```
Course-Section: PHIL 100  0101                    University of Maryland                              Page 1150
Title       INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY                      Baltimore County                                  JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  EALICK, GREG E.                           Spring 2007                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     44
```
```
Questionnaires:  28                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	8	18	4.57	525/1522	4.35	4.31	4.30	4.14	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	6	19	4.50	545/1522	4.26	4.32	4.26	4.18	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	5	21	4.57	456/1285	4.56	4.54	4.30	4.22	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	2	8	14	4.50	473/1476	4.45	4.46	4.22	4.09	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	4	5	5	12	3.75	1013/1412	3.98	4.23	4.06	4.01	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	4	8	11	4.08	763/1381	4.04	4.20	4.08	3.93	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	10	14	4.32	710/1500	4.41	4.37	4.18	4.16	4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	195/1517	4.63	4.30	4.65	4.62	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	11	15	4.46	433/1497	4.29	4.25	4.11	4.02	4.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	5	21	4.64	630/1440	4.58	4.58	4.45	4.40	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1448	4.87	4.84	4.71	4.63	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	9	15	4.37	751/1436	4.36	4.47	4.29	4.24	4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	3	23	4.64	478/1432	4.63	4.52	4.29	4.23	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	22	2	0	1	2	1	3.00	****/1221	3.35	3.67	3.93	3.86	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	468/1280	4.38	4.05	4.10	3.92	4.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	908/1277	4.41	4.43	4.34	4.13	4.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	555/1269	4.66	4.49	4.31	4.04	4.55
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	3.00	4.35	4.33	****

```
                                    Frequency Distribution
```

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	7	C	2	General	4	Under-grad	28	Non-major	28
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: PHIL 100  0201            University of Maryland                              Page 1151
Title      INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY             Baltimore County                                 JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:   HITZ, ZENA                   Spring 2007                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    32
Questionnaires:  22                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                      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  2  5  3  4  8  3.50 1402/1522  4.35  4.31  4.30  4.14  3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  2  2  3 12  3  3.55 1348/1522  4.26  4.32  4.26  4.18  3.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  1  1  2  7 11  4.18  817/1285  4.56  4.54  4.30  4.22  4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   2  0  1  3  7  9  4.20  860/1476  4.45  4.46  4.22  4.09  4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  2  4  6 10  4.09  703/1412  3.98  4.23  4.06  4.01  4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 2 2 2 13 3  3.59 1132/1381  4.04  4.20  4.08  3.93  3.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  1  1  1  6 13  4.32  720/1500  4.41  4.37  4.18  4.16  4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   1  0  0  0  7 14  4.67  932/1517  4.63  4.30  4.65  4.62  4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 1 10 8 1  3.45 1301/1497  4.29  4.25  4.11  4.02  3.45

             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       2   0  0  2  3  6  9  4.10 1148/1440  4.58  4.58  4.45  4.40  4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  2   0  0  0  0  4 16  4.80  765/1448  4.87  4.84  4.71  4.63  4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0  1  0  5  7  7  3.95 1107/1436  4.36  4.47  4.29  4.24  3.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    2   0  2  1  0  8  9  4.05 1013/1432  4.63  4.52  4.29  4.23  4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 18 0 1 0 1 0  3.00 ****/1221  3.35  3.67  3.93  3.86  ****

             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0  0  2  1  6  4  3.92  803/1280  4.38  4.05  4.10  3.92  3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0  0  1  1  5  6  4.23  819/1277  4.41  4.43  4.34  4.13  4.23
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 1 3 9  4.62  501/1269  4.66  4.49  4.31  4.04  4.62
4. Were special techniques successful                 9   5  3  1  2  2  0  2.38  844/ 854  3.39  3.86  4.02  3.87  2.38


                                      Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                 Type              Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    7      0.00-0.99    0      A   12      Required for Majors  12     Graduate      0      Major        0
  28-55    3      1.00-1.99    0      B    9
  56-83    4      2.00-2.99    6      C    1      General               9     Under-grad   22      Non-major   22
  84-150   2      3.00-3.49    3      D    0
  Grad.    0      3.50-4.00    5      F    0      Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                      I    0      Other                 3
                                      ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PHIL 100  0301                University of Maryland                              Page 1152
Title        INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY              Baltimore County                                   JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  THOMAS, JAMES                    Spring 2007                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      44
Questionnaires: 39                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	4	34	4.79	260/1522	4.35	4.31	4.30	4.14	4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	33	4.82	186/1522	4.26	4.32	4.26	4.18	4.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	37	4.92	120/1285	4.56	4.54	4.30	4.22	4.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	8	29	4.78	197/1476	4.45	4.46	4.22	4.09	4.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	4	0	2	9	20	4.17	638/1412	3.98	4.23	4.06	4.01	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	4	8	25	4.57	280/1381	4.04	4.20	4.08	3.93	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	6	30	4.67	312/1500	4.41	4.37	4.18	4.16	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	34	5	4.13	1343/1517	4.63	4.30	4.65	4.62	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	0	2	29	4.94	73/1497	4.29	4.25	4.11	4.02	4.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	5.00	1/1440	4.58	4.58	4.45	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	37	4.95	296/1448	4.87	4.84	4.71	4.63	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	35	4.90	132/1436	4.36	4.47	4.29	4.24	4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	35	4.90	174/1432	4.63	4.52	4.29	4.23	4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	27	2	2	2	0	5	3.36	971/1221	3.35	3.67	3.93	3.86	3.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	69/1280	4.38	4.05	4.10	3.92	4.96
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	2	0	21	4.83	299/1277	4.41	4.43	4.34	4.13	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	112/1269	4.66	4.49	4.31	4.04	4.96
4. Were special techniques successful	17	12	1	0	0	2	7	4.40	252/ 854	3.39	3.86	4.02	3.87	4.40
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 228	****	3.00	4.35	4.33	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	37	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.00	4.58	4.13	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	37	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.50	4.52	4.03	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	37	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.00	4.49	3.85	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	37	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.00	4.45	3.88	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	37	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.00	4.11	3.79	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	3.90	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	3.99	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.31	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.11	****

Enrollment: 44
Questionnaires: 39   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	24	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	8	C	0	General	12	Under-grad	39	Non-major	39
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: PHIL 100  0401              University of Maryland                              Page 1153
Title      INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY                 Baltimore County                                 JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:   EALICK, GREG E.                    Spring 2007                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    44
Questionnaires: 33                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                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  4 13 16  4.36  779/1522  4.35  4.31  4.30  4.14  4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  1  7 15 10  4.03 1064/1522  4.26  4.32  4.26  4.18  4.03
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  1  0  1  2  7 22  4.56  467/1285  4.56  4.54  4.30  4.22  4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  3  0  1  4 11 14  4.27  781/1476  4.45  4.46  4.22  4.09  4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  1  3  1 12 16  4.18  629/1412  3.98  4.23  4.06  4.01  4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3 0 2 8 15  5  3.77 1040/1381  4.04  4.20  4.08  3.93  3.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0  0  0  4  6  9 14  4.00  988/1500  4.41  4.37  4.18  4.16  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0  0  0  0  0  0 33  5.00    1/1517  4.63  4.30  4.65  4.62  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 0 0  4 14  9  4.19  731/1497  4.29  4.25  4.11  4.02  4.19

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0  0  0  0  5 10 18  4.39  938/1440  4.58  4.58  4.45  4.40  4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0  0  0  0  0  2 31  4.94  346/1448  4.87  4.84  4.71  4.63  4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  1  3 16 13  4.24  886/1436  4.36  4.47  4.29  4.24  4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0  0  0  0  1  5 27  4.79  316/1432  4.63  4.52  4.29  4.23  4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 28 1 0  2  1  1  3.20 ****/1221  3.35  3.67  3.93  3.86  ****

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 17  0  1  1  2  3  9  4.13  670/1280  4.38  4.05  4.10  3.92  4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17  0  1  1  1  4  9  4.19  855/1277  4.41  4.43  4.34  4.13  4.19
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 17 0 0 1  2  3 10  4.38  692/1269  4.66  4.49  4.31  4.04  4.38
4. Were special techniques successful                   17 15  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 854  3.39  3.86  4.02  3.87  ****
```

```
                                   Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons                Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    2       0.00-0.99   0      A   13        Required for Majors  22      Graduate     0       Major       0
  28-55    7       1.00-1.99   0      B   15
  56-83    4       2.00-2.99   5      C    0        General               8      Under-grad  33       Non-major  33
  84-150   3       3.00-3.49  10      D    0
  Grad.    0       3.50-4.00   3      F    0        Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                      I    0        Other                 2
                                      ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: PHIL 100  0501              University of Maryland                              Page 1154
Title      INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY               Baltimore County                                  JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  THOMAS, JAMES                      Spring 2007                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    52
Questionnaires:  34                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                         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  1  6 27  4.76  305/1522  4.35  4.31  4.30  4.14  4.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  7 27  4.79  211/1522  4.26  4.32  4.26  4.18  4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  2 32  4.94   90/1285  4.56  4.54  4.30  4.22  4.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   2  0  0  0  8 24  4.75  226/1476  4.45  4.46  4.22  4.09  4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  8  3  1  2  5 14  4.04  734/1412  3.98  4.23  4.06  4.01  4.04
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 3 10 20  4.52  322/1381  4.04  4.20  4.08  3.93  4.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   1  0  1  2  6 23  4.59  396/1500  4.41  4.37  4.18  4.16  4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0 32  1  4.03 1378/1517  4.63  4.30  4.65  4.62  4.03
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0  2 27  4.93   73/1497  4.29  4.25  4.11  4.02  4.93

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0  0  0  1  4 27  4.81  336/1440  4.58  4.58  4.45  4.40  4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0  0  0  0  3 29  4.91  494/1448  4.87  4.84  4.71  4.63  4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0  0  0  1  5 25  4.77  263/1436  4.36  4.47  4.29  4.24  4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0  0  0  1  2 29  4.88  200/1432  4.63  4.52  4.29  4.23  4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 26 1 0 0  0  3  4.00 ****/1221  3.35  3.67  3.93  3.86  ****

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0 0 0 0  2 14  4.88  151/1280  4.38  4.05  4.10  3.92  4.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18 0 0 0 0  1 15  4.94  159/1277  4.41  4.43  4.34  4.13  4.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18 0 0 0 0 2 14  4.88  255/1269  4.66  4.49  4.31  4.04  4.88
4. Were special techniques successful                  18  10  0  1  0  0  5  4.50 ****/ 854  3.39  3.86  4.02  3.87  ****
```

```
                                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                  Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     1       0.00-0.99    1         A   21        Required for Majors  15     Graduate      0       Major       0
 28-55     3       1.00-1.99    0         B    8
 56-83     0       2.00-2.99    4         C    1        General              11     Under-grad   34       Non-major  34
 84-150   14       3.00-3.49    6         D    0
 Grad.     0       3.50-4.00    7         F    0        Electives             3     #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                          I    0        Other                 1
                                          ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PHIL 100  0601            University of Maryland                          Page 1155
Title       INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY           Baltimore County                               JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  YALOWITZ, STEVE              Spring 2007                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     32
Questionnaires: 21                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                               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  1  6  4  10  4.10 1060/1522  4.35  4.31  4.30  4.14  4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0  0  8  8   5  3.86 1217/1522  4.26  4.32  4.26  4.18  3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   0  1  4  6  10  4.19  809/1285  4.56  4.54  4.30  4.22  4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   1   0  1  3  7   9  4.20  860/1476  4.45  4.46  4.22  4.09  4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   1  1  7  7   5  3.67 1077/1412  3.98  4.23  4.06  4.01  3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1   0  2  6  6   5  3.74 1058/1381  4.04  4.20  4.08  3.93  3.74
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0  1  0  6  14  4.57  415/1500  4.41  4.37  4.18  4.16  4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0  0  0  0  21  5.00    1/1517  4.63  4.30  4.65  4.62  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 1  0  0  8  8   4  3.80 1113/1497  4.29  4.25  4.11  4.02  3.80

          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0  1  1  5  14  4.52  774/1440  4.58  4.58  4.45  4.40  4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   0  1  2  1  17  4.62 1060/1448  4.87  4.84  4.71  4.63  4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   1  0  5  8   7  3.95 1107/1436  4.36  4.47  4.29  4.24  3.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   1   0  0  3  4  13  4.50  632/1432  4.63  4.52  4.29  4.23  4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  15  1  0  2  2   1  3.33  983/1221  3.35  3.67  3.93  3.86  3.33

          Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9   0   1  0  3  2   6  4.00  718/1280  4.38  4.05  4.10  3.92  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9   0   0  1  3  1   7  4.17  867/1277  4.41  4.43  4.34  4.13  4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9  0   0  0  1  3   8  4.58  524/1269  4.66  4.49  4.31  4.04  4.58
4. Were special techniques successful                   9  10   0  0  0  1   1  4.50 ****/ 854  3.39  3.86  4.02  3.87  ****

          Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  20   0   0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.36  4.31  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 20 0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/ 228  ****  3.00  4.35  4.33  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 20 0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/ 217  ****  ****  4.51  4.51  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           20   0   0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/ 216  ****  ****  4.42  4.41  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 20   0   0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/ 205  ****  ****  4.23  4.28  ****

          Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 20  0   0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  79  ****  4.00  4.58  4.13  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 20 0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  77  ****  3.50  4.52  4.03  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 20  0   0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  65  ****  4.00  4.49  3.85  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    20   0   0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  78  ****  4.00  4.45  3.88  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                20   0   0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  80  ****  4.00  4.11  3.79  ****

          Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 20   0   0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  47  ****  ****  4.41  3.90  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 20   0   0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  45  ****  ****  4.30  3.90  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       20   0   0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.40  3.99  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   20   0   0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.31  4.00  ****

5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 20   0   0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  34  ****  ****  4.30  4.11  ****

          Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 20  0   0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.63  4.53  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    20   0   0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  23  ****  ****  4.41  4.19  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      20   0   0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  33  ****  ****  4.69  4.57  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       20   0   0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  22  ****  ****  4.54  4.31  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     20   0   0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  18  ****  ****  4.49  4.11  ****
```

