INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY

Title Instructor: HITZ, ZENA

Enrollment: 31 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 1240 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eane	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean			Mean	Mean		Mean
General	0	0	0	2	4	10	0	4 00	1120/1620	4 20	4 25	4 27	4 00	4 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0 1	2 2	4 5	12 12	8 6		1138/1639 1350/1639	4.32	4.35 4.30	4.27 4.22	4.08 4.17	4.00 3.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals		0	0	0	5 4	9								4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1		-		_	-	12	4.32		4.61	4.52	4.28	4.18	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	8 2	8	8	4.38	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	4	6 11	16 8	4.38	459/1532		4.26	4.01	3.88	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0						824/1504	4.20	4.34	4.05	3.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	-	-	3	12	4	5		1420/1612	4.43	4.30	4.16	4.10	3.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	1 7	0	0	0 1	0 2	2 12	23 4	4.92		4.65	4.59	4.65	4.56	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	/	U	U	Т	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
Diamonian														
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	5 6	6	11	4.12	983/1391	4.30	4.20	4.07	4.07	4.12
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	6	19	4.76	375/1388	4.66	4.31	4.28	4.07	4.76
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	2	4	10	19	4.70	456/ 958		3.48	3.93		
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	U	2	4	10	8	4.00	450/ 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	****		4.52	5.00	****

Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY

Instructor: HITZ, ZENA

Enrollment: 31
Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 1240 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	11	Required for Majors	15	 Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PHIL 100 0201 University of Maryland Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY

Baltimore County Instructor: YALOWITZ, STEVE

Enrollment: 33 Questionnaires: 24

FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1241

					Fre	equei	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain new	insights, skills f	rom 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 instructo	or 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 ques	tions 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 evaluat	ions 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 read	lings contribute t	o 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 assig	nments 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 s	system clearly exp	lained	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 wa	s 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 gra	de the overall te	aching 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 instruct	or's lectures wel	l prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	213/1518	4.67	4.55	4.43	4.38	4.93
2. Did the instructo	or seem interested	in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	776/1520	4.90	4.87	4.70	4.61	4.8
3. Was lecture mater	ial presented and	explained clearly	3	0	0	1	4	8	8	4.10	1030/1517	4.51	4.45	4.27	4.20	4.1
4. Did the lectures	contribute to wha	t you learned	2	0	1	0	2	4	15	4.45	703/1550	4.66	4.37	4.22	4.17	4.4
5. Did audiovisual t	echniques 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 discuss	ions contribute t	o what you learned	9	0	1	1	4	2	7	3.87	903/1398	4.35	4.26	4.07	3.85	3.8
2. Were all students	actively encoura	ged to participate	9	0	0	1	4	2	8	4.13	911/1391	4.30	4.31	4.30	4.07	4.1
3. Did the instructo	or encourage fair	and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	496/1388	4.66	4.46	4.28	4.01	4.6
4. Were special tech	miques successful	-	9	14	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	4.00	3.48	3.93	3.71	***
		Frequ	iency	Dist	rib	ution	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	5

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	_			
				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

Ouestionnaires:	32	Student (	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
Queberonnaries.	32	D C uu CII C	COULDC	n varaacron	Queberonnarie

								_	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	1	0	0	0	1	5	25	4.77	293/1639	4.32	4.35	4.27	4.08	4.77
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	5	26	4.84	177/1639		4.30	4.22	4.17	4.84
		uestions reflec			1	0	0	0	1	1	29	4.90	162/1397	4.61	4.52	4.28	4.18	4.90
4. Did ot	ther evalu	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	2	1	0	0	2	3	24	4.76	239/1583	4.37	4.46	4.19	4.01	4.76
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contrib	ute 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 wr	ritten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o 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 th	he grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	0	0	2	2	27	4.81	166/1612	4.43	4.30	4.16	4.10	4.81
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	265/1635	4.65	4.59	4.65	4.56	4.97
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	125/1579	4.37	4.28	4.08	3.95	4.84
		Lectur	_															
1 Wara t	the instr	nronarod	1	0	0	0	0	2	20	4 00	213/1518	4.67	4.55	4.43	4.38	4.90		
			1	-	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1520		4.87	4.70	4.61			
	the instructor seem interested in the subject lecture material presented and explained clear					0	0		0				110/1517		4.45	4.27		4.94
	lecture material presented and explained clear the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0				122/1550			4.22	4.17	
				our understanding	1	19	1	0	1	1			337/1295					
J. Dia at	aaiovibaa.	r ccciniiques en	nance y	our unacrocanaring	_	10	_	Ü	_	_		1.12	557/1255	3.01	3.15	3.71	3.01	1.12
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute 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 a	all studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	18	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1391	4.30	4.31	4.30	4.07	5.00
		_		d open discussion	18	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1388		4.46	4.28	4.01	5.00
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful		18	7	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	****/ 958	4.00	3.48	3.93	3.71	****
				Frequ	iency	7 Dist	trib	ution	n									
Guadita T		G GD3		Pour out of Courts				ъ.									<b>36</b> - 4	
Credits E	Earned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5 			Ту	pe 			Majors	; 
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 19		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s 1	.3	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55																		
56-83	3 2 2.00-2.99 2 C 0					Gei	nera:	l				9	Under-g	rad 3	2	Non-	major	32
84-150	50 7 3.00-3.49 6 D 0																	
Grad.	0	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ſh		
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her					2						
				? 0														

Course-Section: PHIL 100 0401 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY Instructor:

THOMAS, JAMES Fall 2007 Page 1243

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	47				
Questionnaires:	37	Student Co	Course	${\tt Evaluation}$	Questionnaire

I

?

0

							Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1 Did voi	u gain ne	w insights,ski	_	om this course	1	0	0	0	0	3	33	4.92	154/1639	4.32	4.35	4.27	4.08	4.92
		tor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	4	32	4.89	142/1639	4.42	4.30	4.22	4.17	4.89
		estions reflec			1	0	0	1	1	0	34	4.86	189/1397	4.61	4.52	4.28	4.18	4.86
	_	ations reflect		_	1	2	0	0	1	5	28	4.79	196/1583	4.37	4.46	4.19	4.01	4.79
				what you learned	1	2	2	0	8	2	22	4.24	598/1532		4.26	4.01	3.88	4.24
				o what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	7	27	4.64	268/1504	4.20	4.34	4.05	3.78	4.64
		system clearl		-	1	0	0	0	2	4	30	4.78	197/1612	4.43	4.30	4.16	4.10	4.78
	-	was class canc			1	0	0	0	0	0	36	5.00	1/1635	4.65	4.59	4.65	4.56	5.00
				hing effectiveness	10	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	113/1579	4.37	4.28	4.08	3.95	4.89
		Lectur																
		ctor's lecture		3	0	0	0	0	1	33	4.97	64/1518		4.55	4.43	4.38	4.97	
		tor seem inter	-	3	0	0	0	0	0	34	5.00	1/1520	4.90	4.87	4.70	4.61	5.00	
		_		explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	4	30	4.88	173/1517	4.51	4.45	4.27	4.20	4.88
		s contribute t		-	3	0	0	0	0	1	33	4.97	52/1550	4.66	4.37	4.22	4.17	4.97
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	3	19	2	3	1	1	8	3.67	894/1295	3.64	3.49	3.94	3.84	3.67
		<b>D</b> !																
1 Did al	oga digan	Discus		what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	234/1398	4.35	4.26	4.07	3.85	4.78
				ed to participate	14	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.76	311/1391	4.30	4.20	4.07	4.07	4.76
				d open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.03	112/1388		4.46	4.28	4.07	4.03
		chniques succe		id open discussion		16	0	1	1	0	22 5		****/ 958		3.48	3.93	3.71	****
T. WELE S	peciai ce	ciniiques succe	ssiui		11	10	U	_		U	J	1.29	/ 950	1.00	3.40	3.93	3.71	
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utior	ı									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons	2			Ту	ne			Majors	ı
										, 								
00-27	-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 24						quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s 1	.4	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	2
28-55	6	В 5																
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C 0		Gei	nera:	l.				7	Under-g	rad 3	7	Non-	-major	35
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	7	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				3	#### - 1				_	ŗh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	

