

Course-Section: PHIL 100 0101
 Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: THOMAS, JAMES
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1264
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	4	26	4.87	221/1649	4.51	4.43	4.28	4.11	4.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	26	4.87	175/1648	4.51	4.34	4.23	4.16	4.87	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	116/1375	4.76	4.62	4.27	4.10	4.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	24	4.77	227/1595	4.57	4.42	4.20	4.03	4.77	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	3	5	17	4.03	794/1533	3.92	4.33	4.04	3.87	4.03	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	4	5	19	4.45	465/1512	4.07	4.17	4.10	3.86	4.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	4	24	4.73	241/1623	4.46	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	18	12	4.40	1287/1646	4.75	4.56	4.69	4.67	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	38/1621	4.57	4.35	4.06	3.96	4.96	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1568	4.78	4.58	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1572	4.93	4.90	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	27	4.93	118/1564	4.66	4.50	4.28	4.20	4.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1559	4.82	4.59	4.29	4.20	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	11	0	2	3	0	13	4.33	457/1352	3.95	3.76	3.98	3.86	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	90/1384	4.68	4.17	4.08	3.86	4.95	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1382	4.61	4.27	4.29	4.03	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1368	4.74	4.51	4.30	4.01	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	7	1	1	2	1	8	4.08	415/ 948	4.26	3.99	3.95	3.75	4.08	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 555	****	5.00	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 288	****	****	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 15	Required for Majors	13
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	9
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 31
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	0

Course-Section: PHIL 100 0201
 Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: YALOWITZ, STEVE
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1265
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	10	8	4.24	986/1649	4.51	4.43	4.28	4.11	4.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	11	8	4.29	862/1648	4.51	4.34	4.23	4.16	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	453/1375	4.76	4.62	4.27	4.10	4.62	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	497/1595	4.57	4.42	4.20	4.03	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	7	11	4.33	545/1533	3.92	4.33	4.04	3.87	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	2	5	6	6	3.84	1062/1512	4.07	4.17	4.10	3.86	3.84	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	480/1623	4.46	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.52	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	748/1646	4.75	4.56	4.69	4.67	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	14	4	4.16	801/1621	4.57	4.35	4.06	3.96	4.16	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	461/1568	4.78	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	715/1572	4.93	4.90	4.70	4.64	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	10	11	4.52	630/1564	4.66	4.50	4.28	4.20	4.52	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	318/1559	4.82	4.59	4.29	4.20	4.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	14	2	0	1	1	3	3.43	1090/1352	3.95	3.76	3.98	3.86	3.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	2	6	9	4.22	691/1384	4.68	4.17	4.08	3.86	4.22	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	2	5	10	4.33	774/1382	4.61	4.27	4.29	4.03	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	461/1368	4.74	4.51	4.30	4.01	4.72	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	13	3	0	0	0	2	2.60	****/ 948	4.26	3.99	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.30	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	2	A	10	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	22	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				

Course-Section: PHIL 100 0301
 Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: THOMAS, JAMES
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1266
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	8	28	4.78	306/1649	4.51	4.43	4.28	4.11	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	30	4.81	216/1648	4.51	4.34	4.23	4.16	4.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	31	4.86	192/1375	4.76	4.62	4.27	4.10	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	7	27	4.79	200/1595	4.57	4.42	4.20	4.03	4.79	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	4	5	6	17	4.03	794/1533	3.92	4.33	4.04	3.87	4.03	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	9	22	4.47	422/1512	4.07	4.17	4.10	3.86	4.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	7	29	4.81	169/1623	4.46	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	13	22	4.58	1121/1646	4.75	4.56	4.69	4.67	4.58	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	4	26	4.81	133/1621	4.57	4.35	4.06	3.96	4.81	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	32	4.91	220/1568	4.78	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	34	4.97	178/1572	4.93	4.90	4.70	4.64	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	32	4.91	152/1564	4.66	4.50	4.28	4.20	4.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	34	4.97	62/1559	4.82	4.59	4.29	4.20	4.97	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	19	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	286/1352	3.95	3.76	3.98	3.86	4.53	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	0	16	4.82	190/1384	4.68	4.17	4.08	3.86	4.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	146/1382	4.61	4.27	4.29	4.03	4.94	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	158/1368	4.74	4.51	4.30	4.01	4.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	8	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	249/ 948	4.26	3.99	3.95	3.75	4.44	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	5.00	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	34	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	****	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: PHIL 100 0301
 Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: THOMAS, JAMES
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1266
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	22	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	6	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	36	Non-major	36
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 100 0401
 Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: THOMAS, JAMES
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1267
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	26	4.89	194/1649	4.51	4.43	4.28	4.11	4.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	24	4.86	182/1648	4.51	4.34	4.23	4.16	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1375	4.76	4.62	4.27	4.10	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	192/1595	4.57	4.42	4.20	4.03	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	4	2	4	2	14	3.77	1055/1533	3.92	4.33	4.04	3.87	3.77	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	5	18	4.43	493/1512	4.07	4.17	4.10	3.86	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	0	3	23	4.78	199/1623	4.46	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	19	4.68	1026/1646	4.75	4.56	4.69	4.67	4.68	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1621	4.57	4.35	4.06	3.96	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1568	4.78	4.58	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1572	4.93	4.90	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	23	4.85	225/1564	4.66	4.50	4.28	4.20	4.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1559	4.82	4.59	4.29	4.20	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	20	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/1352	3.95	3.76	3.98	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1384	4.68	4.17	4.08	3.86	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1382	4.61	4.27	4.29	4.03	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1368	4.74	4.51	4.30	4.01	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	10	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	****/ 948	4.26	3.99	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 555	****	5.00	4.29	4.14	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 18	Required for Majors	17
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	6
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 28
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	0
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHIL 100 0701
 Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: EALICK, GREG E.
