

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 100 02
Title:	Intro To Philosophy
Instructor:	DiFate,Victor J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	44
Questionnaires:	33

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	4	3	26	4.67	434/1528	4.75	4.42	4.31	4.16	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	30	4.91	117/1527	4.78	4.37	4.28	4.23	4.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	32	4.97	59/1333	4.91	4.50	4.34	4.26	4.97
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	21	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	341/1495	4.66	4.34	4.25	4.11	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	8	4	7	1	12	3.16	1340/1439	4.01	4.27	4.11	3.97	3.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	28	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	****/1425	4.44	4.21	4.12	3.93	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	28	4.82	139/1508	4.65	4.31	4.18	4.11	4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	3	23	6	4.09	1395/1526	4.29	4.57	4.66	4.57	4.09
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	114/1490	4.76	4.29	4.11	4.02	4.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	30	4.91	221/1428	4.83	4.59	4.49	4.43	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	32	4.97	207/1436	4.97	4.82	4.74	4.70	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	28	4.82	220/1427	4.82	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	32	4.97	65/1425	4.93	4.50	4.34	4.31	4.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	12	1	2	2	3	11	4.11	674/1291	4.25	3.73	4.05	3.97	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	3	0	11	4.57	389/1271	4.76	4.20	4.16	3.98	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1276	4.75	4.20	4.33	4.14	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	188/1273	4.92	4.37	4.38	4.18	4.93
4. Were special techniques successful	19	9	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	****/922	4.00	3.96	4.02	3.87	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 100 02
Title:	Intro To Philosophy
Instructor:	DiFate,Victor J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	44
Questionnaires:	33

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/198	****	****	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/208	****	****	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	****	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	****	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	****	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	5.00	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	5.00	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.67	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	****	5.00	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	5.00	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 100 02
Title:	Intro To Philosophy
Instructor:	DiFate,Victor J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	44
Questionnaires:	33

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	21	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	1	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	6	C	1	General	21	Under-grad	33	Non-major	33
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 100 03
Title:	Intro To Philosophy
Instructor:	Smith,Aaron Joh

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	3	7	13	4.33	835/1528	4.75	4.42	4.31	4.16	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	5	13	4.25	902/1527	4.78	4.37	4.28	4.23	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	316/1333	4.91	4.50	4.34	4.26	4.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	1	0	4	8	6	3.95	1114/1495	4.66	4.34	4.25	4.11	3.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	3	20	4.75	168/1439	4.01	4.27	4.11	3.97	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	2	0	5	4	8	3.84	1024/1425	4.44	4.21	4.12	3.93	3.84
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	2	3	7	10	4.14	933/1508	4.65	4.31	4.18	4.11	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	17	7	4.29	1248/1526	4.29	4.57	4.66	4.57	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	3	9	6	4.17	778/1490	4.76	4.29	4.11	4.02	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	3	5	13	4.36	997/1428	4.83	4.59	4.49	4.43	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	0	21	4.91	516/1436	4.97	4.82	4.74	4.70	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	5	3	13	4.27	899/1427	4.82	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	393/1425	4.93	4.50	4.34	4.31	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	14	1	0	3	2	1	3.29	1132/1291	4.25	3.73	4.05	3.97	3.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	342/1271	4.76	4.20	4.16	3.98	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	1	2	4	11	4.21	830/1276	4.75	4.20	4.33	4.14	4.21
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	433/1273	4.92	4.37	4.38	4.18	4.74
4. Were special techniques successful	7	15	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/922	4.00	3.96	4.02	3.87	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 100 03
Title:	Intro To Philosophy
Instructor:	Smith,Aaron Joh

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.08	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/43	****	5.00	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	5.00	4.43	4.33	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C	2	General	15	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	1	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 100 04
Title:	Intro To Philosophy
Instructor:	Thomas,James G

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	51
Questionnaires:	36

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	1	33	4.97	48/1528	4.75	4.42	4.31	4.16	4.97
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	2	32	4.94	70/1527	4.78	4.37	4.28	4.23	4.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	0	34	5.00	1/1333	4.91	4.50	4.34	4.26	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	0	0	3	27	4.90	102/1495	4.66	4.34	4.25	4.11	4.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	1	3	6	20	4.18	727/1439	4.01	4.27	4.11	3.97	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	0	1	4	25	4.68	240/1425	4.44	4.21	4.12	3.93	4.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	5	28	4.79	153/1508	4.65	4.31	4.18	4.11	4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	17	17	4.50	1061/1526	4.29	4.57	4.66	4.57	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	90/1490	4.76	4.29	4.11	4.02	4.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	1	32	4.88	253/1428	4.83	4.59	4.49	4.43	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	33	4.97	155/1436	4.97	4.82	4.74	4.70	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	31	4.94	96/1427	4.82	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	34	5.00	1/1425	4.93	4.50	4.34	4.31	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	19	0	1	3	1	9	4.29	518/1291	4.25	3.73	4.05	3.97	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	0	0	1	9	4.55	413/1271	4.76	4.20	4.16	3.98	4.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	290/1276	4.75	4.20	4.33	4.14	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1273	4.92	4.37	4.38	4.18	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	25	7	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/922	4.00	3.96	4.02	3.87	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 100 04	Term - Fall 2010		Enrollment:	51
Title:	Intro To Philosophy			Questionnaires:	36
Instructor:	Thomas,James G				

