00 4.21 5 Self Paced Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1606 5.00 3.99 4.00 4.21 5 Self Paced Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 55 5.00 5.00 4.34 5.00 5 Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 46 5.00 5.00 4.35 4.92 5 Frequency Distribution Frequency Distribution Frequency Distribution Gradits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 B 1 Second Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 B 1 Second Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 B 1 Graduate 0 Major Second Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 Second Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-29 0 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 1 Non-major Belefitives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant						0								1/1503	5.00	4.49	4.24	4.27	5.0
Discussion Discussion Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1490 4.75 4.24 4.05 4.26 5 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1502 4.67 4.42 4.26 4.46 5 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1489 5.00 4.52 4.29 4.52 5 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1006 5.00 3.99 4.00 4.21 5 Self Paced Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1006 5.00 3.99 4.00 4.21 5 Did study questions make clear the expected goal 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 55 5.00 5.00 4.34 5.00 5 Did study questions make clear the expected goal 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 42 5.00 5.00 4.31 5.00 5 Did study questions make clear the expected goal 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 42 5.00 5.00 4.31 5.00 5 Did study questions make clear the expected goal 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 46 5.00 5.00 4.35 4.92 5 Did study questions make clear the expected goal 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 46 5.00 5.00 4.35 4.92 5 Did study questions make clear the expected goal 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 46 5.00 5.00 4.35 5.00 5 Did study questions make clear the expected goal 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 46 5.00 5.00 4.35 5.00 5 Did study questions make clear the expected goal 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 46 5.00 5.00 4.35 5.00 5 Did study questions make clear the expected goal 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 46 5.00 5.00 4.35 5.00 5 Did study questions make clear the expected goal 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0						-	-	-			0			1/1506	5.00				5.0
Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1490 4.75 4.24 4.05 4.26 5 1. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1502 4.67 4.42 4.05 4.26 4.46 5 1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1489 5.00 4.52 4.29 4.52 5 1. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1006 5.00 3.99 4.00 4.21 5 1. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1006 5.00 3.99 4.00 4.21 5 1. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1006 5.00 3.99 4.00 4.21 5 1. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1006 5.00 3.99 4.00 4.21 5 1. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1006 5.00 3.99 4.00 4.21 5 1. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1006 5.00 3.99 4.00 4.21 5 1. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1006 5.00 3.99 4.00 4.21 5 1. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1006 5.00 3.99 4.00 4.21 5 1. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1006 5.00 3.00 4.31 5.00 5 1. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1006 5.00 3.00 4.31 5.00 5 1. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1006 5.00 3.00 4.31 5.00 5 1. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1006 5.00 3.00 4.31 5.00 5 1. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques enh	ance you	r understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1311	5.00	3.65	3.85	3.88	5.00
Were all students actively encouraged to participate																			
Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1489 5.00 4.52 4.29 4.52 5 1.00 1/1006 5.00 3.99 4.00 4.21 5 1.00 5.00 1/1006 5.00 3.99 4.00 4.21 5 5.00 5.00 5.00 4.34 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 4.34 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00					-	0	0				0			1/1490	4.75		4.05	4.26	5.00
Self Paced Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1006 5.00 3.99 4.00 4.21 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/55 5.00 3.99 4.00 4.21 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0							-	-	-		-			,					5.0
Self Paced Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 55 5.00 5.00 4.34 5.00 5.00 4.34 5.00 5.00 4.34 5.00 5.00 4.34 5.00 5.00 4.34 5.00 5.00 4.34 5.00 5.00 4.34 5.00 5.00 4.34 5.00 5.00 4.34 5.00 5.00 4.34 5.00 5.00 4.34 5.00 5.00 4.34 5.00 5.00 4.34 5.00 5.00 4.34 5.00 5.00 4.34 5.00 5.00 4.34 5.00 5.00 4.34 5.00 5.00 4.34 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5.00 5.0					open discussion														5.00
Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 55 5.00 5.00 4.34 5.00 5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 42 5.00 5.00 4.31 5.00 5. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 46 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.92 5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 46 5.00 5.00 4.31 5.00 5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 46 5.00 5.00 4.31 5.00 5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 46 5.00 5.00 4.31 5.00 5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 46 5.00 5.00 4.31 5.00 5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 46 5.00 5.00 4.31 5.00 5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 46 5.00 5.00 4.31 5.00 5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 42 5.00 5.00 4.31 5.00 5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 46 5.00 5.00 4.31 5.00 5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succes	sful		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1006	5.00	3.99	4.00	4.21	5.00
### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant Did study questions make clear the expected goal 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/42 5.00 5.00 4.31 5.00 5																			
Frequency Distribution Tredits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 0 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 1 Non-major 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant 1 0 Other 1						0	-	-			-			,					5.00
Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 0 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 1 Non-major 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant																		5.00	5.0
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	3. Were y	our conta	acts with the in	structor	helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 46	5.00	5.00	4.45	4.92	5.00
00-27					Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
28-55	Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	}
28-55	00-27	0	0.00-0.99		 А О		Red	auir	ed f	or Ma	ior		0	Graduat	 e	0	Maic	 r	0
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 1 Non-major 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant 1		-		-			1.0.	2411	- La I	O 1710	. ,	_	•	Siddudi	_	•	11000	-	3
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 1		-		-			Gei	nera	1				0	Under-a	rad	1	Non-	-maior	1
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 1		-		-			001	LLLU	-				•	JIIGGI 9		_	1,011		_
P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 1		-					E] e	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means +	here a	re not	enous	rh
I 0 Other 1		-											-					_	
					I 0		Ot1	her					1			3			
? 0					? 0														

