

Course-Section: PHIL 100 1
 Title Intro To Philosophy
 Instructor: Pfeifer, Jessica
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1153
 MAR 22, 2010
 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 | 1 | 4 | 15 | 17 | 4.30 | 842/1509 | 4.58 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.18 | 4.30 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 28 | 4.68 | 344/1509 | 4.66 | 4.39 | 4.26 | 4.25 | 4.68 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 32 | 4.78 | 229/1287 | 4.83 | 4.63 | 4.30 | 4.24 | 4.78 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 16 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 14 | 4.48 | 503/1459 | 4.60 | 4.39 | 4.22 | 4.11 | 4.48 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 9 | 14 | 3.67 | 1105/1406 | 4.08 | 4.26 | 4.09 | 4.02 | 3.67 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 21 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 3.93 | 899/1384 | 4.44 | 4.25 | 4.11 | 3.98 | 3.93 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 28 | 4.69 | 254/1489 | 4.65 | 4.40 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 4.69 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 10 | 4.28 | 1243/1506 | 4.49 | 4.56 | 4.67 | 4.66 | 4.28 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 11 | 4.37 | 511/1463 | 4.66 | 4.36 | 4.09 | 4.02 | 4.37 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 27 | 4.74 | 463/1438 | 4.84 | 4.62 | 4.46 | 4.44 | 4.74 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 34 | 4.97 | 161/1421 | 4.96 | 4.83 | 4.73 | 4.66 | 4.97 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 24 | 4.63 | 469/1411 | 4.75 | 4.50 | 4.31 | 4.27 | 4.63 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 27 | 4.66 | 473/1405 | 4.79 | 4.55 | 4.32 | 4.27 | 4.66 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 10 | 10 | 3.96 | 708/1236 | 3.84 | 3.79 | 4.00 | 3.87 | 3.96 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 14 | 4.50 | 415/1260 | 4.62 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 3.95 | 4.50 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 14 | 4.65 | 453/1255 | 4.58 | 4.26 | 4.33 | 4.15 | 4.65 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 18 | 4.90 | 236/1258 | 4.75 | 4.47 | 4.38 | 4.18 | 4.90 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 17 | 11 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3.00 | ****/ 873 | 4.50 | 4.02 | 4.03 | 3.89 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|-----------------------|---|--------------|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A 24 | Required for Majors 1 | Graduate 0 | Major 0 |
| 28-55 | 7 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B 6 | | | |
| 56-83 | 4 | 2.00-2.99 | 5 | C 0 | General 21 | Under-grad 37 | Non-major 37 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | 5 | D 0 | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 9 | F 0 | Electives 8 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | |
| | | | | P 0 | | | |
| | | | | I 0 | Other 0 | | |
| | | | | ? 1 | | | |

Course-Section: PHIL 100 2
 Title Intro To Philosophy
 Instructor: Thomas, James G
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1154
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor Mean | Instructor Rank | Course Mean | Dept Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|--------------------|--------------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | | | | | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 37 | 4.90 | 159/1509 | 4.58 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.18 | 4.90 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 37 | 4.88 | 141/1509 | 4.66 | 4.39 | 4.26 | 4.25 | 4.88 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 5.00 | 1/1287 | 4.83 | 4.63 | 4.30 | 4.24 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 33 | 4.74 | 200/1459 | 4.60 | 4.39 | 4.22 | 4.11 | 4.74 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 22 | 4.03 | 798/1406 | 4.08 | 4.26 | 4.09 | 4.02 | 4.03 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 28 | 4.66 | 234/1384 | 4.44 | 4.25 | 4.11 | 3.98 | 4.66 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 35 | 4.85 | 127/1489 | 4.65 | 4.40 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 4.85 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 21 | 4.53 | 1054/1506 | 4.49 | 4.56 | 4.67 | 4.66 | 4.53 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 33 | 4.94 | 49/1463 | 4.66 | 4.36 | 4.09 | 4.02 | 4.94 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 38 | 4.93 | 175/1438 | 4.84 | 4.62 | 4.46 | 4.44 | 4.93 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 5.00 | 1/1421 | 4.96 | 4.83 | 4.73 | 4.66 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 5.00 | 1/1411 | 4.75 | 4.50 | 4.31 | 4.27 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 40 | 4.98 | 52/1405 | 4.79 | 4.55 | 4.32 | 4.27 | 4.98 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 22 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 4.06 | 635/1236 | 3.84 | 3.79 | 4.00 | 3.87 | 4.06 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 17 | 4.89 | 143/1260 | 4.62 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 3.95 | 4.89 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 18 | 4.95 | 123/1255 | 4.58 | 4.26 | 4.33 | 4.15 | 4.95 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 5.00 | 1/1258 | 4.75 | 4.47 | 4.38 | 4.18 | 5.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 23 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 4.43 | ****/ 873 | 4.50 | 4.02 | 4.03 | 3.89 | **** |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 184 | **** | **** | 4.16 | 4.06 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 198 | **** | **** | 4.22 | 4.14 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 184 | **** | **** | 4.48 | 4.48 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 177 | **** | **** | 4.36 | 4.29 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 165 | **** | **** | 4.18 | 4.15 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 89 | **** | **** | 4.49 | 4.31 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 92 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.16 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 90 | **** | **** | 4.50 | 4.21 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 92 | **** | **** | 4.38 | 4.21 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 93 | **** | **** | 4.06 | 3.92 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 48 | **** | **** | 4.39 | 3.75 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 48 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 4.29 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 47 | **** | **** | 4.51 | 4.53 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 47 | **** | **** | 4.18 | 4.26 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 44 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.12 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 49 | **** | **** | 4.26 | 4.28 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 41 | **** | **** | 4.14 | 4.13 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 46 | **** | **** | 4.31 | 4.52 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 37 | **** | **** | 4.05 | 4.47 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 30 | **** | **** | 4.27 | 4.21 | **** |

Course-Section: PHIL 100 2
 Title Intro To Philosophy
 Instructor: Thomas, James G
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1154
 MAR 22, 2010
 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 | 32 | Required for Majors | 2 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 3 | 1.00-1.99 | 1 | B | 4 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 6 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C | 0 | General | 23 | Under-grad | 41 | Non-major | 41 |
| 84-150 | 9 | 3.00-3.49 | 9 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 13 | F | 0 | Electives | 13 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: PHIL 100 3
 Title Intro To Philosophy
 Instructor: Thomas, James G
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1155
 MAR 22, 2010
 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 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 27 | 4.93 | 111/1509 | 4.58 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.18 | 4.93 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 27 | 4.90 | 124/1509 | 4.66 | 4.39 | 4.26 | 4.25 | 4.90 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 28 | 4.93 | 89/1287 | 4.83 | 4.63 | 4.30 | 4.24 | 4.93 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 26 | 4.86 | 116/1459 | 4.60 | 4.39 | 4.22 | 4.11 | 4.86 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 18 | 4.34 | 494/1406 | 4.08 | 4.26 | 4.09 | 4.02 | 4.34 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 24 | 4.76 | 149/1384 | 4.44 | 4.25 | 4.11 | 3.98 | 4.76 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 23 | 4.76 | 192/1489 | 4.65 | 4.40 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 4.76 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 12 | 4.43 | 1146/1506 | 4.49 | 4.56 | 4.67 | 4.66 | 4.43 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 5.00 | 1/1463 | 4.66 | 4.36 | 4.09 | 4.02 | 5.00 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 28 | 4.97 | 88/1438 | 4.84 | 4.62 | 4.46 | 4.44 | 4.97 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 5.00 | 1/1421 | 4.96 | 4.83 | 4.73 | 4.66 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 28 | 4.97 | 55/1411 | 4.75 | 4.50 | 4.31 | 4.27 | 4.97 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 28 | 4.93 | 120/1405 | 4.79 | 4.55 | 4.32 | 4.27 | 4.93 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 17 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 4.45 | 314/1236 | 3.84 | 3.79 | 4.00 | 3.87 | 4.45 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 18 | 4.90 | 136/1260 | 4.62 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 3.95 | 4.90 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 19 | 4.95 | 123/1255 | 4.58 | 4.26 | 4.33 | 4.15 | 4.95 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 5.00 | 1/1258 | 4.75 | 4.47 | 4.38 | 4.18 | 5.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 9 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4.50 | 209/ 873 | 4.50 | 4.02 | 4.03 | 3.89 | 4.50 |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 198 | **** | **** | 4.22 | 4.14 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 89 | **** | **** | 4.49 | 4.31 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 92 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.16 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 90 | **** | **** | 4.50 | 4.21 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 48 | **** | **** | 4.39 | 3.75 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 48 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 4.29 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 47 | **** | **** | 4.51 | 4.53 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 47 | **** | **** | 4.18 | 4.26 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 44 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.12 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 49 | **** | **** | 4.26 | 4.28 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 41 | **** | **** | 4.14 | 4.13 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 46 | **** | **** | 4.31 | 4.52 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|-----------------------|---|--------------|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A 23 | Required for Majors 3 | Graduate 0 | Major 0 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B 1 | | | |
| 56-83 | 8 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C 0 | General 17 | Under-grad 29 | Non-major 29 |
| 84-150 | 5 | 3.00-3.49 | 7 | 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 | 2 |
| ? | 1 | | |

