```
Course-Section: PHIL 100  0110            University of Maryland                                    Page 1240
Title      INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY            Baltimore County                                         FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   HITZ, ZENA                  Fall   2007                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     31
Questionnaires: 26                        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  4 12  8  4.00 1138/1639  4.32  4.35  4.27 4.08  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  1  2  5 12  6  3.77 1350/1639  4.42  4.30  4.22 4.17  3.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1  0  0  0  4  9 12  4.32  731/1397  4.61  4.52  4.28 4.18  4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  2  8  8  8  3.85 1198/1583  4.37  4.46  4.19 4.01  3.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  2  2  6 16  4.38  459/1532  4.15  4.26  4.01 3.88  4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  2  4 11  8  4.00  824/1504  4.20  4.34  4.05 3.78  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2  0  0  3 12  4  5  3.46 1420/1612  4.43  4.30  4.16 4.10  3.46
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1  0  0  0  0  2 23  4.92  529/1635  4.65  4.59  4.65 4.56  4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7  0  0  1  2 12  4  4.00  889/1579  4.37  4.28  4.08 3.95  4.00


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1  0  0  0  1 16  8  4.28 1069/1518  4.67  4.55  4.43 4.38  4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  0  0  0  2 23  4.92  437/1520  4.90  4.87  4.70 4.61  4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  2  2 11 10  4.16  973/1517  4.51  4.45  4.27 4.20  4.16
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1  0  0  0  3  6 16  4.52  614/1550  4.66  4.37  4.22 4.17  4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  9  5  2  4  1  3  2.67 1229/1295  3.64  3.49  3.94 3.84  2.67


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0  1  1  3  9 11  4.12  721/1398  4.35  4.26  4.07 3.85  4.12
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0  1  1  6  6 11  4.00  983/1391  4.30  4.31  4.30 4.07  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1  0  0  0  0  6 19  4.76  375/1388  4.66  4.46  4.28 4.01  4.76
4. Were special techniques successful                  1  1  0  2  4 10  8  4.00  456/ 958  4.00  3.48  3.93 3.71  4.00


             Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  21  2  1  0  0  1  1  3.33 ****/ 224  ****  ****  4.10 3.90  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 21  0  1  1  0  1  2  3.40 ****/ 240  ****  ****  4.11 4.01  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 20  2  0  1  0  1  2  4.00 ****/ 219  ****  ****  4.44 4.44  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           20  2  0  0  1  1  2  4.25 ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.35 4.43  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 20  2  0  0  1  1  2  4.25 ****/ 198  ****  ****  4.18 4.25  ****


             Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 20  1  0  1  0  2  2  4.00 ****/  85  ****  ****  4.58 4.50  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 20  1  0  0  0  3  2  4.40 ****/  82  ****  ****  4.52 4.12  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 20  1  0  0  0  3  2  4.40 ****/  78  ****  ****  4.47 4.25  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    20  1  0  0  0  3  2  4.40 ****/  80  ****  ****  4.47 4.39  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                20  1  0  0  0  3  2  4.40 ****/  82  ****  ****  4.16 3.90  ****


             Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 21  0  1  0  1  2  1  3.40 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.04 3.61  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 21  0  0  0  2  2  1  3.80 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.05 3.51  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       21  1  0  0  2  0  2  4.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.75 4.79  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   20  2  0  1  0  1  2  4.00 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.58 5.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 20  2  0  0  1  1  2  4.25 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.56 4.60  ****


             Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 20  0  0  0  1  3  2  4.17 ****/  50  ****  4.78  4.45 4.54  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    20  1  0  0  2  2  1  3.80 ****/  32  ****  3.00  4.51 4.67  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      20  1  0  0  1  2  2  4.20 ****/  43  ****  4.78  4.69 4.69  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       20  1  0  0  1  2  2  4.20 ****/  32  ****  4.67  4.37 4.67  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     20  1  0  0  0  3  2  4.40 ****/  21  ****  5.00  4.52 5.00  ****
```

```
Course-Section: PHIL 100  0110              University of Maryland                    Page 1240
Title       INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY               Baltimore County                       FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  HITZ, ZENA                          Fall   2007                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     31
Questionnaires:  26                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                      Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                    Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27    3          0.00-0.99   0        A   11        Required for Majors  15     Graduate    0        Major       0
 28-55    6          1.00-1.99   0        B   10
 56-83    0          2.00-2.99   1        C    2        General               5     Under-grad  26       Non-major  26
 84-150   0          3.00-3.49   4        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                 3
                                          ?    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	1	0	5	11	7	3.96	1195/1639	4.32	4.35	4.27	4.08	3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	7	8	9	4.08	1029/1639	4.42	4.30	4.22	4.17	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	14	4.42	646/1397	4.61	4.52	4.28	4.18	4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	4	5	11	4.19	852/1583	4.37	4.46	4.19	4.01	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	5	6	10	3.92	897/1532	4.15	4.26	4.01	3.88	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	3	6	10	4.10	775/1504	4.20	4.34	4.05	3.78	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	18	4.58	408/1612	4.43	4.30	4.16	4.10	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	20	3	4.13	1434/1635	4.65	4.59	4.65	4.56	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	0	5	9	5	3.85	1094/1579	4.37	4.28	4.08	3.95	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	213/1518	4.67	4.55	4.43	4.38	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	776/1520	4.90	4.87	4.70	4.61	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	4	8	8	4.10	1030/1517	4.51	4.45	4.27	4.20	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	4	15	4.45	703/1550	4.66	4.37	4.22	4.17	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	18	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1295	3.64	3.49	3.94	3.84	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	4	2	7	3.87	903/1398	4.35	4.26	4.07	3.85	3.87
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	4	2	8	4.13	911/1391	4.30	4.31	4.30	4.07	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	496/1388	4.66	4.46	4.28	4.01	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	9	14	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	4.00	3.48	3.93	3.71	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	4	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: PHIL 100  0301             University of Maryland                         Page 1242
Title      INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY             Baltimore County                               FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   THOMAS, JAMES                    Fall   2007                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    45
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   1   0  0  0  1  5  25  4.77  293/1639  4.32  4.35  4.27  4.08  4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  0  0  5  26  4.84  177/1639  4.42  4.30  4.22  4.17  4.84
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0  0  0  1  1  29  4.90  162/1397  4.61  4.52  4.28  4.18  4.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    2   1  0  0  2  3  24  4.76  239/1583  4.37  4.46  4.19  4.01  4.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  2  1  1  5  8  14  4.14  677/1532  4.15  4.26  4.01  3.88  4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 3 2 25  4.65  260/1504  4.20  4.34  4.05  3.78  4.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  0  0  2  2  27  4.81  166/1612  4.43  4.30  4.16  4.10  4.81
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  1  30  4.97  265/1635  4.65  4.59  4.65  4.56  4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0 0 1 2 22  4.84  125/1579  4.37  4.28  4.08  3.95  4.84


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  0  3  28  4.90  213/1518  4.67  4.55  4.43  4.38  4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  0  31  5.00    1/1520  4.90  4.87  4.70  4.61  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  0  2  29  4.94  110/1517  4.51  4.45  4.27  4.20  4.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  0  0  2  29  4.94  122/1550  4.66  4.37  4.22  4.17  4.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 19 1 0 1 1 9  4.42  337/1295  3.64  3.49  3.94  3.84  4.42


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0 0 0 1 0 13  4.86  189/1398  4.35  4.26  4.07  3.85  4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18 0 0 0 0 0 14  5.00    1/1391  4.30  4.31  4.30  4.07  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18 0 0 0 0 0 14  5.00    1/1388  4.66  4.46  4.28  4.01  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  18  7  1  0  0  2   4  4.14 ****/ 958  4.00  3.48  3.93  3.71  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons                 Type                   Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      2        0.00-0.99    0      A   19        Required for Majors  13      Graduate      0       Major       0
 28-55      2        1.00-1.99    0      B    4
 56-83      2        2.00-2.99    2      C    0        General               9      Under-grad   32       Non-major  32
 84-150     7        3.00-3.49    6      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                 2
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PHIL 100  0401              University of Maryland                                    Page 1243
Title       INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY             Baltimore County                                         FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  THOMAS, JAMES                  Fall   2007                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     47
Questionnaires:  37                     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	3	33	4.92	154/1639	4.32	4.35	4.27	4.08	4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	32	4.89	142/1639	4.42	4.30	4.22	4.17	4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	0	34	4.86	189/1397	4.61	4.52	4.28	4.18	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	5	28	4.79	196/1583	4.37	4.46	4.19	4.01	4.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	0	8	2	22	4.24	598/1532	4.15	4.26	4.01	3.88	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	7	27	4.64	268/1504	4.20	4.34	4.05	3.78	4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	4	30	4.78	197/1612	4.43	4.30	4.16	4.10	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	36	5.00	1/1635	4.65	4.59	4.65	4.56	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	113/1579	4.37	4.28	4.08	3.95	4.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	33	4.97	64/1518	4.67	4.55	4.43	4.38	4.97
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	34	5.00	1/1520	4.90	4.87	4.70	4.61	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	4	30	4.88	173/1517	4.51	4.45	4.27	4.20	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	33	4.97	52/1550	4.66	4.37	4.22	4.17	4.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	19	2	3	1	1	8	3.67	894/1295	3.64	3.49	3.94	3.84	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	234/1398	4.35	4.26	4.07	3.85	4.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	311/1391	4.30	4.31	4.30	4.07	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	112/1388	4.66	4.46	4.28	4.01	4.96
4. Were special techniques successful	14	16	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	****/ 958	4.00	3.48	3.93	3.71	****

