Course-Section: PHIL 100 1 University of Maryland Title Intro To Philosophy

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1153

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 45 Questionnaires: 37 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Pfeifer,Jessica

Instructor:

				equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	Ω	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	Ω	Ο	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	
Discussion				•		_			445/4060					4 = 0
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	Τ	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	****
Freq	encv	Dist	rib	ıtior	1									

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

University of Maryland

Intro To Philosophy

Instructor: Thomas, James G

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 41

Title

Page 1154 Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010 Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General	0	0	0	0	0	4	27	4 00	150/1500	4 50	4 41	1 21	1 10	4.90
<ol> <li>Did you gain new insights, skills from this course</li> <li>Did the instructor make clear the expected goals</li> </ol>	0	0	0	0	0 1	4	37 37	4.90	159/1509 141/1509	4.58 4.66	4.41 4.39	4.31 4.26	4.18 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		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		****/ 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 40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities		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	****

Title Intro To Philosophy

Instructor: Thom Enrollment: 47 Questionnaires: 41

Thomas,James G 47 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 1154 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		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	В	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				?	1						

Thomas, James G

University of Maryland

Intro To Philosophy Baltimore

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Enrollment: 42
Ouestionnaires: 29

Title

56-83

84-150

Grad.

5

0

2.00-2.99

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

7

7

C 0

D 0

0

0

F

Instructor:

1411 200

MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Page 1155

Questions NR NA 1  General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0	2 0 0 0 0 0 1 1	3  0 1 1	2 1 0	5  27 27	Mean  4.93	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0	0 0 0 1	1 1	1		4.93						
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0	0 0 0 1	1 1	1		4.93						
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0	0 0 0 1	1 1	1		4.23		4.58	4.41	4.31	4.18	4.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0	0 0 1	1	_		4.90	111/1509 124/1509		4.39	4.26	4.25	4.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0	0			28	4.93	89/1287		4.63	4.30	4.24	4.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0	1		2	26	4.86	116/1459		4.39	4.22	4.11	4.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		3	6	18	4.34	494/1406		4.26	4.09	4.02	4.34
		0	4	24		149/1384		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		4.40	4.17	4.20	4.76
8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0	0			12		1146/1506		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			4.09	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		4.83	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0	0	0	1		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		4.55	4.32	4.27	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 17 1	0	1	0	9	4.45	314/1236		3.79			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		4.26	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			4.38	4.18	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful 9 10 1	0	0	1	8	4.50	209/ 873			4.03	3.89	4.50
Laboratory											
2. Were you provided with adequate background information $\begin{array}{ccc} 28 & 0 & 0 \end{array}$	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	***
Seminar											
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	0	0	0	1		****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention $\begin{array}{ccc} 28 & 0 & 0 \\ \end{array}$	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.16	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	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		****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 28 0 0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation 28 0 0	0	0	1	0		****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 28 0 0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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					- 0-				4 0 -	4 05	
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 28 0 0	0	0	0	1		****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 28 0 0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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 Distribu	ution	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades	Rea	sons				Ту	ре			Majors	i
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 23 Require	ed fo	or Ma	jor	 S	 3	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 1				_							

General

Electives

17

4

Under-grad 29

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Non-major 29

I 0 Other 2 ? 1

Course-Section: PHIL 100 4 University of Maryland Title Intro To Philosophy Baltimore County

DiFate, Victor J

Instructor:

Baltimore County
Fall 2009

Page 1156

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Enrollment: 42 Questionnaires: 32 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