Course-Section: PHIL 100 4
 Title Intro To Philosophy
 Instructor: DiFate,Victor J
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1156
 MAR 22, 2010
 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 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 19 | 4.58 | 505/1509 | 4.58 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.18 | 4.58 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 27 | 4.87 | 150/1509 | 4.66 | 4.39 | 4.26 | 4.25 | 4.87 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 28 | 4.90 | 127/1287 | 4.83 | 4.63 | 4.30 | 4.24 | 4.90 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 2 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 4.85 | 126/1459 | 4.60 | 4.39 | 4.22 | 4.11 | 4.85 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 8 | 13 | 4.11 | 739/1406 | 4.08 | 4.26 | 4.09 | 4.02 | 4.11 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 2 | 20 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 4.60 | 278/1384 | 4.44 | 4.25 | 4.11 | 3.98 | 4.60 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 26 | 4.90 | 97/1489 | 4.65 | 4.40 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 4.90 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 18 | 4.64 | 957/1506 | 4.49 | 4.56 | 4.67 | 4.66 | 4.64 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 22 | 4.81 | 118/1463 | 4.66 | 4.36 | 4.09 | 4.02 | 4.81 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 26 | 4.93 | 175/1438 | 4.84 | 4.62 | 4.46 | 4.44 | 4.93 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 27 | 4.93 | 376/1421 | 4.96 | 4.83 | 4.73 | 4.66 | 4.93 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 24 | 4.76 | 303/1411 | 4.75 | 4.50 | 4.31 | 4.27 | 4.76 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 25 | 4.89 | 183/1405 | 4.79 | 4.55 | 4.32 | 4.27 | 4.89 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 4 | 17 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 4.27 | 474/1236 | 3.84 | 3.79 | 4.00 | 3.87 | 4.27 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 4.86 | 172/1260 | 4.62 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 3.95 | 4.86 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 4.93 | 143/1255 | 4.58 | 4.26 | 4.33 | 4.15 | 4.93 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 4.93 | 165/1258 | 4.75 | 4.47 | 4.38 | 4.18 | 4.93 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 19 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4.20 | ****/ 873 | 4.50 | 4.02 | 4.03 | 3.89 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|-----------------------|---|--------------|
| 00-27 | 4 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | A 16 | Required for Majors 3 | Graduate 0 | Major 0 |
| 28-55 | 6 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B 6 | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 5 | C 1 | General 15 | Under-grad 32 | Non-major 32 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | 5 | D 0 | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 3 | F 0 | Electives 4 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | |
| | | | | P 0 | | | |
| | | | | I 0 | Other 0 | | |
| | | | | ? 2 | | | |

Course-Section: PHIL 100 5
 Title Intro To Philosophy
 Instructor: Yalowitz, Steven
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1157
 MAR 22, 2010
 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 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 13 | 3.97 | 1154/1509 | 4.58 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.18 | 3.97 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 14 | 3.97 | 1117/1509 | 4.66 | 4.39 | 4.26 | 4.25 | 3.97 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 21 | 4.54 | 491/1287 | 4.83 | 4.63 | 4.30 | 4.24 | 4.54 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 14 | 4.22 | 814/1459 | 4.60 | 4.39 | 4.22 | 4.11 | 4.22 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 16 | 4.36 | 486/1406 | 4.08 | 4.26 | 4.09 | 4.02 | 4.36 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 4.22 | 649/1384 | 4.44 | 4.25 | 4.11 | 3.98 | 4.22 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 16 | 4.34 | 663/1489 | 4.65 | 4.40 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 4.34 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 7 | 4.24 | 1265/1506 | 4.49 | 4.56 | 4.67 | 4.66 | 4.24 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 12 | 11 | 4.14 | 762/1463 | 4.66 | 4.36 | 4.09 | 4.02 | 4.14 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 20 | 4.64 | 617/1438 | 4.84 | 4.62 | 4.46 | 4.44 | 4.64 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 22 | 4.81 | 768/1421 | 4.96 | 4.83 | 4.73 | 4.66 | 4.81 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 16 | 4.36 | 789/1411 | 4.75 | 4.50 | 4.31 | 4.27 | 4.36 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 20 | 4.39 | 768/1405 | 4.79 | 4.55 | 4.32 | 4.27 | 4.39 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4.13 | 598/1236 | 3.84 | 3.79 | 4.00 | 3.87 | 4.13 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 11 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 9 | 3.95 | 819/1260 | 4.62 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 3.95 | 3.95 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 11 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 8 | 3.37 | 1161/1255 | 4.58 | 4.26 | 4.33 | 4.15 | 3.37 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 11 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 11 | 4.00 | 932/1258 | 4.75 | 4.47 | 4.38 | 4.18 | 4.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 11 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | ****/ 873 | 4.50 | 4.02 | 4.03 | 3.89 | **** |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 26 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 184 | **** | **** | 4.16 | 4.06 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 27 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/ 198 | **** | **** | 4.22 | 4.14 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 26 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 184 | **** | **** | 4.48 | 4.48 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 26 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 177 | **** | **** | 4.36 | 4.29 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 26 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 165 | **** | **** | 4.18 | 4.15 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 26 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 89 | **** | **** | 4.49 | 4.31 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 26 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 92 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.16 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 26 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 90 | **** | **** | 4.50 | 4.21 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 26 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 92 | **** | **** | 4.38 | 4.21 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 26 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 93 | **** | **** | 4.06 | 3.92 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 48 | **** | **** | 4.39 | 3.75 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 48 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 4.29 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 27 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 47 | **** | **** | 4.51 | 4.53 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 27 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 47 | **** | **** | 4.18 | 4.26 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 27 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 44 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.12 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/ 49 | **** | **** | 4.26 | 4.28 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 27 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 41 | **** | **** | 4.14 | 4.13 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 27 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 46 | **** | **** | 4.31 | 4.52 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 27 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 37 | **** | **** | 4.05 | 4.47 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 27 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 30 | **** | **** | 4.27 | 4.21 | **** |

Course-Section: PHIL 100 5
 Title Intro To Philosophy
 Instructor: Yalowitz, Steven
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1157
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|----|---------------------|------|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | A | 11 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 4 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 13 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C | 3 | General | 14 | Under-grad | 30 | Non-major | 30 |
| 84-150 | 1 | 3.00-3.49 | 4 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 3 | F | 0 | Electives | 8 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 2 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: PHIL 100 6
 Title Intro To Philosophy
 Instructor: Ealick,Greg
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1158
 MAR 22, 2010
 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 | 4 | 8 | 21 | 4.52 | 586/1509 | 4.58 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.18 | 4.52 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 18 | 4.52 | 531/1509 | 4.66 | 4.39 | 4.26 | 4.25 | 4.52 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 25 | 4.70 | 326/1287 | 4.83 | 4.63 | 4.30 | 4.24 | 4.70 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 13 | 14 | 4.33 | 686/1459 | 4.60 | 4.39 | 4.22 | 4.11 | 4.33 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 15 | 11 | 4.06 | 768/1406 | 4.08 | 4.26 | 4.09 | 4.02 | 4.06 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 13 | 4.32 | 544/1384 | 4.44 | 4.25 | 4.11 | 3.98 | 4.32 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 8 | 19 | 4.36 | 641/1489 | 4.65 | 4.40 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 4.36 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 31 | 4.97 | 233/1506 | 4.49 | 4.56 | 4.67 | 4.66 | 4.97 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 14 | 12 | 4.36 | 523/1463 | 4.66 | 4.36 | 4.09 | 4.02 | 4.36 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 26 | 4.73 | 497/1438 | 4.84 | 4.62 | 4.46 | 4.44 | 4.73 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 5.00 | 1/1421 | 4.96 | 4.83 | 4.73 | 4.66 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 21 | 4.55 | 568/1411 | 4.75 | 4.50 | 4.31 | 4.27 | 4.55 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 26 | 4.73 | 381/1405 | 4.79 | 4.55 | 4.32 | 4.27 | 4.73 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 21 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2.08 | 1218/1236 | 3.84 | 3.79 | 4.00 | 3.87 | 2.08 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 14 | 4.52 | 402/1260 | 4.62 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 3.95 | 4.52 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 10 | 4.24 | 796/1255 | 4.58 | 4.26 | 4.33 | 4.15 | 4.24 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 11 | 4.48 | 650/1258 | 4.75 | 4.47 | 4.38 | 4.18 | 4.48 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 12 | 18 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 873 | 4.50 | 4.02 | 4.03 | 3.89 | **** |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 31 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 198 | **** | **** | 4.22 | 4.14 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 29 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 89 | **** | **** | 4.49 | 4.31 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 29 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 92 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.16 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 29 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 90 | **** | **** | 4.50 | 4.21 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 29 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/ 92 | **** | **** | 4.38 | 4.21 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 29 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 93 | **** | **** | 4.06 | 3.92 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 29 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 48 | **** | **** | 4.39 | 3.75 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 29 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3.25 | ****/ 48 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 4.29 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 29 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/ 47 | **** | **** | 4.51 | 4.53 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 29 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 47 | **** | **** | 4.18 | 4.26 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 29 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 44 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.12 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 3.75 | ****/ 49 | **** | **** | 4.26 | 4.28 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 29 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 41 | **** | **** | 4.14 | 4.13 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 29 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 46 | **** | **** | 4.31 | 4.52 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 29 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 37 | **** | **** | 4.05 | 4.47 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 29 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 30 | **** | **** | 4.27 | 4.21 | **** |