Other

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

Title Baltimore County Instructor: SENG, PHILLIP Fall 2007

Enrollment: 40

Questionnaires: 29 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

								equei			_		ructor		e Dept			
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did vo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	1	4	11	13	4.24	899/1639	4.32	4.35	4.27	4.08	4.24
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	3	9	17	4.48	550/1639		4.30	4.22	4.17	4.48
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	4	5	20	4.55	467/1397			4.28	4.18	4.55
	_	uations reflect			0	3	0	0	6	7	13	4.27	781/1583	4.37	4.46	4.19	4.01	4.27
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute 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 w	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	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 th	he gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	0	0	2	5	22	4.69	293/1612	4.43	4.30	4.16	4.10	4.69
8. How ma	any times	was class cand	elled		1	0	0	0	2	21	5	4.11	1454/1635	4.65	4.59	4.65	4.56	4.11
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	15	7	4.26	646/1579	4.37	4.28	4.08	3.95	4.26
		Lectur	·e															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture	s 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 th	he instru	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 le	d the instructor seem interested in the subject s lecture material presented and explained clea					0	0	0	3	7	17	4.52	584/1517	4.51	4.45	4.27	4.20	4.52
4. Did th	he lectur	es contribute t	o 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 a	udiovisua	l techniques er	hance y	your understanding	2	5	0	0	7	11	4	3.86	761/1295	3.64	3.49	3.94	3.84	3.86
		Discus	sion															
1. Did c	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute 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 a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	ed 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 th	he instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd 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 t	echniques succe	ssful	_	15	12	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 958	4.00	3.48	3.93	3.71	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA	1	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	.s			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0 0	A 4		Red	quir	ed fo	or M	ajor	s 1	.6	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	10	в 17																
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C 3		Gei	nera	Τ				7	Under-g	rad 2	29	Non-	-major	29
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 1 P 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	jh
				= -		0+1	h					1	respons	es to r	be sign	ııııcar	16	
				I 0		Oti	her					1						

Page 1244

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY

Title Instructor: PFEIFER, JESSIC

Enrollment: 38 Questionnaires: 30

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2007

Page 1245 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

		0		MD	3.7.7		eque		S	_		ructor		e Dept		Level	Sect
		Questions		NR 	NA	1	2	3	-4 	5	Mean	Rank 	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,skill	s 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 th	e instruc	ctor make clear t	he 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 th	e exam qu	estions 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 ot	her evalu	ations reflect t	he 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 as	signed re	eadings contribut	e 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 wr	itten ass	signments contrib	ute 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 th	e grading	g 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 ma	ny times	was class cancel	led	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1635	4.65	4.59	4.65	4.56	5.00
9. How wo	uld you g	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 t	he instru	actor'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 th	e instruc	ted 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 le	cture mat	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 th	e lecture	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 au	diovisual	l techniques enha	nce your understanding	3	7	1	0	4	4	11	4.20	505/1295	3.64	3.49	3.94	3.84	4.20
		Discussi	on														
1. Did cl	ass discu	ussions contribut	e 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 a	.ll studer	nts actively enco	uraged to participate	15	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	417/1391	4.30	4.31	4.30	4.07	4.73
			ir 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 s	pecial te	echniques success	ful	14	14	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 958	4.00	3.48	3.93	3.71	***
		Field Wo	rk														
3. Was th	e instruc	ctor available fo	r consultation	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****
		Self Pa	ced														
2. Did st	udv quest		the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	3.00	4.51	4.67	***
		acts with the ins		29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 43		4.78	4.69	4.69	****
			Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Po:	ason	c			Ту	ne			Majors	•
																	, 
00-27	1	0 A 23		Red	quire	ed f	or M	ajor	s 2	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0	
28-55 56-83	8 3	0 B 5 5 C 0		Cer	nera:	1				3	Under-g	rad '	30	Non-	major	30	
84-150	3	2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	6 D 0		GEI	иста.	_				ر	onder-9	ruu .		11011-	ilia JUI	30
Grad.	0		6 F 0		Ele	ecti	<i>r</i> es				1	#### - 3				_	ιh
			P 0 I 0		Otl	her					3	respons	es to 1	oe sign	ıfican	ıt	

? 1

Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY

Instructor: SENG, PHILLIP

Enrollment: 36
Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 1246 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
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	Λ	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		****/ 32		3.00	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 43	****	4.78	4.69	4.69	***
5. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	∠ 5	U	U	U	_	U	U	3.00	/ 43		1./0	4.03	4.09	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	2	 А	7	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				2	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 100 0901 University of Maryland Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY Baltimore County

INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY Baltimore County EALICK, GREG E. Fall 2007

Instructor: EALI Enrollment: 32

Questionnaires: 27

Page 1247 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			- I			Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	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	•	0	-	-	-		1.0	4 00	1110/1510	4 60	4 55	4 42	4 20	4 00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	Τ	1	5	4	16		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	Ţ	25	4.85	. ,	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	Ţ	1	4	3	18	4.33		4.66	4.37	4.22		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	0.0	0	0	0	-	•	0	2 00		ale ale ale ale	4 50	4 45	4 5 4	als als als als
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	0	U		****/ 50	****	4.78	4.45	4.54	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 43	****	4.78	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	0	Τ	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	4.67	4.37	4.67	* * * *

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	1	В	12						
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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 146 0101 University of Maryland CRITICAL THINKING

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Title Instructor: TEMPLETON, ROYE

Enrollment: 41 Questionnaires: 22

Page 1248 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

				-	ncies	3	_		tructor	Course	-			
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		1059/1639		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		4.52	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
▼ a selection														
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	6	1	0	2 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		1398/1520		4.87	4.43	4.50	4.10
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	4	4	4	T.T.		1433/1517		4.45	4.70	4.20	3.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	2	6	4	4		1433/1517		4.37	4.22	4.17	3.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	5	2	3	3			1247/1295			3.94	3.84	2.50
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	5	4	3	3		2.50	124//1295	2.54	3.43	3.94	3.04	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	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	Ü	O	_	O	U	_	3.30	, 210			1.11	1.01	
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	****
Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades			Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors		

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	2	 А	7	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	_			
				2	1						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

? 0

Fall 2007

Title CRITICAL THINKING Instructor: TEMPLETON, ROYE

Course-Section: PHIL 146 0201

Enrollment: 33 Questionnaires: 17

Page 1249 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Questions					NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		 Genera																
1 Did vo	u gain ne	w insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	1	2	9	5	4 06	1103/1639	3.92	4.35	4.27	4.08	4.06
		tor make clear			0	0	0	1	3	6	7		1003/1639		4.30	4.22	4.17	4.12
		estions reflec			0	0	0	1	1	7	8	4.29	758/1397		4.52	4.28	4.18	4.29
		ations reflect			0	13	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/1583	3.43	4.46	4.19	4.01	****
				what you learned	1	0	1	2	2	5	6	3.81			4.26	4.01	3.88	3.81
6. Did wr	itten ass	ignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	13	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1504	4.00	4.34	4.05	3.78	****
7. Was th	e grading	system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	408/1612	4.54	4.30	4.16	4.10	4.59
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1635	4.98	4.59	4.65	4.56	5.00
9. How wo	ould you g	rade the overa	ll teac	ching effectiveness	4	1	0	4	4	4	0	3.00	1477/1579	3.00	4.28	4.08	3.95	3.00
		Lectur	е															
		ctor's lecture			1	0	1	2	0	4	9	4.13	1189/1518	3.94	4.55	4.43	4.38	4.13
2. Did th	e instruc	tor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	1	0	0	1	0	5	10	4.50	1188/1520	4.30	4.87	4.70	4.61	4.50
				explained clearly	1	0	1	1	2	8			1235/1517		4.45	4.27	4.20	3.81
		s contribute t		-	1	0	0	2	4	3	7	3.94	1135/1550	3.52	4.37	4.22	4.17	3.94
5. Did au	diovisual	our understanding	1	9	1	4	0	1	1	2.57	1240/1295	2.54	3.49	3.94	3.84	2.57		
		Discus																
				what you learned	4	0	1	4	4	3	1		1304/1398		4.26	4.07	3.85	2.92
				ed to participate	4	0	5	2	4	2	0		1384/1391		4.31	4.30	4.07	2.23
3. Did th	e instruc	tor encourage	iair an	nd open discussion	4	0	3	3	6	1	0	2.38	1377/1388	2.22	4.46	4.28	4.01	2.38
0 17		Labora	_		1.0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0.00	**** / 040	****	****	4 11	4 01	****
2. were y	ou provid	ed with adequa	те раск	ground information	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	***	* * * *	4.11	4.01	* * * *
1 Did ao	lf paged	Self		what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2 00	****/ 50	****	4.78	4.45	4.54	***
		ions make clea			16	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 32		3.00	4.45	4.67	****
		cts with the i			16	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 43		4.78	4.51	4.67	****
_		k/tutoring by		_	16	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 32		4.78	4.37	4.67	****
		gh proctors fo	_	_	16	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 21		5.00	4.52	5.00	****
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ty	pe			Majors	<b>;</b>			
		Cum. GPA																
00-27 28-55	6 2	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	1 0	A 5 B 7		Red	quir	ea i	or Ma	Jor	s l	U	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	1
28-55 56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 2		Co	nera	1				3	Under-9	rad 1	.7	Non	-major	16
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 1		Gel	пета.	1				3	onder-9	ıau l	- /	NOI1-	-ma Jor	Τ0
84-150 Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		. רק	oa+ i :					2	#### -	Meane +	here -	re not	enous	rh
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	J	P 1		Electives					4	respons				_	111	
				I O		Other					1	I CSPOIIS	CD CO L	o bigi	ıııcaı			
				<u> </u>		Otner						_						