Course-Section: PHIL 100 0601　　　　　　　　University of Maryland
Title　　　　　INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY　　　　　　Baltimore County
Instructor:　YALOWITZ, STEVE　　　　　　　　Spring 2007
Enrollment:　　32
Questionnaires: 21　　　　　　　Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

　　　　　　　　　　　　　　Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

```
                                                  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  2  0  1  3  5  3.82 1264/1522  3.98  4.31  4.30 4.14  3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals      0   0  0  2  1  5  3  3.82 1238/1522  4.08  4.32  4.26 4.18  3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  1  3  7  4.55  488/1285  4.34  4.54  4.30 4.22  4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0   0  0  1  1  5  4  4.09  703/1412  4.08  4.23  4.06 4.01  4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  10  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1381  ****  4.20  4.08 3.93  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained              0   0  0  1  0  1  9  4.64  349/1500  4.55  4.37  4.18 4.16  4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled                    0   0  0  0  1  9  1  4.00 1389/1517  3.73  4.30  4.65 4.62  4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0  0  0  2  3  3  3  3.64 1221/1497  3.63  4.25  4.11 4.02  3.64


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared          0   0  1  0  0  2  8  4.45  864/1440  4.33  4.58  4.45 4.40  4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject     0   0  0  1  1  2  7  4.36 1258/1448  4.61  4.84  4.71 4.63  4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  0   0  1  0  3  3  4  3.82 1193/1436  3.95  4.47  4.29 4.24  3.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned       0   0  2  2  1  1  5  3.45 1287/1432  3.48  4.52  4.29 4.23  3.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0   6  1  0  1  2  1  3.40  956/1221  3.56  3.67  3.93 3.86  3.40


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  5   0  2  1  2  1  0  2.33 1267/1280  2.73  4.05  4.10 3.92  2.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  5   0  1  0  3  2  0  3.00 1214/1277  3.00  4.43  4.34 4.13  3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5   0  1  1  2  0  2  3.17 1194/1269  2.77  4.49  4.31 4.04  3.17
```

                                       Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PHIL 146  0201            University of Maryland                           Page 1157
Title        CRITICAL THINKING            Baltimore County                                JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  TEMPLETON, ROYE              Spring 2007                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     31
Questionnaires: 15                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        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  2  1  0  2 10  4.13 1022/1522  3.98  4.31  4.30  4.14  4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  1  3  1 10  4.33  787/1522  4.08  4.32  4.26  4.18  4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  2  2  3  8  4.13  857/1285  4.34  4.54  4.30  4.22  4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  13  1  0  0  0  1  3.00 ****/1476  ****  4.46  4.22  4.09  ****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  1  4  3  7  4.07  722/1412  4.08  4.23  4.06  4.01  4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 12 1 0  0  1  1  3.33 ****/1381  ****  4.20  4.08  3.93  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  2  0  2 11  4.47  541/1500  4.55  4.37  4.18  4.16  4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  1  0  5  9  0  3.47 1493/1517  3.73  4.30  4.65  4.62  3.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 3 0  1  4  5  3.62 1233/1497  3.63  4.25  4.11  4.02  3.62


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  2  0  0  3  9  4.21 1079/1440  4.33  4.58  4.45  4.40  4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  0  0  0  2 12  4.86  629/1448  4.61  4.84  4.71  4.63  4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0  1  2  0  2  8  4.08 1018/1436  3.95  4.47  4.29  4.24  4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0  3  2  1  1  7  3.50 1270/1432  3.48  4.52  4.29  4.23  3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  8  1  1  1  0  4  3.71  808/1221  3.56  3.67  3.93  3.86  3.71


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7   0  1  2  2  1  2  3.13 1172/1280  2.73  4.05  4.10  3.92  3.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7   0  2  1  2  1  2  3.00 1214/1277  3.00  4.43  4.34  4.13  3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7  0  4  0  2  1  1  2.38 1256/1269  2.77  4.49  4.31  4.04  2.38