Course-Section: PHIL 100 6
 Title Intro To Philosophy
 Instructor: Ealick,Greg
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1158
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|----|---------------------|------|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | A | 9 | Required for Majors | 2 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 6 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 16 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 6 | C | 4 | General | 23 | Under-grad | 33 | Non-major | 33 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 3 | F | 0 | Electives | 3 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: PHIL 100 7
 Title Intro To Philosophy
 Instructor: Thomas, James G
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1159
 MAR 22, 2010
 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 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 29 | 4.85 | 210/1509 | 4.58 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.18 | 4.85 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 28 | 4.84 | 167/1509 | 4.66 | 4.39 | 4.26 | 4.25 | 4.84 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 32 | 4.94 | 89/1287 | 4.83 | 4.63 | 4.30 | 4.24 | 4.94 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 23 | 4.73 | 209/1459 | 4.60 | 4.39 | 4.22 | 4.11 | 4.73 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 10 | 12 | 4.00 | 813/1406 | 4.08 | 4.26 | 4.09 | 4.02 | 4.00 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 23 | 4.59 | 285/1384 | 4.44 | 4.25 | 4.11 | 3.98 | 4.59 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 21 | 4.65 | 297/1489 | 4.65 | 4.40 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 4.65 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 11 | 4.33 | 1205/1506 | 4.49 | 4.56 | 4.67 | 4.66 | 4.33 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 5.00 | 1/1463 | 4.66 | 4.36 | 4.09 | 4.02 | 5.00 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 31 | 4.97 | 88/1438 | 4.84 | 4.62 | 4.46 | 4.44 | 4.97 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 5.00 | 1/1421 | 4.96 | 4.83 | 4.73 | 4.66 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 31 | 4.97 | 55/1411 | 4.75 | 4.50 | 4.31 | 4.27 | 4.97 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 31 | 4.97 | 69/1405 | 4.79 | 4.55 | 4.32 | 4.27 | 4.97 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 20 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3.91 | 774/1236 | 3.84 | 3.79 | 4.00 | 3.87 | 3.91 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 4.69 | 287/1260 | 4.62 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 3.95 | 4.69 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 5.00 | 1/1255 | 4.58 | 4.26 | 4.33 | 4.15 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 4.92 | 189/1258 | 4.75 | 4.47 | 4.38 | 4.18 | 4.92 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 20 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3.75 | ****/ 873 | 4.50 | 4.02 | 4.03 | 3.89 | **** |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 198 | **** | **** | 4.22 | 4.14 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 48 | **** | **** | 4.39 | 3.75 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 48 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 4.29 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 47 | **** | **** | 4.51 | 4.53 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 49 | **** | **** | 4.26 | 4.28 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 41 | **** | **** | 4.14 | 4.13 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 46 | **** | **** | 4.31 | 4.52 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 30 | **** | **** | 4.27 | 4.21 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | A | 24 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 3 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | 3 | C | 0 | General | 18 | Under-grad | 33 | Non-major | 33 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | 7 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 5 | F | 0 | Electives | 9 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: PHIL 146 1
 Title Critical Thinking
 Instructor: Templeton,Roye
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1160
 MAR 22, 2010
 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 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 3.94 | 1184/1509 | 3.73 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.18 | 3.94 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 3.81 | 1221/1509 | 3.83 | 4.39 | 4.26 | 4.25 | 3.81 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 3.81 | 1069/1287 | 3.80 | 4.63 | 4.30 | 4.24 | 3.81 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 13 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/1459 | 3.63 | 4.39 | 4.22 | 4.11 | **** |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 3.56 | 1155/1406 | 3.64 | 4.26 | 4.09 | 4.02 | 3.56 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 12 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3.00 | 1322/1384 | 3.00 | 4.25 | 4.11 | 3.98 | 3.00 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 3.69 | 1227/1489 | 4.18 | 4.40 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 3.69 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 5.00 | 1/1506 | 5.00 | 4.56 | 4.67 | 4.66 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 2.92 | 1408/1463 | 2.99 | 4.36 | 4.09 | 4.02 | 2.92 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 4.13 | 1154/1438 | 4.22 | 4.62 | 4.46 | 4.44 | 4.13 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 8 | 4.33 | 1257/1421 | 4.14 | 4.83 | 4.73 | 4.66 | 4.33 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 3 | 3.73 | 1211/1411 | 3.68 | 4.50 | 4.31 | 4.27 | 3.73 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2.67 | 1381/1405 | 2.83 | 4.55 | 4.32 | 4.27 | 2.67 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 3.10 | 1116/1236 | 3.17 | 3.79 | 4.00 | 3.87 | 3.10 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2.15 | 1254/1260 | 2.33 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 3.95 | 2.15 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 3 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2.46 | 1243/1255 | 2.20 | 4.26 | 4.33 | 4.15 | 2.46 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 3 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 2.46 | 1248/1258 | 2.29 | 4.47 | 4.38 | 4.18 | 2.46 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 3 | 11 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/ 873 | **** | 4.02 | 4.03 | 3.89 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|---|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 4 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 5 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 3 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 4 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C | 5 | General | 7 | Under-grad | 16 | Non-major | 16 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D | 1 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 7 | F | 0 | Electives | 8 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

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 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 3.53 | 1393/1509 | 3.73 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.18 | 3.53 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 3.84 | 1202/1509 | 3.83 | 4.39 | 4.26 | 4.25 | 3.84 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 3.78 | 1084/1287 | 3.80 | 4.63 | 4.30 | 4.24 | 3.78 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 11 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3.63 | 1260/1459 | 3.63 | 4.39 | 4.22 | 4.11 | 3.63 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 3.72 | 1067/1406 | 3.64 | 4.26 | 4.09 | 4.02 | 3.72 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/1384 | 3.00 | 4.25 | 4.11 | 3.98 | **** |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 14 | 4.67 | 276/1489 | 4.18 | 4.40 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 4.67 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 5.00 | 1/1506 | 5.00 | 4.56 | 4.67 | 4.66 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 3.07 | 1385/1463 | 2.99 | 4.36 | 4.09 | 4.02 | 3.07 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 12 | 4.32 | 1021/1438 | 4.22 | 4.62 | 4.46 | 4.44 | 4.32 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 10 | 3.95 | 1358/1421 | 4.14 | 4.83 | 4.73 | 4.66 | 3.95 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 6 | 3.63 | 1245/1411 | 3.68 | 4.50 | 4.31 | 4.27 | 3.63 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3.00 | 1348/1405 | 2.83 | 4.55 | 4.32 | 4.27 | 3.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 3.24 | 1082/1236 | 3.17 | 3.79 | 4.00 | 3.87 | 3.24 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2.50 | 1241/1260 | 2.33 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 3.95 | 2.50 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 3 | 0 | 9 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1.94 | 1255/1255 | 2.20 | 4.26 | 4.33 | 4.15 | 1.94 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 3 | 0 | 9 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2.13 | 1254/1258 | 2.29 | 4.47 | 4.38 | 4.18 | 2.13 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 3 | 13 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 873 | **** | 4.02 | 4.03 | 3.89 | **** |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 16 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 184 | **** | **** | 4.16 | 4.06 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 16 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3.33 | ****/ 198 | **** | **** | 4.22 | 4.14 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 16 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 177 | **** | **** | 4.36 | 4.29 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/ 89 | **** | **** | 4.49 | 4.31 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 17 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 92 | **** | **** | 4.38 | 4.21 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 16 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.33 | ****/ 48 | **** | **** | 4.39 | 3.75 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 16 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 48 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 4.29 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 17 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 47 | **** | **** | 4.51 | 4.53 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 17 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/ 47 | **** | **** | 4.18 | 4.26 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 17 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 44 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.12 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 17 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/ 49 | **** | **** | 4.26 | 4.28 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 41 | **** | **** | 4.14 | 4.13 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 17 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 46 | **** | **** | 4.31 | 4.52 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| 00-27 | 5 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | A 5 | Required for Majors 0 | Graduate 0 | Major 0 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B 8 | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C 5 | General 14 | Under-grad 19 | Non-major 19 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D 0 | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 3 | F 0 | Electives 4 | #### - Means there are not enough | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|-------|---|-----------------------------|
| P | 0 | | | responses to be significant |
| I | 0 | Other | 0 | |
| ? | 1 | | | |

Course-Section: PHIL 150 3
 Title Contemporary Moral Iss
 Instructor: Ealick,Greg
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1162
 MAR 22, 2010
 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 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 10 | 4.45 | 673/1509 | 4.48 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.18 | 4.45 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 6 | 4.00 | 1086/1509 | 4.07 | 4.39 | 4.26 | 4.25 | 4.00 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 11 | 4.71 | 304/1287 | 4.49 | 4.63 | 4.30 | 4.24 | 4.71 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 7 | 4.20 | 834/1459 | 4.31 | 4.39 | 4.22 | 4.11 | 4.20 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 15 | 4.74 | 175/1406 | 4.42 | 4.26 | 4.09 | 4.02 | 4.74 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 9 | 4.32 | 557/1384 | 4.31 | 4.25 | 4.11 | 3.98 | 4.32 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 9 | 4.05 | 951/1489 | 4.06 | 4.40 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 4.05 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 5.00 | 1/1506 | 5.00 | 4.56 | 4.67 | 4.66 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 6 | 4.31 | 567/1463 | 4.43 | 4.36 | 4.09 | 4.02 | 4.31 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 11 | 4.40 | 930/1438 | 4.57 | 4.62 | 4.46 | 4.44 | 4.40 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 18 | 4.90 | 537/1421 | 4.93 | 4.83 | 4.73 | 4.66 | 4.90 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 11 | 4.45 | 689/1411 | 4.41 | 4.50 | 4.31 | 4.27 | 4.45 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 18 | 4.85 | 228/1405 | 4.85 | 4.55 | 4.32 | 4.27 | 4.85 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 15 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2.60 | 1193/1236 | 3.00 | 3.79 | 4.00 | 3.87 | 2.60 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 8 | 3.95 | 807/1260 | 4.00 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 3.95 | 3.95 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 9 | 3.90 | 992/1255 | 4.08 | 4.26 | 4.33 | 4.15 | 3.90 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 14 | 4.50 | 620/1258 | 4.54 | 4.47 | 4.38 | 4.18 | 4.50 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 0 | 16 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2.75 | ****/ 873 | **** | 4.02 | 4.03 | 3.89 | **** |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 18 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 184 | **** | **** | 4.16 | 4.06 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 198 | **** | **** | 4.22 | 4.14 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 177 | **** | **** | 4.36 | 4.29 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 165 | **** | **** | 4.18 | 4.15 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 92 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.16 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 90 | **** | **** | 4.50 | 4.21 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|-----------------------|---|--------------|
| 00-27 | 5 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A 6 | Required for Majors 1 | Graduate 0 | Major 0 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 1 | B 12 | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C 0 | General 15 | Under-grad 20 | Non-major 20 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 2 | D 0 | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 2 | F 0 | Electives 2 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | |
| | | | | P 0 | | | |
| | | | | I 0 | Other 0 | | |
| | | | | ? 0 | | | |