```
                                          Frequency Distribution
```

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	24	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	37	Non-major	35
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: PHIL 100  0501                   University of Maryland                                Page 1244
Title      INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY                   Baltimore County                                     FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   SENG, PHILLIP                      Fall   2007                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    40
Questionnaires: 29                          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  4 11 13  4.24  899/1639  4.32  4.35  4.27  4.08  4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  3  9 17  4.48  550/1639  4.42  4.30  4.22  4.17  4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  4  5 20  4.55  467/1397  4.61  4.52  4.28  4.18  4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   3  0  0  6  7 13  4.27  781/1583  4.37  4.46  4.19  4.01  4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  1  0  4  6 18  4.38  469/1532  4.15  4.26  4.01  3.88  4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1  0  1  5 11 10  4.11  758/1504  4.20  4.34  4.05  3.78  4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  2  5 22  4.69  293/1612  4.43  4.30  4.16  4.10  4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  2 21  5  4.11 1454/1635  4.65  4.59  4.65  4.56  4.11
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 0  0  1 15  7  4.26  646/1579  4.37  4.28  4.08  3.95  4.26

           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0  0  0  1  6 20  4.70  548/1518  4.67  4.55  4.43  4.38  4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0  0  0  0  4 23  4.85  674/1520  4.90  4.87  4.70  4.61  4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  0  3  7 17  4.52  584/1517  4.51  4.45  4.27  4.20  4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0  0  0  2  9 16  4.52  626/1550  4.66  4.37  4.22  4.17  4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 5  0  0  7 11  4  3.86  761/1295  3.64  3.49  3.94  3.84  3.86

           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 14 0  1  3  0  6  5  3.73  980/1398  4.35  4.26  4.07  3.85  3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 15 0  0  2  4  3  5  3.79 1132/1391  4.30  4.31  4.30  4.07  3.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15 0 0  0  0  8  6  4.43  721/1388  4.66  4.46  4.28  4.01  4.43
4. Were special techniques successful                  15  12  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 958  4.00  3.48  3.93  3.71  ****
```

```
                                            Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons              Type               Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     1      0.00-0.99   0       A    4       Required for Majors  16     Graduate     0      Major      0
 28-55    10      1.00-1.99   0       B   17
 56-83     2      2.00-2.99   5       C    3       General               7     Under-grad  29      Non-major 29
 84-150    2      3.00-3.49   2       D    0
 Grad.     0      3.50-4.00   5       F    1       Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                      I    0       Other                 1
                                      ?    1
```

```
Enrollment:     38
Questionnaires: 30                     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

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	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	3	13	13	4.23	909/1639	4.32	4.35	4.27	4.08	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	21	4.67	349/1639	4.42	4.30	4.22	4.17	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	25	4.83	209/1397	4.61	4.52	4.28	4.18	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	217/1583	4.37	4.46	4.19	4.01	4.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	3	7	15	4.00	774/1532	4.15	4.26	4.01	3.88	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	18	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	429/1504	4.20	4.34	4.05	3.78	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	6	18	4.33	718/1612	4.43	4.30	4.16	4.10	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1635	4.65	4.59	4.65	4.56	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	10	14	4.52	362/1579	4.37	4.28	4.08	3.95	4.52
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	7	21	4.69	575/1518	4.67	4.55	4.43	4.38	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	26	4.90	571/1520	4.90	4.87	4.70	4.61	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	7	21	4.69	382/1517	4.51	4.45	4.27	4.20	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	25	4.83	265/1550	4.66	4.37	4.22	4.17	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	7	1	0	4	4	11	4.20	505/1295	3.64	3.49	3.94	3.84	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	113/1398	4.35	4.26	4.07	3.85	4.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	417/1391	4.30	4.31	4.30	4.07	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	157/1388	4.66	4.46	4.28	4.01	4.93
4. Were special techniques successful	14	14	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 958	4.00	3.48	3.93	3.71	****
Field Work														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****
Self Paced														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	3.00	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 43	****	4.78	4.69	4.69	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	23	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	30	Non-major	30
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	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	3				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: PHIL 100  0801              University of Maryland                              Page 1246
Title       INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY              Baltimore County                                   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  SENG, PHILLIP                   Fall   2007                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    36
Questionnaires: 26                     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  3  7 16  4.50  615/1639  4.32 4.35 4.27 4.08 4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  0  0  2  9 15  4.50  517/1639  4.42 4.30 4.22 4.17 4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  0  0  1  4 21  4.77  271/1397  4.61 4.52 4.28 4.18 4.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  2  0  0  6  5 13  4.29  751/1583  4.37 4.46 4.19 4.01 4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 2  3 20  4.62  269/1532  4.15 4.26 4.01 3.88 4.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 7 10  8  3.96  872/1504  4.20 4.34 4.05 3.78 3.96
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  0  0  5  3 18  4.50  490/1612  4.43 4.30 4.16 4.10 4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1  0  0  0  3 16  6  4.12 1441/1635  4.65 4.59 4.65 4.56 4.12
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0 0 1 7 14 4.59  292/1579  4.37 4.28 4.08 3.95 4.59

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1  0  0  0  1  6 18  4.68  588/1518  4.67 4.55 4.43 4.38 4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1  0  0  0  1  1 23  4.88  597/1520  4.90 4.87 4.70 4.61 4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 0 3 4 17  4.58  498/1517  4.51 4.45 4.27 4.20 4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1  0  0  0  2  3 20  4.72  401/1550  4.66 4.37 4.22 4.17 4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 2 1 2 4 8 7  3.82  798/1295  3.64 3.49 3.94 3.84 3.82

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 1 3 12 4.69  316/1398  4.35 4.26 4.07 3.85 4.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 1 0 5 2  9  4.06  959/1391  4.30 4.31 4.30 4.07 4.06
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 0 1 2 1 12 4.50  647/1388  4.66 4.46 4.28 4.01 4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                 10 11  3  1  0  1  0  1.80 ****/ 958  4.00 3.48 3.93 3.71 ****

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 25 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/  50  **** 4.78 4.45 4.54 ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   25  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  32  **** 3.00 4.51 4.67 ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     25  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  43  **** 4.78 4.69 4.69 ****

                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     9      0.00-0.99   2       A    7      Required for Majors  16    Graduate      0     Major       0
  28-55     2      1.00-1.99   0       B   10
  56-83     0      2.00-2.99   2       C    4      General               2    Under-grad   26     Non-major  26
  84-150    0      3.00-3.49   1       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                 1
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PHIL 100  0901              University of Maryland                          Page 1247
Title      INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY               Baltimore County                                FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   EALICK, GREG E.                   Fall   2007                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     32
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  1  1  8  6  11  3.93 1229/1639  4.32  4.35  4.27  4.08  3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  1  0  6  8  12  4.11 1003/1639  4.42  4.30  4.22  4.17  4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  1  2  3  4  17  4.26  795/1397  4.61  4.52  4.28  4.18  4.26
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   2  2  1  3  7  12  4.04  981/1583  4.37  4.46  4.19  4.01  4.04
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  4  3  4  6  10  3.56 1212/1532  4.15  4.26  4.01  3.88  3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  2  2  8  6   9  3.67 1116/1504  4.20  4.34  4.05  3.78  3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  1  0  4  7  15  4.30  767/1612  4.43  4.30  4.16  4.10  4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  2  25  4.93  529/1635  4.65  4.59  4.65  4.56  4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0  1  1  5  5  11  4.04  865/1579  4.37  4.28  4.08  3.95  4.04

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  1  1  5  4  16  4.22 1118/1518  4.67  4.55  4.43  4.38  4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  1  0  1  25  4.85  674/1520  4.90  4.87  4.70  4.61  4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  1  1  4  5  15  4.23  907/1517  4.51  4.45  4.27  4.20  4.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  1  1  4  3  18  4.33  832/1550  4.66  4.37  4.22  4.17  4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 18  2  1  1  2   1  2.86 1206/1295  3.64  3.49  3.94  3.84  2.86

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11  0  2  0  4  3   7  3.81  924/1398  4.35  4.26  4.07  3.85  3.81
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10  0  3  0  2  3   9  3.88 1076/1391  4.30  4.31  4.30  4.07  3.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0  2  0  3  3   9  4.00  944/1388  4.66  4.46  4.28  4.01  4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   10 16  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/ 958  4.00  3.48  3.93  3.71  ****

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 26  0  0  0  1  0   0  3.00 ****/  50  ****  4.78  4.45  4.54  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       26  0  0  0  1  0   0  3.00 ****/  43  ****  4.78  4.69  4.69  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        26  0  0  0  1  0   0  3.00 ****/  32  ****  4.67  4.37  4.67  ****

                                      Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type               Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      3       0.00-0.99   0      A   10      Required for Majors  17     Graduate     0      Major       0
28-55      8       1.00-1.99   1      B   12                                 Under-grad  27      Non-major  27
56-83      3       2.00-2.99   4      C    1      General               3    Under-grad  27      Non-major  27
84-150     4       3.00-3.49   8      D    0
Grad.      0       3.50-4.00   2      F    0      Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                      I    0      Other                 2
                                      ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PHIL 146  0101              University of Maryland                                 Page 1248
Title          CRITICAL THINKING             Baltimore County                                     FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    TEMPLETON, ROYE                   Fall   2007                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       41
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   0   2   7   7   6  3.77 1345/1639  3.92  4.35  4.27  4.08  3.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   4   2   5  11  4.05 1059/1639  4.08  4.30  4.22  4.17  4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   1   2   0   3   3  13  4.19  850/1397  4.24  4.52  4.28  4.18  4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  15   0   3   0   2   2  3.43 1440/1583  3.43  4.46  4.19  4.01  3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   1   2   4   7   8  3.86  942/1532  3.84  4.26  4.01  3.88  3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  16   0   1   1   1   3  4.00  824/1504  4.00  4.34  4.05  3.78  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   1   0   1   5  15  4.50  490/1612  4.54  4.30  4.16  4.10  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   1  21  4.95  331/1635  4.98  4.59  4.65  4.56  4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4   2   3   2   4   6   1  3.00 1477/1579  3.00  4.28  4.08  3.95  3.00


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   1   2   6   4   8  3.76 1364/1518  3.94  4.55  4.43  4.38  3.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   1   1   4   4  11  4.10 1398/1520  4.30  4.87  4.70  4.61  4.10
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0   3   4   4   4   5  3.20 1433/1517  3.51  4.45  4.27  4.20  3.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0   4   2   6   4   4  3.10 1433/1550  3.52  4.37  4.22  4.17  3.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2   6   5   2   3   3   1  2.50 1247/1295  2.54  3.49  3.94  3.84  2.50


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5   0   7   6   2   0   2  2.06 1382/1398  2.49  4.26  4.07  3.85  2.06
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5   0   6   4   5   1   1  2.24 1384/1391  2.23  4.31  4.30  4.07  2.24
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5   0   8   5   1   1   2  2.06 1382/1388  2.22  4.46  4.28  4.01  2.06
4. Were special techniques successful                  5  16   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/ 958  ****  3.48  3.93  3.71  ****


              Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 20   0   0   1   0   0   1  3.50 ****/ 240  ****  ****  4.11  4.01  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 21   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.04  3.61  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 21   0   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/  50  ****  4.78  4.45  4.54  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    21   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  32  ****  3.00  4.51  4.67  ****


                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades           Reasons              Type                    Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    10       0.00-0.99    2        A    7       Required for Majors  12    Graduate     1       Major        0
  28-55     2       1.00-1.99    0        B    4                                                       
  56-83     0       2.00-2.99    1        C    9       General               7    Under-grad  21       Non-major   22
  84-150    2       3.00-3.49    2        D    1
  Grad.     1       3.50-4.00    6        F    0       Electives             1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                          I    0       Other                 2
                                          ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: PHIL 146  0201              University of Maryland                                    Page 1249
Title      CRITICAL THINKING                    Baltimore County                                      FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  TEMPLETON, ROYE                      Fall   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    0   0  0  1  2  9  5  4.06 1103/1639  3.92  4.35   4.27 4.08  4.06
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  1  3  6  7  4.12 1003/1639  4.08  4.30   4.22 4.17  4.12
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  1  1  7  8  4.29  758/1397  4.24  4.52   4.28 4.18  4.29