                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PHIL 150  0101            University of Maryland                                  Page 1158
Title       CONTEMPORARY MORAL ISS          Baltimore County                                   JUN 26, 2007
Instructor: DWYER, SUSAN                      Spring 2007                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    36
Questionnaires: 31                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                    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  2  0  0  1  6  8 14  4.21  949/1522  4.31  4.31  4.30  4.14  4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   2  0  0  3  5  6 15  4.14  996/1522  4.32  4.32  4.26  4.18  4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  2  0  1  1  5  7 15  4.17  825/1285  4.31  4.54  4.30  4.22  4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   2  0  0  3  6  2 18  4.21  850/1476  4.18  4.46  4.22  4.09  4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3  0  0  2  5 12  9  4.00  760/1412  3.95  4.23  4.06  4.01  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 0 1 0 7 10 10 4.00 806/1381  4.16  4.20  4.08  3.93  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           3  0  2  1  2  8 15  4.18  860/1500  4.37  4.37  4.18  4.16  4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled                 3  0  0  0  0  3 25  4.89  509/1517  4.76  4.30  4.65  4.62  4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 3 11 14 4.39 515/1497 4.24  4.25  4.11  4.02  4.39

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       4  0  0  0  0  7 20  4.74  472/1440  4.82  4.58  4.45  4.40  4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  4  0  0  0  0  2 25  4.93  395/1448  4.89  4.84  4.71  4.63  4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 0 0 2  7 18  4.59  490/1436  4.63  4.47  4.29  4.24  4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    4  0  0  0  2  4 21  4.70  406/1432  4.62  4.52  4.29  4.23  4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 2 0 0 2  8 15  4.52  265/1221  4.65  3.67  3.93  3.86  4.52

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 2 2 6  9  8  3.70  941/1280  4.01  4.05  4.10  3.92  3.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 1 5  5 16  4.33  743/1277  4.39  4.43  4.34  4.13  4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 4 9 14 4.37 692/1269  4.35  4.49  4.31  4.04  4.37
4. Were special techniques successful                 4  9  2  1  5  6  4  3.50  673/ 854  3.50  3.86  4.02  3.87  3.50

            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 30 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.63  4.53  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   30  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  23  ****  ****  4.41  4.19  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     30  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  33  ****  ****  4.69  4.57  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      30  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  22  ****  ****  4.54  4.31  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    30  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  18  ****  ****  4.49  4.11  ****

                            Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     7      0.00-0.99    0      A    9      Required for Majors  14    Graduate      0      Major        1
  28-55     4      1.00-1.99    1      B   10
  56-83     6      2.00-2.99    3      C    7      General               7    Under-grad   31      Non-major   30
  84-150    5      3.00-3.49    4      D    0
  Grad.     0      3.50-4.00    8      F    0      Electives             4    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    1                                responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other                 3
                                       ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: PHIL 150  0201            University of Maryland                          Page 1159
Title      CONTEMPORARY MORAL ISS          Baltimore County                              JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:   DWYER, SUSAN                   Spring 2007                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     40
Questionnaires:  9                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                       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  1  0  0  0  0  5  3 4.38  767/1522  4.31  4.31  4.30 4.14  4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   1  0  0  0  1  2  5 4.50  545/1522  4.32  4.32  4.26 4.18  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  1  0  0  0  1  4  3 4.25  766/1285  4.31  4.54  4.30 4.22  4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1  1  0  0  2  3  2 4.00 1009/1476  4.18  4.46  4.22 4.09  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 1 2 1 3 3.86 932/1412  3.95  4.23  4.06 4.01  3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 2 2 3 4.14 713/1381  4.16  4.20  4.08 3.93 4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           2  0  0  0  1  2  4 4.43  600/1500  4.37  4.37  4.18 4.16  4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled                 2  0  0  0  1  0  6 4.71  873/1517  4.76  4.30  4.65 4.62  4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 0 4 2 4.33 573/1497  4.24  4.25  4.11 4.02 4.33


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1  0  0  0  0  1  7 4.88  240/1440  4.82  4.58  4.45 4.40  4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1  0  0  0  0  2  6 4.75  859/1448  4.89  4.84  4.71 4.63  4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 3 5 4.63 457/1436  4.63  4.47  4.29 4.24  4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1  0  0  0  0  4  4 4.50  632/1432  4.62  4.52  4.29 4.23  4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 0 0 0 4 3 4.43 343/1221  4.65  3.67  3.93 3.86 4.43


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 1 0 0 1 4 4.17 644/1280  4.01  4.05  4.10 3.92 4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 1 0 0 1 4 4.17 867/1277  4.39  4.43  4.34 4.13 4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 1 0 0 2 3 4.00 875/1269  4.35  4.49  4.31 4.04 4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                 3  3  0  1  1  0  1 3.33  726/ 854  3.50  3.86  4.02 3.87  3.33


            Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 228  3.00  3.00  4.35 4.33 ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 8 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/  47  ****  ****  4.41 3.90 ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 8 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/  45  ****  ****  4.30 3.90 ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 8 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.63 4.53 ****


                               Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PHIL 150  0301              University of Maryland                                    Page 1160
Title      CONTEMPORARY MORAL ISS            Baltimore County                                         JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:   DWYER, SUSAN                      Spring 2007                                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    17
Questionnaires:  8                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          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   2   0   0   1   0   1   4  4.33  814/1522  4.31  4.31  4.30  4.14  4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    2   0   0   0   2   0   4  4.33  787/1522  4.32  4.32  4.26  4.18  4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   2   0   0   0   1   1   4  4.50  531/1285  4.31  4.54  4.30  4.22  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    2   0   0   0   2   0   4  4.33  703/1476  4.18  4.46  4.22  4.09  4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  0   0   1   1   1   3  4.00  760/1412  3.95  4.23  4.06  4.01  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0  0   0   1   2   3  4.33  519/1381  4.16  4.20  4.08  3.93  4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   0   0   0   1   1   4  4.50  483/1500  4.37  4.37  4.18  4.16  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   0   0   0   0   2   4  4.67  932/1517  4.76  4.30  4.65  4.62  4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  0   0   1   3   1  4.00  898/1497  4.24  4.25  4.11  4.02  4.00


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0   0   0   0   1   5  4.83  304/1440  4.82  4.58  4.45  4.40  4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0   0   0   0   0   6  5.00    1/1448  4.89  4.84  4.71  4.63  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0   0   0   1   0   5  4.67  415/1436  4.63  4.47  4.29  4.24  4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0   0   0   1   0   5  4.67  454/1432  4.62  4.52  4.29  4.23  4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  0  0   0   0   0   6  5.00    1/1221  4.65  3.67  3.93  3.86  5.00


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0   1   0   0   1   4  4.17  644/1280  4.01  4.05  4.10  3.92  4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0   0   0   1   0   5  4.67  470/1277  4.39  4.43  4.34  4.13  4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0  0   0   1   0   5  4.67  461/1269  4.35  4.49  4.31  4.04  4.67
4. Were special techniques successful                  2   3   1   0   0   0   2  3.67  625/ 854  3.50  3.86  4.02  3.87  3.67


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  6   1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.36  4.31  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 6 0  1   0   0   0   1  3.00  220/ 228  3.00  3.00  4.35  4.33  3.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 6 1  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 217  ****  ****  4.51  4.51  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           6   1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 216  ****  ****  4.42  4.41  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 6   1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 205  ****  ****  4.23  4.28  ****


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 6  0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00   67/  79  4.00  4.00  4.58  4.13  4.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 6 0  0   1   0   0   1  3.50   70/  77  3.50  3.50  4.52  4.03  3.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 6  0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00   54/  65  4.00  4.00  4.49  3.85  4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    6   0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00   64/  78  4.00  4.00  4.45  3.88  4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                6   0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00   49/  80  4.00  4.00  4.11  3.79  4.00


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 7   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  47  ****  ****  4.41  3.90  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 7   0   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/  45  ****  ****  4.30  3.90  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       7   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.40  3.99  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   7   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.31  4.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 7   0   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/  34  ****  ****  4.30  4.11  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 7  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.63  4.53  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    7   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  23  ****  ****  4.41  4.19  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      7   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  33  ****  ****  4.69  4.57  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       7   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  22  ****  ****  4.54  4.31  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     7   0   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/  18  ****  ****  4.49  4.11  ****
```

                                           Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
 00-27   0   0.00-0.99   0   A   2   Required for Majors   3   Graduate   0   Major   0
 28-55   1   1.00-1.99   0   B   2
 56-83   0   2.00-2.99   1   C   1   General   2   Under-grad   8   Non-major   8
 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
                                            P   0   responses to be significant
                                            I   0   Other   2
                                            ?   0

```
Course-Section: PHIL 152  0101                   University of Maryland                                      Page 1161
Title         INTRO TO MORAL THEORY              Baltimore County                                           JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:   THOMAS, JAMES                      Spring 2007                                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      44
Questionnaires:  32                         Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                            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   0   5  27  4.84   218/1522  4.65  4.31  4.30  4.14  4.84
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   0   0   0   2  29  4.94    89/1522  4.66  4.32  4.26  4.18  4.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   0   0  32  5.00     1/1285  4.85  4.54  4.30  4.22  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   4   0   0   0   6  22  4.79   197/1476  4.63  4.46  4.22  4.09  4.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  6   1   0   7   2  15  4.20   621/1412  4.41  4.23  4.06  4.01  4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2  0   0   3   5  22  4.63   227/1381  4.38  4.20  4.08  3.93  4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   0   3  29  4.91   109/1500  4.70  4.37  4.18  4.16  4.91
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   2  28   2  4.00  1389/1517  3.63  4.30  4.65  4.62  4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0  0   0   0   1  25  4.96    42/1497  4.66  4.25  4.11  4.02  4.96