Course-Section: PHIL 150 4
 Title Contemporary Moral Iss
 Instructor: Ealick,Greg
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1163
 MAR 22, 2010
 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 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 4.42 | 711/1509 | 4.48 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.18 | 4.42 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3.75 | 1259/1509 | 4.07 | 4.39 | 4.26 | 4.25 | 3.75 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4.10 | 882/1287 | 4.49 | 4.63 | 4.30 | 4.24 | 4.10 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4.09 | 917/1459 | 4.31 | 4.39 | 4.22 | 4.11 | 4.09 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4.17 | 683/1406 | 4.42 | 4.26 | 4.09 | 4.02 | 4.17 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 4.25 | 619/1384 | 4.31 | 4.25 | 4.11 | 3.98 | 4.25 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 4.00 | 986/1489 | 4.06 | 4.40 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 4.00 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 5.00 | 1/1506 | 5.00 | 4.56 | 4.67 | 4.66 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 4.44 | 410/1463 | 4.43 | 4.36 | 4.09 | 4.02 | 4.44 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 4.67 | 588/1438 | 4.57 | 4.62 | 4.46 | 4.44 | 4.67 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 5.00 | 1/1421 | 4.93 | 4.83 | 4.73 | 4.66 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 4.08 | 1010/1411 | 4.41 | 4.50 | 4.31 | 4.27 | 4.08 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 4.75 | 345/1405 | 4.85 | 4.55 | 4.32 | 4.27 | 4.75 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3.40 | 1031/1236 | 3.00 | 3.79 | 4.00 | 3.87 | 3.40 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 3.75 | 936/1260 | 4.00 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 3.95 | 3.75 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 4.17 | 839/1255 | 4.08 | 4.26 | 4.33 | 4.15 | 4.17 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 4.58 | 563/1258 | 4.54 | 4.47 | 4.38 | 4.18 | 4.58 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 873 | **** | 4.02 | 4.03 | 3.89 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

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

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 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 11 | 4.59 | 505/1509 | 4.48 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.18 | 4.59 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 11 | 4.47 | 589/1509 | 4.07 | 4.39 | 4.26 | 4.25 | 4.47 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 4.67 | 359/1287 | 4.49 | 4.63 | 4.30 | 4.24 | 4.67 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 13 | 4.63 | 324/1459 | 4.31 | 4.39 | 4.22 | 4.11 | 4.63 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 10 | 4.35 | 486/1406 | 4.42 | 4.26 | 4.09 | 4.02 | 4.35 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 8 | 4.35 | 505/1384 | 4.31 | 4.25 | 4.11 | 3.98 | 4.35 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 8 | 4.13 | 896/1489 | 4.06 | 4.40 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 4.13 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 5.00 | 1/1506 | 5.00 | 4.56 | 4.67 | 4.66 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 8 | 4.53 | 301/1463 | 4.43 | 4.36 | 4.09 | 4.02 | 4.53 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 12 | 4.65 | 617/1438 | 4.57 | 4.62 | 4.46 | 4.44 | 4.65 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 4.88 | 588/1421 | 4.93 | 4.83 | 4.73 | 4.66 | 4.88 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 12 | 4.71 | 363/1411 | 4.41 | 4.50 | 4.31 | 4.27 | 4.71 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16 | 4.94 | 103/1405 | 4.85 | 4.55 | 4.32 | 4.27 | 4.94 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 12 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4.25 | ****/1236 | 3.00 | 3.79 | 4.00 | 3.87 | **** |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 10 | 4.29 | 589/1260 | 4.00 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 3.95 | 4.29 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 4.18 | 834/1255 | 4.08 | 4.26 | 4.33 | 4.15 | 4.18 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 12 | 4.53 | 605/1258 | 4.54 | 4.47 | 4.38 | 4.18 | 4.53 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/ 873 | **** | 4.02 | 4.03 | 3.89 | **** |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 15 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 184 | **** | **** | 4.16 | 4.06 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 15 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/ 198 | **** | **** | 4.22 | 4.14 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 14 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 89 | **** | **** | 4.49 | 4.31 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 14 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 92 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.16 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 14 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 92 | **** | **** | 4.38 | 4.21 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 14 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 93 | **** | **** | 4.06 | 3.92 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 15 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 48 | **** | **** | 4.39 | 3.75 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 15 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 48 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 4.29 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 15 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/ 49 | **** | **** | 4.26 | 4.28 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 15 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 46 | **** | **** | 4.31 | 4.52 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 15 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 37 | **** | **** | 4.05 | 4.47 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | | |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|---|---------------------|--|------|---|--------|-----------|----|
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 00-27 | 8 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 5 | Required for Majors | | 1 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 9 | | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 1 | General | | 8 | Under-grad | 17 | Non-major | 17 |
| 84-150 | 1 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D | 0 | | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 0 | F | 0 | Electives | | 6 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | | 1 | | | | |

Course-Section: PHIL 152 1
 Title Intro To Moral Theory
 Instructor: Ealick,Greg
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1165
 MAR 22, 2010
 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 | | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 23 | 4.85 | 210/1509 | 4.56 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.18 | 4.85 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 17 | 4.62 | 412/1509 | 4.50 | 4.39 | 4.26 | 4.25 | 4.62 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 24 | 24 | 4.92 | 101/1287 | 4.79 | 4.63 | 4.30 | 4.24 | 4.92 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 18 | 4.71 | 237/1459 | 4.45 | 4.39 | 4.22 | 4.11 | 4.71 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 11 | 3.81 | 1009/1406 | 4.33 | 4.26 | 4.09 | 4.02 | 3.81 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 9 | 4.27 | 599/1384 | 4.14 | 4.25 | 4.11 | 3.98 | 4.27 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 14 | 4.46 | 513/1489 | 4.37 | 4.40 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 4.46 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 5.00 | 1/1506 | 4.27 | 4.56 | 4.67 | 4.66 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 14 | 4.56 | 278/1463 | 4.51 | 4.36 | 4.09 | 4.02 | 4.56 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 19 | 4.69 | 545/1438 | 4.66 | 4.62 | 4.46 | 4.44 | 4.69 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 4.96 | 215/1421 | 4.86 | 4.83 | 4.73 | 4.66 | 4.96 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 19 | 4.69 | 376/1411 | 4.62 | 4.50 | 4.31 | 4.27 | 4.69 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 5.00 | 1/1405 | 4.76 | 4.55 | 4.32 | 4.27 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/1236 | 3.66 | 3.79 | 4.00 | 3.87 | **** |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 16 | 4.89 | 150/1260 | 4.71 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 3.95 | 4.89 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 13 | 4.61 | 494/1255 | 4.60 | 4.26 | 4.33 | 4.15 | 4.61 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 4.94 | 142/1258 | 4.73 | 4.47 | 4.38 | 4.18 | 4.94 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 8 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 873 | 3.68 | 4.02 | 4.03 | 3.89 | **** |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 23 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 184 | **** | **** | 4.16 | 4.06 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 24 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/ 198 | **** | **** | 4.22 | 4.14 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 24 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 184 | **** | **** | 4.48 | 4.48 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 24 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 177 | **** | **** | 4.36 | 4.29 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 24 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 165 | **** | **** | 4.18 | 4.15 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 89 | **** | **** | 4.49 | 4.31 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 24 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 92 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.16 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 24 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 90 | **** | **** | 4.50 | 4.21 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 92 | **** | **** | 4.38 | 4.21 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 93 | **** | **** | 4.06 | 3.92 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | ****/ 48 | **** | **** | 4.39 | 3.75 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 48 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 4.29 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 24 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 47 | **** | **** | 4.51 | 4.53 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 47 | **** | **** | 4.18 | 4.26 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 24 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 44 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.12 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/ 49 | **** | **** | 4.26 | 4.28 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 24 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 41 | **** | **** | 4.14 | 4.13 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 24 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 46 | **** | **** | 4.31 | 4.52 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 24 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 37 | **** | **** | 4.05 | 4.47 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 24 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 30 | **** | **** | 4.27 | 4.21 | **** |

Course-Section: PHIL 152 1
 Title Intro To Moral Theory
 Instructor: Ealick,Greg
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1165
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|----|---------------------|------|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 16 | Required for Majors | 2 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 4 | 1.00-1.99 | 1 | B | 10 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C | 0 | General | 12 | Under-grad | 26 | Non-major | 26 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | 2 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 6 | F | 0 | Electives | 8 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 4 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: PHIL 152 3
 Title Intro To Moral Theory
 Instructor: Thomas,James G
 Enrollment: 46
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1166
 MAR 22, 2010
 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 | 0 | 9 | 34 | 4.79 | 255/1509 | 4.56 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.18 | 4.79 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 35 | 4.79 | 212/1509 | 4.50 | 4.39 | 4.26 | 4.25 | 4.79 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 39 | 4.91 | 127/1287 | 4.79 | 4.63 | 4.30 | 4.24 | 4.91 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 27 | 4.66 | 291/1459 | 4.45 | 4.39 | 4.22 | 4.11 | 4.66 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 8 | 17 | 3.89 | 941/1406 | 4.33 | 4.26 | 4.09 | 4.02 | 3.89 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 14 | 22 | 4.49 | 367/1384 | 4.14 | 4.25 | 4.11 | 3.98 | 4.49 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 33 | 4.71 | 224/1489 | 4.37 | 4.40 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 4.71 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 29 | 12 | 4.26 | 1251/1506 | 4.27 | 4.56 | 4.67 | 4.66 | 4.26 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 8 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 4.88 | 88/1463 | 4.51 | 4.36 | 4.09 | 4.02 | 4.88 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 39 | 4.93 | 175/1438 | 4.66 | 4.62 | 4.46 | 4.44 | 4.93 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 41 | 4.98 | 161/1421 | 4.86 | 4.83 | 4.73 | 4.66 | 4.98 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 38 | 4.95 | 83/1411 | 4.62 | 4.50 | 4.31 | 4.27 | 4.95 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 5.00 | 1/1405 | 4.76 | 4.55 | 4.32 | 4.27 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 4 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 4.85 | 86/1236 | 3.66 | 3.79 | 4.00 | 3.87 | 4.85 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 15 | 4.82 | 194/1260 | 4.71 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 3.95 | 4.82 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 4.94 | 143/1255 | 4.60 | 4.26 | 4.33 | 4.15 | 4.94 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 4.94 | 165/1258 | 4.73 | 4.47 | 4.38 | 4.18 | 4.94 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 28 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.20 | ****/ 873 | 3.68 | 4.02 | 4.03 | 3.89 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|-----------------------|---|--------------|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 2 | A 30 | Required for Majors 2 | Graduate 0 | Major 1 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B 9 | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 7 | C 0 | General 20 | Under-grad 43 | Non-major 42 |
| 84-150 | 16 | 3.00-3.49 | 8 | D 0 | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 9 | F 0 | Electives 15 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | |
| | | | | P 0 | | | |
| | | | | I 0 | Other 3 | | |
| | | | | ? 0 | | | |