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1268
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	1	5	7	11	3.92	1254/1649	4.51	4.43	4.28	4.11	3.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	6	8	10	3.89	1245/1648	4.51	4.34	4.23	4.16	3.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	6	18	4.54	521/1375	4.76	4.62	4.27	4.10	4.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	2	2	6	13	4.17	930/1595	4.57	4.42	4.20	4.03	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	1	5	9	8	3.59	1186/1533	3.92	4.33	4.04	3.87	3.59	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	1	11	4	7	3.42	1309/1512	4.07	4.17	4.10	3.86	3.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	4	7	13	4.04	1014/1623	4.46	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.04	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1646	4.75	4.56	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	0	2	12	7	4.24	709/1621	4.57	4.35	4.06	3.96	4.24	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	3	3	16	4.43	943/1568	4.78	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	690/1572	4.93	4.90	4.70	4.64	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	3	0	5	13	4.18	1010/1564	4.66	4.50	4.28	4.20	4.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	3	2	16	4.35	891/1559	4.82	4.59	4.29	4.20	4.35	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	17	1	2	0	0	2	3.00	****/1352	3.95	3.76	3.98	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	1	0	10	4.50	437/1384	4.68	4.17	4.08	3.86	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	1	0	5	5	4.00	946/1382	4.61	4.27	4.29	4.03	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	2	2	7	4.17	891/1368	4.74	4.51	4.30	4.01	4.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	6	2	0	2	0	2	3.00	****/ 948	4.26	3.99	3.95	3.75	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 16	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99 0	B 14		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 7	C 1	General 5	Under-grad 27 Non-major 27
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 2		
			I 0	Other 2	
			? 1		

Course-Section: PHIL 100 0801
 Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: EALICK, GREG E.
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1269
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	10	10	4.36	830/1649	4.51	4.43	4.28	4.11	4.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	10	10	4.36	756/1648	4.51	4.34	4.23	4.16	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	16	4.64	432/1375	4.76	4.62	4.27	4.10	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	2	4	12	4.42	608/1595	4.57	4.42	4.20	4.03	4.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	5	7	7	3.77	1045/1533	3.92	4.33	4.04	3.87	3.77	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	2	10	5	3.80	1089/1512	4.07	4.17	4.10	3.86	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	6	6	8	3.91	1180/1623	4.46	4.33	4.16	4.08	3.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1646	4.75	4.56	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	12	7	4.24	709/1621	4.57	4.35	4.06	3.96	4.24	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	743/1568	4.78	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	591/1572	4.93	4.90	4.70	4.64	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	6	14	4.55	610/1564	4.66	4.50	4.28	4.20	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	306/1559	4.82	4.59	4.29	4.20	4.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	16	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1049/1352	3.95	3.76	3.98	3.86	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	388/1384	4.68	4.17	4.08	3.86	4.58	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	749/1382	4.61	4.27	4.29	4.03	4.36	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	550/1368	4.74	4.51	4.30	4.01	4.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	8	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 948	4.26	3.99	3.95	3.75	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	14
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 7	Graduate	0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	22
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	0
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHIL 146 0101
 Title CRITICAL THINKING
 Instructor: TEMPLETON, ROYE
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1270
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	2	2	7	8	3.68	1415/1649	3.87	4.43	4.28	4.11	3.68	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	4	4	10	3.86	1262/1648	3.86	4.34	4.23	4.16	3.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	3	3	3	10	3.90	1034/1375	4.07	4.62	4.27	4.10	3.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	2	3	0	3	3.50	1397/1595	3.85	4.42	4.20	4.03	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	8	9	4.09	754/1533	3.95	4.33	4.04	3.87	4.09	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	16	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	****/1512	3.00	4.17	4.10	3.86	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	6	12	4.32	744/1623	4.53	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.32	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	21	1	4.05	1528/1646	4.07	4.56	4.69	4.67	4.05	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	3	2	3	7	3	3.28	1446/1621	3.31	4.35	4.06	3.96	3.28	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	0	1	5	13	4.29	1096/1568	4.34	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	2	4	15	4.50	1241/1572	4.55	4.90	4.70	4.64	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	1	4	7	8	3.82	1267/1564	3.98	4.50	4.28	4.20	3.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	3	2	8	4	3.24	1443/1559	3.29	4.59	4.29	4.20	3.24	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	5	3	6	2	1	2.47	1305/1352	2.70	3.76	3.98	3.86	2.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	9	1	4	4	2	2.45	1350/1384	2.49	4.17	4.08	3.86	2.45	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	7	3	6	1	2	2.37	1369/1382	2.65	4.27	4.29	4.03	2.37	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	10	0	3	2	4	2.47	1346/1368	2.71	4.51	4.30	4.01	2.47	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	17	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 948	****	3.99	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	4.27	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	4	A	5	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	10	General	6	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PHIL 146 0201
 Title CRITICAL THINKING
 Instructor: TEMPLETON, ROYE
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1271
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	3	1	8	8	4.05	1149/1649	3.87	4.43	4.28	4.11	4.05	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	5	3	9	3.85	1271/1648	3.86	4.34	4.23	4.16	3.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	4	11	4.25	806/1375	4.07	4.62	4.27	4.10	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	890/1595	3.85	4.42	4.20	4.03	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	5	5	7	3.80	1017/1533	3.95	4.33	4.04	3.87	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	2	0	2	2	1	3.00	1428/1512	3.00	4.17	4.10	3.86	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	220/1623	4.53	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	18	2	4.10	1506/1646	4.07	4.56	4.69	4.67	4.10	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	3	3	7	3	3.33	1429/1621	3.31	4.35	4.06	3.96	3.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	2	4	13	4.40	983/1568	4.34	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	4	15	4.60	1146/1572	4.55	4.90	4.70	4.64	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	4	3	11	4.15	1037/1564	3.98	4.50	4.28	4.20	4.15	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	5	3	4	6	3.35	1420/1559	3.29	4.59	4.29	4.20	3.35	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	3	2	3	5	1	2.93	1250/1352	2.70	3.76	3.98	3.86	2.93	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	5	2	6	4	0	2.53	1345/1384	2.49	4.17	4.08	3.86	2.53	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	5	2	3	3	4	2.94	1332/1382	2.65	4.27	4.29	4.03	2.94	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	7	0	2	3	5	2.94	1302/1368	2.71	4.51	4.30	4.01	2.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	15	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 948	****	3.99	3.95	3.75	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	7	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	3						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	2						

Course-Section: PHIL 150 0101
 Title CONTEMPORARY MORAL ISS
 Instructor: EALICK, GREG E.