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   0   2  30  4.94   134/1440  4.87  4.58  4.45  4.40  4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   0  32  5.00     1/1448  4.94  4.84  4.71  4.63  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   0   0   0   2  29  4.94    86/1436  4.85  4.47  4.29  4.24  4.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   0   1  31  4.97    65/1432  4.90  4.52  4.29  4.23  4.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 25  0  0   0   1   6  4.86  ****/1221  ****  3.67  3.93  3.86  ****

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 16 0  0   0   0   1  15  4.94    96/1280  4.58  4.05  4.10  3.92  4.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 16 0  0   0   0   1  15  4.94   159/1277  4.80  4.43  4.34  4.13  4.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16 0 0  0   0   1  15  4.94   156/1269  4.83  4.49  4.31  4.04  4.94
4. Were special techniques successful                  16  11  0   0   1   0   4  4.60  ****/ 854  ****  3.86  4.02  3.87  ****

                                            Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                   Type                     Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27       0       0.00-0.99    0         A   28          Required for Majors  16    Graduate      0        Major        0
28-55       1       1.00-1.99    0         B    3
56-83       0       2.00-2.99    2         C    0          General              10    Under-grad   32        Non-major   32
84-150     20       3.00-3.49   11         D    0
Grad.       0       3.50-4.00   11         F    0          Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                           I    0          Other                 6
                                           ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PHIL 152  0201            University of Maryland                              Page 1162
Title      INTRO TO MORAL THEORY           Baltimore County                                  JUN 26, 2007
Instructor: THOMAS, JAMES                  Spring 2007                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     42
Questionnaires: 27                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                     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  0  3 24 4.89  190/1522 4.65 4.31 4.30 4.14 4.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  3 24 4.89  142/1522 4.66 4.32 4.26 4.18 4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  0  0  0  1 26 4.96   60/1285 4.85 4.54 4.30 4.22 4.96
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  3  0  0  1  6 17 4.67  316/1476 4.63 4.46 4.22 4.09 4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  4  1  0  5  5 12 4.17  638/1412 4.41 4.23 4.06 4.01 4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 0 0 2 8 15 4.52  314/1381 4.38 4.20 4.08 3.93 4.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  0  0  1  5 21 4.74  221/1500 4.70 4.37 4.18 4.16 4.74
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  0  0 26  1 4.04 1378/1517 3.63 4.30 4.65 4.62 4.04
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 3 22 4.88 112/1497 4.66 4.25 4.11 4.02 4.88


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1  0  0  0  0  3 23 4.88  224/1440 4.87 4.58 4.45 4.40 4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1  0  0  0  0  0 26 5.00    1/1448 4.94 4.84 4.71 4.63 5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 1 25 4.96   49/1436 4.85 4.47 4.29 4.24 4.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1  0  0  0  0  1 25 4.96   65/1432 4.90 4.52 4.29 4.23 4.96
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 21 0 0 2 1 2 4.00 ****/1221 **** 3.67 3.93 3.86 ****


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 ****/1280 4.58 4.05 4.10 3.92 ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 22 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 ****/1277 4.80 4.43 4.34 4.13 ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 22 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 ****/1269 4.83 4.49 4.31 4.04 ****
4. Were special techniques successful                22  3  0  0  1  0  1 4.00 ****/ 854 **** 3.86 4.02 3.87 ****


                                  Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades        Reasons                 Type                  Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     0      0.00-0.99    0       A   21      Required for Majors  15     Graduate     0      Major       0
 28-55     0      1.00-1.99    0       B    3
 56-83     6      2.00-2.99    4       C    0      General               9     Under-grad  27      Non-major  27
 84-150    9      3.00-3.49    9       D    0
 Grad.     0      3.50-4.00    4       F    0      Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other                 0
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PHIL 152  0301              University of Maryland                              Page 1163
Title      INTRO TO MORAL THEORY             Baltimore County                                   JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  SENG, PHILLIP                      Spring 2007                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     38
Questionnaires:  24                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                      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  1  6  17  4.67  433/1522  4.65  4.31  4.30  4.14  4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  1  7  16  4.63  407/1522  4.66  4.32  4.26  4.18  4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  2  22  4.92  135/1285  4.85  4.54  4.30  4.22  4.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   5  0  0  0  6  13  4.68  295/1476  4.63  4.46  4.22  4.09  4.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  1  1  3  19  4.67  231/1412  4.41  4.23  4.06  4.01  4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 6  0  0  0  7  10  4.59  263/1381  4.38  4.20  4.08  3.93  4.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0  0  0  2  6  15  4.57  425/1500  4.70  4.37  4.18  4.16  4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  6 15  3   0  2.88 1509/1517  3.63  4.30  4.65  4.62  2.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  0  0  0 12  9  4.43  481/1497  4.66  4.25  4.11  4.02  4.43


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  0  0  0  4  19  4.83  320/1440  4.87  4.58  4.45  4.40  4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  0  0  0  2  21  4.91  444/1448  4.94  4.84  4.71  4.63  4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  0  0  0  6  17  4.74  326/1436  4.85  4.47  4.29  4.24  4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0  0  0  0  1  22  4.96   81/1432  4.90  4.52  4.29  4.23  4.96
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 18  1  0  1  0   3  3.80 ****/1221  ****  3.67  3.93  3.86  ****


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9   0  0  0  1  1  13  4.80  184/1280  4.58  4.05  4.10  3.92  4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9   0  0  0  0  2  13  4.87  263/1277  4.80  4.43  4.34  4.13  4.87
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9  0  0  0  0  2  13  4.87  266/1269  4.83  4.49  4.31  4.04  4.87
4. Were special techniques successful                   9  13  0  0  1  1   0  3.50 ****/ 854  ****  3.86  4.02  3.87  ****

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  23  0  1  0  0  0   0  1.00 ****/  47  ****  ****  4.41  3.90  ****


                                   Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA         Expected Grades         Reasons                Type                  Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     3       0.00-0.99   0        A   13        Required for Majors  10    Graduate      0       Major        0
 28-55     2       1.00-1.99   0        B    8
 56-83     3       2.00-2.99   3        C    1        General               6    Under-grad   24       Non-major   24
 84-150    4       3.00-3.49   3        D    0
 Grad.     0       3.50-4.00   7        F    0        Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                        I    0        Other                 6
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PHIL 152  0401              University of Maryland                            Page 1164
Title       INTRO TO MORAL THEORY           Baltimore County                                 JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  SENG, PHILLIP                  Spring 2007                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     26
Questionnaires:  22                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	3	5	11	4.19	959/1522	4.65	4.31	4.30	4.14	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	6	10	4.19	935/1522	4.66	4.32	4.26	4.18	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	2	15	4.52	509/1285	4.85	4.54	4.30	4.22	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	650/1476	4.63	4.46	4.22	4.09	4.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	16	4.62	274/1412	4.41	4.23	4.06	4.01	4.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	0	7	4	6	3.78	1034/1381	4.38	4.20	4.08	3.93	3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	415/1500	4.70	4.37	4.18	4.16	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	9	10	1	3.60	1486/1517	3.63	4.30	4.65	4.62	3.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	554/1497	4.66	4.25	4.11	4.02	4.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	304/1440	4.87	4.58	4.45	4.40	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	683/1448	4.94	4.84	4.71	4.63	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	279/1436	4.85	4.47	4.29	4.24	4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	383/1432	4.90	4.52	4.29	4.23	4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	13	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	****/1221	****	3.67	3.93	3.86	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	718/1280	4.58	4.05	4.10	3.92	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	527/1277	4.80	4.43	4.34	4.13	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	437/1269	4.83	4.49	4.31	4.04	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	12	8	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 854	****	3.86	4.02	3.87	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 228	****	3.00	4.35	4.33	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.00	4.58	4.13	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.50	4.52	4.03	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	3.90	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	3.99	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				