Course-Section: PHIL 152 5
 Title Intro To Moral Theory
 Instructor: Hitz,Zena N
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1167
 MAR 22, 2010
 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 | 1 | 15 | 9 | 4.32 | 811/1509 | 4.56 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.18 | 4.32 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 12 | 10 | 4.24 | 880/1509 | 4.50 | 4.39 | 4.26 | 4.25 | 4.24 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 18 | 4.72 | 304/1287 | 4.79 | 4.63 | 4.30 | 4.24 | 4.72 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 12 | 8 | 4.04 | 951/1459 | 4.45 | 4.39 | 4.22 | 4.11 | 4.04 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 17 | 4.60 | 269/1406 | 4.33 | 4.26 | 4.09 | 4.02 | 4.60 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 10 | 3.92 | 912/1384 | 4.14 | 4.25 | 4.11 | 3.98 | 3.92 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 5 | 8 | 3.56 | 1279/1489 | 4.37 | 4.40 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 3.56 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 5.00 | 1/1506 | 4.27 | 4.56 | 4.67 | 4.66 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 15 | 2 | 3.95 | 918/1463 | 4.51 | 4.36 | 4.09 | 4.02 | 3.95 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 14 | 4.40 | 930/1438 | 4.66 | 4.62 | 4.46 | 4.44 | 4.40 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 19 | 4.75 | 881/1421 | 4.86 | 4.83 | 4.73 | 4.66 | 4.75 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 11 | 4.38 | 768/1411 | 4.62 | 4.50 | 4.31 | 4.27 | 4.38 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 11 | 4.29 | 866/1405 | 4.76 | 4.55 | 4.32 | 4.27 | 4.29 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 11 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 2.92 | 1160/1236 | 3.66 | 3.79 | 4.00 | 3.87 | 2.92 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 13 | 4.60 | 352/1260 | 4.71 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 3.95 | 4.60 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 13 | 4.43 | 647/1255 | 4.60 | 4.26 | 4.33 | 4.15 | 4.43 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 12 | 4.48 | 650/1258 | 4.73 | 4.47 | 4.38 | 4.18 | 4.48 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 4 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 3.81 | 580/ 873 | 3.68 | 4.02 | 4.03 | 3.89 | 3.81 |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3.75 | ****/ 198 | **** | **** | 4.22 | 4.14 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 21 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/ 184 | **** | **** | 4.48 | 4.48 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 22 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 177 | **** | **** | 4.36 | 4.29 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 22 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 165 | **** | **** | 4.18 | 4.15 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 21 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/ 89 | **** | **** | 4.49 | 4.31 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 22 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/ 92 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.16 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 22 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/ 90 | **** | **** | 4.50 | 4.21 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3.67 | ****/ 92 | **** | **** | 4.38 | 4.21 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3.33 | ****/ 93 | **** | **** | 4.06 | 3.92 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3.33 | ****/ 48 | **** | **** | 4.39 | 3.75 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3.33 | ****/ 48 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 4.29 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 47 | **** | **** | 4.51 | 4.53 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 22 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/ 47 | **** | **** | 4.18 | 4.26 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 22 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/ 44 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.12 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3.67 | ****/ 49 | **** | **** | 4.26 | 4.28 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 41 | **** | **** | 4.14 | 4.13 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3.33 | ****/ 46 | **** | **** | 4.31 | 4.52 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 22 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/ 37 | **** | **** | 4.05 | 4.47 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 22 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/ 30 | **** | **** | 4.27 | 4.21 | **** |

Course-Section: PHIL 152 5
 Title Intro To Moral Theory
 Instructor: Hitz, Zena N
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1167
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|----|---------------------|------|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 5 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 6 | Required for Majors | 3 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 1 |
| 28-55 | 4 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 15 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C | 0 | General | 12 | Under-grad | 25 | Non-major | 24 |
| 84-150 | 1 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 3 | F | 0 | Electives | 3 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 4 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: PHIL 152 6
 Title Intro To Moral Theory
 Instructor: Seng,Phillip S
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1168
 MAR 22, 2010
 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 | 3 | 1 | 9 | 18 | 4.25 | 882/1509 | 4.56 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.18 | 4.25 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 19 | 4.16 | 962/1509 | 4.50 | 4.39 | 4.26 | 4.25 | 4.16 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 24 | 4.52 | 509/1287 | 4.79 | 4.63 | 4.30 | 4.24 | 4.52 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 18 | 4.28 | 748/1459 | 4.45 | 4.39 | 4.22 | 4.11 | 4.28 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 20 | 4.52 | 325/1406 | 4.33 | 4.26 | 4.09 | 4.02 | 4.52 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 2 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 11 | 3.61 | 1145/1384 | 4.14 | 4.25 | 4.11 | 3.98 | 3.61 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 18 | 4.40 | 597/1489 | 4.37 | 4.40 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 4.40 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 16 | 2 | 3.45 | 1487/1506 | 4.27 | 4.56 | 4.67 | 4.66 | 3.45 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 10 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 16 | 4.55 | 294/1463 | 4.51 | 4.36 | 4.09 | 4.02 | 4.55 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 21 | 4.45 | 865/1438 | 4.66 | 4.62 | 4.46 | 4.44 | 4.45 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 25 | 4.68 | 1002/1421 | 4.86 | 4.83 | 4.73 | 4.66 | 4.68 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 17 | 4.33 | 810/1411 | 4.62 | 4.50 | 4.31 | 4.27 | 4.33 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 25 | 4.65 | 486/1405 | 4.76 | 4.55 | 4.32 | 4.27 | 4.65 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 20 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3.27 | 1074/1236 | 3.66 | 3.79 | 4.00 | 3.87 | 3.27 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 9 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 16 | 4.42 | 496/1260 | 4.71 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 3.95 | 4.42 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 9 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 15 | 4.33 | 723/1255 | 4.60 | 4.26 | 4.33 | 4.15 | 4.33 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 10 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 16 | 4.48 | 650/1258 | 4.73 | 4.47 | 4.38 | 4.18 | 4.48 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 9 | 18 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3.33 | ****/ 873 | 3.68 | 4.02 | 4.03 | 3.89 | **** |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 28 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/ 184 | **** | **** | 4.16 | 4.06 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 30 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4.00 | ****/ 198 | **** | **** | 4.22 | 4.14 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 29 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 184 | **** | **** | 4.48 | 4.48 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 30 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/ 177 | **** | **** | 4.36 | 4.29 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 30 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 165 | **** | **** | 4.18 | 4.15 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 27 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | ****/ 89 | **** | **** | 4.49 | 4.31 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 29 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | ****/ 92 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.16 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 29 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | ****/ 90 | **** | **** | 4.50 | 4.21 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 29 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 92 | **** | **** | 4.38 | 4.21 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 29 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/ 93 | **** | **** | 4.06 | 3.92 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 48 | **** | **** | 4.39 | 3.75 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 48 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 4.29 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 31 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/ 47 | **** | **** | 4.51 | 4.53 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 31 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/ 47 | **** | **** | 4.18 | 4.26 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 31 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/ 44 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.12 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 31 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/ 49 | **** | **** | 4.26 | 4.28 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 31 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/ 41 | **** | **** | 4.14 | 4.13 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 31 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/ 46 | **** | **** | 4.31 | 4.52 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 31 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 30 | **** | **** | 4.27 | 4.21 | **** |

Course-Section: PHIL 152 6
 Title Intro To Moral Theory
 Instructor: Seng, Phillip S
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1168
 MAR 22, 2010
 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 | 6 | Required for Majors | 4 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 14 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 3 | C | 1 | General | 16 | Under-grad | 33 | Non-major | 33 |
| 84-150 | 1 | 3.00-3.49 | 0 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 3 | F | 0 | Electives | 2 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: PHIL 152 7
 Title Intro To Moral Theory
 Instructor: Seng,Phillip S
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1169
 MAR 22, 2010
 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 | 1 | 13 | 22 | 4.58 | 505/1509 | 4.56 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.18 | 4.58 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 27 | 4.72 | 289/1509 | 4.50 | 4.39 | 4.26 | 4.25 | 4.72 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 31 | 4.86 | 159/1287 | 4.79 | 4.63 | 4.30 | 4.24 | 4.86 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 27 | 4.58 | 367/1459 | 4.45 | 4.39 | 4.22 | 4.11 | 4.58 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 31 | 4.83 | 121/1406 | 4.33 | 4.26 | 4.09 | 4.02 | 4.83 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 20 | 4.41 | 430/1384 | 4.14 | 4.25 | 4.11 | 3.98 | 4.41 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 28 | 4.69 | 243/1489 | 4.37 | 4.40 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 4.69 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 22 | 2 | 3.64 | 1478/1506 | 4.27 | 4.56 | 4.67 | 4.66 | 3.64 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 18 | 4.60 | 248/1463 | 4.51 | 4.36 | 4.09 | 4.02 | 4.60 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 28 | 4.82 | 334/1438 | 4.66 | 4.62 | 4.46 | 4.44 | 4.82 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 31 | 4.91 | 483/1421 | 4.86 | 4.83 | 4.73 | 4.66 | 4.91 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 27 | 4.76 | 291/1411 | 4.62 | 4.50 | 4.31 | 4.27 | 4.76 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 31 | 4.88 | 194/1405 | 4.76 | 4.55 | 4.32 | 4.27 | 4.88 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 5 | 21 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 3.60 | 936/1236 | 3.66 | 3.79 | 4.00 | 3.87 | 3.60 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 23 | 4.81 | 209/1260 | 4.71 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 3.95 | 4.81 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 19 | 4.69 | 412/1255 | 4.60 | 4.26 | 4.33 | 4.15 | 4.69 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 23 | 4.81 | 363/1258 | 4.73 | 4.47 | 4.38 | 4.18 | 4.81 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 10 | 17 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 3.56 | 688/ 873 | 3.68 | 4.02 | 4.03 | 3.89 | 3.56 |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 198 | **** | **** | 4.22 | 4.14 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 184 | **** | **** | 4.48 | 4.48 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 89 | **** | **** | 4.49 | 4.31 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 92 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.16 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 35 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 48 | **** | **** | 4.39 | 3.75 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 48 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 4.29 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 49 | **** | **** | 4.26 | 4.28 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 41 | **** | **** | 4.14 | 4.13 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|-----------------------|---|--------------|
| 00-27 | 3 | 0.00-0.99 | 2 | A 11 | Required for Majors 3 | Graduate 0 | Major 1 |
| 28-55 | 3 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B 21 | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C 0 | General 16 | Under-grad 36 | Non-major 35 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | 4 | D 0 | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 6 | F 0 | Electives 11 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | |
| | | | | P 0 | | | |
| | | | | I 0 | Other 1 | | |
| | | | | ? 0 | | | |