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1272
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	6	7	4.25	965/1649	4.64	4.43	4.28	4.11	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	2	11	4.38	743/1648	4.31	4.34	4.23	4.16	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	488/1375	4.76	4.62	4.27	4.10	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	672/1595	4.44	4.42	4.20	4.03	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	7	7	4.25	624/1533	4.32	4.33	4.04	3.87	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	8	7	4.31	616/1512	4.27	4.17	4.10	3.86	4.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	437/1623	4.41	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.56	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	535/1621	4.50	4.35	4.06	3.96	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	779/1568	4.70	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	665/1572	4.97	4.90	4.70	4.64	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	1	12	4.50	651/1564	4.62	4.50	4.28	4.20	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	390/1559	4.89	4.59	4.29	4.20	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	11	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	1049/1352	2.92	3.76	3.98	3.86	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	5	7	4.21	697/1384	4.14	4.17	4.08	3.86	4.21	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	757/1382	4.22	4.27	4.29	4.03	4.36	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	541/1368	4.79	4.51	4.30	4.01	4.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	11	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 948	2.33	3.99	3.95	3.75	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	11
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 5	Graduate	0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	1
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHIL 150 0102
 Title CONTEMPORARY MORAL ISS
 Instructor: EALICK, GREG E.
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1273
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4									

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	776/1649	4.64	4.43	4.28	4.11	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	839/1648	4.31	4.34	4.23	4.16	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	199/1375	4.76	4.62	4.27	4.10	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	497/1595	4.44	4.42	4.20	4.03	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	366/1533	4.32	4.33	4.04	3.87	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	835/1512	4.27	4.17	4.10	3.86	4.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	635/1623	4.41	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.56	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	313/1621	4.50	4.35	4.06	3.96	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	983/1568	4.70	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1572	4.97	4.90	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	780/1564	4.62	4.50	4.28	4.20	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	318/1559	4.89	4.59	4.29	4.20	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	1323/1352	2.92	3.76	3.98	3.86	2.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	1	4	3.50	1081/1384	4.14	4.17	4.08	3.86	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	4	1	5	4.10	923/1382	4.22	4.27	4.29	4.03	4.10	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	579/1368	4.79	4.51	4.30	4.01	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	8	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 948	2.33	3.99	3.95	3.75	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	****	3.68	3.54	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHIL 150 0103
 Title CONTEMPORARY MORAL ISS
 Instructor: EALICK, GREG E.
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1274
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	12	4.92	149/1649	4.64	4.43	4.28	4.11	4.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	729/1648	4.31	4.34	4.23	4.16	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	296/1375	4.76	4.62	4.27	4.10	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	497/1595	4.44	4.42	4.20	4.03	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	643/1533	4.32	4.33	4.04	3.87	4.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	6	6	4.23	711/1512	4.27	4.17	4.10	3.86	4.23	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	659/1623	4.41	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.56	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	559/1621	4.50	4.35	4.06	3.96	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	330/1568	4.70	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1572	4.97	4.90	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	434/1564	4.62	4.50	4.28	4.20	4.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1559	4.89	4.59	4.29	4.20	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1352	2.92	3.76	3.98	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	10	4.54	418/1384	4.14	4.17	4.08	3.86	4.54	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	1	0	11	4.62	530/1382	4.22	4.27	4.29	4.03	4.62	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1368	4.79	4.51	4.30	4.01	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	10	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 948	2.33	3.99	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.30	4.17	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHIL 150 0104
 Title CONTEMPORARY MORAL ISS
 Instructor: EALICK, GREG E.