P 0

I

0

2

General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course  2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals  2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals  3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals  5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  7. Was the grading system clearly explained  8. How many times was class cancelled  8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  8. Did user the instructor's lectures well prepared  9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  8. Did user the instructor's lectures well prepared  9. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared  9. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  2. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned  3. O O O O D D Did William (A. Did W			Ouestions			NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1 0 0 0 0 1 11 2 9 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 0 1 2 27 4.87 150/1509 4.58 4.31 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 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 4.85 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   2 20 1 0 0 0 0 9 4.60 278/1384 4.44 4.25 4.11 3.98 4.60 4.39 4.22 4.11 4.85 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned   2 20 1 0 0 0 0 9 4.60 278/1384 4.44 4.25 4.11 3.98 4.60 4.94 4.00 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 8 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 0 1 3 22 4.81 118/1463 4.66 4.36 4.09 4.02 4.81 1.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.0																			
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 2 0 0 0 0 1 2 2 7 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 0 2 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 27 4 0.00-0.99 1 A 16 Expected goals 2 17 0 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 2 20 1 0 0 0 9 4.60 27 4 0.00-0.99 1 A 16 Expected goals 3 1 1 1 1 5 8 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 0 3 26 4.90 97/1489 4.65 4.04 4.17 4.20 4.90 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 0 0 0 1 1 8 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 0 1 1 3 22 4.81 118/1463 4.66 4.36 4.09 4.02 4.81 Each research the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 0 0 0 2 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 0 2 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 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 0 2 2 27 4.93 376/1421 4.96 4.83 4.73 4.66 4.93 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 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 4.89 5. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 17 0 0 0 0 1 1 14 4.93 143/1255 4.58 4.26 4.33 4.15 4.93 3.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.0			General																
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 0 2 11 4.85 126/1495 4.60 4.93 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 8. How many times was class cancelled 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 8 4.64 957/1506 4.49 4.56 4.07 4.06 4.68 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 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 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 2 6 4.93 175/1438 4.84 4.62 4.46 4.44 4.93 2. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 0 2 2 7 4.93 376/1421 4.96 4.83 4.73 4.66 4.93 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.0						1	0	0	0	1	11	19	4.58	505/1509	4.58	4.41		4.18	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 2 17 0 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 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 1 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 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 0 2 26 4.93 175/1438 4.84 4.62 4.46 4.44 4.93 3.00 0 0 0 2 27 4.93 376/1421 4.96 4.83 4.73 4.66 4.93 3.00 0 0 0 2 27 4.93 376/1421 4.96 4.83 4.73 4.66 4.93 3.00 0 0 0 2 27 4.93 376/1421 4.96 4.83 4.73 4.66 4.93 3.00 0 0 0 2 27 4.93 376/1421 4.96 4.83 4.73 4.66 4.93 3.00 0 0 0 2 2 7 4.93 376/1421 4.96 4.83 4.73 4.66 4.93 3.00 0 0 0 0 2 2 7 4.27 4.27 4.27 4.27 4.27 4.27 4.2	2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	2	0	0	0	1	2	27	4.87	150/1509	4.66	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.87
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 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 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 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 26 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 0 2 27 4.93 376/1421 4.96 4.83 4.73 4.66 4.93 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 4.93 143/1255 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 6 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8	3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflect	the e	expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	28	4.90	127/1287	4.83	4.63	4.30	4.24	4.90
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 95/1506 4.49 4.56 4.64 4.66 4.64 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 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 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 0 2 27 4.93 376/1421 4.96 4.83 4.73 4.66 4.93   3. 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 4.93 143/1255 4.58 4.26 4.33 4.15 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  O0-27 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 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 0 B 6 6   56-83 1 2.00-2.99 5 C 1 General 15 Under-grad 32 Non-major 32	4. Did oth	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	spected goals	2	17	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	126/1459	4.60	4.39	4.22	4.11	4.85
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 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 2. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 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 4.93 143/1255 4.58 4.26 4.33 4.15 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  O0-27 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 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	5. Did ass	signed re	adings contribu	ite 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
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 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 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 0 2 2 7 4.93 376/1421 4.96 4.83 4.73 4.66 4.93 3. Was lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 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 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 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 1 4 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 0 4 4.20 ****/ 873 4.50 4.02 4.03 3.89 ****  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades 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	6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contri	bute t	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
Lecture   Lect	7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	expla	ined	3	0	0	0	0	3	26	4.90	97/1489	4.65	4.40	4.17	4.20	4.90
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8. How mar	ny times	was class cance	lled		4	0	0	0	0	10	18	4.64	957/1506	4.49	4.56	4.67	4.66	4.64
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overal	l tead	ching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	3	22	4.81	118/1463	4.66	4.36	4.09	4.02	4.81
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared			Legture																
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  OO-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	1 Wara th	ho inatri		propared	1	0	Λ	Λ	Λ	2	26	1 02	175/1/20	1 01	1 62	1 16	1 11	1 02	
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 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  O0-27 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							-	-	-	-	2			-,					
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 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 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 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  O-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					-			-			2			,					
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0 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 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 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 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									-		-			,					
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						_	-	1	-	-	-			,					
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  O0-27 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	5. Did aud	uiovisuai	. teciniiques enn	lance y	our understanding	4	1 /		U	Т	۷	,	4.2/	4/4/1230	3.04	3.79	4.00	3.07	4.27
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			Discuss	ion															
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 ****    Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors	1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contribu	ite 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
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  56-83 1 2.00-2.99 5 D 0	2. Were al	ll studer	nts actively end	ourage	ed to participate	17	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	143/1255	4.58	4.26	4.33	4.15	4.93
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	3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage f	air ar	nd open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	165/1258	4.75	4.47	4.38	4.18	4.93
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	4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succes	sful		19	8	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	****/ 873	4.50	4.02	4.03	3.89	****
00-27					Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	ution	n									
00-27																			
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	Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	s Reasons								Туј	pe			Majors	
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	00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A 16	Required for Majo:						`s	3	Graduat	= e	0	Majo	r or	0
84-150 2 3.00-3.49 5 D 0	28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	в 6												_		
	56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C 1	General						1	.5	Under-g	rad 3	2	Non-	major	32
Grad. 0 $3.50-4.00$ 3 F 0 Electives 4 $\#\#\#$ - Means there are not enough	84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D 0									_				-	
	Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives							4	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h

Other

0

### University of Maryland Baltimore County

Intro To Philosophy Fall 2009

Title Yalowitz,Steven Instructor:

Enrollment: 40 Questionnaires: 30

Page 1157 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d 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	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-		_	
				?	0						

Intro To Philosophy

Instructor: Ealick, Greg

Enrollment: 41
Questionnaires: 33

Title

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1158 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			Mean
General	_	0	0	0	4	0	0.1	4 50	F06/1F00	4 50	4 41	4 21	4 10	4 50
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0 0	0	0	4 1	8 14	21 18	4.52 4.52	586/1509 531/1509	4.58 4.66	4.41 4.39	4.31 4.26	4.18 4.25	4.52 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	4.20	4.23	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	2	13	14	4.70	686/1459	4.60	4.83	4.22	4.11	4.70
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
J. Now would for grade the overall codening circultumess	,	Ü	Ü	O	_			1.50	323/1103	1.00	1.50	1.05	1.02	1.30
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		****/ 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														
	29	0	2	0	2	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29 29	0	1	0	1	1	1		****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	2	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.29	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29 29	1	0	0	1	1	1		****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.53	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	3	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 44	****	****	4.10	4.12	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	3	U	U	1	U	U	3.00	/ 44			4.34	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	****