Course-Section: PHIL 248 1
 Title Intro Scientif Reasoni
 Instructor: Seng,Phillip S
 Enrollment: 51
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1170
 MAR 22, 2010
 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 | 4 | 10 | 12 | 12 | 3.84 | 1258/1509 | 3.84 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.34 | 3.84 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 17 | 12 | 4.00 | 1086/1509 | 4.00 | 4.39 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.00 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 8 | 23 | 4.43 | 602/1287 | 4.43 | 4.63 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.43 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 15 | 8 | 3.62 | 1265/1459 | 3.62 | 4.39 | 4.22 | 4.30 | 3.62 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 10 | 19 | 4.24 | 599/1406 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.09 | 4.09 | 4.24 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 3.39 | 1239/1384 | 3.39 | 4.25 | 4.11 | 4.09 | 3.39 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 10 | 18 | 4.17 | 854/1489 | 4.17 | 4.40 | 4.17 | 4.19 | 4.17 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 23 | 8 | 4.05 | 1364/1506 | 4.05 | 4.56 | 4.67 | 4.61 | 4.05 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 13 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 13 | 5 | 3.88 | 998/1463 | 3.88 | 4.36 | 4.09 | 4.08 | 3.88 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 29 | 4.79 | 379/1438 | 4.79 | 4.62 | 4.46 | 4.48 | 4.79 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 24 | 4.65 | 1037/1421 | 4.65 | 4.83 | 4.73 | 4.76 | 4.65 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 21 | 4.42 | 713/1411 | 4.42 | 4.50 | 4.31 | 4.37 | 4.42 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 22 | 4.41 | 745/1405 | 4.41 | 4.55 | 4.32 | 4.39 | 4.41 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 4 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 17 | 4.33 | 421/1236 | 4.33 | 3.79 | 4.00 | 4.11 | 4.33 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 23 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 4.33 | 558/1260 | 4.33 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.19 | 4.33 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 4.60 | 505/1255 | 4.60 | 4.26 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 4.60 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 4.73 | 444/1258 | 4.73 | 4.47 | 4.38 | 4.44 | 4.73 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 23 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 4.18 | 372/ 873 | 4.18 | 4.02 | 4.03 | 4.04 | 4.18 |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 184 | **** | **** | 4.16 | 4.54 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 198 | **** | **** | 4.22 | 4.51 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 184 | **** | **** | 4.48 | 4.62 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 177 | **** | **** | 4.36 | 4.65 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 165 | **** | **** | 4.18 | 4.56 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 89 | **** | **** | 4.49 | 5.00 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 92 | **** | **** | 4.54 | **** | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 90 | **** | **** | 4.50 | **** | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 92 | **** | **** | 4.38 | 4.00 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 93 | **** | **** | 4.06 | 2.88 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 48 | **** | **** | 4.39 | 4.79 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 48 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 4.50 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 47 | **** | **** | 4.51 | 4.83 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 47 | **** | **** | 4.18 | 4.56 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 44 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.67 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 49 | **** | **** | 4.26 | 4.33 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 41 | **** | **** | 4.14 | **** | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 46 | **** | **** | 4.31 | 4.00 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 37 | **** | **** | 4.05 | **** | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 30 | **** | **** | 4.27 | **** | **** |

Course-Section: PHIL 248 1
 Title Intro Scientif Reasoni
 Instructor: Seng,Phillip S
 Enrollment: 51
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1170
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | |
|----------------|----|-----------|---|-----------------|----|---------------------|------|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 14 | Required for Majors | 18 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 4 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 17 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 10 | 2.00-2.99 | 8 | C | 3 | General | 12 | Under-grad | 38 | Non-major | 38 |
| 84-150 | 7 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 7 | F | 0 | Electives | 3 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

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 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 19 | 4.69 | 374/1509 | 4.46 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.34 | 4.69 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 19 | 4.65 | 367/1509 | 4.50 | 4.39 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.65 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 19 | 4.69 | 326/1287 | 4.60 | 4.63 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.69 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 20 | 4.80 | 146/1459 | 4.63 | 4.39 | 4.22 | 4.30 | 4.80 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 14 | 4.29 | 539/1406 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.09 | 4.09 | 4.29 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 20 | 4.76 | 140/1384 | 4.74 | 4.25 | 4.11 | 4.09 | 4.76 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 13 | 4.19 | 823/1489 | 4.06 | 4.40 | 4.17 | 4.19 | 4.19 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 21 | 4.84 | 702/1506 | 4.86 | 4.56 | 4.67 | 4.61 | 4.84 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 11 | 4.50 | 325/1463 | 4.30 | 4.36 | 4.09 | 4.08 | 4.50 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 15 | 4.44 | 878/1438 | 4.48 | 4.62 | 4.46 | 4.48 | 4.44 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 24 | 4.96 | 215/1421 | 4.92 | 4.83 | 4.73 | 4.76 | 4.96 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 11 | 4.29 | 849/1411 | 4.33 | 4.50 | 4.31 | 4.37 | 4.29 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 17 | 4.68 | 446/1405 | 4.52 | 4.55 | 4.32 | 4.39 | 4.68 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 11 | 4.22 | 512/1236 | 4.17 | 3.79 | 4.00 | 4.11 | 4.22 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 16 | 4.42 | 496/1260 | 3.84 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.19 | 4.42 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 15 | 4.54 | 547/1255 | 4.21 | 4.26 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 4.54 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 14 | 4.38 | 742/1258 | 4.25 | 4.47 | 4.38 | 4.44 | 4.38 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 2 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 4.20 | 366/ 873 | 4.14 | 4.02 | 4.03 | 4.04 | 4.20 |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 198 | **** | **** | 4.22 | 4.51 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 24 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 89 | **** | **** | 4.49 | 5.00 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 92 | **** | **** | 4.54 | **** | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 90 | **** | **** | 4.50 | **** | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 92 | **** | **** | 4.38 | 4.00 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 93 | **** | **** | 4.06 | 2.88 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 48 | **** | **** | 4.39 | 4.79 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 48 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 4.50 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 47 | **** | **** | 4.51 | 4.83 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 47 | **** | **** | 4.18 | 4.56 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 49 | **** | **** | 4.26 | 4.33 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 41 | **** | **** | 4.14 | **** | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 25 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 46 | **** | **** | 4.31 | 4.00 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A 17 | Required for Majors 22 | Graduate 0 | Major 0 |
| 28-55 | 4 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B 8 | | | |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | 5 | C 0 | General 2 | Under-grad 26 | Non-major 26 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D 0 | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 6 | F 0 | Electives 0 | #### - Means there are not enough | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|-------|---|-----------------------------|
| P | 0 | | | responses to be significant |
| I | 0 | Other | 0 | |
| ? | 0 | | | |

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 | 3 | 0 | 11 | 12 | 4.23 | 901/1509 | 4.46 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.34 | 4.23 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 11 | 4.35 | 763/1509 | 4.50 | 4.39 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.35 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 17 | 4.50 | 519/1287 | 4.60 | 4.63 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 14 | 4.46 | 520/1459 | 4.63 | 4.39 | 4.22 | 4.30 | 4.46 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 8 | 4.19 | 656/1406 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.09 | 4.09 | 4.19 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 18 | 4.72 | 182/1384 | 4.74 | 4.25 | 4.11 | 4.09 | 4.72 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 15 | 3.92 | 1082/1489 | 4.06 | 4.40 | 4.17 | 4.19 | 3.92 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 23 | 4.88 | 622/1506 | 4.86 | 4.56 | 4.67 | 4.61 | 4.88 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 6 | 4.11 | 799/1463 | 4.30 | 4.36 | 4.09 | 4.08 | 4.11 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 16 | 4.52 | 775/1438 | 4.48 | 4.62 | 4.46 | 4.48 | 4.52 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 22 | 4.88 | 588/1421 | 4.92 | 4.83 | 4.73 | 4.76 | 4.88 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 11 | 4.36 | 779/1411 | 4.33 | 4.50 | 4.31 | 4.37 | 4.36 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 15 | 4.36 | 798/1405 | 4.52 | 4.55 | 4.32 | 4.39 | 4.36 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 4.12 | 607/1236 | 4.17 | 3.79 | 4.00 | 4.11 | 4.12 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 8 | 6 | 4 | 3.26 | 1118/1260 | 3.84 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.19 | 3.26 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 3 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 10 | 3.87 | 1010/1255 | 4.21 | 4.26 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 3.87 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 9 | 4.13 | 884/1258 | 4.25 | 4.47 | 4.38 | 4.44 | 4.13 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 3 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 4 | 4.07 | 424/ 873 | 4.14 | 4.02 | 4.03 | 4.04 | 4.07 |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 198 | **** | **** | 4.22 | 4.51 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 22 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 89 | **** | **** | 4.49 | 5.00 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3.67 | ****/ 92 | **** | **** | 4.54 | **** | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/ 90 | **** | **** | 4.50 | **** | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/ 92 | **** | **** | 4.38 | 4.00 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | ****/ 93 | **** | **** | 4.06 | 2.88 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 25 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 48 | **** | **** | 4.39 | 4.79 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 25 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 48 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 4.50 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 25 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 49 | **** | **** | 4.26 | 4.33 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 41 | **** | **** | 4.14 | **** | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 46 | **** | **** | 4.31 | 4.00 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 37 | **** | **** | 4.05 | **** | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 30 | **** | **** | 4.27 | **** | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | A 14 | Required for Majors 17 | Graduate 0 | Major 0 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B 6 | General 0 | Under-grad 26 | Non-major 26 |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C 0 | | | |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | 7 | D 0 | Electives 5 | #### - Means there are not enough | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 1 | F 0 | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|-------|---|-----------------------------|
| P | 0 | | | responses to be significant |
| I | 0 | Other | 0 | |
| ? | 0 | | | |