Course Section: PHIL 400 0110 University of Maryland Page 1310 Title INDEP STUDY IN PHIL Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007

Title INDEP STUDY IN PHIL
Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 1

Questionnaires: 1

Fall 2006
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	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	1/1669	5.00	4.48	4.23	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	4.75	4.40	4.19	4.22	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.63	4.24	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1617	4.67	4.36	4.15	4.22	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1555	4.75	4.29	4.00	4.08	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1543	5.00	4.16	4.06	4.18	5.00
 Was the grading system clearly explained 	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1647	4.50	4.38	4.12	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1668	4.75	4.56	4.67	4.70	5.00
Lecture														
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1404/1551	4.67	4.82	4.66	4.73	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1490	4.75	4.24	4.05	4.26	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1502	4.67	4.42	4.26	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.52	4.29	4.52	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1006	5.00	3.99	4.00	4.21	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 55	5.00	5.00	4.34	5.00	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 42	5.00	5.00	4.31	5.00	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 46	5.00	5.00	4.45	4.92	5.00

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

Course Section: PHIL 400 0301 University of Maryland Title INDEP STUDY IN PHIL Baltimore County Instructor: YALOWITZ, STEVE Fall 2006

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 1

1

University of Maryland Page 1311
Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007
Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

			Fr	eque	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	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	1/1669	5.00	4.48	4.23	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	4.75	4.40	4.19	4.22	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.63	4.24	4.38	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	773/1555	4.75	4.29	4.00	4.08	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1043/1647	4.50	4.38	4.12	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1530/1668	4.75	4.56	4.67	4.70	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1605	4.67	4.29	4.07	4.16	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.57	4.39	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1551		4.82	4.66	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.49	4.24	4.27	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.57	4.26	4.29	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	849/1490	4.75	4.24	4.05	4.26	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	0		1013/1502		4.42	4.26	4.46	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489		4.52		4.52	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	٥	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 112	5.00	4.86	4.38	4.74	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 97		4.86	4.36	4.69	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	46/ 98		4.61		3.86	
Freq	iency	. Die	trib	utio	า									
. redr	aciicy	יבוט	CIID	ac101	.1									
Credits Farned Cum CDA Evnested Grades				Do.	aconc				Тъг	na			Majore	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	1	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	1	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	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				2	Λ						

Course Section:	PHIL 400 1101	University of	f Maryland	Page 1312
Title	INDEP STUDY IN PHIL	Baltimore	County	JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:	DIXON, BEN	Fall	2006	Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 1 Questionnaires: 1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncie	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	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	1/1669	5.00	4.48	4.23	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1094/1666	4.75	4.40	4.19	4.22	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1029/1617	4.67	4.36	4.15	4.22	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1555	4.75	4.29	4.00	4.08	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1543	5.00	4.16	4.06	4.18	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1043/1647	4.50	4.38	4.12	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1668	4.75	4.56	4.67	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	918/1605	4.67	4.29	4.07	4.16	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1490	4.75	4.24	4.05	4.26	5.00
To a second		- -	2 1		_									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	•	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				2	٥						