? 0

```
Course-Section: PHIL 248  0101            University of Maryland                          Page 1165
Title      INTRO SCIENTIF REASONI         Baltimore County                               JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:   SENG, PHILLIP               Spring 2007                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    47
Questionnaires: 24                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        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   1   3   9  11  4.25   899/1522  4.25  4.31  4.30  4.34  4.25
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals      0   0   0   0   1  10  13  4.50   545/1522  4.50  4.32  4.26  4.29  4.50
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals     0   0   0   0   3   6  15  4.50   531/1285  4.50  4.54  4.30  4.36  4.50
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals      0   1   0   0   2   5  16  4.61   378/1476  4.61  4.46  4.22  4.20  4.61
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  1   0   0   0   1   5  17  4.70   205/1412  4.70  4.23  4.06  4.00  4.70
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  0   0   0   5   7  11  4.26   594/1381  4.26  4.20  4.08  3.97  4.26
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained              1   0   0   0   3   4  16  4.57   425/1500  4.57  4.37  4.18  4.20  4.57
 8. How many times was class cancelled                    1   0   4  10   8   0   1  2.30  1516/1517  2.30  4.30  4.65  4.63  2.30
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3  0   0   0   4  10   7  4.14   782/1497  4.14  4.25  4.11  4.11  4.14


             Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared          1   0   0   0   2   7  14  4.52   774/1440  4.52  4.58  4.45  4.42  4.52
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject     1   0   0   0   0   4  19  4.83   710/1448  4.83  4.84  4.71  4.78  4.83
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  2   0   0   0   1   6  15  4.64   446/1436  4.64  4.47  4.29  4.29  4.64
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned       1   0   0   0   2   5  16  4.61   527/1432  4.61  4.52  4.29  4.31  4.61
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  19   0   1   1   1   1  3.50  ****/1221  ****  3.67  3.93  4.02  ****


             Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  9   0   1   0   1   2  11  4.47   424/1280  4.47  4.05  4.10  4.08  4.47
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  9   0   0   0   0   3  12  4.80   317/1277  4.80  4.43  4.34  4.33  4.80
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9   0   0   0   0   3  12  4.80   332/1269  4.80  4.49  4.31  4.33  4.80
 4. Were special techniques successful                    9  13   0   1   0   0   1  3.50  ****/ 854  ****  3.86  4.02  4.00  ****


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA          Expected Grades           Reasons                  Type                    Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1        0.00-0.99   0       A   16        Required for Majors   2      Graduate      0        Major        0
  28-55     1        1.00-1.99   0       B    6                                                            
  56-83     2        2.00-2.99   7       C    2        General               1      Under-grad   24        Non-major   24
  84-150   10        3.00-3.49   3       D    0                                                            
  Grad.     0        3.50-4.00   8       F    0        Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other                21
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PHIL 251  0101                University of Maryland                              Page 1166
Title        ETH ISS SCI ENG&INF TE           Baltimore County                                   JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  WILSON, RICHARD                  Spring 2007                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     31
Questionnaires: 27                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                    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  3  1  5  9  9  3.74 1300/1522  3.96  4.31  4.30  4.34  3.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  1  1  3 12 10  4.07 1042/1522  4.04  4.32  4.26  4.29  4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  7  2 18  4.41  650/1285  4.47  4.54  4.30  4.36  4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   1  0  1  1  9 15  4.46  535/1476  4.55  4.46  4.22  4.20  4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  10  3  2  2  3  6  3.44 1207/1412  3.77  4.23  4.06  4.00  3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  3  3  9 12  4.11  743/1381  4.32  4.20  4.08  3.97  4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0  1  5  4  7  9  3.69 1223/1500  3.75  4.37  4.18  4.20  3.69
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0  0  0  1  7 18  4.65  942/1517  4.76  4.30  4.65  4.63  4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7  0  0  0  4 11  5  4.05  865/1497  4.03  4.25  4.11  4.11  4.05


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0  2  1  7  8  7  3.68 1326/1440  3.84  4.58  4.45  4.42  3.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0  0  0  0  4 21  4.84  656/1448  4.89  4.84  4.71  4.78  4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0  1  0  5 11  8  4.00 1056/1436  4.12  4.47  4.29  4.29  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0  1  2  5  4 13  4.04 1018/1432  4.05  4.52  4.29  4.31  4.04
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3  8  1  1  6  3  5  3.63  850/1221  3.81  3.67  3.93  4.02  3.63


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4   0  3  2  6  5  7  3.48 1046/1280  3.81  4.05  4.10  4.08  3.48
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4   0  1  2  4  3 13  4.09  908/1277  4.18  4.43  4.34  4.33  4.09
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5  0  0  1  7  3 11  4.09  855/1269  4.25  4.49  4.31  4.33  4.09
4. Were special techniques successful                   4   6  2  1  5  4  5  3.53  668/ 854  4.11  3.86  4.02  4.00  3.53


              Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 26 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 228  ****  3.00  4.35  4.56  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 26 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 217  ****  ****  4.51  4.57  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            26  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 216  ****  ****  4.42  4.72  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  26  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 205  ****  ****  4.23  4.37  ****


              Seminar
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 26 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  77  ****  3.50  4.52  5.00  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 26  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  65  ****  4.00  4.49  5.00  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     26  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  78  ****  4.00  4.45  5.00  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 26  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  80  ****  4.00  4.11  4.00  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  26  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  47  ****  ****  4.41  4.83  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  26  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  45  ****  ****  4.30  4.58  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        26  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.40  4.75  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    26  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.31  4.75  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 26  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.63  ****  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     26  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  23  ****  ****  4.41  ****  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       26  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  33  ****  ****  4.69  ****  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        26  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  22  ****  ****  4.54  ****  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      26  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  18  ****  ****  4.49  ****  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	16	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	27	Non-major	27
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: PHIL 251  0102                University of Maryland                              Page 1167
Title        ETH ISS SCI ENG&INF TE           Baltimore County                                   JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  WILSON, RICHARD                  Spring 2007                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     33
Questionnaires: 17                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                    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   1   0   2   0   1   3  10  4.19   970/1522  3.96  4.31  4.30  4.34  4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   1   2   1   4   8  4.00  1080/1522  4.04  4.32  4.26  4.29  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   2   0   0   0   3   1  11  4.53   499/1285  4.47  4.54  4.30  4.36  4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    2   1   0   1   0   2  11  4.64   336/1476  4.55  4.46  4.22  4.20  4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3  4   1   1   0   2   6  4.10   697/1412  3.77  4.23  4.06  4.00  4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0  0   1   1   2  11  4.53   305/1381  4.32  4.20  4.08  3.97  4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   0   2   0   3   4   6  3.80  1147/1500  3.75  4.37  4.18  4.20  3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   0   0   0   0   2  13  4.87   577/1517  4.76  4.30  4.65  4.63  4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0  1   0   1   6   4  4.00   898/1497  4.03  4.25  4.11  4.11  4.00


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        3   0   1   1   0   7   5  4.00  1186/1440  3.84  4.58  4.45  4.42  4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0   0   0   0   1  14  4.93   346/1448  4.89  4.84  4.71  4.78  4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4  0   0   2   0   4   7  4.23   896/1436  4.12  4.47  4.29  4.29  4.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0   1   1   2   3   8  4.07  1009/1432  4.05  4.52  4.29  4.31  4.07
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 4  0   0   3   5   3  4.00   606/1221  3.81  3.67  3.93  4.02  4.00


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0   1   0   2   5   7  4.13   664/1280  3.81  4.05  4.10  4.08  4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0   0   1   2   4   8  4.27   796/1277  4.18  4.43  4.34  4.33  4.27
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0  0   1   2   2  10  4.40   671/1269  4.25  4.49  4.31  4.33  4.40
4. Were special techniques successful                  2   5   0   0   0   3   7  4.70   129/ 854  4.11  3.86  4.02  4.00  4.70


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  16  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.36  4.62  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 16 0 0  0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/ 228  ****  3.00  4.35  4.56  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 16 0 0  0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/ 217  ****  ****  4.51  4.57  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           16  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/ 216  ****  ****  4.42  4.72  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 16  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/ 205  ****  ****  4.23  4.37  ****


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 16 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  79  ****  4.00  4.58  4.58  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16 0 0  0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  77  ****  3.50  4.52  5.00  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 16 0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  65  ****  4.00  4.49  5.00  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    16  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  78  ****  4.00  4.45  5.00  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                16  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/  80  ****  4.00  4.11  4.00  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 16  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  47  ****  ****  4.41  4.83  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 16  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  45  ****  ****  4.30  4.58  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       16  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/  39  ****  ****  4.40  4.75  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   16  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  35  ****  ****  4.31  4.75  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 16  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  34  ****  ****  4.30  4.17  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 16 0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  37  ****  ****  4.63  ****  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    16  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  23  ****  ****  4.41  ****  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      16  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  33  ****  ****  4.69  ****  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       16  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/  22  ****  ****  4.54  ****  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     16  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  18  ****  ****  4.49  ****  ****