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  13  0  1  2  1  0  3.00 ****/1583  3.43  4.46   4.19 4.01  ****
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   0  1  2  2  5  6  3.81  981/1532  3.84  4.26   4.01 3.88  3.81
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 13  0  0  1  2  1  4.00 ****/1504  4.00  4.34   4.05 3.78  ****
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  2  3 12  4.59  408/1612  4.54  4.30   4.16 4.10  4.59
 8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  0 17  5.00    1/1635  4.98  4.59   4.65 4.56  5.00
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4  1  0  4  4  4  0  3.00 1477/1579  3.00  4.28   4.08 3.95  3.00


              Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  1  2  0  4  9  4.13 1189/1518  3.94  4.55   4.43 4.38  4.13
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  0  1  0  5 10  4.50 1188/1520  4.30  4.87   4.70 4.61  4.50
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  1  1  2  8  4  3.81 1235/1517  3.51  4.45   4.27 4.20  3.81
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0  0  2  4  3  7  3.94 1135/1550  3.52  4.37   4.22 4.17  3.94
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  9  1  4  0  1  1  2.57 1240/1295  2.54  3.49   3.94 3.84  2.57


              Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  4  0  1  4  4  3  1  2.92 1304/1398  2.49  4.26   4.07 3.85  2.92
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  4  0  5  2  4  2  0  2.23 1384/1391  2.23  4.31   4.30 4.07  2.23
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4  0  3  3  6  1  0  2.38 1377/1388  2.22  4.46   4.28 4.01  2.38


              Laboratory
 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 16 0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/ 240  ****  ****   4.11 4.01  ****


              Self  Paced
 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned  16  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  50  ****  4.78   4.45 4.54  ****
 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal      16  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  32  ****  3.00   4.51 4.67  ****
 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful        16  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  43  ****  4.78   4.69 4.69  ****
 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful         16  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  32  ****  4.67   4.37 4.67  ****
 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students       16  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  21  ****  5.00   4.52 5.00  ****


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                  Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     6      0.00-0.99    1      A    5       Required for Majors  10    Graduate      0      Major       1
  28-55     2      1.00-1.99    0      B    7
  56-83     1      2.00-2.99    3      C    2       General               3    Under-grad   17      Non-major  16
  84-150    2      3.00-3.49    2      D    1
  Grad.     0      3.50-4.00    3      F    0       Electives             2    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    1                                  responses to be significant
                                       I    0       Other                 1
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PHIL 150  0101            University of Maryland                              Page 1250
Title      CONTEMPORARY MORAL ISS          Baltimore County                                  FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   EALICK, GREG E.                  Fall   2007                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    17
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   0   0   0   1   1   1  13  4.63   482/1639  4.51  4.35  4.27  4.08  4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   1   3   3   9  4.25   859/1639  4.29  4.30  4.22  4.17  4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   5   0   0   1   5   5  4.36   696/1397  4.47  4.52  4.28  4.18  4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1   0   0   4   2   9  4.33   697/1583  4.45  4.46  4.19  4.01  4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0   1   0   2   5   7  4.13   677/1532  4.34  4.26  4.01  3.88  4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0  0   0   3   5   7  4.27   603/1504  4.36  4.34  4.05  3.78  4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   0   1   4   3   7  4.07  1003/1612  4.42  4.30  4.16  4.10  4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0   0   0   1  14  4.93   463/1635  4.96  4.59  4.65  4.56  4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0  0   0   2   7   3  4.08   841/1579  4.35  4.28  4.08  3.95  4.08

           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   2   4  10  4.50   807/1518  4.75  4.55  4.43  4.38  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   2   0  14  4.75   890/1520  4.81  4.87  4.70  4.61  4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   0   3   4   9  4.38   758/1517  4.46  4.45  4.27  4.20  4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   2   2  12  4.63   500/1550  4.65  4.37  4.22  4.17  4.63

           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0   0   1   1   3   8  4.38   525/1398  4.15  4.26  4.07  3.85  4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0   0   0   0   3  10  4.77   380/1391  4.21  4.31  4.30  4.07  4.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0  0   0   1   0  12  4.85   286/1388  4.57  4.46  4.28  4.01  4.85
4. Were special techniques successful                  5  10   1   0   0   0   0  1.00  ****/ 958  3.90  3.48  3.93  3.71  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA       Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      2      0.00-0.99   0      A   7       Required for Majors  9     Graduate     0      Major        0
 28-55      2      1.00-1.99   0      B   4
 56-83      1      2.00-2.99   1      C   1       General              1     Under-grad  16      Non-major   16
 84-150     2      3.00-3.49   2      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                3
                                     ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: PHIL 150  0102              University of Maryland                    Page 1251
Title       CONTEMPORARY MORAL ISS          Baltimore County                          FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  EALICK, GREG E.                    Fall   2007                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      19
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  0   0  0  0  1  5 10  4.56  550/1639  4.51  4.35  4.27  4.08  4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  3  1 12  4.56  455/1639  4.29  4.30  4.22  4.17  4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  11  0  0  0  2  3  4.60  417/1397  4.47  4.52  4.28  4.18  4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   1  0  0  2  4  9  4.47  524/1583  4.45  4.46  4.19  4.01  4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0   0  0  0  0  5 11  4.69  223/1532  4.34  4.26  4.01  3.88  4.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0   0  0  0  2  4 10  4.50  367/1504  4.36  4.34  4.05  3.78  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  1  0  2 13  4.69  293/1612  4.42  4.30  4.16  4.10  4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0  0 16  5.00    1/1635  4.96  4.59  4.65  4.56  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  5   0  0  0  2  2  7  4.45  439/1579  4.35  4.28  4.08  3.95  4.45

               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0  0  0  0  1 15  4.94  149/1518  4.75  4.55  4.43  4.38  4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0  0  0  1  2 13  4.75  890/1520  4.81  4.87  4.70  4.61  4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  1   0  0  0  1  1 13  4.80  239/1517  4.46  4.45  4.27  4.20  4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1   0  0  0  1  0 14  4.87  219/1550  4.65  4.37  4.22  4.17  4.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  1  12  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/1295  2.50  3.49  3.94  3.84  ****

               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1   0  3  0  2  3  7  3.73  980/1398  4.15  4.26  4.07  3.85  3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  1   0  1  1  3  3  7  3.93 1040/1391  4.21  4.31  4.30  4.07  3.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  1   0  1  0  1  2 11  4.47  684/1388  4.57  4.46  4.28  4.01  4.47
4. Were special techniques successful                 1  10  0  0  1  2  2  4.20  380/ 958  3.90  3.48  3.93  3.71  4.20

                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons              Type                Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0       0.00-0.99    0         A    8        Required for Majors   7    Graduate      0     Major       1
  28-55      4       1.00-1.99    0         B    5
  56-83      3       2.00-2.99    2         C    0        General               1    Under-grad   16     Non-major  15
  84-150     1       3.00-3.49    4         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                 3
                                           ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PHIL 150  0104           University of Maryland                           Page 1252
Title      CONTEMPORARY MORAL ISS          Baltimore County                             FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   EALICK, GREG E.                  Fall   2007                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     17
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    0   0   0  1  3  2 11  4.35  797/1639  4.51  4.35  4.27  4.08  4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   1  0  2  8  6  4.06 1052/1639  4.29  4.30  4.22  4.17  4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   8   0  0  1  3  5  4.44  603/1397  4.47  4.52  4.28  4.18  4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   0   0  0  1  5 10  4.56  413/1583  4.45  4.46  4.19  4.01  4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   0   1  0  2  5  8  4.19  640/1532  4.34  4.26  4.01  3.88  4.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0   1  0  2  3 10  4.31  560/1504  4.36  4.34  4.05  3.78  4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0   0  0  1  6  9  4.50  490/1612  4.42  4.30  4.16  4.10  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0   0  0  0  1 15  4.94  463/1635  4.96  4.59  4.65  4.56  4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 1   0  0  1  3  6  4.50  382/1579  4.35  4.28  4.08  3.95  4.50

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0   0  0  1  1 13  4.80  360/1518  4.75  4.55  4.43  4.38  4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0   0  0  0  1 14  4.93  382/1520  4.81  4.87  4.70  4.61  4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0   0  0  3  6  6  4.20  947/1517  4.46  4.45  4.27  4.20  4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0   1  0  2  0 12  4.47  690/1550  4.65  4.37  4.22  4.17  4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  9   2  2  0  1  1  2.50 1247/1295  2.50  3.49  3.94  3.84  2.50

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2   0   0  0  1  8  6  4.33  560/1398  4.15  4.26  4.07  3.85  4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2   0   0  1  6  1  7  3.93 1040/1391  4.21  4.31  4.30  4.07  3.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0   0  0  3  3  9  4.40  740/1388  4.57  4.46  4.28  4.01  4.40
4. Were special techniques successful                   2  10   1  0  1  1  2  3.60  682/ 958  3.90  3.48  3.93  3.71  3.60

                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons              Type                Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    3       0.00-0.99   0        A    3        Required for Majors  5    Graduate     0      Major       0
  28-55    1       1.00-1.99   0        B    7
  56-83    0       2.00-2.99   0        C    1        General              4    Under-grad  17      Non-major  17
  84-150   0       3.00-3.49   1        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                1
                                        ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: PHIL 152  0201              University of Maryland                              Page 1253
Title       INTRO TO MORAL THEORY           Baltimore County                                    FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  FERRY, MICHAEL                  Fall  2007                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     19
Questionnaires:  10                      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  9  4.90  171/1639  4.68  4.35  4.27 4.08  4.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0  0  1  4  5  4.40  684/1639  4.54  4.30  4.22 4.17  4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0  0  0  3  7  4.70  342/1397  4.74  4.52  4.28 4.18  4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   2   0  0  0  2  6  4.75  239/1583  4.64  4.46  4.19 4.01  4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   0  0  0  1  9  4.90  105/1532  4.32  4.26  4.01 3.88  4.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  0  4  6  4.60  291/1504  4.40  4.34  4.05 3.78  4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0  0  0  0 10  5.00    1/1612  4.70  4.30  4.16 4.10  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0  0  0  6  4  4.40 1235/1635  4.32  4.59  4.65 4.56  4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0  0  0  3  5  4.63  269/1579  4.60  4.28  4.08 3.95  4.63


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0  0  0  0 10  5.00    1/1518  4.75  4.55  4.43 4.38  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0  0  0  0 10  5.00    1/1520  4.94  4.87  4.70 4.61  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0  0  0  1  9  4.90  157/1517  4.72  4.45  4.27 4.20  4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0  0  0  1  9  4.90  174/1550  4.75  4.37  4.22 4.17  4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 7  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/1295  3.90  3.49  3.94 3.84  ****


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0   0  0  0  1  7  4.88  177/1398  4.74  4.26  4.07 3.85  4.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0   0  0  0  0  8  5.00    1/1391  4.66  4.31  4.30 4.07  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0  0  0  0  0  8  5.00    1/1388  4.93  4.46  4.28 4.01  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  2   2   0  0  2  1  3  4.17  399/ 958  3.74  3.48  3.93 3.71  4.17


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons                  Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     0      0.00-0.99    0        A    5       Required for Majors   7     Graduate      0       Major        0
  28-55     2      1.00-1.99    0        B    4
  56-83     2      2.00-2.99    1        C    0       General               1     Under-grad   10       Non-major   10
  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                 1
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PHIL 152  0301            University of Maryland                              Page 1254
Title      INTRO TO MORAL THEORY          Baltimore County                                   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    FERRY, MICHAEL             Fall   2007                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    35
Questionnaires: 23                    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	0	10	12	4.43	712/1639	4.68	4.35	4.27	4.08	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	17	4.52	496/1639	4.54	4.30	4.22	4.17	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	17	4.61	417/1397	4.74	4.52	4.28	4.18	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	13	4.48	512/1583	4.64	4.46	4.19	4.01	4.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	7	13	4.30	535/1532	4.32	4.26	4.01	3.88	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	8	11	4.32	560/1504	4.40	4.34	4.05	3.78	4.32
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	6	13	4.39	644/1612	4.70	4.30	4.16	4.10	4.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	12	4.52	1121/1635	4.32	4.59	4.65	4.56	4.52
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	9	10	4.45	450/1579	4.60	4.28	4.08	3.95	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	684/1518	4.75	4.55	4.43	4.38	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1520	4.94	4.87	4.70	4.61	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	523/1517	4.72	4.45	4.27	4.20	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	6	16	4.61	522/1550	4.75	4.37	4.22	4.17	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	18	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	****/1295	3.90	3.49	3.94	3.84	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	277/1398	4.74	4.26	4.07	3.85	4.74
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	0	4	14	4.63	516/1391	4.66	4.31	4.30	4.07	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1388	4.93	4.46	4.28	4.01	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	1	0	3	6	7	4.06	446/ 958	3.74	3.48	3.93	3.71	4.06