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1275
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1649	4.64	4.43	4.28	4.11	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	966/1648	4.31	4.34	4.23	4.16	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	199/1375	4.76	4.62	4.27	4.10	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	636/1595	4.44	4.42	4.20	4.03	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	575/1533	4.32	4.33	4.04	3.87	4.30	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	465/1512	4.27	4.17	4.10	3.86	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	757/1623	4.41	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.56	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	207/1621	4.50	4.35	4.06	3.96	4.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1568	4.70	4.58	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1572	4.97	4.90	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	169/1564	4.62	4.50	4.28	4.20	4.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1559	4.89	4.59	4.29	4.20	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	644/1384	4.14	4.17	4.08	3.86	4.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	4	1	4	3.80	1069/1382	4.22	4.27	4.29	4.03	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	264/1368	4.79	4.51	4.30	4.01	4.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	7	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	926/ 948	2.33	3.99	3.95	3.75	2.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	2	A	5	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	12	Non-major	11
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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 152 0201
 Title INTRO TO MORAL THEORY
 Instructor: DIXON, BEN
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1276
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	1	6	13	4.22	1007/1649	4.45	4.43	4.28	4.11	4.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	13	4.43	658/1648	4.50	4.34	4.23	4.16	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	258/1375	4.70	4.62	4.27	4.10	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	4	8	7	4.16	943/1595	4.33	4.42	4.20	4.03	4.16	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	20	4.78	162/1533	4.67	4.33	4.04	3.87	4.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	2	10	3	4	3.24	1383/1512	4.10	4.17	4.10	3.86	3.24	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	3	5	12	4.09	989/1623	4.39	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.09	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	16	4	4.04	1528/1646	4.29	4.56	4.69	4.67	4.04	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	7	9	4.32	619/1621	4.52	4.35	4.06	3.96	4.32	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	8	13	4.50	852/1568	4.57	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	20	4.86	690/1572	4.86	4.90	4.70	4.64	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	447/1564	4.48	4.50	4.28	4.20	4.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	1	18	4.68	487/1559	4.67	4.59	4.29	4.20	4.68	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	7	0	2	0	6	5	4.08	650/1352	3.97	3.76	3.98	3.86	4.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	468/1384	4.64	4.17	4.08	3.86	4.47	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	3	4	11	4.32	790/1382	4.35	4.27	4.29	4.03	4.32	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	327/1368	4.72	4.51	4.30	4.01	4.84	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	15	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/ 948	3.56	3.99	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	****	5.00	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	****/ 288	****	****	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	4.27	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: PHIL 152 0201
 Title INTRO TO MORAL THEORY
 Instructor: DIXON, BEN
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1276
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	3	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 152 0301
 Title INTRO TO MORAL THEORY
 Instructor: DIXON, BEN
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1277
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	497/1649	4.45	4.43	4.28	4.11	4.61	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	4	11	4.39	729/1648	4.50	4.34	4.23	4.16	4.39	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	2	13	4.50	546/1375	4.70	4.62	4.27	4.10	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	2	2	2	8	4.14	956/1595	4.33	4.42	4.20	4.03	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	198/1533	4.67	4.33	4.04	3.87	4.72	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	2	3	10	4.31	616/1512	4.10	4.17	4.10	3.86	4.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	4	10	4.33	720/1623	4.39	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	13	5	4.28	1384/1646	4.29	4.56	4.69	4.67	4.28	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	595/1621	4.52	4.35	4.06	3.96	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	2	13	4.59	755/1568	4.57	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	790/1572	4.86	4.90	4.70	4.64	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	473/1564	4.48	4.50	4.28	4.20	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	0	15	4.71	463/1559	4.67	4.59	4.29	4.20	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	1	0	5	1	3	3.50	1049/1352	3.97	3.76	3.98	3.86	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	201/1384	4.64	4.17	4.08	3.86	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	616/1382	4.35	4.27	4.29	4.03	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	493/1368	4.72	4.51	4.30	4.01	4.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	7	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 948	3.56	3.99	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	1	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 288	****	****	3.68	3.54	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHIL 152 0401
 Title INTRO TO MORAL THEORY
 Instructor: SENG, PHILLIP
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1278
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	5	21	4.59	536/1649	4.45	4.43	4.28	4.11	4.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	23	4.79	225/1648	4.50	4.34	4.23	4.16	4.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	67/1375	4.70	4.62	4.27	4.10	4.97		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	3	6	17	4.54	462/1595	4.33	4.42	4.20	4.03	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	24	4.79	156/1533	4.67	4.33	4.04	3.87	4.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	4	21	4.55	345/1512	4.10	4.17	4.10	3.86	4.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	6	23	4.79	179/1623	4.39	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	20	7	4.17	1454/1646	4.29	4.56	4.69	4.67	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	7	18	4.72	191/1621	4.52	4.35	4.06	3.96	4.72	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	23	4.79	424/1568	4.57	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	473/1572	4.86	4.90	4.70	4.64	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	8	19	4.64	498/1564	4.48	4.50	4.28	4.20	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	24	4.79	347/1559	4.67	4.59	4.29	4.20	4.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	19	1	2	0	1	5	3.78	900/1352	3.97	3.76	3.98	3.86	3.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	175/1384	4.64	4.17	4.08	3.86	4.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	562/1382	4.35	4.27	4.29	4.03	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1368	4.72	4.51	4.30	4.01	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	9	2	1	1	0	1	2.40	****/ 948	3.56	3.99	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 555	****	5.00	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 288	****	****	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: PHIL 152 0401
 Title INTRO TO MORAL THEORY
 Instructor: SENG, PHILLIP
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1278
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	29	Non-major	29
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 152 0501
 Title INTRO TO MORAL THEORY
 Instructor: SENG, PHILLIP
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1279