```

```
Course-Section: PHIL 251  0102                University of Maryland                      Page 1167
Title        ETH ISS SCI ENG&INF TE            Baltimore County                          JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  WILSON, RICHARD                    Spring 2007                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     33
Questionnaires: 17                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades              Reasons                 Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27     3          0.00-0.99   0       A    8        Required for Majors   3       Graduate    0       Major       0
28-55     3          1.00-1.99   0       B    5

56-83     0          2.00-2.99   3       C    0        General               0       Under-grad  17      Non-major   17
84-150    1          3.00-3.49   2       D    0
Grad.     0          3.50-4.00   1       F    0        Electives             1       #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                       responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other                 9
                                         ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: PHIL 322  0101          University of Maryland                           Page 1168
Title        HIST OF PHIL:MODERN            Baltimore County                            JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  BRAUDE, STEPHEN                  Spring 2007                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      74
Questionnaires:  45                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                    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   1   0  1  2  4 13 24  4.30   859/1522   4.30  4.31  4.30  4.34  4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    2   0  1  1  6 13 22  4.26   874/1522   4.26  4.32  4.26  4.25  4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   2   0  0  1  1 12 29  4.60   425/1285   4.60  4.54  4.30  4.30  4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  25  0  0  1  5 13  4.63   347/1476   4.63  4.46  4.22  4.26  4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  1  0  1  8 15 19  4.21   613/1412   4.21  4.23  4.06  4.03  4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 25  3  0  2  2 11  4.00   806/1381   4.00  4.20  4.08  4.13  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   1  2  0  2 13 26  4.42   615/1500   4.42  4.37  4.18  4.13  4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   0  0  0  0 39  4  4.09  1358/1517   4.09  4.30  4.65  4.62  4.09
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0  0  5 16 20  4.37   544/1497   4.37  4.25  4.11  4.13  4.37


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0  0  0  0  7 36  4.84   304/1440   4.84  4.58  4.45  4.46  4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  4 40  4.91   494/1448   4.91  4.84  4.71  4.71  4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  1  0  3  6 34  4.64   446/1436   4.64  4.47  4.29  4.30  4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   1  1  1  1  6 34  4.65   466/1432   4.65  4.52  4.29  4.29  4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 34  0  1  1  1  4  4.14  ****/1221   ****  3.67  3.93  3.94  ****


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 20 0  0  1  6  7 11  4.12   670/1280   4.12  4.05  4.10  4.14  4.12
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 20 0  1  1  2  4 17  4.40   692/1277   4.40  4.43  4.34  4.38  4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 20 0  0  0  3  4 18  4.60   509/1269   4.60  4.49  4.31  4.39  4.60
4. Were special techniques successful                  21  22  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/ 854   ****  3.86  4.02  4.00  ****

            Seminar
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 43 1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  77   ****  3.50  4.52  4.30  ****


                                  Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA          Expected Grades            Reasons                    Type                       Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0      0.00-0.99    0      A   16      Required for Majors  2     Graduate      0      Major        5
 28-55      0      1.00-1.99    0      B   19
 56-83      6      2.00-2.99    5      C    4      General              1     Under-grad   45      Non-major   40
 84-150    21      3.00-3.49   14      D    0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   12      F    1      Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other               34
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PHIL 322H 0101                    University of Maryland                                    Page 1169
Title          HIST OF PHIL:MODERN                   Baltimore County                                       JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:    BRAUDE, STEPHEN                         Spring 2007                                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       5
Questionnaires:   5                            Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                        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  1  1  3  4.40  733/1522   4.40  4.31  4.30  4.34  4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  2  2  1  3.80 1244/1522   3.80  4.32  4.26  4.25  3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  1  1  3  4.40  650/1285   4.40  4.54  4.30  4.30  4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   1  0  0  2  0  1  3.67 1245/1476   3.67  4.46  4.22  4.26  3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  1  1  0  1  2  3.40 1225/1412   3.40  4.23  4.06  4.03  3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1 1  0  0  1  1  3.33 1227/1381   3.33  4.20  4.08  4.13  3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  2  1  2  4.00  988/1500   4.00  4.37  4.18  4.13  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  4  1  4.20 1301/1517   4.20  4.30  4.65  4.62  4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0  0  1  4  0  3.80 1113/1497   3.80  4.25  4.11  4.13  3.80

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  1  0  4  4.60  682/1440   4.60  4.58  4.45  4.46  4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  1  0  0  4  4.40 1241/1448   4.40  4.84  4.71  4.71  4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  2  1  2  4.00 1056/1436   4.00  4.47  4.29  4.30  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  294/1432   4.80  4.52  4.29  4.29  4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 4 0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/1221   ****  3.67  3.93  3.94  ****

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  2  0  1  0  2.67 1250/1280   2.67  4.05  4.10  4.14  2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  470/1277   4.67  4.43  4.34  4.38  4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0  0  0  2  1  4.33  721/1269   4.33  4.49  4.31  4.39  4.33
4. Were special techniques successful                  2   2  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 854   ****  3.86  4.02  4.00  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PHIL 346  0101                 University of Maryland                              Page 1170
Title       DEDUCTIVE SYSTEMS                    Baltimore County                                  JUN 26, 2007
Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD                       Spring 2007                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     35
Questionnaires: 25                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             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   2   9  14  4.48  630/1522  4.48  4.31  4.30  4.34  4.48
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   0   3   6  16  4.52  522/1522  4.52  4.32  4.26  4.25  4.52
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   2   0   0   0   4  19  4.83  212/1285  4.83  4.54  4.30  4.30  4.83
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  15   0   0   0   3   7  4.70  285/1476  4.70  4.46  4.22  4.26  4.70
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   3   0   1   1   9  11  4.36  466/1412  4.36  4.23  4.06  4.03  4.36
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  20   0   0   0   0   5  5.00 ****/1381  ****  4.20  4.08  4.13  ****
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   1   0   2  11  11  4.24  799/1500  4.24  4.37  4.18  4.13  4.24
 8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0   0   0   3  22  4.88  532/1517  4.88  4.30  4.65  4.62  4.88
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5  0   0   0   2  12   6  4.20  718/1497  4.20  4.25  4.11  4.13  4.20


                Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0   2   1   7  15  4.40  931/1440  4.40  4.58  4.45  4.46  4.40
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   1   0   1   0  23  4.76  840/1448  4.76  4.84  4.71  4.71  4.76
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   0   1   1   8  15  4.48  624/1436  4.48  4.47  4.29  4.30  4.48
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0   0   1   3   6  15  4.40  758/1432  4.40  4.52  4.29  4.29  4.40
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  18   1   0   1   1   4  4.00  606/1221  4.00  3.67  3.93  3.94  4.00


                Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 17   0   0   1   1   2   4  4.13  670/1280  4.13  4.05  4.10  4.14  4.13
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17   0   0   1   1   2   4  4.13  891/1277  4.13  4.43  4.34  4.38  4.13
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18   0   0   0   0   2   5  4.71  420/1269  4.71  4.49  4.31  4.39  4.71
 4. Were special techniques successful                   17   5   0   0   0   1   2  4.67 ****/ 854  ****  3.86  4.02  4.00  ****

                Field Work
 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  24   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  45  ****  ****  4.30  4.39  ****


                               Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA         Expected Grades         Reasons                Type                Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     1      0.00-0.99   0       A   18        Required for Majors   2    Graduate      0      Major       4
 28-55     2      1.00-1.99   0       B    5
 56-83     4      2.00-2.99   1       C    0        General               4    Under-grad   25      Non-major  21
 84-150    8      3.00-3.49   5       D    0
 Grad.     0      3.50-4.00   6       F    0        Electives             1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                      I    0        Other                17
                                      ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PHIL 350  0101              University of Maryland                        Page 1171
Title      ETHICAL THEORY                     Baltimore County                            JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  DIXON, BEN                        Spring 2007                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   27
Questionnaires: 13                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        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  1  2  1  2  7  3.92 1200/1522  3.92  4.31  4.30 4.34  3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  1  0  4  8  4.46  607/1522  4.46  4.32  4.26 4.25  4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   8  0  1  0  1  2  4.00  938/1285  4.00  4.54  4.30 4.30  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  1  1  2  9  4.46  535/1476  4.46  4.46  4.22 4.26  4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  1  0  5  7  4.38  448/1412  4.38  4.23  4.06 4.03  4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  0  1  1  2  8  4.42  423/1381  4.42  4.20  4.08 4.13  4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  1  1  0  4  7  4.15  882/1500  4.15  4.37  4.18 4.13  4.15
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0 11  2  4.15 1325/1517  4.15  4.30  4.65 4.62  4.15
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0  0  2  5  4  4.18  731/1497  4.18  4.25  4.11 4.13  4.18


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  1  0  0  3  9  4.46  851/1440  4.46  4.58  4.45 4.46  4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  1  1 11  4.77  840/1448  4.77  4.84  4.71 4.71  4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  4  9  4.69  383/1436  4.69  4.47  4.29 4.30  4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  1  2  2  8  4.31  847/1432  4.31  4.52  4.29 4.29  4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 9  1  2  0  0  1  2.50 1165/1221  2.50  3.67  3.93 3.94  2.50


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6  0  0  0  1  0  6  4.71  253/1280  4.71  4.05  4.10 4.14  4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6  0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1277  5.00  4.43  4.34 4.38  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1269  5.00  4.49  4.31 4.39  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  6   6  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 854  ****  3.86  4.02 4.00  ****


                                     Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA         Expected Grades         Reasons                  Type                 Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