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

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	 А	9	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-			
				?	0						

Intro To Philosophy Thomas, James G Title

Instructor:

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 33

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1159 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Geneva 1														
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	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			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		4.63	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		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 effectivenes	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		4.62		4.44	4.97
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	32	5.00	1/1421		4.83	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1		4.97	55/1411		4.50	4.31		4.97
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1 2	0 20	0	0 1	0 3	3		4.97 3.91	69/1405 774/1236		4.55		4.27 3.87	4.97 3.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	20	U	Т	3	3	4	3.91	//4/1230	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		4.18	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	1 32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 198	****	****	4 22	4.14	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	.1 52	O	Ü	O	O	O	_	3.00	/ 100			1.22	1.11	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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		****/ 41	****	****		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	****
Pro	quency	, Dia	trib	ut i o	n									
rre	_uency	, DIS	CLID	ullo.	11									
Credita Formed Com CDN Francted Crede	~			Do		~			т.				Modera	

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: PHIL 146 1 Critical Thinking Fall 2009 Templeton, Roye

Page 1160 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	39		
Questionnaires:	16	Student Course	Evaluation Questionnaire

Title

Instructor:

	- 1					Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
	0	0	0	2	2	_	6	2 0.4	1184/1509	2 72	4.41	4.31	4.18	3.94
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	2	6							
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	-	1	3	3	4	6		1221/1509		4.39	4.26	4.25	3.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	Τ	4	7		1069/1287		4.63	4.30		3.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	1	0	0	2	0		****/1459		4.39	4.22	4.11	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	5	4		1155/1406		4.26	4.09	4.02	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	1	2	1	0		1322/1384		4.25	4.11	3.98	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	1	5	6		1227/1489		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	0	^	_	-1	_	-	4 12	1154/1420	4 00	4 60	1 10	1 11	4 1 2
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	Τ.	5	7		1154/1438		4.62	4.46	4.44	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	4	8		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		1211/1411		4.50	4.31	4.27	3.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	3	4	2	2		1381/1405		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	Λ	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		1243/1255	2.20	4.26	4.33	4.15	2.15
		0	2	3	4	0	7		1248/1258		4.47	4.38	4.13	2.46
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3		4	3	4	0	2		-,					∠.40 ****
4. Were special techniques successful	3	11	U	Τ	Τ	U	U	∠.50	****/ 873	****	4.02	4.03	3.89	^ ^ * *
From	onat	. Dia	-vih	+ i o	_									

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General		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 enoug	h
				P	0	Electives		responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 146 2 University of Maryland Title Critical Thinking

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1161

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: Templeton, Roye Enrollment: 39 Questionnaires: 19 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Quescionnai	105. 1.		beddelle coe	AL DC	Буат	uacı	OII Q	ucb c	101111	alle							
							eque					tructor	Course	_	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4 	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mear
		General															
1. Did you	gain ne	w insights,skills from	m this course	0	0	2	1	6	5	5	3.53	1393/150	9 3.73	4.41	4.31	4.18	3.53
2. Did the	instruct	tor make clear the exp	pected goals	0	0	1	2	3	6	7	3.84	1202/150	9 3.83	4.39	4.26	4.25	3.84
3. Did the	exam que	estions reflect the ex	xpected goals	1	0	3	1	2	3	9	3.78	1084/128	7 3.80	4.63	4.30	4.24	3.78
4. Did othe	r evalua	ations reflect the exp	pected goals	0	11	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	1260/145	9 3.63	4.39	4.22	4.11	3.63
5. Did assi	gned rea	adings contribute to v	what you learned	1	0	2	2	3	3	8	3.72	1067/140	6 3.64	4.26	4.09	4.02	3.72
6. Did writ	ten ass:	ignments contribute to	what you learned	1	16	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/138	4 3.00	4.25	4.11	3.98	***
7. Was the	grading	system clearly explai	ined	1	0	0	1	0	3	14	4.67	276/148	9 4.18	4.40	4.17	4.20	4.67
8. How many	times v	was class cancelled		1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/150	6 5.00	4.56	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How woul	d you g	rade the overall teach	ning effectiveness	3	1	3	1	4	6	1	3.07	1385/146	3 2.99	4.36	4.09	4.02	3.07
		Lecture															
1. Were the	instru	ctor's lectures well ;	prepared	0	0	0	1	4	2	12	4.32	1021/143	8 4.22	4.62	4.46	4.44	4.32
		tor seem interested in	-	0	0	1	2	4	2	10		1358/142		4.83	4.73	4.66	3.95
		erial presented and ex	_	0	0	3	1	2	7	6		1245/141		4.50	4.31	4.27	3.63
		s contribute to what		0	0	5	3	3	3	5		1348/140		4.55	4.32	4.27	3.00
		our understanding	0	2	4	1	5	1			1082/123			4.00	3.87	3.24	
		Discussion															
1 Did aloa	a diaan	ssions contribute to v	what was learned	3	0	6	2	4	2	2	2 50	1241/126	0 2.33	4.25	4.14	3.95	2.50
		ts actively encouraged	_	3	0	9	3	2	0	2		1255/125		4.25	4.14	4.15	1.94
		tor encourage fair and		3	0	9	2	1	2	2		1254/125		4.47	4.33	4.13	2.13
		d open discussion	3	13	2	0	0	1			****/ 87		4.47	4.03	3.89	****	
4. Were spe	ciai te	chniques successful		3	13	۷	U	U	1	U	2.00	/ 07	3	4.02	4.03	3.09	
		Laboratory															
		rease understanding of		16	2	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 18		****	4.16	4.06	***
_	_	ed with adequate backs	-	16	0	1	0	0	1	1		****/ 19		****	4.22	4.14	****
4. Did the	lab inst	tructor provide assist	tance	16	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 17	7 ****	****	4.36	4.29	****
		Seminar															
		opics relevant to the		17	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 8	9 ****	****	4.49	4.31	***
4. Did pres	entation	ns contribute to what	you learned	17	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 9	2 ****	****	4.38	4.21	****
		Field Work															
1. Did fiel	d exper	ience contribute to wh	nat you learned	16	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/ 4	8 ****	****	4.39	3.75	***
	_	understand your evalu	_	16	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 4	8 ****	****	4.41	4.29	***
		tor available for cons		17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 4	7 ****	****	4.51	4.53	***
4. To what	degree o	could you discuss you	r evaluations	17	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 4	7 ****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conf	erences	help you carry out f	ield activities	17	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 4	4 ****	****	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	****/ 4	9 ****	****	4.26	4.28	***
		ions make clear the ex		17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 4	1 ****	****	4.14	4.13	***
	Were your contacts with the instructor helpful				1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 4	6 ****	****	4.31	4.52	****
			Frequ	ıency	7 Dis	trib	utio	n									
a 11. –	,	g	-		_	_						_					
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades							Rea	ason	s 			T;	уре 			Majors	; 
00-27					Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	0	Gradua	te	0	Majo	r	0
28-55 56-83						nera	1			1	.4	IIndo	amad 1	9	Non	ma da	1.0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2								1	. 1	Under-	grau .	. J	MO11-	-major	19