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	6	20	4.59	536/1649	4.45	4.43	4.28	4.11	4.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	22	4.66	375/1648	4.50	4.34	4.23	4.16	4.66	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	23	4.79	245/1375	4.70	4.62	4.27	4.10	4.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	9	17	4.59	394/1595	4.33	4.42	4.20	4.03	4.59	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	7	22	4.76	180/1533	4.67	4.33	4.04	3.87	4.76	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	11	16	4.48	408/1512	4.10	4.17	4.10	3.86	4.48	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	21	4.66	333/1623	4.39	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.66	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	8	13	8	4.00	1544/1646	4.29	4.56	4.69	4.67	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	7	19	4.73	178/1621	4.52	4.35	4.06	3.96	4.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	21	4.69	604/1568	4.57	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	26	4.86	690/1572	4.86	4.90	4.70	4.64	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	6	20	4.59	570/1564	4.48	4.50	4.28	4.20	4.59	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	25	4.86	250/1559	4.67	4.59	4.29	4.20	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	16	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	556/1352	3.97	3.76	3.98	3.86	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	478/1384	4.64	4.17	4.08	3.86	4.46	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	893/1382	4.35	4.27	4.29	4.03	4.15	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	693/1368	4.72	4.51	4.30	4.01	4.46	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	10	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 948	3.56	3.99	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 555	****	5.00	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	1	0	1	4	0	3.33	****/ 288	****	****	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: PHIL 152 0501
 Title INTRO TO MORAL THEORY
 Instructor: SENG, PHILLIP
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1279
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	7	Under-grad	29	Non-major	29
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 152 0601
 Title INTRO TO MORAL THEORY
 Instructor: SMITH, AARON
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1280
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	6	8	4.25	965/1649	4.45	4.43	4.28	4.11	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	9	4.25	897/1648	4.50	4.34	4.23	4.16	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	1	12	4.44	629/1375	4.70	4.62	4.27	4.10	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	2	4	8	4.20	890/1595	4.33	4.42	4.20	4.03	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	5	9	4.31	565/1533	4.67	4.33	4.04	3.87	4.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	8	4	3.94	980/1512	4.10	4.17	4.10	3.86	3.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	6	3	7	4.06	999/1623	4.39	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.06	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	465/1646	4.29	4.56	4.69	4.67	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	374/1621	4.52	4.35	4.06	3.96	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	1112/1568	4.57	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.27	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	840/1572	4.86	4.90	4.70	4.64	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	4	6	4	3.80	1273/1564	4.48	4.50	4.28	4.20	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	901/1559	4.67	4.59	4.29	4.20	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	495/1352	3.97	3.76	3.98	3.86	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	367/1384	4.64	4.17	4.08	3.86	4.62	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	844/1382	4.35	4.27	4.29	4.03	4.23	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	569/1368	4.72	4.51	4.30	4.01	4.62	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	1	0	4	1	3	3.56	688/ 948	3.56	3.99	3.95	3.75	3.56	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 555	****	5.00	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	****	3.68	3.54	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHIL 251 0101
 Title ETH ISS SCI ENG&INF TE
 Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 49
 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1281
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	10	13	16	4.07	1136/1649	4.10	4.43	4.28	4.29	4.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	12	8	15	3.80	1313/1648	4.05	4.34	4.23	4.25	3.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	13	19	4.18	868/1375	4.34	4.62	4.27	4.37	4.18	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	2	12	22	4.49	524/1595	4.57	4.42	4.20	4.22	4.49	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	2	2	8	11	12	3.83	996/1533	3.98	4.33	4.04	4.04	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	12	21	4.36	574/1512	4.47	4.17	4.10	4.14	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	3	10	9	10	6	3.16	1509/1623	3.41	4.33	4.16	4.21	3.16	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	11	27	4.67	1037/1646	4.71	4.56	4.69	4.63	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	1	10	13	10	3.86	1105/1621	4.02	4.35	4.06	4.01	3.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	3	1	12	11	11	3.68	1422/1568	3.95	4.58	4.43	4.39	3.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	34	4.89	615/1572	4.93	4.90	4.70	4.73	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	4	12	7	13	3.66	1340/1564	3.87	4.50	4.28	4.27	3.66	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	7	7	7	16	3.79	1258/1559	3.92	4.59	4.29	4.33	3.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	13	1	2	9	3	10	3.76	907/1352	3.53	3.76	3.98	4.07	3.76	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	3	5	5	6	8	3.41	1122/1384	3.55	4.17	4.08	3.99	3.41	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	1	9	7	9	3.81	1065/1382	3.97	4.27	4.29	4.19	3.81	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	3	4	6	13	4.00	948/1368	4.20	4.51	4.30	4.21	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	15	0	1	1	6	3	4.00	431/ 948	3.97	3.99	3.95	3.89	4.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.47	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	36	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 555	****	5.00	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	3.33	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	39	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	****	3.68	3.65	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 32	Required for Majors	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 40
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	30
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHIL 251 0201
 Title ETH ISS SCI ENG&INF TE
 Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1282
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	8	12	4.12	1106/1649	4.10	4.43	4.28	4.29	4.12	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	9	13	4.31	839/1648	4.05	4.34	4.23	4.25	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	9	15	4.50	546/1375	4.34	4.62	4.27	4.37	4.50		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	19	4.65	332/1595	4.57	4.42	4.20	4.22	4.65	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	5	8	10	4.13	733/1533	3.98	4.33	4.04	4.04	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	18	4.58	331/1512	4.47	4.17	4.10	4.14	4.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	4	6	7	8	3.65	1323/1623	3.41	4.33	4.16	4.21	3.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	19	4.76	897/1646	4.71	4.56	4.69	4.63	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	1	13	7	4.18	766/1621	4.02	4.35	4.06	4.01	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	3	10	10	4.21	1162/1568	3.95	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.21	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	296/1572	4.93	4.90	4.70	4.73	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	1	12	8	4.09	1091/1564	3.87	4.50	4.28	4.27	4.09	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	3	11	8	4.04	1102/1559	3.92	4.59	4.29	4.33	4.04	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	4	1	3	4	5	3.29	1146/1352	3.53	3.76	3.98	4.07	3.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	9	6	6	3.70	997/1384	3.55	4.17	4.08	3.99	3.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	5	7	10	4.13	905/1382	3.97	4.27	4.29	4.19	4.13	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	3	8	12	4.39	758/1368	4.20	4.51	4.30	4.21	4.39	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	7	1	0	2	9	4	3.94	502/ 948	3.97	3.99	3.95	3.89	3.94	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 555	****	5.00	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	****	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	A	16	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	26	Non-major	26
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PHIL 321 0101
 Title HIST OF PHIL:ANCIENT
 Instructor: EALICK, GREG E.