Course-Section: PHIL 150 0101 University of Maryland Title CONTEMPORARY MORAL ISS Baltimore County

Instructor: EALICK, GREG E.

Enrollment: 17

Questionnaires: 16 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1250 FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

	-					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	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	****
Frequ	encv	Dist	rib	utio	า									

Credits Ea	Credits Earned			Expected	d 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	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	I 0 Other	Other	3	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 150 0102 University of Maryland Title CONTEMPORARY MORAL ISS Baltimore County

Instructor: EALICK, GREG E. Fall 2007

Enrollment: 19

Ouestionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 1251

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 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 5 11 4.69 223/1532 4.34 4.26 4.01 3.88 4.69 367/1504 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 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 4.45Lecture 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

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0		8	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 150 0104 University of Maryland Title CONTEMPORARY MORAL ISS

Baltimore County Fall 2007

EALICK, GREG E. Instructor:

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 17

Page 1252 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Ctudant	('Ollred	Evaluation	Ollection	marra

			Frequencies						ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	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

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d 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	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

#### Course-Section: PHIL 152 0201 University of Maryland Title INTRO TO MORAL THEORY

? 0

Baltimore County Instructor: FERRY, MICHAEL Fall 2007

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 10

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1253

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

							Fr	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	171/1639	4.68	4.35	4.27	4.08	4.90
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	684/1639	4.54	4.30	4.22	4.17	4.40
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	342/1397	4.74	4.52	4.28	4.18	4.70
	_	uations reflect		_	0	2	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	239/1583	4.64	4.46	4.19	4.01	4.75
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute 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
				o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	291/1504	4.40	4.34	4.05	3.78	4.60
		g system clearl			0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1612	4.70	4.30	4.16	4.10	5.00
		was class cand			0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	1235/1635	4.32	4.59	4.65	4.56	4.40
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	269/1579	4.60	4.28	4.08	3.95	4.63
		Lectur	е															
1. Were th	ere the instructor's lectures well prepared		prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1518	4.75	4.55	4.43	4.38	5.00	
	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
	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	0	1	9	4.90	157/1517	4.72	4.45	4.27	4.20	4.90
	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
				our understanding	1	7	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1295	3.90	3.49	3.94	3.84	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute 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
				d to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	684/1639 4.54 4.30 4.22 4.17 342/1397 4.74 4.52 4.28 4.18 239/1583 4.64 4.46 4.19 4.01 105/1532 4.32 4.26 4.01 3.88 291/1504 4.40 4.34 4.05 3.78 1/1612 4.70 4.30 4.16 4.10 1235/1635 4.32 4.59 4.65 4.56 269/1579 4.60 4.28 4.08 3.99  1/1518 4.75 4.55 4.43 4.38 1/1520 4.94 4.87 4.70 4.61 157/1517 4.72 4.45 4.27 4.20 174/1550 4.75 4.37 4.22 4.17 ****/1295 3.90 3.49 3.94 3.84  177/1398 4.74 4.26 4.07 3.89 1/1391 4.66 4.31 4.30 4.07 1/1388 4.93 4.46 4.28 4.03	4.07	5.00			
				d open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1388	4.93	4.46	4.28	4.01	5.00
		echniques succe		-	2	2	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	399/ 958	3.74	3.48	3.93	3.71	4.17
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arnod	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				D.O.	asons	,			т.	no			Majore	
				Expected Grades						- 			ту. 					, . – – – –
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	7	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	в 4														
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General					1	Under-g	rad 1	.0	Non-	-major	10		
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0					_	βh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot]	her					1						

Course-Section: PHIL 152 0301 University of Maryland

I

?

0

1

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
---------	--------	------------	---------------

							Fr	eque:	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	- lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	1	0	10	12	4.43	712/1639	4.68	4.35	4.27	4.08	4.43
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	3	2	17	4.52	496/1639	4.54	4.30	4.22	4.17	4.52
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	3	3	17	4.61	417/1397	4.74	4.52	4.28	4.18	4.61
		uations reflect			0	0	0	0	2	8	13	4.48	512/1583	4.64	4.46	4.19	4.01	4.48
				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 wr	ritten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o 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 th	ne grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	4	6	13	4.39	644/1612	4.70	4.30	4.16	4.10	4.39
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	11	12	4.52	1121/1635	4.32	4.59	4.65	4.56	4.52
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	9	10	4.45	450/1579	4.60	4.28	4.08	3.95	4.45
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	e the instructor's lectures well prepared the instructor seem interested in the subject		prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	684/1518	4.75	4.55	4.43	4.38	4.61	
2. Did th	ne instru	n 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 le	ecture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	523/1517	4.72	4.45	4.27	4.20	4.57
4. Did th	ne lecture	es contribute t	o 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 au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	18	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	****/1295	3.90	3.49	3.94	3.84	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute 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 a	all studer	nts actively en	courage	d 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 th	ne instruc	ctor encourage	fair ar	d 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 s	special te	echniques succe	ssful		4	2	1	0	3	6	7	4.06	446/ 958	3.74	3.48	3.93	3.71	4.06
				Frequ	.ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ту	ne			Majors	ı.
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	2	A 8		Red	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s 1	.2	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55								_				_	_		_			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 2	General							7	Under-g	rad 2	3	Non-	-major	23
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	ıh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	uficar	ıt	