   00-27     0       0.00-0.99    0        A    7       Required for Majors   5      Graduate      0       Major        1
   28-55     0       1.00-1.99    0        B    3
   56-83     1       2.00-2.99    0        C    1       General               2      Under-grad   13       Non-major   12
   84-150    6       3.00-3.49    4        D    0
   Grad.     0       3.50-4.00    5        F    0       Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    1                                    responses to be significant
                                           I    0       Other                 7
                                           ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PHIL 350H 0101                    University of Maryland                                    Page 1172
Title                                               Baltimore County                                      JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:    DIXON, BEN                              Spring 2007                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       9
Questionnaires:   7                           Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                  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   1   4   2  4.14 1012/1522  4.14  4.31  4.30  4.34  4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   0   0   0   2   5  4.71  299/1522   4.71  4.32  4.26  4.25  4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   0   3   4  4.57  406/1476   4.57  4.46  4.22  4.26  4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0   0   0   1   6  4.86  119/1412   4.86  4.23  4.06  4.03  4.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0   0   2   0   5  4.43  413/1381   4.43  4.20  4.08  4.13  4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0   0   0   2   1   4  4.29  750/1500   4.29  4.37  4.18  4.13  4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0   0   0   0   6   1  4.14 1331/1517  4.14  4.30  4.65  4.62  4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0  0   0   3   3  4.50  385/1497   4.50  4.25  4.11  4.13  4.50


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0   0   0   1   2   4  4.43  904/1440   4.43  4.58  4.45  4.46  4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0   0   0   0   0   7  5.00    1/1448   5.00  4.84  4.71  4.71  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0   0   1   1   5  4.57  514/1436   4.57  4.47  4.29  4.30  4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0   0   0   0   2   5  4.71  394/1432   4.71  4.52  4.29  4.29  4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 4 1  0   1   1   0  2.67 1148/1221  2.67  3.67  3.93  3.94  2.67


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0   1   1   1   2  3.80  874/1280   3.80  4.05  4.10  4.14  3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 0   0   0   0   5  5.00    1/1277   5.00  4.43  4.34  4.38  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0  0   0   0   5  5.00    1/1269   5.00  4.49  4.31  4.39  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                 2   4   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 854  ****  3.86  4.02  4.00  ****


                                              Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PHIL 368  0101                    University of Maryland                              Page 1173
Title      AESTHETICS                             Baltimore County                                   JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:   SENG, PHILLIP                       Spring 2007                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    32
Questionnaires: 22                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                   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   1   0  0  0  3  6 12  4.43   707/1522    4.43  4.31   4.30  4.34  4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  0  4  9  8  4.19   935/1522    4.19  4.32   4.26  4.25  4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  13  0  0  2  3  4  4.22   787/1285    4.22  4.54   4.30  4.30  4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   2  0  1  3  5 11  4.30   735/1476    4.30  4.46   4.22  4.26  4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  1  4 17  4.73   185/1412    4.73  4.23   4.06  4.03  4.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  1  7 14  4.59   255/1381    4.59  4.20   4.08  4.13  4.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   1  0  0  2  8 11  4.43   600/1500    4.43  4.37   4.18  4.13  4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  7 13  2  3.77  1469/1517    3.77  4.30   4.65  4.62  3.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0  0  0  0  4 14  4.78   172/1497    4.78  4.25   4.11  4.13  4.78


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  1  9 12  4.50   798/1440    4.50  4.58   4.45  4.46  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  2 19  4.90   494/1448    4.90  4.84   4.71  4.71  4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  6 16  4.73   341/1436    4.73  4.47   4.29  4.30  4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  0  1  8 13  4.55   590/1432    4.55  4.52   4.29  4.29  4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1  0  0  2  4 15  4.62   206/1221    4.62  3.67   3.93  3.94  4.62


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0  0  0  1  4 14  4.68   273/1280    4.68  4.05   4.10  4.14  4.68
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0  0  0  0  4 15  4.79   340/1277    4.79  4.43   4.34  4.38  4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0  0  0  0  1 18  4.95   134/1269    4.95  4.49   4.31  4.39  4.95
4. Were special techniques successful                  3   7  0  1  1  2  8  4.42   246/ 854    4.42  3.86   4.02  4.00  4.42


                                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons               Type                Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0        0.00-0.99  0       A   15        Required for Majors   1    Graduate      0      Major       7
  28-55      2        1.00-1.99  0       B    6

  56-83      8        2.00-2.99  4       C    0        General              12    Under-grad   22      Non-major  15
  84-150     7        3.00-3.49  7       D    0
  Grad.      0        3.50-4.00  5       F    0        Electives             1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other                 8
                                         ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: PHIL 372  0101            University of Maryland                          Page 1174
Title        PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE         Baltimore County                               JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:    EALICK, GREG E.             Spring 2007                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    26
Questionnaires: 11                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                       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  0  2  9  4.82  239/1522  4.82  4.31  4.30  4.34  4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  1  3  7  4.55  499/1522  4.55  4.32  4.26  4.25  4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  1   6  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1285  5.00  4.54  4.30  4.30  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1   0  0  0  0  3  7  4.70  285/1476  4.70  4.46  4.22  4.26  4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  2  4  5  4.27  547/1412  4.27  4.23  4.06  4.03  4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 0 4 6  4.60  247/1381  4.60  4.20  4.08  4.13  4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1   0  0  0  1  3  6  4.50  483/1500  4.50  4.37  4.18  4.13  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0  1 10  4.91  487/1517  4.91  4.30  4.65  4.62  4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 5 5  4.50  385/1497  4.50  4.25  4.11  4.13  4.50


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0  0  0  0  0 11  5.00    1/1440  5.00  4.58  4.45  4.46  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0  0  0  0  0 11  5.00    1/1448  5.00  4.84  4.71  4.71  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 2 9  4.82  207/1436  4.82  4.47  4.29  4.30  4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0  0  0  0  1 10  4.91  161/1432  4.91  4.52  4.29  4.29  4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 9 1 0 0 0 1  3.00 ****/1221  ****  3.67  3.93  3.94  ****


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 4 5  4.56  357/1280  4.56  4.05  4.10  4.14  4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 0 0 0 2 7  4.78  351/1277  4.78  4.43  4.34  4.38  4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 0 0 1 8  4.89  244/1269  4.89  4.49  4.31  4.39  4.89
4. Were special techniques successful                 3   7  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 854  ****  3.86  4.02  4.00  ****


                                       Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PHIL 391  0101           University of Maryland                          Page 1175
Title       PHILOSOPHY OF SEX             Baltimore County                               JUN 26, 2007
Instructor: TEMPLETON, ROYE               Spring 2007                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    25
Questionnaires: 14                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                       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  4  5  5  4.07 1074/1522  4.07  4.31  4.30  4.34  4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   1  0  0  0  3  7  3  4.00 1080/1522  4.00  4.32  4.26  4.25  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  1  3  0  2  8  3.93 1009/1285  3.93  4.54  4.30  4.30  3.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  2  0  1  4  4  3  3.75 1198/1476  3.75  4.46  4.22  4.26  3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  3 11  4.79  149/1412  4.79  4.23  4.06  4.03  4.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 3 4 4 3  3.50 1152/1381  3.50  4.20  4.08  4.13  3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  0  1  2  1 10  4.43  600/1500  4.43  4.37  4.18  4.13  4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  1  3  7  3  3.86 1458/1517  3.86  4.30  4.65  4.62  3.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 2 5 4 3 3.57 1250/1497  3.57  4.25  4.11  4.13  3.57


           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0  0  0  0  0  2 12  4.86  272/1440  4.86  4.58  4.45  4.46  4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0  0  0  1  1  2 10  4.50 1157/1448  4.50  4.84  4.71  4.71  4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 1 1 1 11  4.57  514/1436  4.57  4.47  4.29  4.30  4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0  0  1  1  0  4  8  4.21  914/1432  4.21  4.52  4.29  4.29  4.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 1 2 1 4 5  3.77  781/1221  3.77  3.67  3.93  3.94  3.77


           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 4 2 1 1 1  2.22 1269/1280  2.22  4.05  4.10  4.14  2.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 1 1 4 1 2  3.22 1195/1277  3.22  4.43  4.34  4.38  3.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0 3 3 0 2  3.13 1201/1269  3.13  4.49  4.31  4.39  3.13


                                      Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                  Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0     0.00-0.99   0       A    3      Required for Majors  2    Graduate     0      Major        4
  28-55      0     1.00-1.99   0       B    5
  56-83      1     2.00-2.99   5       C    1      General              6    Under-grad  14      Non-major   10
  84-150     8     3.00-3.49   2       D    0
  Grad.      0     3.50-4.00   4       F    0      Electives            1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    4                               responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other                5
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PHIL 420  0101            University of Maryland                         Page 1176
Title      CONTINENTAL PHILOSOPHY          Baltimore County                             JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  WILSON, RICHARD               Spring 2007                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    21
Questionnaires:  12                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                   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   2  0  1  0  1  3  5  4.10 1054/1522  4.10  4.31  4.30  4.42  4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    2  0  0  1  3  4  2  3.70 1290/1522  3.70  4.32  4.26  4.34  3.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   2  7  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1285  5.00  4.54  4.30  4.42  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    2  1  0  0  1  4  4  4.33  703/1476  4.33  4.46  4.22  4.31  4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  1  0  2  7  4.50  339/1412  4.50  4.23  4.06  4.11  4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 1 2  1  6  4.20  663/1381  4.20  4.20  4.08  4.21  4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2  0  0  2  3  3  2  3.50 1298/1500  3.50  4.37  4.18  4.25  3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2  0  0  0  0  1  9  4.90  487/1517  4.90  4.30  4.65  4.71  4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 1 1 3  4  4.11  820/1497  4.11  4.25  4.11  4.21  4.11

             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2  0  1  1  1  3  4  3.80 1287/1440  3.80  4.58  4.45  4.52  3.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2  0  0  0  0  1  9  4.90  494/1448  4.90  4.84  4.71  4.75  4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0  0  0  5  3  2  3.70 1228/1436  3.70  4.47  4.29  4.32  3.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2  0  0  0  2  3  5  4.30  847/1432  4.30  4.52  4.29  4.34  4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 5 0 1 1  1  0  3.00 1064/1221  3.00  3.67  3.93  4.04  3.00