Electives

4

#### - Means there are not enough

D

0

3

3

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

2

84-150

Grad.

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 0 .

Course-Section: PHIL 150 3 University of Maryland Title

Contemporary Moral Iss Baltimore County Ealick,Greg Fall 2009

Instructor: Enrollment: 22

Ouestionnaires: 20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1162

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Questions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 1 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 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 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 4.320 0 0 1 6 4 9 4.05 951/1489 4.06 4.40 4.17 4.20 4.05 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 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 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 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 4.504. 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 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 198 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.22 4.14 \*\*\*\* 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 19 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 177 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.36 4.29 \*\*\*\* 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 19 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 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 92 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.54 4.16 \*\*\*\* 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 90 \*\*\*\* 4.50 4.21 \*\*\*\* Frequency Distribution Reasons Type Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades 00-27 5 0.00-0.99 0 A 6
28-55 1 1.00-1.99 1 B 12
56-83 2 2.00-2.99 0 C 0
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 2 D 0
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 0 General 15 Under-grad 20 Non-major 20 F 0 Electives 2 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant Other I 0 0

Course-Section: PHIL 150 4 University of Maryland Page 1163 Title Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Contemporary Moral Iss

Instructor: Ealick,Greg

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 12

# Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	q		Tnst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	711/1509		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
<u>.                                    </u>														
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		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		4.25	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	****
Frequ	rib	ıt i oı	า											

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

Course-Section: PHIL 150 5 University of Maryland

Contemporary Moral Iss Ealick,Greg Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 17

Page 1164 Baltimore County Fall 2009 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Eva.	luation	Questio	nnaire
---------	--------	------	---------	---------	--------

Ouestions			Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	_	UMBC		Sect
Quescions		NA						Mean	Ralik	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
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 0	3	8 17	4.13	896/1489	4.06	4.40	4.17	4.20	4.13 5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	7	1 /	4.53	1/1506 301/1463	5.00 4.43	4.56 4.36	4.67 4.09	4.66 4.02	4.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	U	U	U	U	/	8	4.53	301/1463	4.43	4.30	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		4.55	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 -	-	•	•	0	-	0	4 00		ale ale ale ale	ate ate ate ate	4 16	4 06	ale ale ale ale
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	1 0	0 1	0	0	1	0		****/ 184 ****/ 198	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	U	Т	U	U	1	U	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	1.00	****/ 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 -	^	1	0	0	1	0	0 50	<b></b>			4 06	4 00	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15 15	0 1	1	0	0	1 1	0		****/ 49 ****/ 46	****	****	4.26	4.28 4.52	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 37	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
T. was the reedback/tucoring by proctors herprur	13	Т	U	U	U	Т	U	4.00	31			4.05	4.4/	
Frequ	ency	Dist	crib	ution	ı									

Credits E	arned	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	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-		_	