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1283
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	12	15	4.40	776/1649	4.40	4.43	4.28	4.27	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	13	14	4.30	839/1648	4.30	4.34	4.23	4.18	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	22	1	0	0	4	2	3.86	****/1375	****	4.62	4.27	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	7	19	4.61	383/1595	4.61	4.42	4.20	4.21	4.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	7	18	4.41	465/1533	4.41	4.33	4.04	4.05	4.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	10	16	4.50	380/1512	4.50	4.17	4.10	4.11	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	1	12	13	4.29	780/1623	4.29	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	266/1646	4.96	4.56	4.69	4.67	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	0	9	12	4.45	442/1621	4.45	4.35	4.06	4.02	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	9	19	4.62	699/1568	4.62	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	27	4.93	414/1572	4.93	4.90	4.70	4.64	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	7	18	4.59	560/1564	4.59	4.50	4.28	4.25	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	7	21	4.69	487/1559	4.69	4.59	4.29	4.23	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	23	0	2	2	0	1	3.00	****/1352	****	3.76	3.98	3.97	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	655/1384	4.29	4.17	4.08	4.11	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	616/1382	4.50	4.27	4.29	4.37	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	472/1368	4.71	4.51	4.30	4.39	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	16	12	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 948	****	3.99	3.95	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 20		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 5	C 0	General 8	Under-grad 30 Non-major 29
84-150	10	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 12	
			? 1		

Course-Section: PHIL 321H 0101
 Title HIST OF PHIL:ANCIENT
 Instructor: EALICK, GREG E.
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1284
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	550/1649	4.57	4.43	4.28	4.27	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	475/1648	4.57	4.34	4.23	4.18	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.62	4.27	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	192/1595	4.80	4.42	4.20	4.21	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.33	4.04	4.05	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	263/1512	4.67	4.17	4.10	4.11	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.33	4.16	4.08	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.56	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	191/1621	4.71	4.35	4.06	4.02	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	316/1568	4.86	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.90	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	406/1564	4.71	4.50	4.28	4.25	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.59	4.29	4.23	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	520/1384	4.43	4.17	4.08	4.11	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	435/1382	4.71	4.27	4.29	4.37	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	472/1368	4.71	4.51	4.30	4.39	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	3.99	3.95	4.00	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHIL 327 0101
 Title AMERICAN PRAGMATISM
 Instructor: BRAUDE, STEPHEN
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1285
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	603/1649	4.54	4.43	4.28	4.27	4.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	521/1648	4.54	4.34	4.23	4.18	4.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.62	4.27	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1595	****	4.42	4.20	4.21	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	174/1533	4.77	4.33	4.04	4.05	4.77	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1512	****	4.17	4.10	4.11	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	210/1623	4.77	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	1121/1646	4.58	4.56	4.69	4.67	4.58	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	313/1621	4.57	4.35	4.06	4.02	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	480/1568	4.75	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.90	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	570/1564	4.58	4.50	4.28	4.25	4.58	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	695/1559	4.50	4.59	4.29	4.23	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	1	3	2	3	3.50	1049/1352	3.50	3.76	3.98	3.97	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	644/1384	4.30	4.17	4.08	4.11	4.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	455/1382	4.70	4.27	4.29	4.37	4.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	264/1368	4.90	4.51	4.30	4.39	4.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.99	3.95	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 1	General 7	Under-grad 14 Non-major 9
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 4	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHIL 332 0101
 Title PHIL OF ASIAN MART ART
 Instructor: TEMPLETON, ROYE
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1286
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	0	12	4.29	922/1649	4.29	4.43	4.28	4.27	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	2	2	1	9	3.65	1421/1648	3.65	4.34	4.23	4.18	3.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	5	1	5	3.18	1303/1375	3.18	4.62	4.27	4.22	3.18	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	2	2	2	4	4	3.43	1435/1595	3.43	4.42	4.20	4.21	3.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	1	5	6	3.87	955/1533	3.87	4.33	4.04	4.05	3.87	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	7	3	3	3.40	1320/1512	3.40	4.17	4.10	4.11	3.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	0	4	10	4.38	671/1623	4.38	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	13	3	4.19	1447/1646	4.19	4.56	4.69	4.67	4.19	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	3	0	2	5	5	3.60	1302/1621	3.60	4.35	4.06	4.02	3.60	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	372/1568	4.81	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	815/1572	4.81	4.90	4.70	4.64	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	1	1	11	4.19	1010/1564	4.19	4.50	4.28	4.25	4.19	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	3	10	4.25	966/1559	4.25	4.59	4.29	4.23	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	457/1352	4.33	3.76	3.98	3.97	4.33	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	4	2	2	2	2	2.67	1335/1384	2.67	4.17	4.08	4.11	2.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	5	1	5	1	2	2.57	1358/1382	2.57	4.27	4.29	4.37	2.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	6	0	4	1	3	2.64	1340/1368	2.64	4.51	4.30	4.39	2.64	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHIL 346 0101
 Title DEDUCTIVE SYSTEMS
 Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1287
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	1	2	8	17	4.23	986/1649	4.23	4.43	4.28	4.27	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	4	7	16	4.17	999/1648	4.17	4.34	4.23	4.18	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	6	23	4.70	370/1375	4.70	4.62	4.27	4.22	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	23	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	****/1595	****	4.42	4.20	4.21	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	1	2	4	3	12	4.05	788/1533	4.05	4.33	4.04	4.05	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	25	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/1512	****	4.17	4.10	4.11	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	2	4	6	4	12	3.71	1293/1623	3.71	4.33	4.16	4.08	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	22	4.73	945/1646	4.73	4.56	4.69	4.67	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	1	2	9	11	4.17	789/1621	4.17	4.35	4.06	4.02	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	0	5	7	14	4.11	1235/1568	4.11	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	1	4	22	4.68	1059/1572	4.68	4.90	4.70	4.64	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	1	4	5	16	4.26	939/1564	4.26	4.50	4.28	4.25	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	2	2	4	18	4.33	901/1559	4.33	4.59	4.29	4.23	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	24	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1352	****	3.76	3.98	3.97	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	3	0	2	6	5	3.63	1029/1384	3.63	4.17	4.08	4.11	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	1	2	13	4.59	555/1382	4.59	4.27	4.29	4.37	4.59
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	2	0	3	2	9	4.00	948/1368	4.00	4.51	4.30	4.39	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	15	12	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 948	****	3.99	3.95	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors								
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	8		
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	13								
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	31	Non-major	23		
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	0								