```
                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons                Type               Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      7      0.00-0.99    2        A    8      Required for Majors  12    Graduate      0     Major        0
 28-55      1      1.00-1.99    0        B    9
 56-83      0      2.00-2.99    1        C    2      General               7    Under-grad   23     Non-major   23
 84-150     1      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                 2
                                         ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: PHIL 152  0401              University of Maryland                              Page 1255
Title       INTRO TO MORAL THEORY            Baltimore County                                   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   SENG, PHILLIP                  Fall   2007                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     40
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  1  1 11 14 4.41  754/1639 4.68  4.35  4.27 4.08  4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  0  1  5 12  9 4.07 1036/1639 4.54  4.30  4.22 4.17  4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  0  0  1 13 13 4.44  603/1397 4.74  4.52  4.28 4.18  4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  3  0  0  2 13  9 4.29  751/1583 4.64  4.46  4.19 4.01  4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 0 2 3 21 4.59  281/1532 4.32  4.26  4.01 3.88  4.59
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1 0 2 2 13 8 4.08 780/1504 4.40  4.34  4.05 3.78  4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  0  0  2  7 18 4.59  398/1612 4.70  4.30  4.16 4.10  4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  0  1 19  7 4.22 1374/1635 4.32  4.59  4.65 4.56  4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 0 0 0 1 8 10 4.47 416/1579 4.60  4.28  4.08 3.95  4.47