Other

2

Title INTRO TO MORAL THEORY

Instructor: SENG, PHILLIP

Enrollment: 40
Questionnaires: 27

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 1255 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 Did 1701	u gain ne	General w insights,skil	_	thia gourgo	0	0	0	1	1	11	14	1 11	754/1639	4.68	4.35	4.27	4.08	4.41
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1		12	9		1036/1639		4.30	4.27	4.17	4.41
		lestions reflect	_	_	0	0	0	0	1	13	13	4.44	603/1397		4.52	4.28	4.18	4.44
	_	ations reflect			0	3	0	0	2	13	9	4.29	751/1583		4.46	4.19	4.01	4.29
				hat you learned	0	0	1	0	2	3	21	4.59	281/1532		4.26	4.01	3.88	4.59
				what you learned	1	1	0	2	2	13		4.08	780/1504		4.34	4.05	3.78	4.08
		g system clearly		_	0	0	0	0	2	7	18	4.59	398/1612	4.70	4.30	4.16	4.10	4.59
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	1	19	7	4.22	1374/1635	4.32	4.59	4.65	4.56	4.22
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teach	ing effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	8	10	4.47	416/1579	4.60	4.28	4.08	3.95	4.47
		Lecture	<u>a</u>															
1. Were th	he instru	actor's lectures	s well p	repared	1	0	0	0	4	8	14	4.38	968/1518	4.75	4.55	4.43	4.38	4.38
			_	_	0	0	0	0	0	6	21	4.78	855/1520	4.94	4.87	4.70	4.61	4.78
3. Was led	the instructor seem interested in the sub- lecture material presented and explained of the lectures contribute to what you learned audiovisual techniques enhance your unders	plained 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		ou learned	0	0	1	0	3	7	16	4.37	796/1550	4.75	4.37	4.22	4.17	4.37		
5. Did aud	I the lectures contribute to what you learned I audiovisual techniques enhance your understa		our understanding	3	18	1	0	2	3	0	3.17	****/1295	3.90	3.49	3.94	3.84	****	
	Discussion																	
	Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learned						_				_							
					6	0	0	0	2	10	9	4.33	560/1398		4.26	4.07	3.85	4.33
		-	_	l to participate	6	0	0	2	3	7	9	4.10	940/1391	4.66	4.31	4.30	4.07	4.10
		ctor encourage i echniques succes		l open discussion	6 6	0 13	0 2	0	0 3	7 2	14 1	4.67			4.46	4.28	4.01 3.71	4.67
4. were sp	рестат се	echniques succes	SSIUI		ь	13	2	U	3	2	1	3.00	841/ 958	3.74	3.48	3.93	3.71	3.00
		Laborat	-															
2. Were yo	ou provid	ded with adequat	te backs	round information	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	***	****	4.11	4.01	***
		Semina	r															
2. Was the	e instruc	ctor available	for indi	vidual attention	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****
		Field V	Work															
3. Was the	e instruc	ctor available		sultation	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	***
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
a 1'. =	,	a ana						_					_					
Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Rea	ason	s 				pe 			Majors 	; 
00-27	00-27 2 0.00-0.99 1 A 12					Red	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s 1	.0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	1
28-55							_					_	_					
56-83						Gei	nera	Τ				7	Under-g	rad 2	27	Non-	-major	26
	84-150 1 3.00-3.49 0 D 0											0			,			,
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				2	#### -					ın
				1 0		O+1	0.0					1	respons	es to b	e sign	ııııcar	1T	
				3 0 I 0		Uti	ner					4						
				? U														

Title INTRO TO MORAL THEORY

Instructor: THOMAS, JAMES

Enrollment: 45 Questionnaires: 34

Page 1256 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2007

			Fre	equei	ncie	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	0	0	3	28	4.78	281/1639	4.68	4.35	4.27	7 4.08 2 4.17 8 4.18 9 4.01 9 3.88 5 3.78 6 4.10 5 4.56 8 3.95 3 4.38 6 4.10 5 4.56 8 3.95 3 4.38 7 4.20 2 4.17 4 3.84 7 3.85 0 4.07 8 4.01 8 4.01 8 4.50 2 4.12 7 4.25 7 4.25 7 4.25 7 4.39 6 3.90 6 4.60 6 4.60	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		4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	3	1	25	4.67	317/1612		4.30	4.16		4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	1	0	0	23	7		1441/1635	4.32	4.59	4.65		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		4.69
J. now would you grade the overall teaching circultiveness	Ü	Ü	_	-	Ü	_	23	1.05	220/13/5	1.00	1.20	1.00	3.75	1.05
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		4.93
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		4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	0	28	4.90	185/1550	4.72	4.45	4.27		4.90
-			2		2									
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	0.0	0	_	_	0	-	1.0	4 00	100/1200	4 54	4 06	4 00	2 05	4 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	129/1398		4.26	4.07		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		4.64
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		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		****/ 85	****	****	4.58		****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 82	****	****	4.52		****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 78	****	****	4.47		****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47		****
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		****
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	****
		-	-	-	-	-					<del>-</del>			

Title INTRO TO MORAL THEORY

Instructor: THOMAS, JAMES

Enrollment: 45
Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 1256 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	24	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 152 0601 University of Maryland Title INTRO TO MORAL THEORY Baltimore County

Instructor: THOMAS, JAMES

Enrollment: 47 Ouestionnaires: 38

Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire Page 1257

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 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 3.84 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 \*\*\*\*

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	25	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	_			
				?	1						

ETH ISS SCI ENG&INF TE

Title WILSON, RICHARD

Instructor:

Enrollment: 41 Questionnaires: 37

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 1258 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eane	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	7	16	12		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		1321/1518	4.07		4.43	4.48	3.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	2	33		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		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
Diament and														
Discussion	0	0	0	_	_		1.0	2 06	016/1200	4 00	4 06	4 00	4 1 4	2 06
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		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	****	****
0.10 - 1														
Self Paced	2.5	_		0	_	_	-	F 00	****	4. 4. 4. 4.	4 50	4 4-	2 24	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	0	Τ	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	****

Title ETH ISS SCI ENG&INF TE

Instructor: WII

WILSON, RICHARD

Enrollment: 41
Questionnaires: 37

Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 1258 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits Ea	redits Earned Cum. GPA			Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	 А	24	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	29				
				?	1						

ETH ISS SCI ENG&INF TE

Title WILSON, RICHARD

Instructor:

Enrollment: 39 Questionnaires: 26

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 1259 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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		4.52	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		4.46	4.19	4.28	4.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	5	1	1	6	4	5		1152/1532		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		4.34	4.05	4.09	4.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	5	6		4.24	837/1612		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		4.59	4.65		4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	382/1579		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		****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	0	1		,	****	****	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	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 82	****	****	4.52	3.00	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25 25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80 ****/ 82	****	****	4.47	2.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	U	U	U	U	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		****/ 42	****	****	4.75	***	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 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		****/ 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	****

Title ETH ISS SCI ENG&INF TE

Instructor:

Enrollment: 39

WILSON, RICHARD Fall 2007

Page 1259 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 26

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	2	 А	17	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	1						

Baltimore County Fall 2007

University of Maryland Page 1260 Title HIST OF PHIL: ANCIENT FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029 HITZ, ZENA Instructor:

Enrollment:	47					
Questionnaires:	36	S	tudent	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Ouestions							_	ncie		_		ructor	Course	_				
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain nev	w insights,ski		this course	2	0	3	5	6	11	9	3.53	1488/1639	3.53	4.35	4.27	4.28	3.53
		tor make clear			2	0	2	4	9	12	7	3.53	1473/1639	3.53	4.30	4.22	4.20	3.53
3. Did th	ne exam que	estions reflec	t the ex	pected goals	3	2	2	3	6	13	7	3.65	1228/1397	3.65	4.52	4.28	4.26	3.65
4. Did ot	her evalua	ations reflect	the exp	ected goals	2	3	1	4	6	9	11	3.81	1226/1583	3.81	4.46	4.19	4.24	3.81
5. Did as	signed rea	adings contrib	ute to w	hat 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 wr	itten ass	ignments contr	ibute 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 th	e grading	system clearl	y explai	ned	2	0	6	6	10	5	7	3.03	1517/1612	3.03	4.30	4.16	4.12	3.03
8. How ma	ny times v	was class canc	elled		2	0	0	0	0	16	18	4.53	1121/1635	4.53	4.59	4.65	4.66	4.53
9. How wo	ould you gr	rade the overa	ll teach	ing 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 t	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						1	2	5	9	16	4 12	1189/1518	4.12	4 55	4.43	4.39	4.12
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	1	5			837/1520		4.87	4.70	4.68	4.78
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	3	2		13	8		1301/1517			4.27	4.23	3.64
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	3	3	4				1237/1550		4.37	4.22	4.20	3.75
	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned . Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					29	1		1	1			****/1295		3.49		3.95	****
		Discus																
				hat you learned	15	0	3	2	6	5			1183/1398		4.26	4.07	4.13	3.33
				to participate	15	0	0	2					752/1391		4.31	4.30	4.35	4.33
				open discussion	16	0	1	0	3			4.40	740/1388		4.46	4.28	4.34	4.40
4. Were s	special ted	chniques succe	ssful		15	16	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	****/ 958	****	3.48	3.93	3.97	****
		Semina	r															
1. Were a	ssigned to		_	announced theme	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	***
				Frequ	ency	r Dist	cribu	ıtio	n									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ty	pe			Majors	;
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 8					Rec	 guire		 or M	aior		4	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	11
	28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 16								11		-	-	or addac	-	-		-	
56-83						Ger	neral	L				2	Under-q	rad 3	6	Non-	-major	25
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	9	D 0		001		-				_	011001 9	5	-	2,011		2.5
Grad.						Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
	-	2.22 2.30	•	P 0								-	respons				_	•
				I O		Oth	ner				2	0		2				
	? 1																	