? 1

Intro To Moral Theory

Instructor: Ealick,Greg

Title

Enrollment: 38 Questionnaires: 26

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1165 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions		NA	Fre	equei 2	ncie	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General	0	0	0	0	1	0	0.0	4 05	010/1500	4 56	4 41	4 21	4 10	4 05
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1 1	2 8	23 17	4.85	210/1509	4.56	4.41	4.31 4.26	4.18 4.25	4.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.62 4.92	412/1509 101/1287	4.50 4.79	4.39 4.63	4.26	4.25	4.62 4.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	5	18	4.71	237/1459	4.79	4.83	4.22	4.11	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	5	6	11		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		4.56	4.67		5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	11		4.56				4.09		4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	19	4.69	545/1438		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		4.50	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.0	4 00	150/1060	4 71	4 05	4 14	2 05	4 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8 8	0	0	0	0 2	2	16 13	4.89 4.61	150/1260 494/1255	4.71 4.60	4.25 4.26	4.14	3.95 4.15	4.89 4.61
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.61	142/1258	4.60	4.26	4.33	4.15	4.61
4. Were special techniques successful	8	13	0	0	1	3	1		****/ 873			4.36	3.89	****
1. Were special techniques successivi	0	13	U	U	1	J		1.00	/ 0/3	3.00	1.02	1.03	3.09	
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		****/ 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	0.4	0	0	0	0	0	_	F 00	****/ 89	****	****	4 40	4 21	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24 24	0 1	0	0	0	0	2 1	5.00	****/ 89 ****/ 92	****	****	4.49 4.54	4.31 4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.54	4.10	****
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	****

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

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		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	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 152 3 University of Maryland Page 1166
Title Intro To Moral Theory Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Title Intro To Moral Theory Baltimore Count Instructor: Thomas, James G Fall 2009

3.00-3.49 8

3.50-4.00

D 0

Ρ

I

0

0

0

0

Enrollment: 46
Ouestionnaires: 43

84-150

Grad.

16

0

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

					Frequencies					Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Questions	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	- lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	9	34	4.79	255/1509	4.56	4.41	4.31	4.18	4.79
_	-	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	7	35	4.79	212/1509	4.50	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.79
3. Did th	e exam q	uestions reflect	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	39	4.91	127/1287	4.79	4.63	4.30	4.24	4.91
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	5	0	0	2	9	27	4.66	291/1459	4.45	4.39	4.22	4.11	4.66
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contribu	ute 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 wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o 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 th	e gradin	g system clearly	y expla	ined	1	0	0	0	3	6	33	4.71	224/1489	4.37	4.40	4.17	4.20	4.71
8. How ma	ny times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	1	29	12	4.26	1251/1506	4.27	4.56	4.67	4.66	4.26
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overal	ll teac	hing 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 t	he instr	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	39	4.93	175/1438	4.66	4.62	4.46	4.44	4.93		
2. Did th	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared . Did the instructor seem interested in the subject							0	0	1	41	4.98	161/1421	4.86	4.83	4.73	4.66	4.98
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presented	d and e	xplained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	38	4.95	83/1411	4.62	4.50	4.31	4.27	4.95
4. Did th	e lectur	es contribute to	o 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 au	diovisua	l techniques en	nance y	our understanding	4	26	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	86/1236	3.66	3.79	4.00	3.87	4.85
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contribu	ute 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 a	ll stude	nts actively end	courage	d 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 th	e instru	ctor encourage i	fair an	d 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 s	pecial t	echniques succes	ssful		28	10	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/ 873	3.68	4.02	4.03	3.89	****
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	.s			Ту	pe			Majors	5			
00.00														- 				
00-27							quir	ed f	or M	ajor	S	2	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 9		~		,			_		77		12	37		4.0
56-83 84-150	2 16	2.00-2.99	7	C 0		Ge	nera	Т			2	20	Under-g	raa 4	13	Non-	major	42

Electives

Other

15

3

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Intro To Moral Theory

Instructor: Hitz, Zena N

Enrollment: 38
Questionnaires: 25

Title

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1167 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies		Tnst	ructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
General			•				_		044/4500			4 04	4 40	
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	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	,	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	. ,	4.14	4.25	4.11	3.98	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	3	7	5	8		1279/1489	4.37	4.40	4.17	4.20	3.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	-	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	U	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	_		•			_			0=0/4040	4 54	4 0-			
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	352/1260	4.71		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 5	0 1	0	2	7	12	4.48	650/1258	4.73	4.47	4.38	4.18	4.48
4. Were special techniques successful	4	Э	Т	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	0.1	•	•	0	-	-	0	2 50	****	ale ale ale ale	ale ale ale ale	4 40	4 21	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	2	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 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	2	0		****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	U	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	****
0.15 - 1														
Self Paced	0.0	^	0	^	1	_	0	2 65	<b>4444</b> /40	****	****	4 06	4 00	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	2	0		****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	1 2	1	1	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22 22	0 1	0	0	1	1	0	3.33	****/ 46 ****/ 37	****	****	4.31 4.05	4.52	****
<ol> <li>Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful</li> <li>Were there enough proctors for all the students</li> </ol>	22	1	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 30	****	****	4.05	4.47 4.21	****
J. Were there enough proctors for all the students	44	Т	U	U	Т	Т	U	3.50	/ 30			7.4/	7.41	

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

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4	-			
				?	1						

Questionnaires: 33

Title

University of Maryland

Intro To Moral Theory Baltimore Co

Seng, Phillip S Fai

Instructor: Seng, Phillie Enrollment: 43

Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 1168 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionn	aire
---------	--------	------------	-----------	------

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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	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			4.14	3.95	4.42
<ol> <li>Were all students actively encouraged to participate</li> </ol>	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	, -	****	****	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		****/ 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	****
mini di manda														
Field Work	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4 00	****/ 48	****	++++	4 20	2 75	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	-	0	_	0	_	4.00	, 10	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	-	1	•	1	4.00	, 10	****	****	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	***	****	4.14	4.52	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	1	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****
J. Here there enough proctors for all the students	ЭI	_	U	1	U	U	U	2.00	/ 30			7.4/	<b>1.</b> ∠⊥	