           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1  0  0  0  4  8 14 4.38  968/1518 4.75  4.55  4.43 4.38  4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0  0  0  0  0  6 21 4.78  855/1520 4.94  4.87  4.70 4.61  4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 2 2 10 13 4.26  886/1517 4.72  4.45  4.27 4.20  4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0  0  1  0  3  7 16 4.37  796/1550 4.75  4.37  4.22 4.17  4.37
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 18 1 0 2 3 0 3.17 ****/1295 3.90  3.49  3.94 3.84  ****


           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 2 10 9 4.33 560/1398 4.74  4.26  4.07 3.85  4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6 0 0 2 3 7 9 4.10 940/1391 4.66  4.31  4.30 4.07  4.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0 0 0 7 14 4.67 496/1388 4.93  4.46  4.28 4.01  4.67
4. Were special techniques successful                 6 13  2  0  3  2  1 3.00  841/ 958 3.74  3.48  3.93 3.71  3.00

           Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 26 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 240 **** **** 4.11 4.01 ****

           Seminar
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 26 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 82 **** **** 4.52 4.12 ****

           Field Work
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      26 0  0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/  42 **** **** 4.75 4.79 ****

                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned      Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    2       0.00-0.99    1     A  12        Required for Majors  10    Graduate     0      Major      1
  28-55    2       1.00-1.99    0     B   6                                   Under-grad  27      Non-major 26
  56-83    0       2.00-2.99    0     C   4        General               7
  84-150   1       3.00-3.49    0     D   0
  Grad.    0       3.50-4.00    2     F   0        Electives             2    #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P   0                                   responses to be significant
                                      I   0        Other                 4
                                      ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: PHIL 152  0501          University of Maryland                              Page 1256
Title       INTRO TO MORAL THEORY       Baltimore County                                   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    THOMAS, JAMES            Fall   2007                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      45
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	2	0	1	0	0	3	28	4.78	281/1639	4.68	4.35	4.27	4.08	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	0	0	1	29	4.84	177/1639	4.54	4.30	4.22	4.17	4.84
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1397	4.74	4.52	4.28	4.18	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	1	0	0	2	25	4.79	207/1583	4.64	4.46	4.19	4.01	4.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	10	4	1	5	3	9	3.55	1218/1532	4.32	4.26	4.01	3.88	3.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	1	3	7	19	4.47	416/1504	4.40	4.34	4.05	3.78	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	3	1	25	4.67	317/1612	4.70	4.30	4.16	4.10	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	1	0	0	23	7	4.13	1441/1635	4.32	4.59	4.65	4.56	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	1	0	1	23	4.69	220/1579	4.60	4.28	4.08	3.95	4.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	1	0	27	4.83	330/1518	4.75	4.55	4.43	4.38	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	0	28	4.93	382/1520	4.94	4.87	4.70	4.61	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	0	1	27	4.86	189/1517	4.72	4.45	4.27	4.20	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	0	28	4.90	185/1550	4.75	4.37	4.22	4.17	4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	18	2	2	2	1	4	3.27	1093/1295	3.90	3.49	3.94	3.84	3.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	129/1398	4.74	4.26	4.07	3.85	4.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	1	0	0	1	12	4.64	507/1391	4.66	4.31	4.30	4.07	4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1388	4.93	4.46	4.28	4.01	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	20	10	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 958	3.74	3.48	3.93	3.71	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.78	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	3.00	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	4.78	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.67	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****

```
Course-Section: PHIL 152  0501              University of Maryland                    Page 1256
Title          INTRO TO MORAL THEORY        Baltimore County                          FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    THOMAS, JAMES                Fall   2007                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     45
Questionnaires: 34                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons                 Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27    1      0.00-0.99   0        A   24        Required for Majors  15      Graduate    0       Major         0
 28-55    2      1.00-1.99   0        B    2
 56-83    2      2.00-2.99   5        C    0        General               6      Under-grad  34      Non-major     34
 84-150   7      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                 4
                                      ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PHIL 152  0601            University of Maryland                         Page 1257
Title      INTRO TO MORAL THEORY          Baltimore County                              FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   THOMAS, JAMES                  Fall   2007                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    47
Questionnaires: 38                     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  1  3 33  4.86  205/1639  4.68  4.35  4.27 4.08  4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  0  1  3 33  4.86  156/1639  4.54  4.30  4.22 4.17  4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0  0  0  0  2 35  4.95   97/1397  4.74  4.52  4.28 4.18  4.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   1  0  0  0  3 33  4.92  128/1583  4.64  4.46  4.19 4.01  4.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  5  1  2  4  6 19  4.25  580/1532  4.32  4.26  4.01 3.88  4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1  0  0  5  6 25  4.56  329/1504  4.40  4.34  4.05 3.78  4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   0  0  0  1  3 32  4.86  134/1612  4.70  4.30  4.16 4.10  4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0 25 12  4.32 1295/1635  4.32  4.59  4.65 4.56  4.32
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 11 1 1  0  0  2 23  4.77  167/1579  4.60  4.28  4.08 3.95  4.77


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        4   0  0  0  0  2 32  4.94  128/1518  4.75  4.55  4.43 4.38  4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   4   0  0  0  0  1 33  4.97  164/1520  4.94  4.87  4.70 4.61  4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4  0  0  0  0  0 34  5.00    1/1517  4.72  4.45  4.27 4.20  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     4   0  0  0  0  1 33  4.97   52/1550  4.75  4.37  4.22 4.17  4.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 19 0  1  2  0 12  4.53  251/1295  3.90  3.49  3.94 3.84  4.53


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 21 0  0  0  0  3 14  4.82  205/1398  4.74  4.26  4.07 3.85  4.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 21 0  0  0  0  1 16  4.94  136/1391  4.66  4.31  4.30 4.07  4.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 21 0 0  0  0  0 17  5.00    1/1388  4.93  4.46  4.28 4.01  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  21  9  0  0  1  4  3  4.25 ****/ 958  3.74  3.48  3.93 3.71  ****


                                   Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      2      0.00-0.99   0      A   25        Required for Majors  14    Graduate    0      Major      0
 28-55      6      1.00-1.99   0      B    8
 56-83      2      2.00-2.99   8      C    0        General              18    Under-grad  38     Non-major  38
 84-150    14      3.00-3.49  14      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                 2
                                      ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: PHIL 251  0101          University of Maryland                              Page 1258
Title       ETH ISS SCI ENG&INF TE       Baltimore County                                 FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD              Fall  2007                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     41
Questionnaires: 37                       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  0  7 16 12  3.97 1172/1639  4.17  4.35  4.27 4.35  3.97
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  1  0  7  9 20  4.27  840/1639  4.35  4.30  4.22 4.27  4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  1  6 11 19  4.30  758/1397  4.31  4.52  4.28 4.39  4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  2  0  1  1 10 23  4.57  402/1583  4.52  4.46  4.19 4.28  4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 13  1  2  9  7  4  3.48 1258/1532  3.56  4.26  4.01 4.09  3.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  1  0  7 10 18  4.22  638/1504  4.45  4.34  4.05 4.09  4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  1  9 12 15  4.11  976/1612  4.17  4.30  4.16 4.21  4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1  1  0  0  0  6 29  4.83  781/1635  4.87  4.59  4.65 4.63  4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 1 0  7 15  7  3.90 1056/1579  4.20  4.28  4.08 4.14  3.90

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  2  2  7 13 13  3.89 1321/1518  4.07  4.55  4.43 4.48  3.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  2  2 33  4.84  725/1520  4.79  4.87  4.70 4.78  4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0  1  1  9 11 15  4.03 1071/1517  4.16  4.45  4.27 4.34  4.03
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  3  1 13 11  9  3.59 1300/1550  3.95  4.37  4.22 4.33  3.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 11 3 1  6  6  9  3.68  882/1295  3.75  3.49  3.94 4.07  3.68

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0  2  0  5 11 10  3.96  816/1398  4.09  4.26  4.07 4.14  3.96
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0  0  1  8  9 10  4.00  983/1391  4.11  4.31  4.30 4.35  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 1 0 10  8  9  3.86 1056/1388  3.93  4.46  4.28 4.37  3.86
4. Were special techniques successful                  9  8  0  1  7  6  6  3.85  554/ 958  3.93  3.48  3.93 4.00  3.85

            Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 36 0 0 0 0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 240  ****  ****  4.11 4.47  ****

            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 36 0 0 0 0  0  1  5.00 ****/  85  ****  ****  4.58 4.00  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 36 0 0 0 0  0  1  5.00 ****/  82  ****  ****  4.52 3.00  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 36 0 0 0 0  0  1  5.00 ****/  78  ****  ****  4.47 ****  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    36  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  80  ****  ****  4.47 2.00  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                36  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  82  ****  ****  4.16 4.00  ****

            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 36 0 0 0 0  0  1  5.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.04 4.78  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 36 0 0 0 0  0  1  5.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.05 4.28  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       36  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.75 ****  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   36  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.58 ****  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 36 0 0 0 0  0  1  5.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.56 ****  ****

            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 36 0 0 0 0  0  1  5.00 ****/  50  ****  4.78  4.45 3.24  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    36  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  32  ****  3.00  4.51 4.33  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      36  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  43  ****  4.78  4.69 ****  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       36  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  32  ****  4.67  4.37 1.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     36  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  21  ****  5.00  4.52 3.00  ****
```

```
Course-Section: PHIL 251  0101                University of Maryland                        Page 1258
Title          ETH ISS SCI ENG&INF TE          Baltimore County                           FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    WILSON, RICHARD                  Fall   2007                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     41
Questionnaires: 37                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades           Reasons                Type                    Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27     2        0.00-0.99   1        A   24        Required for Majors  2      Graduate    0        Major       0
28-55     8        1.00-1.99   0        B    5
56-83     1        2.00-2.99   4        C    0        General              0      Under-grad  37       Non-major   37
84-150    1        3.00-3.49   6        D    0
Grad.     0        3.50-4.00   2        F    0        Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                        I    0        Other               29
                                        ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: PHIL 251  0201               University of Maryland                              Page 1259
Title        ETH ISS SCI ENG&INF TE          Baltimore County                                   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  WILSON, RICHARD                 Fall   2007                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     39
Questionnaires: 26                     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    4   0  0  0  4  6 12  4.36  788/1639  4.17  4.35  4.27  4.35  4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     3   0  0  0  2  9 12  4.43  633/1639  4.35  4.30  4.22  4.27  4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    4   0  0  0  2 11  9  4.32  740/1397  4.31  4.52  4.28  4.39  4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     4   1  0  0  1  9 11  4.48  512/1583  4.52  4.46  4.19  4.28  4.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 4   5  1  1  6  4  5  3.65 1152/1532  3.56  4.26  4.01  4.09  3.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 4 0  0  0  2  3 17  4.68  230/1504  4.45  4.34  4.05  4.09  4.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             5   0  0  0  5  6 10  4.24  837/1612  4.17  4.30  4.16  4.21  4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled                   4   1  0  0  0  2 19  4.90  662/1635  4.87  4.59  4.65  4.63  4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 11 1 0  0  0  7  7  4.50  382/1579  4.20  4.28  4.08  4.14  4.50

             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         6   0  0  1  3  6 10  4.25 1094/1518  4.07  4.55  4.43  4.48  4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    6   0  0  0  2  1 17  4.75  890/1520  4.79  4.87  4.70  4.78  4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 6   0  0  0  4  6 10  4.30  833/1517  4.16  4.45  4.27  4.34  4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      6   0  1  0  2  6 11  4.30  860/1550  3.95  4.37  4.22  4.33  4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6  3  0  2  5  4  6  3.82  791/1295  3.75  3.49  3.94  4.07  3.82

             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8   0  0  0  5  4  9  4.22  651/1398  4.09  4.26  4.07  4.14  4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8   0  0  1  2  7  8  4.22  839/1391  4.11  4.31  4.30  4.35  4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8  0  0  1  5  5  7  4.00  944/1388  3.93  4.46  4.28  4.37  4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   8   6  1  0  2  4  5  4.00  456/ 958  3.93  3.48  3.93  4.00  4.00

             Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  25   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 224  ****  ****  4.10  4.33  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 25 0 0 0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 240  ****  ****  4.11  4.47  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 25 0 0 0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 219  ****  ****  4.44  4.61  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           25   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.35  4.43  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 25   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 198  ****  ****  4.18  4.08  ****

             Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 25  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  85  ****  ****  4.58  4.00  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 25 0 0 0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  82  ****  ****  4.52  3.00  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 25  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  78  ****  ****  4.47  ****  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    25   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  80  ****  ****  4.47  2.00  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                25   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  82  ****  ****  4.16  4.00  ****

             Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 25   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.04  4.78  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 25   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.05  4.28  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       25   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.75  ****  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   25   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.58  ****  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 25   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.56  ****  ****

             Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 25  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  50  ****  4.78  4.45  3.24  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    25   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  32  ****  3.00  4.51  4.33  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      25   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  43  ****  4.78  4.69  ****  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       25   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  32  ****  4.67  4.37  1.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     25   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  21  ****  5.00  4.52  3.00  ****
```

                                            Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	2	A	17	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	26	Non-major	26
84-150	1	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	18				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: PHIL 321  0101            University of Maryland                        Page 1260
Title      HIST OF PHIL:ANCIENT            Baltimore County                             FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   HITZ, ZENA                   Fall  2007                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     47
Questionnaires: 36               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  3  5  6 11  9  3.53 1488/1639  3.53  4.35  4.27  4.28  3.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     2  0  2  4  9 12  7  3.53 1473/1639  3.53  4.30  4.22  4.20  3.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    3  2  2  3  6 13  7  3.65 1228/1397  3.65  4.52  4.28  4.26  3.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     2  3  1  4  6  9 11  3.81 1226/1583  3.81  4.46  4.19  4.24  3.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  0  2  0  7  7 18  4.15  670/1532  4.15  4.26  4.01  4.05  4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2  0  1  3  4 11 15  4.06  797/1504  4.06  4.34  4.05  4.12  4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             2  0  6  6 10  5  7  3.03 1517/1612  3.03  4.30  4.16  4.12  3.03
8. How many times was class cancelled                   2  0  0  0  0 16 18  4.53 1121/1635  4.53  4.59  4.65  4.66  4.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9 0 1  3 11  7  5  3.44 1345/1579  3.44  4.28  4.08  4.07  3.44


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         3  0  1  2  5  9 16  4.12 1189/1518  4.12  4.55  4.43  4.39  4.12
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    4  0  0  0  1  5 26  4.78  837/1520  4.78  4.87  4.70  4.68  4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0  3  2  7 13  8  3.64 1301/1517  3.64  4.45  4.27  4.23  3.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      4  0  3  3  4 11 11  3.75 1237/1550  3.75  4.37  4.22  4.20  3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 29  1  0  1  1  0  2.67 ****/1295  ****  3.49  3.94  3.95  ****


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 15 0  3  2  6  5  5  3.33 1183/1398  3.33  4.26  4.07  4.13  3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 15 0  0  2  2  4 13  4.33  752/1391  4.33  4.31  4.30  4.35  4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16 0  1  0  3  2 14  4.40  740/1388  4.40  4.46  4.28  4.34  4.40
4. Were special techniques successful                   15 16  1  1  0  0  3  3.60 ****/ 958  ****  3.48  3.93  3.97  ****

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 35 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  85  ****  ****  4.58  4.50  ****