#### Course-Section: PHIL 321H 0101 University of Maryland Title HIST OF PHIL: ANCIENT Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: HITZ, ZENA

Enrollment: 7 Questionnaires: 3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1261

responses to be significant

						Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Questions	;		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did you	u gain ne	w insights,skil	ls fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	430/1639	4.67	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.67
_	_	tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1090/1639	4.00	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.00
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflect	the e	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 oth	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1010/1583	4.00	4.46	4.19	4.24	4.00
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contribu	ite 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 wri	itten ass	ignments contri	bute t	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	e grading	system clearly	expla	ained	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1327/1612	3.67	4.30	4.16	4.12	3.67
8. How mar	ny times	was class cance	lled		0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1001/1635	4.67	4.59	4.65	4.66	4.67
9. How wor	uld you g	rade the overal	l tead	ching 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 th	l. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1021/1518	4.33	4.55	4.43	4.39	4.33
2. Did the	e instruc	tor seem intere	sted i	n 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 led	cture mat	erial presented	l and e	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	e lecture	s 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 aud	diovisual	techniques enh	ance y	our understanding	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1158/1295	3.00	3.49	3.94	3.95	3.00
		Discuss	ion															
1. Did cla	ass discu			what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.26	4.07	4.13	5.00
				ed 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	e instruc	tor encourage f	air ar	nd open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.46	4.28	4.34	5.00
				Frequ	ency	7 Dist	ribu	ıtior	ı									
Credita Fa								Po:	asons	2			Туј	ne			Majors	
	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades									, 								, 
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3						Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	5	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	1
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0																		
56-83							nera!	L				0	Under-g	rad	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	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ŗh

Other

3

I

0

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title AMERICAN PRAGMATISM Baltimore Count Instructor: BRAUDE, STEPHEN Fall 2007

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 11

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1262 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

					Frequencies		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
1 Did way gain n	General	from this source	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	1 1E	601/1620	4.45	4.35	4.27	1 20	1 1E
	ew insights, skills		0	0	0	0	0	2 5	6	4.45	684/1639 476/1639				4.28	4.45
	ctor make clear the questions reflect the		0	0	0	0	0	0	11	4.55 5.00	1/1397	4.55 5.00	4.30 4.52	4.22	4.20 4.26	4.55 5.00
	uations reflect th			5	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.52	4.19	4.24	5.00
		to what you learned	1 0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	311/1532	4.55	4.46	4.19	4.24	4.55
_	_	te to what you learned	0	4	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	724/1504	4.14	4.26	4.01	4.12	4.14
	ig system clearly e		0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	113/1612		4.34	4.16	4.12	4.91
	was class cancell		0	0	0	0	0	9	2		1402/1635	4.18	4.59	4.65	4.66	4.18
		teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	. ,	4.60	4.28	4.08	4.07	4.60
•	-	<u> </u>														
1	Lecture	-11	0	0	0	0	0	-1	1.0	4 01	012/1510	4 01	4 55	4 42	4 20	4 01
	uctor's lectures w		0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	213/1518	4.91	4.55	4.43	4.39	4.91
	ctor seem interest		0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.87	4.70	4.68	5.00
	res contribute to w	nd explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2 1	9 10	4.82	230/1517	4.82	4.45	4.27	4.23	4.82
		_	1	7	1	0	1	0			174/1550	4.91	4.37	4.22		3.00
5. Did audiovisua	ii techniques enhan	ce your understanding	Т	/	1	U	1	U	1	3.00	1158/1295	3.00	3.49	3.94	3.95	3.00
	Discussion															
1. Did class disc	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned					0	0	2	5	4.25	625/1398	4.25	4.26	4.07	4.13	4.25
2. Were all stude	nts actively encou	raged to participate	3	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1082/1391	3.88	4.31	4.30	4.35	3.88
		r 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 t	echniques successf	ul	3	7	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 958	****	3.48	3.93	3.97	****
	Laborator	V														
2. Were you provi		background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.08	****
	m! 11 m															
1 5'1 6' 11	Field Wor		1.0	0	-	•	0	0	0	1 00		ale ale ale ale	ale ale ale ale	4 0 4	4 50	ale ale ale ale
		to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you cleari	y understand your	evaluation criteria	10	0	0	U	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	***		4.05	4.31	
	Self Pac	ed														
1. Did self-paced	l 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 ques	tions make clear t	ne expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	3.00	4.51	5.00	****
	Fr															
Credits Earned	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad						sons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27 1						ed fo	or Ma	ajor	 s	1	Graduat	====== =	0	Majo	 or	3
28-55 0	1.00-1.99 0	в 2						-						-		
56-83 1		Ger	nera	1				2	Under-g	rad 1	1	Non-	-major	8		
84-150 5																
Grad. 0		Ele	ecti	ves				2	#### - 1				_	jh		
	Р 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt		
		I 0	Other							6						

?

0

University of Maryland Page 1263
Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

O L	a	The second second second	Ouestionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestronnarie

Course-Section: PHIL 346 0101

39

DEDUCTIVE SYSTEMS

WILSON, RICHARD

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 30

3.77			_	ncie				tructor		1	01120	Level	Sect
NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
0	Λ	Ω	0	3	11	16	4 43	712/1639	4 43	4 35	4 27	4 28	4.43
			-	1									4.30
-			_	1	9								4.50
		_	-	2	4	6							4.08
			-	7	_	8							4.04
-			0	2		-		- ,				4.12	3.25
0	0	1	0									4.12	4.27
0	0	0	0	0								4.66	4.27
3 4	0	0	1	5				- ,					4.12
1	0	0	0	5	11	13	4.28	1077/1518	4.28	4.55	4.43	4.39	4.28
1	0	0	0	0	5	24	4.83	750/1520	4.83	4.87	4.70	4.68	4.83
1	0	1	0	7	9	12	4.07	1048/1517	4.07	4.45	4.27	4.23	4.07
1	0	0	2	3	6	18	4.38	796/1550	4.38	4.37	4.22	4.20	4.38
1	20	1	0	4	1	3	3.56	953/1295	3.56	3.49	3.94	3.95	3.56
20	0	1	3	2	2	2	3.10	1260/1398	3.10	4.26	4.07	4.13	3.10
20	0	0	1	4	1	4	3.80	1124/1391	3.80	4.31	4.30	4.35	3.80
20	0	0	1	3	3	3	3.80	1078/1388	3.80	4.46	4.28	4.34	3.80
20	9	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 958	****	3.48	3.93	3.97	****
quency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
5			Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	;
	Re	auir	ed fo	or M	aior	 s	1	 Graduat	 e	0	Maio	r r	4
					J						5		
	Ge:	nera	1				3	Under-q	rad 3	0	Non-	major	26
								J				-	
	El	ecti	ves				1	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
								respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
	Ot:	her				2	:0	-					
	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 17 0 3 3 0 22 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 7 1 0 0 3 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 1 7 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 3 0 0 1 1 1 0 0 1 0 1 0 17 1 0 2 0 3 0 0 7 1 0 22 2 0 2 0 0 1 0 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 5 1 0 0 0 0 5 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 7 1 0 0 2 3 1 20 1 0 4  20 0 1 3 2 20 0 0 1 4 20 0 0 1 3 20 9 0 0 0  quency Distribution  Required for M General Electives	0 0 0 0 3 11 0 0 1 1 1 12 0 0 1 0 1 9 0 17 1 0 2 4 0 3 0 0 7 12 d 0 22 2 0 2 2 0 0 1 0 3 12 0 0 0 0 0 0 22 s 4 0 0 1 5 10  1 0 0 0 5 11 1 0 0 0 5 11 1 0 0 0 5 11 1 0 0 0 7 9 1 0 0 2 3 6 1 20 1 0 4 1 20 0 1 3 2 2 20 0 0 1 4 1 20 0 0 1 3 3 20 9 0 0 0 1 quency Distribution  Required for Major  General Electives	0 0 0 0 3 11 16 0 0 1 1 1 1 12 15 0 0 1 0 1 9 19 0 17 1 0 2 4 6 0 3 0 0 7 12 8 d 0 22 2 0 2 2 2 0 0 1 0 3 12 14 0 0 0 0 0 0 22 8 s 4 0 0 1 5 10 10  1 0 0 0 5 11 13 1 0 0 0 0 5 24 1 0 1 0 7 9 12 1 0 0 0 2 3 6 18 1 20 1 0 4 1 3  20 0 1 3 2 2 2 2 20 0 0 1 4 1 4 20 0 0 1 3 3 3 3 20 9 0 0 0 1 0 0  quency Distribution  Required for Majors  General Electives	0 0 0 0 3 11 16 4.43 0 0 1 1 1 1 12 15 4.30 0 0 1 0 1 9 19 4.50 0 17 1 0 2 4 6 4.08 0 3 0 0 7 12 8 4.04 d 0 22 2 0 2 2 2 3.25 0 0 1 0 3 12 14 4.27 0 0 0 0 0 0 22 8 4.27 s 4 0 0 1 5 10 10 4.12  1 0 0 0 5 11 13 4.28 1 0 0 0 5 24 4.83 1 0 1 0 7 9 12 4.07 1 0 0 2 3 6 18 4.38 1 20 1 0 4 1 3 3.56  20 0 1 3 2 2 2 3.10 20 0 0 1 4 1 4 3.80 20 0 0 1 3 3 3 3 3.80 20 9 0 0 0 1 0 4.00  Quency Distribution  Required for Majors 1  General 3  Electives 1	0 0 0 0 3 11 16 4.43 712/1639 0 0 1 1 1 12 15 4.30 813/1639 0 0 1 0 1 9 19 4.50 517/1397 0 17 1 0 2 4 6 4.08 960/1583 0 3 0 0 7 12 8 4.04 751/1532 d 0 22 2 0 2 2 2 3.25 1340/1504 0 0 1 0 3 12 14 4.27 802/1612 0 0 0 0 0 0 22 8 4.27 1342/1635 d 4 0 0 1 5 10 10 4.12 818/1579  1 0 0 0 5 11 13 4.28 1077/1518 1 0 0 0 0 5 24 4.83 750/1520 1 0 1 0 7 9 12 4.07 1048/1517 1 0 0 2 3 6 18 4.38 796/1550 1 20 1 0 4 1 3 3.56 953/1295  20 0 1 3 2 2 2 2 3.10 1260/1398 20 0 0 1 4 1 4 3.80 1124/1391 20 0 0 1 3 3 3 3.80 1078/1388 20 9 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 958  Quency Distribution  Required for Majors 1 Graduat  General 3 Under-g Electives 1 #### - respons	0 0 0 0 3 11 16 4.43 712/1639 4.43 0 0 1 1 1 12 15 4.30 813/1639 4.30 0 0 1 0 1 9 19 4.50 517/1397 4.50 0 17 1 0 2 4 6 4.08 960/1583 4.08 0 3 0 0 7 12 8 4.04 751/1532 4.04 d 0 22 2 0 2 2 2 3.25 1340/1504 3.25 0 0 1 0 3 12 14 4.27 802/1612 4.27 0 0 0 0 0 0 22 8 4.27 1342/1635 4.27 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 10 10 4.12 818/1579 4.12  1 0 0 0 5 11 13 4.28 1077/1518 4.28 1 0 0 0 0 5 24 4.83 750/1520 4.83 1 0 1 0 7 9 12 4.07 1048/1517 4.07 1 0 0 2 3 6 18 4.38 796/1550 4.38 1 20 1 0 4 1 3 3.56 953/1295 3.56  20 0 1 3 2 2 2 3 3.10 1260/1398 3.10 20 0 0 1 4 1 4 3 8.80 1124/1391 3.80 20 0 0 1 3 3 3 3 3.80 1078/1388 3.80 20 9 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 958 ****  Quency Distribution  Required for Majors 1 Graduate  General 3 Under-grad 3  Electives 1 #### - Means tresponses to be	0 0 0 0 3 11 16 4.43 712/1639 4.43 4.35 0 0 1 1 1 12 15 4.30 813/1639 4.30 4.30 0 0 1 0 1 9 19 4.50 517/1397 4.50 4.52 0 17 1 0 2 4 6 4.08 960/1583 4.08 4.46 0 3 0 0 7 12 8 4.04 751/1532 4.04 4.26 d 0 22 2 0 2 2 2 3.25 1340/1504 3.25 4.34 0 0 1 0 3 12 14 4.27 802/1612 4.27 4.30 0 0 0 0 0 22 8 4.27 1342/1635 4.27 4.59 s 4 0 0 1 5 10 10 4.12 818/1579 4.12 4.28  1 0 0 0 5 11 13 4.28 1077/1518 4.28 4.55 1 0 0 0 0 5 24 4.83 750/1520 4.83 4.87 1 0 1 0 7 9 12 4.07 1048/1517 4.07 4.45 1 0 0 2 3 6 18 4.38 796/1550 4.38 4.37 1 20 1 0 4 1 3 3.56 953/1295 3.56 3.49  20 0 1 3 2 2 2 3 3.10 1260/1398 3.10 4.26 20 0 0 1 4 1 4 3.80 1124/1391 3.80 4.31 20 0 0 1 3 3 3 3.80 1078/1388 3.80 4.46 20 9 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 958 **** 3.48  quency Distribution  Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0  General 3 Under-grad 30  Electives 1 #### - Means there a responses to be sign	0 0 0 0 3 11 16 4.43 712/1639 4.43 4.35 4.27 0 0 1 1 1 1 12 15 4.30 813/1639 4.30 4.30 4.22 0 0 1 1 0 1 9 19 4.50 517/1397 4.50 4.52 4.28 0 17 1 0 2 4 6 4.08 960/1583 4.08 4.46 4.19 0 3 0 0 7 12 8 4.04 751/1532 4.04 4.26 4.01 d 0 22 2 0 2 2 2 3.25 1340/1504 3.25 4.34 4.05 0 0 1 0 3 12 14 4.27 802/1612 4.27 4.30 4.16 0 0 0 0 0 0 22 8 4.27 1342/1635 4.27 4.59 4.65 d 4 0 0 1 5 10 10 4.12 818/1579 4.12 4.28 4.08  1 0 0 0 0 5 11 13 4.28 1077/1518 4.28 4.55 4.43 1 0 0 0 0 5 24 4.83 750/1520 4.83 4.87 4.70 1 0 1 0 7 9 12 4.07 1048/1517 4.07 4.45 4.27 1 0 0 2 3 6 18 4.38 796/1550 4.38 4.37 4.22 1 20 1 0 4 1 3 3.56 953/1295 3.56 3.49 3.94  20 0 1 3 2 2 2 3.10 1260/1398 3.10 4.26 4.07 20 0 0 1 4 1 4 3.80 1124/1391 3.80 4.31 4.30 20 0 0 1 3 3 3 3 3.80 1078/1388 3.80 4.46 4.28 20 9 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 958 **** 3.48 3.93  Quency Distribution  Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major  General 3 Under-grad 30 Non- Electives 1 #### - Means there are not responses to be significan	0 0 0 0 3 11 16 4.43 712/1639 4.43 4.35 4.27 4.28 0 0 1 1 1 1 12 15 4.30 813/1639 4.30 4.30 4.22 4.20 0 0 1 0 1 9 19 4.50 517/1397 4.50 4.52 4.28 4.26 0 17 1 0 2 4 6 4.08 960/1583 4.08 4.46 4.19 4.24 0 3 0 0 7 12 8 4.04 751/1532 4.04 4.26 4.01 4.05 10 22 2 0 2 2 2 3.25 1340/1504 3.25 4.34 4.05 4.12 0 0 1 0 3 12 14 4.27 802/1612 4.27 4.30 4.16 4.12 0 0 0 1 0 3 12 14 4.27 802/1612 4.27 4.30 4.16 4.12 0 0 0 1 5 10 10 4.12 818/1579 4.12 4.28 4.08 4.07  1 0 0 0 5 11 13 4.28 1077/1518 4.28 4.55 4.43 4.39 1 0 0 0 0 5 24 4.83 750/1520 4.83 4.87 4.70 4.68 1 0 1 0 7 9 12 4.07 1048/1517 4.07 4.45 4.27 4.23 1 0 0 2 3 6 18 4.38 796/1550 4.38 4.37 4.22 4.20 1 20 1 0 4 1 3 3.56 953/1295 3.56 3.49 3.94 3.95  20 0 1 3 2 2 2 3 3.10 1260/1398 3.10 4.26 4.07 4.13 20 0 0 1 4 4 4 3.80 1124/1391 3.80 4.31 4.30 4.35 20 0 0 1 4 1 4 3.80 1124/1391 3.80 4.31 4.30 4.35 20 0 0 1 3 3 3 3.80 1078/1388 3.80 4.46 4.28 4.34 20 9 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 958 **** 3.48 3.93 3.97  Quency Distribution  S Reasons Type Majors  Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major  General 3 Under-grad 30 Non-major  Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enougersponses to be significant