Ti	tle HO	ONORS INDEP STUDY-PHI	Baltimore County	JAN 18, 2007
Co	urse Section: PI	HIL 405 0401	University of Maryland	Page 1313

Instructor: BRAUDE, STEPHEN Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	1	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	ž
-----------------	---	-----------------------------------------	---

Enrollment:

1

		Frequencies				Instr	uctor	Course Dept		UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions		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	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.48	4.23	4.39	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.56	4.67	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1605	5.00	4.29	4.07	4.16	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 55	5.00	5.00	4.34	5.00	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 46	5.00	5.00	4.45	4.92	5.00

Credits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors					
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1		
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	1	#### - Means there are not enough					
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant			
				I	1	Other	0						
				2	0								

Course Section: PHIL 452 0101 University of Maryland ADV TOPICS IN ETHICS

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Instructor: DWYER, SUSAN Enrollment: 14

Ouestionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 1314

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 7 4.78 244/1669 4.78 4.48 4.23 4.39 4.78 0 0 0 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 1 2 6 4.56 494/1666 4.56 4.40 4.19 4.22 4.56 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 5 0 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 1/1421 5.00 4.63 4.24 4.38 5.00 0 0 0 4 5.00 0 0 2 6 4.75 219/1617 4.75 4.36 4.15 4.22 4.75 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 4 5 4.56 301/1555 4.56 4.29 4.00 4.08 4.56 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned $1 \quad 0 \quad 0$ 0 0 2 6 4.75 180/1543 4.75 4.16 4.06 4.18 4.75 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 1 3 5 4.44 583/1647 4.44 4.38 4.12 4.14 4.44 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 4 5 4.56 1157/1668 4.56 4.56 4.67 4.70 4.56 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 194/1605 4.71 4.29 4.07 4.16 4.71 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 Ω Ω 0 1 8 4.89 223/1514 4.89 4.57 4.39 4.45 4.89 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 9 5.00 1/1551 5.00 4.82 4.66 4.73 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 5 4 4.44 653/1503 4.44 4.49 4.24 4.27 4.44 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 188/1506 4.89 4.57 4.26 4.29 4.89 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 5 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 ****/1311 **** 3.65 3.85 3.88 **** Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. 0 0 6 4.86 177/1490 4.86 4.24 4.05 4.26 4.86

0 0

7 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 0 0 0 0 1/1502 5.00 4.42 4.26 4.46 5.00 2 0 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1489 5.00 4.52 4.29 4.52 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 2 5 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/1006 **** 3.99 4.00 4.21 ****

Seminar

1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2 0 0 0 5 4.57 58/ 112 4.57 4.86 4.38 4.74 4.57 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 2 0 0 Ω 0 3 4 4.57 47/ 97 4.57 4.86 4.36 4.69 4.57 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 2 0 6 4.86 32/ 92 4.86 4.93 4.22 4.48 4.86 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 2 1 32/ 105 4.83 4.92 4.20 4.27 4.83 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 1 2 0 0 1 5 4.83 25/ 98 4.83 4.61 3.95 3.86 4.83

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

Course Section: PHIL 470 0101 University of Maryl Title PHILOSOPHY OF MIND Baltimore County Instructor: YALOWITZ, STEVE Fall 2006

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 17

21

University of Maryland Page 1315
Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007
Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

7+11don+	00117000	Erroluntion	Ouestionnaire
 student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestronnarie