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned      Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                   Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     0       0.00-0.99   0     A    8     Required for Majors  4    Graduate      0      Major       11
  28-55     1       1.00-1.99   0     B   16
  56-83     6       2.00-2.99   5     C    5     General              2    Under-grad   36      Non-major   25
  84-150   12       3.00-3.49   9     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               20
                                      ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: PHIL 321H 0101                University of Maryland                              Page 1261
Title         HIST OF PHIL:ANCIENT              Baltimore County                                 FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   HITZ, ZENA                        Fall  2007                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      7
Questionnaires:  3                        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  2  4.67   430/1639  4.67  4.35  4.27  4.28  4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  3  0  4.00  1090/1639  4.00  4.30  4.22  4.20  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   1  0  0  0  1  1  4.50   517/1397  4.50  4.52  4.28  4.26  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  3  0  4.00  1010/1583  4.00  4.46  4.19  4.24  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33   506/1532  4.33  4.26  4.01  4.05  4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  1  1  1  4.00   824/1504  4.00  4.34  4.05  4.12  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  1  0  1  1  3.67  1327/1612  3.67  4.30  4.16  4.12  3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  1001/1635  4.67  4.59  4.65  4.66  4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33   569/1579  4.33  4.28  4.08  4.07  4.33

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33  1021/1518  4.33  4.55  4.43  4.39  4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00     1/1520  5.00  4.87  4.70  4.68  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  0  1  1  1  4.00  1083/1517  4.00  4.45  4.27  4.23  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67   457/1550  4.67  4.37  4.22  4.20  4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  2  0  0  1  0  0  3.00  1158/1295  3.00  3.49  3.94  3.95  3.00