Course-Section: PHIL 321 1
 Title Hist Of Phil: Ancient
 Instructor: Hitz, Zena N
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1173
 MAR 22, 2010
 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 | 1 | 3 | 12 | 8 | 4.13 | 1021/1509 | 4.13 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.32 | 4.13 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 13 | 5 | 3.92 | 1156/1509 | 3.92 | 4.39 | 4.26 | 4.25 | 3.92 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 9 | 4.22 | 811/1287 | 4.22 | 4.63 | 4.30 | 4.33 | 4.22 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 10 | 4.30 | 715/1459 | 4.30 | 4.39 | 4.22 | 4.26 | 4.30 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 9 | 4.21 | 647/1406 | 4.21 | 4.26 | 4.09 | 4.12 | 4.21 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 10 | 4.22 | 659/1384 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.11 | 4.15 | 4.22 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 3.78 | 1184/1489 | 3.78 | 4.40 | 4.17 | 4.14 | 3.78 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 22 | 4.92 | 524/1506 | 4.92 | 4.56 | 4.67 | 4.67 | 4.92 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 11 | 2 | 3.70 | 1142/1463 | 3.70 | 4.36 | 4.09 | 4.08 | 3.70 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 12 | 4.40 | 930/1438 | 4.40 | 4.62 | 4.46 | 4.43 | 4.40 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 16 | 4.80 | 794/1421 | 4.80 | 4.83 | 4.73 | 4.73 | 4.80 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 10 | 4 | 3.85 | 1166/1411 | 3.85 | 4.50 | 4.31 | 4.29 | 3.85 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 11 | 4.40 | 758/1405 | 4.40 | 4.55 | 4.32 | 4.32 | 4.40 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 5 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/1236 | **** | 3.79 | 4.00 | 4.07 | **** |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 4.06 | 725/1260 | 4.06 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.22 | 4.06 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 11 | 4.47 | 602/1255 | 4.47 | 4.26 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 4.47 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 12 | 4.47 | 650/1258 | 4.47 | 4.47 | 4.38 | 4.42 | 4.47 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 7 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2.91 | 835/ 873 | 2.91 | 4.02 | 4.03 | 4.08 | 2.91 |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|------------------------|---|--------------|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A 6 | Required for Majors 17 | Graduate 0 | Major 3 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B 12 | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C 2 | General 2 | Under-grad 24 | Non-major 21 |
| 84-150 | 6 | 3.00-3.49 | 4 | D 0 | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 8 | F 0 | Electives 2 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | |
| | | | | P 0 | | | |
| | | | | I 0 | Other 2 | | |
| | | | | ? 2 | | | |

Course-Section: PHIL 346 1
 Title Deductive Systems
 Instructor: Wilson, Richard
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1174
 MAR 22, 2010
 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 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 10 | 4.22 | 911/1509 | 4.22 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.32 | 4.22 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 16 | 4.67 | 356/1509 | 4.67 | 4.39 | 4.26 | 4.25 | 4.67 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 14 | 4.56 | 472/1287 | 4.56 | 4.63 | 4.30 | 4.33 | 4.56 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3.50 | 1314/1459 | 3.50 | 4.39 | 4.22 | 4.26 | 3.50 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 3.69 | 1093/1406 | 3.69 | 4.26 | 4.09 | 4.12 | 3.69 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 14 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4.00 | ****/1384 | **** | 4.25 | 4.11 | 4.15 | **** |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 11 | 4.56 | 399/1489 | 4.56 | 4.40 | 4.17 | 4.14 | 4.56 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 7 | 4.39 | 1177/1506 | 4.39 | 4.56 | 4.67 | 4.67 | 4.39 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 4.29 | 598/1463 | 4.29 | 4.36 | 4.09 | 4.08 | 4.29 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 13 | 4.56 | 737/1438 | 4.56 | 4.62 | 4.46 | 4.43 | 4.56 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 16 | 4.83 | 716/1421 | 4.83 | 4.83 | 4.73 | 4.73 | 4.83 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 16 | 4.89 | 159/1411 | 4.89 | 4.50 | 4.31 | 4.29 | 4.89 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 4.72 | 381/1405 | 4.72 | 4.55 | 4.32 | 4.32 | 4.72 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 14 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4.00 | ****/1236 | **** | 3.79 | 4.00 | 4.07 | **** |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 12 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.17 | 681/1260 | 4.17 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.22 | 4.17 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4.33 | 723/1255 | 4.33 | 4.26 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 4.33 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 4.67 | 507/1258 | 4.67 | 4.47 | 4.38 | 4.42 | 4.67 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 12 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 873 | **** | 4.02 | 4.03 | 4.08 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|-----------------------|---|--------------|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A 9 | Required for Majors 9 | Graduate 0 | Major 1 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B 3 | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C 1 | General 3 | Under-grad 18 | Non-major 17 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 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 0 | | |
| | | | | ? 2 | | | |

Course-Section: PHIL 370 1
 Title Phil And Parapsycholog
 Instructor: Braude,Stephen
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1175
 MAR 22, 2010
 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 | 2 | 7 | 14 | 4.52 | 574/1509 | 4.52 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.32 | 4.52 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 13 | 4.43 | 652/1509 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.26 | 4.25 | 4.43 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 19 | 4.78 | 229/1287 | 4.78 | 4.63 | 4.30 | 4.33 | 4.78 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 12 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3.50 | 1314/1459 | 3.50 | 4.39 | 4.22 | 4.26 | 3.50 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 12 | 4.26 | 575/1406 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.09 | 4.12 | 4.26 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 12 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3.91 | 939/1384 | 3.91 | 4.25 | 4.11 | 4.15 | 3.91 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 14 | 4.43 | 555/1489 | 4.43 | 4.40 | 4.17 | 4.14 | 4.43 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 6 | 4.26 | 1251/1506 | 4.26 | 4.56 | 4.67 | 4.67 | 4.26 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 11 | 4.53 | 309/1463 | 4.53 | 4.36 | 4.09 | 4.08 | 4.53 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 14 | 4.59 | 687/1438 | 4.59 | 4.62 | 4.46 | 4.43 | 4.59 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 19 | 4.86 | 639/1421 | 4.86 | 4.83 | 4.73 | 4.73 | 4.86 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 13 | 4.55 | 568/1411 | 4.55 | 4.50 | 4.31 | 4.29 | 4.55 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 16 | 4.64 | 499/1405 | 4.64 | 4.55 | 4.32 | 4.32 | 4.64 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 10 | 4.22 | 512/1236 | 4.22 | 3.79 | 4.00 | 4.07 | 4.22 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 3.92 | 844/1260 | 3.92 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.22 | 3.92 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 7 | 4.15 | 845/1255 | 4.15 | 4.26 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 4.15 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 4.54 | 598/1258 | 4.54 | 4.47 | 4.38 | 4.42 | 4.54 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 9 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 873 | **** | 4.02 | 4.03 | 4.08 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|-----------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 13 | Required for Majors 5 | Graduate 0 Major 3 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 6 | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 2 | C 0 | General 3 | Under-grad 23 Non-major 20 |
| 84-150 | 11 | 3.00-3.49 10 | D 0 | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 5 | F 0 | Electives 13 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | P 1 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other 0 | |
| | | | ? 0 | | |