							Frequencies					Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera																
1 Did voi	1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course						0	0	2	6	9	4.41	719/1669	4 41	4.48	4.23	4.39	4.41
-	_	tor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	676/1666		4.40	4.19	4.22	4.41
		estions reflec			1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	441/1421	4.63	4.63	4.24	4.38	4.63
	_	ations reflect		_	0	4	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	554/1617		4.36	4.15	4.22	4.46
				hat you learned	0	0	1	0	2	5	Ω	4.12	, -		4.29	4.13	4.08	4.12
				what you learned what you learned		3	0	3	4	3	4		1236/1543		4.16	4.06	4.18	3.57
		system clearl			. 0	0	0	0	2	6	_	4.41			4.38	4.12	4.14	4.41
		was class canc		illed	0	1	0	0	1	13	2		1498/1668		4.56	4.67	4.70	4.06
				ning effectiveness	_	2	0	0	2	7	5		737/1605		4.29	4.07	4.16	4.21
9. 110W WOO	ara you gi	rade the overa	II ceaci	ing effectiveness	, т	2	U	U	2	,	5	7.21	737/1003	7.21	4.29	4.07	4.10	7.21
		Lectur																
		ctor's lecture	_	-	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	522/1514			4.39	4.45	4.71
		tor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	358/1551	4.94	4.82	4.66	4.73	4.94
				plained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	879/1503	4.25	4.49	4.24	4.27	4.25
		s contribute t	_		1	1	0	0	2	4	9	4.47			4.57	4.26	4.29	4.47
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques en	hance yo	our understanding	1	15	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1311	***	3.65	3.85	3.88	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discus	ssions contrib	ute to v	hat you learned	5	0	0	2	4	3	3	3.58	1124/1490	3.58	4.24	4.05	4.26	3.58
2. Were al	ll student	s actively en	courageo	l to participate	5	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	632/1502	4.50	4.42	4.26	4.46	4.50
3. Did the	e instruct	or encourage	fair and	l open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	532/1489	4.67	4.52	4.29	4.52	4.67
		Semina	_															
1 Word as	raianod ta			announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 112	****	4.86	4.38	4.74	****
				vidual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 97	****	4.86	4.36	4.74	****
		ns contribute			16	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 105		4.92	4.20		****
4. Did pre	esentation	is contribute	to Wilat	you rearned	10	U	U	U	U	1	U	4.00	/ 105		4.92	4.20	4.27	
				Freq	uency	Dis	trib	utior	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	;			Rea	ason	s			Tvi	Type		Majors		.
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Re	quire	ed fo	or M	ajor	s	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 7		_							1		_			_
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C 2		Ge	nera:	L				4	Under-g	rad 1	.7	Non-	-major	6
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D 0								0			,			,
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		EI	ectiv	ves				0	<pre>#### - Means there are not e responses to be significant</pre>				_	ın
				- 0		0+	h				-	2					iL	
	I 0 Other							1	.2									

1

Course Section: PHIL 472 0101 University of Maryland Title ADV TOP: PHIL OF SCIENC Baltimore County

Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1316

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: EALICK, GREG E.

Enrollment: 9
Ouestionnaires: 5

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1669 5.00 4.48 4.23 4.39 5.00 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1669 5.00 4.48 4.23 4.39 5.00 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 181/1666 4.80 4.40 4.19 4.22 4.80 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 3 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1421 5.00 4.63 4.24 4.38 5.00 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1617 5.00 4.36 4.15 4.22 5.00 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 1 3 4.40 438/1555 4.40 4.29 4.00 4.08 4.40 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 180/1543 4.75 4.16 4.06 4.18 4.757. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 167/1647 4.80 4.38 4.12 4.14 4.80 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1668 5.00 4.56 4.67 4.70 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 1 0 0 1 3 4.00 918/1605 4.00 4.29 4.07 4.16 4.00Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1514 5.00 4.57 4.39 4.45 5.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 788/1551 4.80 4.82 4.66 4.73 4.80 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1503 5.00 4.49 4.24 4.27 5.00 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 286/1506 4.80 4.57 4.26 4.29 4.80 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 4 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/1311 **** 3.65 3.88 **** Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 4.40 558/1490 4.40 4.24 4.05 4.26 4.40 0 1 4 4.80 336/1502 4.80 4.42 4.26 4.46 4.80 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1489 5.00 4.52 4.29 4.52 5.00 0 4 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1006 **** 3.99 4.00 4.21 **** 4. Were special techniques successful Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme $$ 3 $$ 0 $$ 0 0 0 2 5.00 $$ 1/112 5.00 4.86 4.38 4.74 5.00 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/ 97 5.00 4.86 4.36 4.69 5.00 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/ 92 5.00 4.93 4.22 4.48 5.00 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/105 5.00 4.92 4.20 4.27 5.00 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 3 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/ 98 5.00 4.61 3.95 3.86 5.00 Frequency Distribution Cum. GPA Expected Grades Credits Earned Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 4 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 C 0 General 56-83 2 2.00-2.99 1 0 Under-grad 5 Non-major 1 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 D 0 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant

Other

Ι 0

? 1