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00     1/1398  5.00  4.26  4.07  4.13  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00     1/1391  5.00  4.31  4.30  4.35  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00     1/1388  5.00  4.46  4.28  4.34  5.00
```

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        1
 28-55      0      1.00-1.99   0        B   0                                                        
 56-83      0      2.00-2.99   0        C   0        General              0     Under-grad   3       Non-major    2
 84-150     0      3.00-3.49   0        D   0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   2        F   0        Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0                                  responses to be significant
                                        I   0        Other                3
                                        ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: PHIL 327  0101              University of Maryland                              Page 1262
Title      AMERICAN PRAGMATISM              Baltimore County                                   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   BRAUDE, STEPHEN               Fall  2007                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    24
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  2  2  7 4.45  684/1639 4.45 4.35 4.27 4.28 4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  0  0  5  6 4.55  476/1639 4.55 4.30 4.22 4.20 4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  0 11 5.00    1/1397 5.00 4.52 4.28 4.26 5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1  5  0  0  0  0  5 5.00    1/1583 5.00 4.46 4.19 4.24 5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  2  1  8 4.55  311/1532 4.55 4.26 4.01 4.05 4.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 4  0  1  1  1  4 4.14  724/1504 4.14 4.34 4.05 4.12 4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0  0  0  0  0  1 10 4.91  113/1612 4.91 4.30 4.16 4.12 4.91
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0  0  0  0  0  9  2 4.18 1402/1635 4.18 4.59 4.65 4.66 4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0  0  0  4  6 4.60  283/1579 4.60 4.28 4.08 4.07 4.60


                  Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0  0  0  0  0  1 10 4.91  213/1518 4.91 4.55 4.43 4.39 4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0  0  0  0  0  0 11 5.00    1/1520 5.00 4.87 4.70 4.68 5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  2  9 4.82  230/1517 4.82 4.45 4.27 4.23 4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0  0  0  0  0  1 10 4.91  174/1550 4.91 4.37 4.22 4.20 4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 7  1  0  1  0  1 3.00 1158/1295 3.00 3.49 3.94 3.95 3.00


                  Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0  1  0  0  2  5 4.25  625/1398 4.25 4.26 4.07 4.13 4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0  0  0  3  3  2 3.88 1082/1391 3.88 4.31 4.30 4.35 3.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0  0  0  1  4  3 4.25  834/1388 4.25 4.46 4.28 4.34 4.25
4. Were special techniques successful                   3  7  0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/ 958 **** 3.48 3.93 3.97 ****


                  Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0 0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 240 **** **** 4.11 4.08 ****


                  Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  10  0  1  0  0  0  0 1.00 ****/  52 **** **** 4.04 4.78 ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  10  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  53 **** **** 4.05 4.31 ****


                  Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 10  0  0  0  0  1  0 4.00 ****/  50 **** 4.78 4.45 5.00 ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     10  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  32 **** 3.00 4.51 5.00 ****


                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons              Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1        0.00-0.99   1        A   5        Required for Majors  1    Graduate      0        Major       3
  28-55     0        1.00-1.99   0        B   2                                                         
  56-83     1        2.00-2.99   2        C   4        General              2    Under-grad   11        Non-major   8
  84-150    5        3.00-3.49   1        D   0                                                         
  Grad.     0        3.50-4.00   3        F   0        Electives            2    #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P   0                                  responses to be significant
                                          I   0        Other                6
                                          ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: PHIL 346  0101              University of Maryland                          Page 1263
Title      DEDUCTIVE SYSTEMS                   Baltimore County                            FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  WILSON, RICHARD                     Fall   2007                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     39
Questionnaires:  30                    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   3  11  16  4.43   712/1639  4.43  4.35  4.27  4.28  4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   1   1   1  12  15  4.30   813/1639  4.30  4.30  4.22  4.20  4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   1   0   1   9  19  4.50   517/1397  4.50  4.52  4.28  4.26  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  17   1   0   2   4   6  4.08   960/1583  4.08  4.46  4.19  4.24  4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   3   0   0   7  12   8  4.04   751/1532  4.04  4.26  4.01  4.05  4.04
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  22   2   0   2   2   2  3.25  1340/1504  3.25  4.34  4.05  4.12  3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   1   0   3  12  14  4.27   802/1612  4.27  4.30  4.16  4.12  4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0  22   8  4.27  1342/1635  4.27  4.59  4.65  4.66  4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4  0   0   1   5  10  10  4.12   818/1579  4.12  4.28  4.08  4.07  4.12


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   0   0   5  11  13  4.28  1077/1518  4.28  4.55  4.43  4.39  4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   0   0   0   5  24  4.83   750/1520  4.83  4.87  4.70  4.68  4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0   1   0   7   9  12  4.07  1048/1517  4.07  4.45  4.27  4.23  4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   0   2   3   6  18  4.38   796/1550  4.38  4.37  4.22  4.20  4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  20   1   0   4   1   3  3.56   953/1295  3.56  3.49  3.94  3.95  3.56


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 20  0   1   3   2   2   2  3.10  1260/1398  3.10  4.26  4.07  4.13  3.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 20  0   0   1   4   1   4  3.80  1124/1391  3.80  4.31  4.30  4.35  3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 20  0   0   1   3   3   3  3.80  1078/1388  3.80  4.46  4.28  4.34  3.80
4. Were special techniques successful                  20   9   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/ 958  ****  3.48  3.93  3.97  ****


                                       Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA          Expected Grades         Reasons                Type                  Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1       0.00-0.99    0       A   15        Required for Majors   1      Graduate      0       Major       4
  28-55     1       1.00-1.99    0       B    9
  56-83     5       2.00-2.99    1       C    3        General               3      Under-grad   30       Non-major  26
  84-150   10       3.00-3.49    8       D    0
  Grad.     0       3.50-4.00   11       F    0        Electives             1      #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other                20
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PHIL 358  0101            University of Maryland                            Page 1264
Title     BIOETHICS                        Baltimore County                                 FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   FERRY, MICHAEL  (Instr. A)       Fall   2007                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    33
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  0  2  7 11  4.14 1029/1639  4.14  4.35  4.27  4.28  4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  3  2 10  7  3.95 1176/1639  3.95  4.30  4.22  4.20  3.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  1  2  3  6 10  4.00  973/1397  4.00  4.52  4.28  4.26  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   6  0  2  3  5  6  3.94 1113/1583  3.94  4.46  4.19  4.24  3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  1   0  2  0  4  7  8  3.90  911/1532  3.90  4.26  4.01  4.05  3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1   4  0  0  4  6  7  4.18  690/1504  4.18  4.34  4.05  4.12  4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  0  4  7  4  6  3.57 1371/1612  3.57  4.30  4.16  4.12  3.57
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  1 14  6  4.24 1366/1635  4.24  4.59  4.65  4.66  4.24
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1   0  0  1  5  6  9  4.10  835/1579  4.10  4.28  4.08  4.07  4.10


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0  0  0  3  4 13  4.50  807/1518  4.50  4.55  4.43  4.39  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0  0  0  0  3 17  4.85  674/1520  4.85  4.87  4.70  4.68  4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0  0  0  4  4 12  4.40  726/1517  4.40  4.45  4.27  4.23  4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  0  4  3 14  4.48  677/1550  3.40  4.37  4.22  4.20  3.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1   3  2  0  1 10  5  3.89  746/1295  3.89  3.49  3.94  3.95  3.89


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  7   0  0  1  2  4  8  4.27  616/1398  4.27  4.26  4.07  4.13  4.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  7   0  0  1  2  2 10  4.40  694/1391  4.40  4.31  4.30  4.35  4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5   0  1  2  0  3 11  4.24  847/1388  4.24  4.46  4.28  4.34  4.24
4. Were special techniques successful                  7   8  3  1  1  1  1  2.43  925/ 958  2.43  3.48  3.93  3.97  2.43


                                Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades         Reasons              Type              Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     2       0.00-0.99   0       A   12        Required for Majors   3    Graduate      0     Major        3
 28-55     0       1.00-1.99   0       B    6
 56-83     1       2.00-2.99   1       C    1        General               0    Under-grad   22     Non-major   19
 84-150    7       3.00-3.49   3       D    0
 Grad.     0       3.50-4.00   4       F    0        Electives             1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                       I    0        Other                13
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PHIL 358  0101              University of Maryland                          Page 1265
Title      BIOETHICS                         Baltimore County                               FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:                  (Instr. C)          Fall   2007                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     33
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  0  2  7 11  4.14 1029/1639  4.14  4.35  4.27 4.28  4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  3  2 10  7  3.95 1176/1639  3.95  4.30  4.22 4.20  3.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  1  2  3  6 10  4.00  973/1397  4.00  4.52  4.28 4.26  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   6  0  2  3  5  6  3.94 1113/1583  3.94  4.46  4.19 4.24  3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0  2  0  4  7  8  3.90  911/1532  3.90  4.26  4.01 4.05  3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 4  0  4  6  7     4.18  690/1504  4.18  4.34  4.05 4.12  4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  0  4  7  4  6  3.57 1371/1612  3.57  4.30  4.16 4.12  3.57
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  1 14  6  4.24 1366/1635  4.24  4.59  4.65 4.66  4.24

               Lecture
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    18   2  0  2  0  0  0  2.00 ****/1550  3.40  4.37  4.22 4.20  3.40

               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7  0  0  1  2  4  8  4.27  616/1398  4.27  4.26  4.07 4.13  4.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7  0  0  1  2  2 10  4.40  694/1391  4.40  4.31  4.30 4.35  4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0  1  2  0  3 11  4.24  847/1388  4.24  4.46  4.28 4.34  4.24
4. Were special techniques successful                  7   8  3  1  1  1  1  2.43  925/ 958  2.43  3.48  3.93 3.97  2.43


                                      Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons                    Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     2        0.00-0.99   0        A   12        Required for Majors   3        Graduate      0        Major       3
  28-55     0        1.00-1.99   0        B    6
  56-83     1        2.00-2.99   1        C    1        General               0        Under-grad   22        Non-major  19
  84-150    7        3.00-3.49   3        D    0
  Grad.     0        3.50-4.00   4        F    0        Electives             1        #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                      responses to be significant
                                          I    0        Other                13
                                          ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PHIL 358H 0101            University of Maryland                          Page 1266
Title      BIOETHICS                       Baltimore County                              FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   FERRY, MICHAEL  (Instr. A)        Fall   2007                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    2
Questionnaires:  2                    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   0   1  4.00 1138/1639  4.00  4.35  4.27  4.28  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 1090/1639  4.00  4.30  4.22  4.20  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00    1/1397  5.00  4.52  4.28  4.26  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00    1/1583  5.00  4.46  4.19  4.24  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00    1/1532  5.00  4.26  4.01  4.05  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00    1/1504  5.00  4.34  4.05  4.12  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 1044/1612  4.00  4.30  4.16  4.12  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 1135/1635  4.50  4.59  4.65  4.66  4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0  0   1   1   0  3.50 1318/1579  3.50  4.28  4.08  4.07  3.50


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50  807/1518  4.50  4.55  4.43  4.39  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00    1/1520  5.00  4.87  4.70  4.68  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00    1/1517  5.00  4.45  4.27  4.23  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50  638/1550  3.25  4.37  4.22  4.20  3.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0  0  0   0   1   1  4.50  265/1295  4.50  3.49  3.94  3.95  4.50


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00    1/1398  5.00  4.26  4.07  4.13  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00    1/1391  5.00  4.31  4.30  4.35  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0  0  0   0   0   2  5.00    1/1388  5.00  4.46  4.28  4.34  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  0   1   0   0   1   0   0  3.00  841/ 958  3.00  3.48  3.93  3.97  3.00


                                      Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PHIL 358H 0101              University of Maryland                        Page 1267
Title      BIOETHICS                         Baltimore County                            FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:                  (Instr. B)          Fall   2007                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      2
Questionnaires:  2                      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  0  1  4.00 1138/1639  4.00  4.35  4.27  4.28  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 1090/1639  4.00  4.30  4.22  4.20  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1397  5.00  4.52  4.28  4.26  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1583  5.00  4.46  4.19  4.24  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  1  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1532  5.00  4.26  4.01  4.05  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  1  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1504  5.00  4.34  4.05  4.12  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 1044/1612  4.00  4.30  4.16  4.12  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 1135/1635  4.50  4.59  4.65  4.66  4.50

              Lecture
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0  0  0  2  0  0  0  2.00 1518/1550  3.25  4.37  4.22  4.20  3.25

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1398  5.00  4.26  4.07  4.13  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1391  5.00  4.31  4.30  4.35  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1388  5.00  4.46  4.28  4.34  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                 0  1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00  841/ 958  3.00  3.48  3.93  3.97  3.00

                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PHIL 370  0101              University of Maryland                              Page 1268
Title        PHIL AND PARAPSYCHOLOG          Baltimore County                                   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  BRAUDE, STEPHEN                 Fall   2007                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      29
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  2  1  4  5  9  3.86 1289/1639  3.86  4.35  4.27  4.28  3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1  0  0  2  5  5  9  4.00 1090/1639  4.00  4.30  4.22  4.20  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1  0  0  0  6  4 11  4.24  813/1397  4.24  4.52  4.28  4.26  4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     2 11  0  1  2  3  3  3.89 1171/1583  3.89  4.46  4.19  4.24  3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0  2  1  5  6  7  3.71 1092/1532  3.71  4.26  4.01  4.05  3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 17 0 1  1  1  1  3.50 ****/1504  ****  4.34  4.05  4.12  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1  0  0  4  7  3  7  3.62 1354/1612  3.62  4.30  4.16  4.12  3.62
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1  0  0  0  4 13  4  4.00 1497/1635  4.00  4.59  4.65  4.66  4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0  1  4  8  2  3.73 1185/1579  3.73  4.28  4.08  4.07  3.73


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         3  0  0  2  2  6  9  4.16 1169/1518  4.16  4.55  4.43  4.39  4.16
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    3  0  0  0  0  0 19  5.00    1/1520  5.00  4.87  4.70  4.68  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4  0  0  1  2  6  9  4.28  864/1517  4.28  4.45  4.27  4.23  4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      3  0  0  1  1  4 13  4.53  614/1550  4.53  4.37  4.22  4.20  4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 5  1  3  2  5  3  3.43 1023/1295  3.43  3.49  3.94  3.95  3.43


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7  0  1  1  6  3  4  3.53 1096/1398  3.53  4.26  4.07  4.13  3.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9  0  1  2  0  2  8  4.08  950/1391  4.08  4.31  4.30  4.35  4.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 1  0  3  5  6  4.00  944/1388  4.00  4.46  4.28  4.34  4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   7 13  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/ 958  ****  3.48  3.93  3.97  ****


            Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 21 0 0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 240  ****  ****  4.11  4.08  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 21  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.04  4.78  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 21  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.05  4.31  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 21 0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  50  ****  4.78  4.45  5.00  ****


                                     Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades            Reasons                Type                      Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     0        0.00-0.99   0       A    9       Required for Majors   1      Graduate      0       Major        4
 28-55     2        1.00-1.99   0       B    6
 56-83     4        2.00-2.99   3       C    1       General              12      Under-grad   22       Non-major   18
 84-150    2        3.00-3.49   6       D    0
 Grad.     0        3.50-4.00   2       F    0       Electives             2      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other                 1
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PHIL 371  0101              University of Maryland                              Page 1269