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					
				P	0								
				I	0				Other	18			
				?	2								

Course-Section: PHIL 358 0101
 Title BIOETHICS
 Instructor: DIXON, BEN
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1288
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	7	8	4.44	736/1649	4.44	4.43	4.28	4.27	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	658/1648	4.44	4.34	4.23	4.18	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	226/1375	4.81	4.62	4.27	4.22	4.81	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	818/1595	4.25	4.42	4.20	4.21	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	119/1533	4.88	4.33	4.04	4.05	4.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	493/1512	4.43	4.17	4.10	4.11	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	4	8	4.25	815/1623	4.25	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	2	4.13	1491/1646	4.13	4.56	4.69	4.67	4.13	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	511/1621	4.40	4.35	4.06	4.02	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	1213/1568	4.13	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	414/1572	4.93	4.90	4.70	4.64	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	854/1564	4.33	4.50	4.28	4.25	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	749/1559	4.47	4.59	4.29	4.23	4.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	302/1384	4.70	4.17	4.08	4.11	4.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	455/1382	4.70	4.27	4.29	4.37	4.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	369/1368	4.80	4.51	4.30	4.39	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	9	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 948	****	3.99	3.95	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	16	Non-major	8
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 358H 0101
 Title BIOETHICS
 Instructor: DIXON, BEN
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1289
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	1183/1649	4.00	4.43	4.28	4.27	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	999/1648	4.17	4.34	4.23	4.18	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	212/1375	4.83	4.62	4.27	4.22	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	497/1595	4.50	4.42	4.20	4.21	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	366/1533	4.50	4.33	4.04	4.05	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1202/1512	3.60	4.17	4.10	4.11	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	502/1623	4.50	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1193/1646	4.50	4.56	4.69	4.67	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	789/1621	4.17	4.35	4.06	4.02	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	731/1568	4.60	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.90	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.50	4.28	4.25	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	318/1559	4.80	4.59	4.29	4.23	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1219/1352	3.00	3.76	3.98	3.97	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	673/1384	4.25	4.17	4.08	4.11	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	831/1382	4.25	4.27	4.29	4.37	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	426/1368	4.75	4.51	4.30	4.39	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.99	3.95	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHIL 370 0101
 Title PHIL AND PARAPSYCHOLOG
 Instructor: BRAUDE, STEPHEN
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1290
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	986/1649	4.23	4.43	4.28	4.27	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	9	2	3.92	1208/1648	3.92	4.34	4.23	4.18	3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	521/1375	4.54	4.62	4.27	4.22	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	782/1595	4.29	4.42	4.20	4.21	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	575/1533	4.31	4.33	4.04	4.05	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1035/1512	3.89	4.17	4.10	4.11	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	4	1	7	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	1037/1646	4.67	4.56	4.69	4.67	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	1078/1621	3.89	4.35	4.06	4.02	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	969/1568	4.42	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	740/1572	4.85	4.90	4.70	4.64	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	801/1564	4.38	4.50	4.28	4.25	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	573/1559	4.62	4.59	4.29	4.23	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	457/1352	4.33	3.76	3.98	3.97	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	4	2	1	3.11	1244/1384	3.11	4.17	4.08	4.11	3.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	946/1382	4.00	4.27	4.29	4.37	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	403/1368	4.78	4.51	4.30	4.39	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	5	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.99	3.95	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHIL 399A 0101
 Title TOP IN PHIL:PHIL OF FI
 Instructor: SENG, P.
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1291
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	3	10	11	4.33	871/1649	4.33	4.43	4.28	4.27	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	10	10	4.30	839/1648	4.30	4.34	4.23	4.18	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	16	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	546/1375	4.50	4.62	4.27	4.22	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	3	7	12	4.41	636/1595	4.41	4.42	4.20	4.21	4.41	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	7	13	4.38	505/1533	4.38	4.33	4.04	4.05	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	9	13	4.46	451/1512	4.46	4.17	4.10	4.11	4.46	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	1	3	5	7	6	3.64	1332/1623	3.64	4.33	4.16	4.08	3.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	13	10	4.38	1310/1646	4.38	4.56	4.69	4.67	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	0	0	8	9	4.33	595/1621	4.33	4.35	4.06	4.02	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	1	8	11	4.38	1002/1568	4.38	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	296/1572	4.95	4.90	4.70	4.64	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	689/1564	4.48	4.50	4.28	4.25	4.48	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	618/1559	4.57	4.59	4.29	4.23	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	101/1352	4.90	3.76	3.98	3.97	4.90	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	400/1384	4.56	4.17	4.08	4.11	4.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	521/1382	4.63	4.27	4.29	4.37	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	295/1368	4.88	4.51	4.30	4.39	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	7	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	3.99	3.95	4.00	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 1	A 11	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 7	Under-grad 26 Non-major 23
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 7	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHIL 399B 0101
 Title TOP IN PHIL:BUSIN ETHI
 Instructor: WILSON, R.
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1292
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	8	7	4	3.70	1402/1649	3.70	4.43	4.28	4.27	3.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	7	5	7	3.85	1271/1648	3.85	4.34	4.23	4.18	3.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	7	8	4.00	950/1375	4.00	4.62	4.27	4.22	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	12	5	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	4.42	4.20	4.21	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	4	0	7	1	5	3.18	1396/1533	3.18	4.33	4.04	4.05	3.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	6	6	7	3.95	952/1512	3.95	4.17	4.10	4.11	3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	6	2	5	3	4	2.85	1565/1623	2.85	4.33	4.16	4.08	2.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	1	0	5	9	4	3.79	1618/1646	3.79	4.56	4.69	4.67	3.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	10	4	2	3.50	1345/1621	3.50	4.35	4.06	4.02	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	1	7	4	5	3.47	1466/1568	3.47	4.58	4.43	4.39	3.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	1	17	4.75	931/1572	4.75	4.90	4.70	4.64	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	7	4	6	3.74	1306/1564	3.74	4.50	4.28	4.25	3.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	6	5	5	3.58	1351/1559	3.58	4.59	4.29	4.23	3.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	2	1	3	4	4	3.50	1049/1352	3.50	3.76	3.98	3.97	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	4	1	6	0	3	2.79	1317/1384	2.79	4.17	4.08	4.11	2.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	2	3	4	3	3.29	1265/1382	3.29	4.27	4.29	4.37	3.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	866/1368	4.21	4.51	4.30	4.39	4.21
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	2	0	4	0	2	3.00	844/ 948	3.00	3.99	3.95	4.00	3.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	2	A	9	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 399C 0101
 Title TOP IN PHIL:PHIL OF HU
 Instructor: THOMAS, J.