Course-Section: PHIL 399 1
 Title Topics in Philosophy
 Instructor: Templeton,Roye
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1176
 MAR 22, 2010
 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 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 4.50 | 598/1509 | 4.25 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.32 | 4.50 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 8 | 4.42 | 683/1509 | 4.17 | 4.39 | 4.26 | 4.25 | 4.42 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 4.33 | 708/1287 | 4.33 | 4.63 | 4.30 | 4.33 | 4.33 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 4.25 | 770/1459 | 4.20 | 4.39 | 4.22 | 4.26 | 4.25 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 4.33 | 502/1406 | 4.45 | 4.26 | 4.09 | 4.12 | 4.33 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4.00 | 807/1384 | 3.96 | 4.25 | 4.11 | 4.15 | 4.00 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 4.83 | 133/1489 | 4.45 | 4.40 | 4.17 | 4.14 | 4.83 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 5.00 | 1/1506 | 4.50 | 4.56 | 4.67 | 4.67 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 4.33 | 545/1463 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.09 | 4.08 | 4.33 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 4.58 | 700/1438 | 4.26 | 4.62 | 4.46 | 4.43 | 4.58 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 4.83 | 716/1421 | 4.74 | 4.83 | 4.73 | 4.73 | 4.83 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 4.50 | 617/1411 | 4.29 | 4.50 | 4.31 | 4.29 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 4.17 | 960/1405 | 4.12 | 4.55 | 4.32 | 4.32 | 4.17 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 4.00 | 664/1236 | 4.00 | 3.79 | 4.00 | 4.07 | 4.00 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3.38 | 1096/1260 | 3.94 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.22 | 3.38 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 4 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3.13 | 1198/1255 | 3.94 | 4.26 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 3.13 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 4 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 3.13 | 1215/1258 | 3.98 | 4.47 | 4.38 | 4.42 | 3.13 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 4 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/ 873 | 4.00 | 4.02 | 4.03 | 4.08 | **** |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 184 | **** | **** | 4.16 | 4.07 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHIL 399 3
 Title Topics in Philosophy
 Instructor: Seng, Phillip
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1177
 MAR 22, 2010
 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 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 4.00 | 1114/1509 | 4.25 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.32 | 4.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 3.93 | 1148/1509 | 4.17 | 4.39 | 4.26 | 4.25 | 3.93 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/1287 | 4.33 | 4.63 | 4.30 | 4.33 | **** |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 4.14 | 877/1459 | 4.20 | 4.39 | 4.22 | 4.26 | 4.14 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 4.57 | 287/1406 | 4.45 | 4.26 | 4.09 | 4.12 | 4.57 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 3.93 | 912/1384 | 3.96 | 4.25 | 4.11 | 4.15 | 3.93 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 4.07 | 937/1489 | 4.45 | 4.40 | 4.17 | 4.14 | 4.07 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 3 | 4.00 | 1383/1506 | 4.50 | 4.56 | 4.67 | 4.67 | 4.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 4.30 | 579/1463 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.09 | 4.08 | 4.30 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 3 | 3.93 | 1255/1438 | 4.26 | 4.62 | 4.46 | 4.43 | 3.93 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 10 | 4.64 | 1037/1421 | 4.74 | 4.83 | 4.73 | 4.73 | 4.64 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4.07 | 1015/1411 | 4.29 | 4.50 | 4.31 | 4.29 | 4.07 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 4 | 4.07 | 1014/1405 | 4.12 | 4.55 | 4.32 | 4.32 | 4.07 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/1236 | 4.00 | 3.79 | 4.00 | 4.07 | **** |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 4.50 | 415/1260 | 3.94 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.22 | 4.50 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 4.75 | 344/1255 | 3.94 | 4.26 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 4.75 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 4.83 | 324/1258 | 3.98 | 4.47 | 4.38 | 4.42 | 4.83 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 2 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4.00 | 442/ 873 | 4.00 | 4.02 | 4.03 | 4.08 | 4.00 |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 89 | **** | **** | 4.49 | 4.86 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 92 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.67 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 90 | **** | **** | 4.50 | 4.63 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 92 | **** | **** | 4.38 | 4.73 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 93 | **** | **** | 4.06 | 3.94 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|--------|---|----|-----------|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | A 8 | Required for Majors | 6 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 5 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | B 5 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | C 0 | General | 2 | Under-grad | 14 | Non-major | 9 |
| 84-150 | 4 | 3.00-3.49 | D 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | F 0 | Electives | 6 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | P 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | ? 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: PHIL 405 1
 Title Honors Indep Study-Phi
 Instructor: Yalowitz, Steven
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1178
 MAR 22, 2010
 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 |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHIL 452 1
 Title Adv Topics In Ethics
 Instructor: Ealick,Greg
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1179
 MAR 22, 2010
 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 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 4.60 | 482/1509 | 4.60 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.39 | 4.60 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 4.70 | 322/1509 | 4.70 | 4.39 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.70 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 183/1287 | 4.83 | 4.63 | 4.30 | 4.38 | 4.83 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5.00 | 1/1459 | 5.00 | 4.39 | 4.22 | 4.32 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 4.90 | 90/1406 | 4.90 | 4.26 | 4.09 | 4.11 | 4.90 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 4.90 | 71/1384 | 4.90 | 4.25 | 4.11 | 4.23 | 4.90 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 4.60 | 341/1489 | 4.60 | 4.40 | 4.17 | 4.18 | 4.60 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5.00 | 1/1506 | 5.00 | 4.56 | 4.67 | 4.67 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 4.60 | 248/1463 | 4.60 | 4.36 | 4.09 | 4.18 | 4.60 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 4.80 | 363/1438 | 4.80 | 4.62 | 4.46 | 4.50 | 4.80 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 4.90 | 537/1421 | 4.90 | 4.83 | 4.73 | 4.76 | 4.90 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5.00 | 1/1411 | 5.00 | 4.50 | 4.31 | 4.35 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 4.80 | 285/1405 | 4.80 | 4.55 | 4.32 | 4.34 | 4.80 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.00 | 664/1236 | 4.00 | 3.79 | 4.00 | 4.03 | 4.00 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 172/1260 | 4.86 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.25 | 4.86 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1255 | 5.00 | 4.26 | 4.33 | 4.46 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1258 | 5.00 | 4.47 | 4.38 | 4.51 | 5.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 3 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 873 | **** | 4.02 | 4.03 | 4.26 | **** |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 184 | **** | **** | 4.16 | 4.62 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 198 | **** | **** | 4.22 | 4.37 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 165 | **** | **** | 4.18 | 4.29 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 89 | **** | **** | 4.49 | 4.71 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 92 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.83 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 90 | **** | **** | 4.50 | 4.69 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 92 | **** | **** | 4.38 | 4.64 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 93 | **** | **** | 4.06 | 4.32 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 48 | **** | **** | 4.39 | 4.75 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 48 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 4.54 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 49 | **** | **** | 4.26 | 4.67 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 41 | **** | **** | 4.14 | 4.50 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

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

| | | | |
|---|---|-------|---|
| I | 0 | Other | 1 |
| ? | 0 | | |

Course-Section: PHIL 472 1
 Title Adv Top:Phil Of Scienc
 Instructor: Pfeifer,Jessica
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1180
 MAR 22, 2010
 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 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1509 | 5.00 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.39 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4.60 | 424/1509 | 4.60 | 4.39 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.60 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1287 | 5.00 | 4.63 | 4.30 | 4.38 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 146/1459 | 4.80 | 4.39 | 4.22 | 4.32 | 4.80 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1406 | 5.00 | 4.26 | 4.09 | 4.11 | 5.00 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 107/1384 | 4.80 | 4.25 | 4.11 | 4.23 | 4.80 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 151/1489 | 4.80 | 4.40 | 4.17 | 4.18 | 4.80 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 4.20 | 1300/1506 | 4.20 | 4.56 | 4.67 | 4.67 | 4.20 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 209/1463 | 4.67 | 4.36 | 4.09 | 4.18 | 4.67 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1438 | 5.00 | 4.62 | 4.46 | 4.50 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1421 | 5.00 | 4.83 | 4.73 | 4.76 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 243/1411 | 4.80 | 4.50 | 4.31 | 4.35 | 4.80 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1405 | 5.00 | 4.55 | 4.32 | 4.34 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3.50 | 984/1236 | 3.50 | 3.79 | 4.00 | 4.03 | 3.50 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1260 | 5.00 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.25 | 5.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1255 | 5.00 | 4.26 | 4.33 | 4.46 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1258 | 5.00 | 4.47 | 4.38 | 4.51 | 5.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | 442/ 873 | 4.00 | 4.02 | 4.03 | 4.26 | 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 | | 1 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 1 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 1 | | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C | 0 | General | | 1 | Under-grad | 5 | Non-major | 4 |
| 84-150 | 1 | 3.00-3.49 | 0 | 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 | | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | | |

Course-Section: PHIL 484 1
 Title Kant's Theoretical Phi
 Instructor: Wilson, Richard
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1181
 MAR 22, 2010
 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 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3.78 | 1297/1509 | 3.78 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.39 | 3.78 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.22 | 891/1509 | 4.22 | 4.39 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.22 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4.40 | 638/1287 | 4.40 | 4.63 | 4.30 | 4.38 | 4.40 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 4.63 | 324/1459 | 4.63 | 4.39 | 4.22 | 4.32 | 4.63 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 4.22 | 623/1406 | 4.22 | 4.26 | 4.09 | 4.11 | 4.22 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 4.11 | 742/1384 | 4.11 | 4.25 | 4.11 | 4.23 | 4.11 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 4.22 | 791/1489 | 4.22 | 4.40 | 4.17 | 4.18 | 4.22 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4.89 | 622/1506 | 4.89 | 4.56 | 4.67 | 4.67 | 4.89 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.43 | 438/1463 | 4.43 | 4.36 | 4.09 | 4.18 | 4.43 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 4.11 | 1166/1438 | 4.11 | 4.62 | 4.46 | 4.50 | 4.11 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 4.78 | 846/1421 | 4.78 | 4.83 | 4.73 | 4.76 | 4.78 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 4.00 | 1051/1411 | 4.00 | 4.50 | 4.31 | 4.35 | 4.00 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 4.00 | 1047/1405 | 4.00 | 4.55 | 4.32 | 4.34 | 4.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3.67 | 904/1236 | 3.67 | 3.79 | 4.00 | 4.03 | 3.67 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3.83 | 896/1260 | 3.83 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.25 | 3.83 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 4 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2.83 | 1228/1255 | 2.83 | 4.26 | 4.33 | 4.46 | 2.83 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 4.67 | 507/1258 | 4.67 | 4.47 | 4.38 | 4.51 | 4.67 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 873 | **** | 4.02 | 4.03 | 4.26 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---|--------|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | A 4 | Required for Majors | 3 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | B 2 | 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 | 4 |
| | | | P 0 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 0 |
| | | | ? 1 | | |

Course-Section: PHIL 498 2
 Title Adv. Topics in Philoso
 Instructor: Yalowitz, Steven
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1182
 MAR 22, 2010
 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 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 598/1509 | 4.50 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.39 | 4.50 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | 859/1509 | 4.25 | 4.39 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.25 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1287 | 5.00 | 4.63 | 4.30 | 4.38 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1459 | 5.00 | 4.39 | 4.22 | 4.32 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 164/1406 | 4.75 | 4.26 | 4.09 | 4.11 | 4.75 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | 531/1384 | 4.33 | 4.25 | 4.11 | 4.23 | 4.33 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1489 | 5.00 | 4.40 | 4.17 | 4.18 | 5.00 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4.00 | 1383/1506 | 4.00 | 4.56 | 4.67 | 4.67 | 4.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 151/1463 | 4.75 | 4.36 | 4.09 | 4.18 | 4.75 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 447/1438 | 4.75 | 4.62 | 4.46 | 4.50 | 4.75 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1421 | 5.00 | 4.83 | 4.73 | 4.76 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 303/1411 | 4.75 | 4.50 | 4.31 | 4.35 | 4.75 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1405 | 5.00 | 4.55 | 4.32 | 4.34 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1236 | 5.00 | 3.79 | 4.00 | 4.03 | 5.00 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1260 | 5.00 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.25 | 5.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1255 | 5.00 | 4.26 | 4.33 | 4.46 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1258 | 5.00 | 4.47 | 4.38 | 4.51 | 5.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/ 873 | 5.00 | 4.02 | 4.03 | 4.26 | 5.00 |

Frequency Distribution

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