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

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		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	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				?	1						

Intro To Moral Theory

Title 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								ncie				tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 Did 1101	aain n	General	from this source	0	0	0	0	1	13	22	4.58	505/1509	4.56	4.41	4.31	4.18	4.58
		ew insignes,skills ctor make clear th	s from this course	0	0	0	0	1	8	27	4.72	,	4.50	4.41	4.26	4.16	4.72
			the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	31	4.86			4.63	4.30	4.24	4.86
	_	uations reflect th		0	0	1	0	3	5	27	4.58	367/1459	4.45	4.39	4.22	4.11	4.58
			e to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	31	4.83	121/1406		4.26	4.09	4.02	4.83
	_	-	ite to what you learned	0	2	0	0	6	8	20	4.41			4.25	4.11	3.98	4.41
		g system clearly e	-	0	0	0	0	3	5	28	4.69	243/1489	4.37	4.40	4.17	4.20	4.69
	_	was class cancell	-	0	0	1	1	10	22	2		1478/1506		4.56	4.67	4.66	3.64
	-		teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	12	18	4.60	248/1463	4.51	4.36	4.09	4.02	4.60
J. 110W WOO	ara you	grade the overair	ceaching effectiveness	O	O	O	Ü	O	12	10	1.00	210/1103	1.51	1.50	1.00	1.02	1.00
		Lecture															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lectures v	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	e instru	ctor seem interest	ted 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 led	cture ma	terial presented a	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	e lectur	es contribute to v	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 aud	diovisua	l techniques enhar	nce your understanding	5	21	1	1	3	1	4	3.60	936/1236	3.66	3.79	4.00	3.87	3.60
1 5 1 1		Discussion		10	0	0	-	0	_	0.0	4 01	000/1060	4 51	4 05	4 1 4	2 05	4 01
	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned Were all students actively encouraged to participate						1	0	2	23	4.81	209/1260		4.25	4.14	3.95	4.81
		_		10	0	0	0	1	6	19	4.69	412/1255	4.60	4.26	4.33	4.15	4.69
			ir and open discussion	10 10	0 17	0 1	0 1	2	1	23 4	4.81	363/1258	4.73	4.47	4.38	4.18	4.81
4. were sp	peciai t	echniques successi	LUI	10	1/		Т	3	U	4	3.50	688/ 873	3.08	4.02	4.03	3.89	3.56
		Laborato	CV														
2. Were vo	ou provi		background information	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
			ole for lab activities	35	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 184	****	***	4.48	4.48	****
	_																
		Seminar															
1. Were as	ssigned	topics relevant to	the announced theme	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the	e instru	ctor available for	c individual attention	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.16	****
		Field Wor															
			to what you learned	35	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	,	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you	u clearl	y understand your	evaluation criteria	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
		0-16 D-															
1 543	16	Self Pac		2.5	0	^	0	1	0	^	2 00	****/ 10			1 00	4 00	****
	_	-	e to what you learned	35 35	0	0	0	1	0	0 1		****/ 49 ****/ 41	****	****	4.26 4.14	4.28	****
Z. DIG SU	uay ques	tions make clear t	The expected goal	35	U	U	U	U	U	Τ.	5.00	~~~/ 41			4.14	4.13	* * * * *
			Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utic	n									
Credits Fa	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade						Re	ason	g			Ty	ne			Majors	
									. <i>-</i> 								
00-27							ed f	or M	ajor	s	3	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	1
28-55									-						_		
56-83							1			1	.6	Under-g	rad 3	36	Non-	-major	35
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1 D 0														
Grad.						ecti	ves			1	.1	#### -	Means t	there a	are not	enoug	ıh
	P 0											respons	es to k	oe sigr	nificar	nt	

Other

I

?

0

0

1

Intro Scientif Reasoni

Seng,Phillip S Instructor:

Enrollment: 51 Questionnaires: 38

Title

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1170 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fre	-ane	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	0	•	0		1.0	1.0	1.0	2 04	1050/1500	2 04	4 41	4 21	4 24	2 04
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	4	10	12	12		1258/1509		4.41	4.31	4.34	3.84
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	•	1	1	/	17	12		1086/1509		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			4.63	4.30	4.35	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1 1	3 0	4 1	2	5 7	15 10	8 19	4.24	1265/1459 599/1406		4.39 4.26	4.22 4.09	4.30	3.62 4.24
-	1	4	6	2	7	9	19							
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	5		-		1239/1384		4.25	4.11	4.09	3.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	5 6	10	18 8	4.17			4.40	4.17	4.19	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	0	1	6	23 13	5	3.88	1364/1506 998/1463		4.56 4.36	4.67 4.09	4.61 4.08	4.05
9. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	U	U	1	0	13	5	3.00	990/1403	3.00	4.30	4.09	4.00	3.00
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
- 1														
Laboratory				_			_	- 00						
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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			****	4.36	4.65	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	U	U	U	U	U	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	,	****	****	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	,		****	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,		****	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		****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****
The second secon		ŭ	-	Ü	•	J	-		, 50					

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

Credits I	edits Earned Cu			Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	14	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_		_	
				?	1						

Eth Iss Sci Eng&Inf Te

Title Wilson, Richard Instructor:

Enrollment: 39 Questionnaires: 26

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1171 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions	MD	NA	Fre	eque: 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect
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		4.14	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		****/ 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	0.00	****/ 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		****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	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	****

Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d 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	В	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	1

I

Eth Iss Sci Eng&Inf Te

Title Wilson, Richard Instructor:

Enrollment: 41 Questionnaires: 26

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1172 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				equei					ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	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		4.39	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		4.63	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		4.83	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		4.50	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		4.55	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		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		4.47	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		****/ 92	****	****	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 90	****	****	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 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		****/ 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 25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	***
Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful		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	***	****
From	onat	. Dia	- rih	1+ i 01	_									

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	В	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	26	Non-major	26
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1

I

Course-Section: PHIL 321 1 University of Maryland Page 1173 Title Hist Of Phil:Ancient Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Hitz,Zena N

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 24

# Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

~			~													
			Frequencies						Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain new	insights, skills fr	om 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 instructo	r make clear the e	xpected 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 ques			0	1	0	0	4	10	9	4.22	811/1287	4.22	4.63	4.30	4.33	4.22
4. Did other evaluat	ions reflect the e	xpected 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 read	ings 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 assig	nments 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 s	ystem clearly expla	ained	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 wa	s 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 gra	de the overall tea	ching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	6	11	2	3.70	1142/1463	3.70	4.36	4.09	4.08	3.70
	Lecture															
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared			4	0	0	1	2	_	1 2	1 10	930/1438	4.40	4.62	4.46	4.43	4.40
2. Did the instructo			4	0	0	0	0			4.80			4.83	4.73	4.73	4.80
3. Was lecture mater		_	4	0	0	1	5	10			1166/1411	3.85	4.50	4.73	4.29	3.85
4. Did the lectures	_	-	4	0	0	1	1	7			758/1405		4.55		4.32	4.40
5. Did audiovisual t		-	5	17	0	0	1	0			****/1236			4.00	4.32	****
5. Did addiovisual t	ecilitques emiance	your understanding	5	1/	U	U	1	U	1	4.00	/1230		3.79	4.00	4.07	
	Discussion															
1. Did class discuss	ions 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 encourage	ed 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 instructo	r encourage fair a	nd 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 tech	4. Were special techniques successful				2	2	3	3	1	2.91	835/ 873	2.91	4.02	4.03	4.08	2.91
	Freq				trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	ıs			Ty	pe			Majors	

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l 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	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	_			
				?	2						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2009

Page 1174 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	18	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
				Frequ	encies

Course-Section: PHIL 346 1

Deductive Systems

Wilson, Richard

32

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

	Questions				NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncie	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 541		Genera	_		^	0	1	1	1	_	1.0	4 00	011/1500	4 00	4 41	4 21	4 20	4 00
		ew insights,ski ctor make clear			0	0	1	U T	1	0	10 16	4.22	911/1509 356/1509		4.41 4.39	4.31	4.32	4.22 4.67
		ctor make clear mestions reflec			0	0	1	0	1	2	14	4.67	472/1287		4.63	4.26	4.25	4.67
	_	ations reflect		_	0	12	1	0	T	1	74		1314/1459		4.39	4.22	4.33	3.50
				what you learned	0	2	2	2	1	5	6		1093/1406		4.26	4.09	4.12	3.69
	_	-		o what you learned	0	14	1	0	0	0	3		****/1384		4.25	4.11	4.15	****
		signments contr system clearl			0	7.4	0	0	1	6	_	4.56	399/1489		4.40	4.17	4.14	4.56
		was class canc		IIICa	0	0	0	0	0	11	7		1177/1506		4.56	4.67	4.67	4.39
				hing effectiveness	3	1	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	598/1463		4.36	4.09	4.08	4.29
3. 110W WO	ara you g	rade che overa	II ccac	iiiig ciicccivenebb	3	_	_	O	_	-	Ü	1.27	33071103	1.25	1.50	1.05	1.00	1.25
		Lectur	_															
1. Were ti	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	3	2	13	4.56	737/1438	4.56	4.62	4.46	4.43	4.56
	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject				0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	716/1421		4.83	4.73	4.73	4.83
	Was lecture material presented and explained clear				0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	159/1411	4.89	4.50	4.31	4.29	4.89
	Was lecture material presented and explained clear 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 au	diovisual	techniques en	nance y	our understanding	0	14	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1236	****	3.79	4.00	4.07	****
		_	_	_														
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute 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 a	ll studen	nts actively en	courage	d 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 th	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d 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 s	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		12	5	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 873	****	4.02	4.03	4.08	***
				Freq	uency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 9		Re	quir	ed f	or M	 ajor	 s	9	Graduat	 е	0	Majo	r	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3						-						_		
56-83				C 1		Ge	nera	1				3	Under-g	rad 1	.8	Non-	major	17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.						El	ecti	ves				3	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ŗh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot	her					0						
				? 2	Other													

Course-Section: PHIL 370 1 University of Maryland Page 1175 Title Phil And Parapsycholog Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Braude,Stephen

Enrollment: 30 Questionnaires: 23

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

Fall 2009

	<u>-</u>			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mear
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	4.4
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	4.7
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	3.5
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	4.2
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learn	ed 0	12	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	939/1384	3.91	4.25	4.11	4.15	3.93
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 effectivene	ss 4	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	309/1463	4.53	4.36	4.09	4.08	4.5
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	4.5
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	g 1	4	0	1	4	3	10	4.22	512/1236	4.22	3.79	4.00	4.07	4.2
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	3.9
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	4.1
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussio	n 10	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	598/1258	4.54	4.47	4.38	4.42	4.5
4. Were special techniques successful	9	12	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 873	****	4.02	4.03	4.08	***
Fr	equency	y Dis	strib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad	es			Rea	ason	ıs			Ту	pe			Majors	i
00.07														