Course-Section: PHIL 358 0101 University of Maryland Title BIOETHICS Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008

Fall 2007

Page 1264

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: FERRY, MICHAEL (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 33 Questionnaires: 22

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	- 1					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	0	•	_	0	_	_		4 1 4	1000/1600	4 1 4	4 25	4 00	4 00	4 1 4
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	2	7/	11		1029/1639			4.27	4.28	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	10	./		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		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		4.34	4.05	4.12	4.18
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	1	0	0	4	7	4	6		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														
<ol> <li>Were the instructor's lectures well prepared</li> </ol>	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
Freq	onar	Diat	- wib	1+101	2									
riequ	remoy	ופדע	TID	ucloi	.1									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	1	Expecte	d 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	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

#### Course-Section: PHIL 358 0101 University of Maryland Page 1265 Title Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008

BIOETHICS Fall 2007 Instructor: (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 33

Questionnaires: 22

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Quescionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
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
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

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	А	12	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	า
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13	-			
				2	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 358H 0101 University of Maryland Page 1266
Title BIOETHICS Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008

Instructor: FERRY, MICHAEL (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 2
Questionnaires: 2

Fall 2007
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	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		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
T a aba														
Lecture	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4 50	007/1510	4 50	4 55	4 42	4 20	4 50
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	T	T	4.50	807/1518 1/1520		4.55	4.43	4.39	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1520	5.00 5.00	4.87 4.45	4.70 4.27	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	-	0	1			638/1550		4.45		4.23	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50		3.25		4.22	4.20	3.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	U	U	U	U	Т	Τ	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
Frequ	enas	Diet	-rih	1+101	2									
rredo	спсу	ומדת	اللديد	ACTU1	.1									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d 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	В	1	-					
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		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 sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-			
				?	0						

#### Course-Section: PHIL 358H 0101 University of Maryland Page 1267 FEB 13, 2008

Title BIOETHICS Baltimore County Fall 2007 Instructor: (Instr. B)

2 Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 2

Ctudont	Conrac	Evaluation	Ougation	n - i - n - n
Scudent	COULSE	Evaluation	Ouescion	Halle

Job IRBR3029

		Frequencies					Ins	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	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	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

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l 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	В	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-		_	
				2	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 370 0101

Title PHIL AND PARAPSYCHOLOG

Instructor: BRAUDE, STEPHEN

Enrollment: 29 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 1268

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					-					Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 1															
1 Did voi	u gain ne	ew insights,skil	_	this course	1	0	2	1	4	5	9	3 86	1289/1639	3.86	4.35	4.27	4.28	3.86
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	2	5	5	9		1090/1639		4.30	4.22	4.20	4.00
		estions reflect	_	_	1	0	0	0	6	4	-		813/1397		4.52	4.28	4.26	4.24
	_	ations reflect	_	_	2	11	0	1	2	3	3		1171/1583		4.46	4.19	4.24	3.89
		eadings contribu	_	9	1	0	2	1	5	6	7	3.71	1092/1532		4.26	4.01	4.05	3.71
				what you learned	1	17	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/1504	****	4.34	4.05	4.12	****
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly	y explair	red	1	0	0	4	7	3	7	3.62	1354/1612	3.62	4.30	4.16	4.12	3.62
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	4	13	4	4.00	1497/1635	4.00	4.59	4.65	4.66	4.00
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overal	ll teachi	ng effectiveness	7	0	0	1	4	8	2	3.73	1185/1579	3.73	4.28	4.08	4.07	3.73
		Lecture	e															
1. Were th	he instru	actor's lectures	s well pr	repared	3	0	0	2	2	6	9	4.16	1169/1518	4.16	4.55	4.43	4.39	4.16
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem intere	ested 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 led	Was lecture material presented and explained clear old the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	1	2	6	9	4.28	864/1517	4.28	4.45	4.27	4.23	4.28
4. Did the	e lecture	ou learned	3	0	0	1	1	4	13	4.53	614/1550	4.53	4.37	4.22	4.20	4.53		
5. Did aud	diovisual	ır understanding	3	5	1	3	2	5	3	3.43	1023/1295	3.43	3.49	3.94	3.95	3.43		
		Discuss																
1. Did cla	Discussion  Did class discussions contribute to what you learn						1	1	6	3	4	3.53	1096/1398	3.53	4.26	4.07	4.13	3.53
		nts actively end			7 9	0	1	2	0	2	8	4.08	950/1391	4.08	4.31	4.30	4.35	4.08
				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 sp	pecial te	echniques succes	ssful	-	7	13	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 958	****	3.48	3.93	3.97	****
		Laborat	corv															
2. Were yo	ou provid		-	ound information	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.08	****
		Field W	Mork															
1. Did fie	eld exper	rience contribut		it vou learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
		v understand you			21	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****
2. 214 70.	u 010u11/	•		01100114		Ü	_	Ü	Ü	ŭ	Ū	1.00	, 5.			1.00	1.01	
1. Did se	lf-paced	Self F system contribu		nat vou learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 5(	) ****	4.78	4.45	5.00	****
	1			-									,					
	F							utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Expected Grades				Re	ason	S			Ty	pе			Majors	3		
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 9							ed f	or Ma	ajor	`====	1	Graduat	: :е	0	Majo	 or	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 6						J						5 -		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C 1		Ge	nera	1			1	.2	Under-	rad 2	22	Non-	-major	18
84-150														-			3 - "	
Grad.						El	ecti	ves				2	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	Jh
	P 0												respons	ses to b	oe sigr	nificar	nt	
	I 0					Ot]	her					1						
				s 0														

University of Maryland Course-Section: PHIL 371 0101 Page 1269 EPISTEMOLOGY Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 EALICK, GREG E. Job IRBR3029

	Student	Course	${\tt Evaluation}$	Questionnaire
--	---------	--------	--------------------	---------------

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 18

31

		Question	5		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean			
		Genera																
-	_	ew insights,ski			0	0	0	1	0	4	13	4.61	495/1639	4.61	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.61
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	9	9	4.50	517/1639	4.50	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.50
	_	estions reflect		_	1		0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1397	****	4.52	4.28	4.26	****
		ations reflect			0	2	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	100/1583	4.94	4.46	4.19	4.24	
	_	_		what you learned	0	0	0	0	1		13	4.67	236/1532		4.26	4.01	4.05	4.67
				o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	67/1504	4.94	4.34	4.05	4.12	4.94
		g system clearly		ined	0	0	0	2	3	1	12	4.28	,		4.30	4.16	4.12	4.28
	-	was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94				4.65	4.66	4.94
9. How wo	uld you g	ning 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 t	he instru	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	e instruc	n 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 le	cture mat	xplained 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	e lecture	es 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 au	diovisual	l techniques enl	nance y	our understanding	1	15	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1295	****	3.49	3.94	3.95	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contrib	ate 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 a	ll studer	nts actively end	courage	d 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	e instruc	ctor encourage :	fair an	d 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 s	pecial te	echniques succes	ssful		6	10	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 958	****	3.48	3.93	3.97	****
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	}
00-27								ed f	or Ma	ajor	S	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	12
28-55	1	В 7		_							1	, .				_		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C 1	General							4	Under-g	rad 1	.8	Non-	-major	6
84-150		3.00-3.49	5	D 0	<b>71</b>						-			,				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		Electives						1	#### - 1					ın
				P 1	0.1						_	2	respons	es to b	e sign	ııııcan	1T	
				Ι 0	I 0 Other						1	.3						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: PHIL 399A 0101 Title TOP IN PHIL Instructor: TEMPLETON, ROYE Fall 2007

Enrollment: 0 Questionnaires: 4

4. Were special techniques successful

Page 13 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

		Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	Ο	Λ	Λ	Λ	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	U	2	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	7	1	1		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	7	4.25	580/1532	****	4.07	4.19	3.88	4.25
3 3	-	0	2	0	0	1	1		,		4.14		3.78	2.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	-	•	Τ	1		1457/1504			4.05		
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	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		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
J. Did additivibual econniques chilance your understanding	O	O	O	U	_	2	_	1.00	023/12/3		1.51	3.71	3.01	1.00
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

### Frequency Distribution

0 3 1 0 0 0 1.00 951/ 958 \*\*\*\* 4.39 3.93 3.71 1.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d 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	В	2	-					
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General		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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				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.