             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 1 0 1  2  4  4.00  718/1280  4.00  4.05  4.10  4.28  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 1  2  5  4.50  594/1277  4.50  4.43  4.34  4.50  4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 1 2  5  4.50  586/1269  4.50  4.49  4.31  4.49  4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                  4  5  0  0  1  1  1  4.00  426/ 854  4.00  3.86  4.02  4.31  4.00

             Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 11 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 228  ****  3.00  4.35  4.32  ****

             Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 10 1 0 0 0  0  1  5.00 ****/  79  ****  4.00  4.58  4.67  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    11  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  78  ****  4.00  4.45  4.58  ****

             Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 11 0 0 0 0  1  0  4.00 ****/  47  ****  ****  4.41  4.51  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 11 0 0 0 0  1  0  4.00 ****/  45  ****  ****  4.30  4.22  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   11  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.31  4.13  ****

             Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 11 0 0 0 0  1  0  4.00 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.63  4.33  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades         Reasons                 Type                    Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      1       0.00-0.99   0       A    7       Required for Majors  0     Graduate      0      Major        3
  28-55      1       1.00-1.99   0       B    3                                                       
  56-83      2       2.00-2.99   2       C    0       General              3     Under-grad   12      Non-major    9
  84-150     5       3.00-3.49   2       D    0                                                       
  Grad.      0       3.50-4.00   4       F    0       Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                         I    0       Other                6
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PHIL 445  0101              University of Maryland                              Page 1177
Title       PHILOSOPHY OF LANGUAGE          Baltimore County                                 JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  EALICK, GREG E.                    Spring 2007                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     25
Questionnaires: 19                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                 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   2   1   5  11  4.32  837/1522  4.32  4.31  4.30  4.42  4.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   1   0   3   3  12  4.32  811/1522  4.32  4.32  4.26  4.34  4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  16   0   0   0   1   2  4.67 ****/1285  ****  4.54  4.30  4.42  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1   0   0   1   1  16  4.83  162/1476  4.83  4.46  4.22  4.31  4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   3   5  11  4.42  411/1412  4.42  4.23  4.06  4.11  4.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0   0   0   4  15  4.79  130/1381  4.79  4.20  4.08  4.21  4.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   2   1  16  4.74  232/1500  4.74  4.37  4.18  4.25  4.74
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0   0   0   1  17  4.94  292/1517  4.94  4.30  4.65  4.71  4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0   0   1   4  13  4.67  264/1497  4.67  4.25  4.11  4.21  4.67

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   1   0   2  16  4.74  492/1440  4.74  4.58  4.45  4.52  4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   0  19  5.00    1/1448  5.00  4.84  4.71  4.75  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   1   1   3  14  4.58  514/1436  4.58  4.47  4.29  4.32  4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   0   3  16  4.84  240/1432  4.84  4.52  4.29  4.34  4.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 18  0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/1221  ****  3.67  3.93  4.04  ****

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0   0   0   1   6   9  4.50  390/1280  4.50  4.05  4.10  4.28  4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0   0   0   0   3  13  4.81  308/1277  4.81  4.43  4.34  4.50  4.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0  0   0   0   2  14  4.88  255/1269  4.88  4.49  4.31  4.49  4.88
4. Were special techniques successful                  3  15   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 854  ****  3.86  4.02  4.31  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons                   Type                    Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0      0.00-0.99    0      A   10      Required for Majors   1    Graduate      0      Major       6
28-55      0      1.00-1.99    0      B    6
56-83      3      2.00-2.99    2      C    0      General               5    Under-grad   19      Non-major  13
84-150     4      3.00-3.49    4      D    0
Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    3      F    0      Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                                responses to be significant
                                      I    0      Other                11
                                      ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: PHIL 454  0101          University of Maryland
Title      ANIMALS & THE ENVRNMNT        Baltimore County
Instructor:   DIXON, BEN                 Spring 2007
Enrollment:    25
Questionnaires: 16                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

| | | 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	1	0	1	2	1	6	5	3.80	1269/1522	3.80	4.31	4.30	4.42	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	0	6	7	4.13	996/1522	4.13	4.32	4.26	4.34	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	13	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1285	****	4.54	4.30	4.42	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	367/1476	4.62	4.46	4.22	4.31	4.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	2	12	4.60	283/1412	4.60	4.23	4.06	4.11	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	7	6	4.13	723/1381	4.13	4.20	4.08	4.21	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	415/1500	4.57	4.37	4.18	4.25	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	14	1	4.07	1368/1517	4.07	4.30	4.65	4.71	4.07
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	8	3	4.08	852/1497	4.08	4.25	4.11	4.21	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	891/1440	4.44	4.58	4.45	4.52	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	575/1448	4.88	4.84	4.71	4.75	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	3	6	6	4.00	1056/1436	4.00	4.47	4.29	4.32	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	0	4	8	4.00	1036/1432	4.00	4.52	4.29	4.34	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	2	3	1	3	1	2.80	1121/1221	2.80	3.67	3.93	4.04	2.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	3	1	6	4.09	687/1280	4.09	4.05	4.10	4.28	4.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	308/1277	4.82	4.43	4.34	4.50	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.49	4.31	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 854	****	3.86	4.02	4.31	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	7	Under-grad	16	Non-major	14
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: PHIL 471  0101                University of Maryland                              Page 1179
Title       FREEDOM,DETERMIMISM,RE             Baltimore County                                  JUN 26, 2007
Instructor: YALOWITZ, STEVE                    Spring 2007                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    20
Questionnaires: 11                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                    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  1  1  2  7  4.36  779/1522   4.36  4.31   4.30 4.42  4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  3  8  4.73  288/1522   4.73  4.32   4.26 4.34  4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  2  9  4.82  220/1285   4.82  4.54   4.30 4.42  4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   2  0  0  1  2  6  4.56  425/1476   4.56  4.46   4.22 4.31  4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  3  1  1  6  3.91  892/1412   3.91  4.23   4.06 4.11  3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  0  2  2  3  3  3.70 1076/1381   3.70  4.20   4.08 4.21  3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  0  5  6  4.55  444/1500   4.55  4.37   4.18 4.25  4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  1  5  5  4.36 1193/1517   4.36  4.30   4.65 4.71  4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  0  1  2  4  4  4.00  898/1497   4.00  4.25   4.11 4.21  4.00

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  0  3  8  4.73  512/1440   4.73  4.58   4.45 4.52  4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  0  2  9  4.82  737/1448   4.82  4.84   4.71 4.75  4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  0  0  3  8  4.73  341/1436   4.73  4.47   4.29 4.32  4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  0  0  2  9  4.82  280/1432   4.82  4.52   4.29 4.34  4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  9  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/1221   ****  3.67   3.93 4.04  ****

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1   0  1  1  1  2  5  3.90  825/1280   3.90  4.05   4.10 4.28  3.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1   0  0  0  1  1  8  4.70  442/1277   4.70  4.43   4.34 4.50  4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1  0  0  0  1  2  7  4.60  509/1269   4.60  4.49   4.31 4.49  4.60
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned         Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons              Type                  Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     0        0.00-0.99   0         A    5        Required for Majors  0     Graduate      0      Major        6
 28-55     1        1.00-1.99   0         B    5
 56-83     2        2.00-2.99   2         C    1        General              2     Under-grad   11      Non-major    5
 84-150    8        3.00-3.49   2         D    0
 Grad.     0        3.50-4.00   6         F    0        Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                          I    0        Other                9
                                          ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PHIL 481  0101            University of Maryland                        Page 1180
Title      ANCIENT PHILOSOPHY              Baltimore County                             JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:   HITZ, ZENA                   Spring 2007                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    13
Questionnaires:   6                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                    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  0  1  5  4.83  225/1522  4.83 4.31  4.30 4.42  4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   0  0  0  1  4  4.80  201/1522  4.80 4.32  4.26 4.34  4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   4   0  0  0  1  1  4.50  531/1285  4.50 4.54  4.30 4.42  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0  0  0  1  5  4.83  162/1476  4.83 4.46  4.22 4.31  4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   0  0  0  1  5  4.83  126/1412  4.83 4.23  4.06 4.11  4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  108/1381  4.83 4.20  4.08 4.21  4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0  1  0  2  3  4.17  871/1500  4.17 4.37  4.18 4.25  4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1517  5.00 4.30  4.65 4.71  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0  0  0  3  2  4.40  506/1497  4.40 4.25  4.11 4.21  4.40


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   0  0  0  1  4  4.80  353/1440  4.80 4.58  4.45 4.52  4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   0  0  0  1  4  4.80  765/1448  4.80 4.84  4.71 4.75  4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   0  0  0  1  4  4.80  217/1436  4.80 4.47  4.29 4.32  4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   0  0  1  0  4  4.60  527/1432  4.60 4.52  4.29 4.34  4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 4  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1221  **** 3.67  3.93 4.04  ****


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0   0  0  1  1  3  4.40  477/1280  4.40 4.05  4.10 4.28  4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0   0  0  0  1  4  4.80  317/1277  4.80 4.43  4.34 4.50  4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  332/1269  4.80 4.49  4.31 4.49  4.80
4. Were special techniques successful                  1   2   0  0  0  1  2  4.67  141/ 854  4.67 3.86  4.02 4.31  4.67


                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     0       0.00-0.99   0        A    2        Required for Majors  0    Graduate     0      Major       0
  28-55     0       1.00-1.99   0        B    3
  56-83     0       2.00-2.99   1        C    0        General              0    Under-grad   6      Non-major   6
  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 significant
                                         I    0        Other                4
                                         ?    0
```