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d 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	В	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	n
				P	1			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				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	Questi	lonnai	ire
---------	--------	------------	--------	--------	-----

			Fre	eque	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General		•		_	_	_	•	4 = 0	=00/4=00	4 0-		4 04	4 00	4 0
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	Τ	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		4.25	4.11	4.15	4.00
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	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
Logturo														
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared		0	0	1	1	0	1.0	4.58	700/1438	4.26	1 ()	1 10	1 12	4 50
	0	0	0	Τ	Τ	0	10		,		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	Ţ	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	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: PHIL 399 3

Topics in Philosophy

Title Seng,Phillip Instructor:

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1177 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions			Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
Gamena l														
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		1114/1509	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		****/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	, -	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	. ,	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	- ,	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	. ,	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			4.36	4.09	4.08	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	7	3		1255/1438		4.62	4.46	4.43	3.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	10		1037/1421		4.83	4.73	4.73	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	5	5		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		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	1.0	0	_	_	0	-	0	4 00	****	at at at at	ale ale ale ale	4 40	4 06	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	Ţ	0	4.00	,	****	****	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	Ţ		****/ 92			4.54	4.67	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	Ţ	0	0		****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 92 ****/ 93	****	****	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	U	U	Τ	U	U	3.00	/ 93	^^^	^ ^ ^ *	4.06	3.94	***

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	6 6	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	14	Non-major	9
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	6	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 405 1 University of Maryland Page 1178 MAR 22, 2010 Title Honors Indep Study-Phi Baltimore County Job IRBR3029

Instructor: Yalowitz,Steven
Enrollment: 1 Questionnaires: 1

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Ĺ	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Adv Topics In Ethics

Instructor: Ealick, Greg

Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 10

Title

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1179 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

2000				~										
	ructor	Course	Dont	TIMDC	Level	Sect								
Questions	MD	NA	1	2	ncies 3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			Mean
Quescions	MK	IVA			3	4		Mean	Railk	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
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		4.39	4.26	4.26	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	5	4.83				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			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			4.09	4.11	4.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	71/1384			4.11		4.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	341/1489		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			4.67		
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	248/1463			4.09		4.60
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	U	O	U	O	O	-	O	1.00	210/1103	1.00	1.50	1.00	1.10	1.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	Q	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		4.83	4.73	4.76	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1411					5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	285/1405			4.32		4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	664/1236			4.00		4.00
5. Did dadiovibadi ecominqueb emanee your anderbeanding	Ü	9	_	Ü	J	_	3	1.00	001/1250	1.00	3.75	1.00	1.05	1.00
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		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		4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	0	1	0	0	Ó		****/ 873			4.03		****
i. Were special techniques successful	3	O	U	_	O	O	O	2.00	, 073		1.02	1.05	1.20	
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		****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.29	****
3. Were requirements for tab reports creatly specified		Ü	O	0	J	Ü	_	3.00	, 103			1.10	1.27	
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		****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.69	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 93	****	****	4.06	4.32	****
o. Note directa for grading made drear	Ü	Ū	Ū	Ü	Ü	_	-	1.50	, , , , ,			1.00	1.02	
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		****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.54	****
2. Pla for olderly anadiboana four evaluation official		Ū	Ū	Ü	Ü	Ū	-	5.00	, 10				1.01	
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		****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.50	****
	-	-	-	-	-	-	_		,					
Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Farned Cum CDN Evnested Grades				_					_					
Credita Farned Cum CDA Evpeated Grades				RA	agong	2			Ttr	ne -			Maiore	2

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

I 0 Other 1 ?

Course-Section: PHIL 472 1 University of Maryland Title Adv Top:Phil Of Scienc Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010 Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Pfeifer,Jessica Instructor:

Enrollment: 7 Questionnaires: 5

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1180

			Fr	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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	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	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		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	Λ	0	Λ	0	0	Λ	_	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	4.73	4.75	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	- <del>1</del>	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
3. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	U		U		U	2	3.30	904/1230	3.30	3.13	4.00	4.03	3.30
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		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		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		0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	442/ 873	4.00	4.02	4.03	4.26	4.00
Theory		. D	i lo-		_									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		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	В	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 a	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sign	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 484 1 University of Maryland Page 1181 Title Kant's Theoretical Phi Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Wilson, Richard

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 10

# Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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			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		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		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			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	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 873	****	4.02	4.03	4.26	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	9
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				?	1						

Course-Section: PHIL 498 2 University of Maryland Title Adv. Topics in Philoso Baltimore County

Yalowitz,Steven

Instructor: Enrollment: 5

Questionnaires: 4

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 1182

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

					Fr	equei	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain new	insights, skills for	rom 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 instructo			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 ques	tions 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 evaluat		_	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.39	4.22	4.32	5.00
5. Did assigned read	lings 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 assig	nments 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 s	ystem clearly expl	lained	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 wa			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 gra	de the overall tea	aching 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 instruct	or's lectures well	l 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 instructo	r 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 mater	ial 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	_	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.55	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual t		-	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 discuss	ions contribute to	what vou 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		-	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1255		4.26	4.33	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructo			1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.47	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special tech	_	•	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	4.02	4.03	4.26	5.00
		Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	

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