Title      EPISTEMOLOGY                       Baltimore County                                  FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   EALICK, GREG E.                    Fall   2007                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    31
Questionnaires: 18                       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  0  4 13  4.61  495/1639  4.61  4.35  4.27  4.28  4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  9  9  4.50  517/1639  4.50  4.30  4.22  4.20  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1  14  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/1397  ****  4.52  4.28  4.26  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   2  0  0  0  1 15  4.94  100/1583  4.94  4.46  4.19  4.24  4.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  1  4 13  4.67  236/1532  4.67  4.26  4.01  4.05  4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 17 4.94  67/1504  4.94  4.34  4.05  4.12  4.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  2  3  1 12  4.28  790/1612  4.28  4.30  4.16  4.12  4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  1 17  4.94  397/1635  4.94  4.59  4.65  4.66  4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 1 5 7  4.46  427/1579  4.46  4.28  4.08  4.07  4.46


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  1  2 15  4.78  416/1518  4.78  4.55  4.43  4.39  4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  0 18  5.00    1/1520  5.00  4.87  4.70  4.68  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  2  6 10  4.44  674/1517  4.44  4.45  4.27  4.23  4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  0  1  2 15  4.78  325/1550  4.78  4.37  4.22  4.20  4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 15 0 0 1 1 0  3.50 ****/1295  ****  3.49  3.94  3.95  ****


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6  0  0  0  1  4  7  4.50  426/1398  4.50  4.26  4.07  4.13  4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6 0 0 0 0 0 12  5.00    1/1391  5.00  4.31  4.30  4.35  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0 0 0 1 11  4.92  201/1388  4.92  4.46  4.28  4.34  4.92
4. Were special techniques successful                  6  10  1  0  0  0  1  3.00 ****/ 958  ****  3.48  3.93  3.97  ****


                                  Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                 Type                    Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     0      0.00-0.99   0        A    8      Required for Majors   0      Graduate     0       Major       12
 28-55     1      1.00-1.99   0        B    7
 56-83     4      2.00-2.99   2        C    1      General               4      Under-grad  18       Non-major    6
 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    1                                  responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other                13
                                       ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: PHIL 399A 0101            University of Maryland                        Page   13
Title           TOP IN PHIL                Baltimore County                            FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:     TEMPLETON, ROYE            Fall  2007                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     0
Questionnaires: 4                    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   2   1  4.00 1138/1639  ****  4.31  4.27  4.08  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   3   1  4.25  859/1639   ****  4.37  4.22  4.17  4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   1   1   2  4.25  795/1397   ****  4.51  4.28  4.18  4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   2   1   1  3.75 1261/1583   ****  4.31  4.19  4.01  3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   0   0   1   1   2  4.25  580/1532   ****  4.07  4.01  3.88  4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  2  0  0  1  1  2.75 1457/1504   ****  4.14  4.05  3.78  2.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   0   0   4  5.00    1/1612   ****  4.13  4.16  4.10  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0   4  5.00    1/1635   ****  4.78  4.65  4.56  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  0  0  1  0  2  0  3.33 1390/1579   ****  4.13  4.08  3.95  3.33

               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   0   1   3  4.75  454/1518   ****  4.46  4.43  4.38  4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   1   3  4.75  890/1520   ****  4.76  4.70  4.61  4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1517   ****  4.43  4.27  4.20  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   2   1   1   0  2.75 1476/1550   ****  4.20  4.22  4.17  2.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  0  0  0  1  2  1  4.00  623/1295   ****  4.31  3.94  3.84  4.00

               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0  3  1  0  0  0  1.25 1397/1398   ****  4.37  4.07  3.85  1.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0  2  0  2  0  0  2.00 1385/1391   ****  4.60  4.30  4.07  2.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0  0  1  3  0  0  0  1.75 1386/1388   ****  4.53  4.28  4.01  1.75
4. Were special techniques successful                  0   3   1   0   0   0   0  1.00  951/ 958   ****  4.39  3.93  3.71  1.00

                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                 Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0      0.00-0.99    1         A   0      Required for Majors  1       Graduate     0       Major       0
  28-55      0      1.00-1.99    0         B   2
  56-83      2      2.00-2.99    0         C   1      General              0       Under-grad   4       Non-major   1
  84-150     0      3.00-3.49    1         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                2
                                          ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: PHIL 399B 0101          University of Maryland                          Page   24
Title       TOPICS IN PHIL BUS ETHICS    Baltimore County                               FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  WILSON, R.                   Fall   2007                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     0
Questionnaires:  1                    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  0  4.00 1138/1639  ****  4.31  4.27  4.08  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 1090/1639  ****  4.37  4.22  4.17  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  973/1397  ****  4.51  4.28  4.18  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 1010/1583  ****  4.31  4.19  4.01  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 1524/1532  ****  4.07  4.01  3.88  2.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  824/1504  ****  4.14  4.05  3.78  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 1519/1612  ****  4.13  4.16  4.10  3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1635  ****  4.78  4.65  4.56  5.00


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 1237/1518  ****  4.46  4.43  4.38  4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 1414/1520  ****  4.76  4.70  4.61  4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 1083/1517  ****  4.43  4.27  4.20  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 1077/1550  ****  4.20  4.22  4.17  4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  623/1295  ****  4.31  3.94  3.84  4.00


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades        Reasons                 Type                 Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0      0.00-0.99    0       A    0        Required for Majors  0      Graduate     0      Major        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   1      Non-major    1
  84-150     0      3.00-3.49    0       D    0
  Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    0       F    0        Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other                0
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PHIL 400  0901                University of Maryland                         Page 1270
Title       INDEP STUDY IN PHIL                Baltimore County                            FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  WILSON, RICHARD                    Fall   2007                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      4
Questionnaires:  3                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 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	1	1	1	4.00	1138/1639	4.25	4.35	4.27	4.42	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1410/1639	4.33	4.30	4.22	4.29	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.46	4.19	4.31	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.26	4.01	4.07	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	544/1504	4.67	4.34	4.05	4.20	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1596/1635	4.33	4.59	4.65	4.72	3.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	569/1579	4.67	4.28	4.08	4.21	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.55	4.43	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.87	4.70	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.45	4.27	4.34	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.37	4.22	4.24	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.26	4.07	4.23	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.31	4.30	4.48	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.46	4.28	4.50	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	37/ 50	4.67	4.78	4.45	4.85	4.33
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	31/ 32	3.00	3.00	4.51	4.00	3.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	34/ 43	4.67	4.78	4.69	4.85	4.33
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	23/ 32	4.50	4.67	4.37	4.67	4.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 21	5.00	5.00	4.52	4.50	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PHIL 400  1101              University of Maryland                        Page 1271
Title       INDEP STUDY IN PHIL              Baltimore County                            FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  EALICK, GREG E.                   Fall  2007                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    1
Questionnaires:  2                   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  1  4.50  615/1639  4.25  4.35  4.27  4.42  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1639  4.33  4.30  4.22  4.29  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1583  5.00  4.46  4.19  4.31  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1532  5.00  4.26  4.01  4.07  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1504  4.67  4.34  4.05  4.20  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1612  5.00  4.30  4.16  4.18  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1635  4.33  4.59  4.65  4.72  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1579  4.67  4.28  4.08  4.21  5.00

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1518  5.00  4.55  4.43  4.51  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1520  5.00  4.87  4.70  4.75  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1517  5.00  4.45  4.27  4.34  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1550  5.00  4.37  4.22  4.24  5.00

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1398  5.00  4.26  4.07  4.23  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1391  5.00  4.31  4.30  4.48  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1388  5.00  4.46  4.28  4.50  5.00

                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/  50  4.67  4.78  4.45  4.85  5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      1   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/  43  4.67  4.78  4.69  4.85  5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       1   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/  32  4.50  4.67  4.37  4.67  5.00

                            Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PHIL 405  0701                University of Maryland                              Page 1272
Title        HONORS INDEP STUDY-PHI           Baltimore County                                   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  WILSON, RICHARD                  Fall  2007                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     4
Questionnaires:  1                     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  0  1  5.00    1/1639  5.00  4.35  4.27  4.42  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 1090/1639  4.00  4.30  4.22  4.29  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00  774/1532  4.00  4.26  4.01  4.07  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 1044/1612  4.00  4.30  4.16  4.18  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1635  5.00  4.59  4.65  4.72  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1579  5.00  4.28  4.08  4.21  5.00


                   Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 1237/1518  4.00  4.55  4.43  4.51  4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1520  5.00  4.87  4.70  4.75  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1517  5.00  4.45  4.27  4.34  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 1077/1550  4.00  4.37  4.22  4.24  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   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               1     Under-grad    1      Non-major   1
  84-150     0      3.00-3.49   0         D    0
  Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   0         F    0       Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                         I    0       Other                 0
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PHIL 405H 0101              University of Maryland                              Page 1273
Title       HONORS INDEP STUDY-PHI          Baltimore County                                   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  PFEIFER, JESSIC                     Fall  2007                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     1
Questionnaires:  1                      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  0  1  5.00   1/1639   5.00  4.35  4.27  4.42  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1639   5.00  4.30  4.22  4.29  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1583   5.00  4.46  4.19  4.31  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1532   5.00  4.26  4.01  4.07  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1504   5.00  4.34  4.05  4.20  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1635   5.00  4.59  4.65  4.72  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1579   5.00  4.28  4.08  4.21  5.00

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/ 50    5.00  4.78  4.45  4.85  5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/ 43    5.00  4.78  4.69  4.85  5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/ 32    5.00  4.67  4.37  4.67  5.00

                                        Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PHIL 499A 0101          University of Maryland                              Page   12
Title           ADVAN TOP IN PHIL: THE EMOTIONS    Baltimore County                        FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:     YALOWITZ, STEVEN                   Fall  2007                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       0
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   0  0  0  0  0  5 11  4.69  404/1639  ****  4.31 4.27 4.08 4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1  0  0  0  1  8  6  4.33  774/1639  ****  4.37 4.22 4.17 4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  8  8  4.50  517/1397  ****  4.51 4.28 4.18 4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  2  0  0  4  2  8  4.29  761/1583  ****  4.31 4.19 4.01 4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  3  1 12  4.56  299/1532  ****  4.07 4.01 3.88 4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 3 0 0 2 5 5  4.25  612/1504  ****  4.14 4.05 3.78 4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1  0  0  1  3  1 10  4.33  718/1612  ****  4.13 4.16 4.10 4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1  0  0  0  0 13  2  4.13 1434/1635  ****  4.78 4.65 4.56 4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 1 0 0 0 7 7  4.50  382/1579  ****  4.13 4.08 3.95 4.50


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1  0  0  0  0  3 12  4.80  360/1518  ****  4.46 4.43 4.38 4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  0  0  0  2 13  4.87  648/1520  ****  4.76 4.70 4.61 4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  0  7  8  4.53  560/1517  ****  4.43 4.27 4.20 4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1  0  0  0  1  1 13  4.80  288/1550  ****  4.20 4.22 4.17 4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 10 0 2 2 0 1  3.00 1158/1295  ****  4.31 3.94 3.84 3.00


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0  1  0  3  4  4  3.83  916/1398  ****  4.37 4.07 3.85 3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0  1  1  0  3  7  4.17  887/1391  ****  4.60 4.30 4.07 4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 0 1 11  4.92  201/1388  ****  4.53 4.28 4.01 4.92


             Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 15 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 ****/  85  ****  4.74 4.58 4.50 ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 15 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 ****/  82  ****  4.15 4.52 4.12 ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 ****/  78  ****  4.71 4.47 4.25 ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                15  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  82  ****  4.14 4.16 3.90 ****

                                         Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27    0       0.00-0.99   0        A   6        Required for Majors  0     Graduate     0      Major       0
 28-55    1       1.00-1.99   0        B   5
 56-83    2       2.00-2.99   2        C   2        General          4     Under-grad  16      Non-major   2
 84-150   7       3.00-3.49   4        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           10
                                       ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: PHIL 499B 0101                University of Maryland                          Page   18
Title          ADV TOP IN PHIL POSS WLDS       Baltimore County                              FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    PHEIFER, JESSICA                    Fall   2007                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      0
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    8   0   0   0   2   2   7  4.45  684/1639   ****  4.31  4.27  4.08  4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     8   0   0   0   1   2   8  4.64  382/1639   ****  4.37  4.22  4.17  4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    8   8   0   0   1   0   2  4.33  ****/1397   ****  4.51  4.28  4.18  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     8   0   0   0   1   0  10  4.82  181/1583   ****  4.31  4.19  4.01  4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 8   0   1   1   0   3   6  4.09  707/1532   ****  4.07  4.01  3.88  4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 8 0   0   1   2   2   6  4.18  678/1504   ****  4.14  4.05  3.78  4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             8   0   0   0   2   2   7  4.45  561/1612   ****  4.13  4.16  4.10  4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled                   8   0   0   0   0   8   3  4.27  1334/1635  ****  4.78  4.65  4.56  4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 11 0  0   0   1   4   3  4.25  657/1579   ****  4.13  4.08  3.95  4.25


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         8   0   0   0   0   2   9  4.82  345/1518   ****  4.46  4.43  4.38  4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    8   0   0   0   0   3   8  4.73  943/1520   ****  4.76  4.70  4.61  4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 8   0   0   0   0   4   7  4.64  439/1517   ****  4.43  4.27  4.20  4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      8   0   0   0   0   2   9  4.82  276/1550   ****  4.20  4.22  4.17  4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8  9   0   0   0   2   0  4.00  ****/1295   ****  4.31  3.94  3.84  ****


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11  0   0   0   1   3   4  4.38  532/1398   ****  4.37  4.07  3.85  4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11  0   0   0   0   0   8  5.00    1/1391   ****  4.60  4.30  4.07  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0  0   0   0   0   8  5.00    1/1388   ****  4.53  4.28  4.01  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   11  2   0   0   1   0   5  4.67  155/ 958   ****  4.39  3.93  3.71  4.67


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme  9  0   0   0   0   3   7  4.70   47/  85   ****  4.74  4.58  4.50  4.70
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 9  2   0   0   0   2   6  4.75   36/  82   ****  4.15  4.52  4.12  4.75
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned  9  3   0   0   0   3   4  4.57   44/  78   ****  4.71  4.47  4.25  4.57
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned      9  0   0   0   1   2   7  4.60   41/  80   ****  4.72  4.47  4.39  4.60
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                  9  1   0   0   2   2   5  4.33   42/  82   ****  4.14  4.16  3.90  4.33

                                 Frequency Distribution


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