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1293
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	7	22	4.58	536/1649	4.58	4.43	4.28	4.27	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	9	22	4.71	310/1648	4.71	4.34	4.23	4.18	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	133/1375	4.93	4.62	4.27	4.22	4.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	4	24	4.86	162/1595	4.86	4.42	4.20	4.21	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	6	22	4.60	288/1533	4.60	4.33	4.04	4.05	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	23	4.70	240/1512	4.70	4.17	4.10	4.11	4.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	27	4.87	140/1623	4.87	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.87
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	14	15	4.52	1184/1646	4.52	4.56	4.69	4.67	4.52
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	75/1621	4.92	4.35	4.06	4.02	4.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	28	4.90	245/1568	4.90	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.90	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.50	4.28	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.59	4.29	4.23	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	1	28	4.90	101/1352	4.90	3.76	3.98	3.97	4.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	275/1384	4.72	4.17	4.08	4.11	4.72
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	373/1382	4.78	4.27	4.29	4.37	4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	158/1368	4.94	4.51	4.30	4.39	4.94
4. Were special techniques successful	14	9	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	203/ 948	4.50	3.99	3.95	4.00	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 20	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 1	General 13	Under-grad 31 Non-major 25
84-150	13	3.00-3.49 9	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 7	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHIL 400 0901
 Title INDEP STUDY IN PHIL
 Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1294
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.43	4.28	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1648	4.67	4.34	4.23	4.36	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.62	4.27	4.48	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1595	4.75	4.42	4.20	4.36	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1533	4.83	4.33	4.04	4.14	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1512	4.50	4.17	4.10	4.26	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.33	4.16	4.27	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1193/1646	4.58	4.56	4.69	4.71	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1621	4.83	4.35	4.06	4.24	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.58	4.43	4.54	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.90	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.50	4.28	4.40	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.59	4.29	4.41	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	690/1352	4.00	3.76	3.98	4.07	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.17	4.08	4.35	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.27	4.29	4.56	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.51	4.30	4.58	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	3.99	3.95	4.31	5.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	5.00	4.29	4.41	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 53	5.00	5.00	4.30	4.64	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHIL 400 1101
 Title INDEP STUDY IN PHIL
 Instructor: EALICK, GREG E.
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1295
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	3	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.43	4.28	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	797/1648	4.67	4.34	4.23	4.36	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	497/1595	4.75	4.42	4.20	4.36	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	241/1533	4.83	4.33	4.04	4.14	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	883/1512	4.50	4.17	4.10	4.26	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.33	4.16	4.27	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1037/1646	4.58	4.56	4.69	4.71	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	234/1621	4.83	4.35	4.06	4.24	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.58	4.43	4.54	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.90	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.50	4.28	4.40	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.59	4.29	4.41	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.17	4.08	4.35	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.27	4.29	4.56	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.51	4.30	4.58	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 53	5.00	5.00	4.30	4.64	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	5.00	4.43	4.84	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHIL 452 0101
 Title ADV TOPICS IN ETHICS
 Instructor: DWYER, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1296
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.43	4.28	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	441/1648	4.60	4.34	4.23	4.36	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	271/1375	4.78	4.62	4.27	4.48	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	362/1595	4.63	4.42	4.20	4.36	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	106/1533	4.90	4.33	4.04	4.14	4.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	156/1512	4.80	4.17	4.10	4.26	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	448/1623	4.56	4.33	4.16	4.27	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	1287/1646	4.40	4.56	4.69	4.71	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	113/1621	4.86	4.35	4.06	4.24	4.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.58	4.43	4.54	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.90	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	473/1564	4.67	4.50	4.28	4.40	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.59	4.29	4.41	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1352	****	3.76	3.98	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.17	4.08	4.35	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.27	4.29	4.56	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	654/1368	4.50	4.51	4.30	4.58	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 948	****	3.99	3.95	4.31	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.66	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.54	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.57	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.44	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 288	****	****	3.68	3.71	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHIL 470 0101
 Title PHILOSOPHY OF MIND
 Instructor: YALOWITZ, STEVE
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1297
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	644/1649	4.50	4.43	4.28	4.50	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	556/1648	4.50	4.34	4.23	4.36	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	233/1375	4.80	4.62	4.27	4.48	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	362/1595	4.63	4.42	4.20	4.36	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	288/1533	4.60	4.33	4.04	4.14	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	883/1512	4.00	4.17	4.10	4.26	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	1	7	4.30	757/1623	4.30	4.33	4.16	4.27	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	1103/1646	4.60	4.56	4.69	4.71	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	847/1621	4.11	4.35	4.06	4.24	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	387/1568	4.80	4.58	4.43	4.54	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.90	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	651/1564	4.50	4.50	4.28	4.40	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	318/1559	4.80	4.59	4.29	4.41	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1051/1384	3.57	4.17	4.08	4.35	3.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1050/1382	3.86	4.27	4.29	4.56	3.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	601/1368	4.57	4.51	4.30	4.58	4.57	

Frequency Distribution

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