Enrollment: 0 Questionnaires: 1

Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	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

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

Course-Section: PHIL 400 0901 University of Ma:
Title INDEP STUDY IN PHIL Baltimore Course Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD Fall 200

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 3

4

University of Maryland Page 1270
Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluati	on Quest:	ionnaire
---------	--------	----------	-----------	----------

		Question	s		NR	NA	Fro	eque: 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 Did w	ou goin n	Genera ew insights,ski	_	thia gourgo	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4 00	1138/1639	4.25	4.35	4.27	4.42	4.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	0	1	1		1410/1639	4.23	4.30	4.27	4.42	3.67
		uations reflect			0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.46	4.19	4.31	5.00
			_	hat you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1532		4.26	4.01	4.07	5.00
	_	_		what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	544/1504	4.67	4.34	4.05	4.20	4.33
		was class canc			0	0	0	1	0	1	1		1596/1635	4.33	4.59	4.65	4.72	3.67
	-			ing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	1		569/1579	4.67	4.28	4.08	4.21	4.33
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	the instru	uctor's lecture	s well p	repared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.55	4.43	4.51	5.00
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	ested in	the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.87	4.70	4.75	5.00
		-		plained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1517	5.00	4.45	4.27	4.34	5.00
4. Did th	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																	
				hat you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.26	4.07	4.23	5.00
				l 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 th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair and	l 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 se	elf-paced	system contrib	ute to w	hat 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 st	tudy quest	tions make clea	r the ex	pected goal	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	31/ 32	3.00	3.00	4.51	4.00	3.00
_	•	acts with the i		-	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	34/ 43	4.67	4.78	4.69	4.85	4.33
		ck/tutoring by	_	_	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	23/ 32		4.67	4.37	4.67	4.00
5. Were t	there enou	ugh proctors fo	r all th	e students	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 21	5.00	5.00	4.52	4.50	5.00
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	;			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Red	auir	ed f	or Ma	ior		0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0		100	-1~++		110		-	-	5244446	-	_	.14.70	-	_
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				1	Under-q	rad	3	Non-	-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	GCIICIAI								5				3	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0									respons				_	•
				I 1		Ot]	her					2	-					
				? 0														

Course-Section: PHIL 400 1101 University of Maryland
Title INDEP STUDY IN PHIL Baltimore County
Instructor: EALICK, GREG E. Fall 2007

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 2

1

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2007

Page 1271

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

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

		Question	s		NR	NA	Fr	-	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1 Did vo	ou gain ne	Genera ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	615/1639	4.25	4.35	4.27	4.42	4.50
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1639		4.30	4.22	4.29	5.00
		uations reflect			0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583		4.46	4.19	4.31	5.00
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1532		4.26	4.01	4.07	5.00
	_	_		what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504		4.34	4.05	4.20	5.00
		g system clearl		2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1612		4.30	4.16	4.18	5.00
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1635		4.59	4.65	4.72	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	ning 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 t	the instr	uctor's lecture	s 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 th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.87	4.70	4.75	5.00
		-		xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1517		4.45	4.27	4.34	5.00
4. Did th	. 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																	
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.26	4.07	4.23	5.00
				d 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 th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.46	4.28	4.50	5.00
		Self																
	_	-		what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 50			4.45	4.85	5.00
		acts with the i			1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 43		4.78	4.69	4.85	5.00
4. Was th	ne feedba	ck/tutoring by	proctor	s helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 32	4.50	4.67	4.37	4.67	5.00
				Frequ	iency	Dist	rib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 A 1		Red		ed fo	or Ma	iors	 s	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0							-	-		-	-	) ~		_
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0						J				3				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives						1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ıh	
				P 0	Electives					respons				_				
				I 0		Otl	ner					0	-					
				? 0														

#### Course-Section: PHIL 405 0701 University of Maryland Page 1272 Title HONORS INDEP STUDY-PHI Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD

Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies				Inst	cructor	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	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	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	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

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0		1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				2	Λ						

#### Course-Section: PHIL 405H 0101 University of Maryland Page 1273 HONORS INDEP STUDY-PHI Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Title Fall 2007 Instructor: PFEIFER, JESSIC Enrollment: 1

Enrollment:	1			
Questionnaires:	1	Student Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

				equer	ncies	3		Instr	uctor	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	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	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	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	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

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d 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	В	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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				2	Λ						

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

Instructor: YALOWITE Enrollment: 0

Enrollment: 0
Questionnaires: 16

# Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

2000 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0																
					Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1. Did you gain new	General		0	0	0	0	0	_	11	4.69	404/1639	****	4.31	4.27	4.08	4.69
2. Did the instruct			1	0	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	774/1639	****	4.31	4.27	4.17	4.09
3. Did the exam que			0	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	517/1397	****	4.51	4.28	4.18	4.50
4. Did other evalua		_	0	2	0	0	4	2	8	4.29	761/1583	****	4.31	4.19	4.01	4.29
5. Did assigned rea		1 5	0	0	0	0	3	1	12	4.56	299/1532	****	4.07	4.01	3.88	4.56
		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	9	-	1	0	0	1	3	1	10	4.33	718/1612	****	4.13	4.16	4.10	4.33
8. How many times w			1	0	0	0	0	13	2		1434/1635	****	4.78	4.65	4.56	4.13
-		aching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	382/1579	****	4.13	4.08	3.95	4.50
		_														
	Lecture															
1. Were the instruc	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared					0	0	3	12	4.80	360/1518	****	4.46	4.43	4.38	4.80
2. Did the instruct	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	2	13	4.87	648/1520	****	4.76	4.70	4.61	4.87
3. Was lecture mate	rial 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 wha	t 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
	-1															
1 544 43.44 44.44	Discussion		4	0	1	^	2	4	4	2 02	016/1200		4 27	4 07	2 05	2 02
1. Did class discus		-	4	0	1	1	3	4	4	3.83	916/1398	****	4.37	4.07	3.85	3.83
2. Were all student			4	0	1	U T	0	3	7	4.17 4.92	887/1391	****	4.60	4.30	4.07	4.17
3. Did the instruct	or encourage fair	and open discussion	4	U	U	U	U	1	11	4.92	201/1388	* * * * *	4.53	4.28	4.01	4.92
	Seminar															
1. Were assigned to	pics relevant to the	he announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.74	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instruct	_		15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	4.15	4.52	4.12	***
3. Did research pro	jects contribute to	o 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	****
Fre				o Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	ıs			Ty	pe			Majors	}

Credits Ea	·			Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	С	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 si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10	_			
				2	Ω						

Course-Section: PHIL 499B 0101

Title ADV TOP IN PHIL POSS WLDS

Instructor: PHEIFER, JESSICA

0

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 19

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 18 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Fre NR NA 1		_	ncies		_		ructor	Course	_		Level		
Questions	NR	NA	Τ	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		****	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														
	11	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.38	F20/1200	****	4.37	4.07	3.85	4.38
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	532/1398 1/1391	****	4.37	4.07	4.07	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1391		4.53	4.28	4.07	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	155/ 958		4.39	3.93	3.71	
1. Were special techniques successful	11	2	U	U	1	U	J	1.07	133/ 330		4.32	3.93	3.71	1.07
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
. Did presentations contribute to what you learned		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

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	responses to be significant		
				I	0	Other	6	-		_	
				?	2						