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	26	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	16	Under-grad	36	Non-major	36
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	8	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	9						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 100 05
Title:	Intro To Philosophy
Instructor:	DiFate,Victor J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	43
Questionnaires:	32

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	27	4.75	307/1528	4.75	4.42	4.31	4.16	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	27	4.84	170/1527	4.78	4.37	4.28	4.23	4.84
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	28	4.84	201/1333	4.91	4.50	4.34	4.26	4.84
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	51/1495	4.66	4.34	4.25	4.11	4.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	4	5	4	18	4.06	818/1439	4.01	4.27	4.11	3.97	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	16	0	1	0	1	14	4.75	175/1425	4.44	4.21	4.12	3.93	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	4	25	4.69	261/1508	4.65	4.31	4.18	4.11	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	4	12	15	4.35	1201/1526	4.29	4.57	4.66	4.57	4.35
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	106/1490	4.76	4.29	4.11	4.02	4.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	155/1428	4.83	4.59	4.49	4.43	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	29	4.97	207/1436	4.97	4.82	4.74	4.70	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	96/1427	4.82	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	114/1425	4.93	4.50	4.34	4.31	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	12	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	102/1291	4.25	3.73	4.05	3.97	4.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	140/1271	4.76	4.20	4.16	3.98	4.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	290/1276	4.75	4.20	4.33	4.14	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1273	4.92	4.37	4.38	4.18	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	21	2	1	1	1	0	6	4.00	467/922	4.00	3.96	4.02	3.87	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 100 05
Title:	Intro To Philosophy
Instructor:	DiFate,Victor J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	43
Questionnaires:	32

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/198	****	****	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/208	****	****	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	****	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	****	4.37	4.30	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	5.00	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	5.00	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.67	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.08	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	****	5.00	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	5.00	4.43	4.33	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 100 05	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 43
Title: Intro To Philosophy		Questionnaires: 32
Instructor: DiFate,Victor J		

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 21	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 6	C 1	General 20	Under-grad 32 Non-major 32
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 6	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 5		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 100 06
Title:	Intro To Philosophy
Instructor:	DiFate,Victor J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	47
Questionnaires:	37

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	29	4.73	348/1528	4.75	4.42	4.31	4.16	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	29	4.73	290/1527	4.78	4.37	4.28	4.23	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	34	4.92	132/1333	4.91	4.50	4.34	4.26	4.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	20	0	1	0	3	13	4.65	332/1495	4.66	4.34	4.25	4.11	4.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	4	9	8	11	3.50	1216/1439	4.01	4.27	4.11	3.97	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	27	2	0	1	1	6	3.90	976/1425	4.44	4.21	4.12	3.93	3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	31	4.78	163/1508	4.65	4.31	4.18	4.11	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	3	29	4	4.03	1415/1526	4.29	4.57	4.66	4.57	4.03
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	5	27	4.84	106/1490	4.76	4.29	4.11	4.02	4.84
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	8	24	4.75	478/1428	4.83	4.59	4.49	4.43	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	31	4.94	361/1436	4.97	4.82	4.74	4.70	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	5	27	4.84	193/1427	4.82	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	31	4.94	114/1425	4.93	4.50	4.34	4.31	4.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	11	0	2	2	5	13	4.32	496/1291	4.25	3.73	4.05	3.97	4.32
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	204/1271	4.76	4.20	4.16	3.98	4.81
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	385/1276	4.75	4.20	4.33	4.14	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	345/1273	4.92	4.37	4.38	4.18	4.81
4. Were special techniques successful	16	14	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	****/922	4.00	3.96	4.02	3.87	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 100 06
Title:	Intro To Philosophy
Instructor:	DiFate,Victor J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	47
Questionnaires:	37

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	27	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	18	Under-grad	37	Non-major	37
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	8	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 100 07
Title:	Intro To Philosophy
Instructor:	Thomas,James G

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	47
Questionnaires:	42

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	3	39	4.93	128/1528	4.75	4.42	4.31	4.16	4.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	36	4.86	161/1527	4.78	4.37	4.28	4.23	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	39	4.93	117/1333	4.91	4.50	4.34	4.26	4.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	1	5	32	4.82	169/1495	4.66	4.34	4.25	4.11	4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	3	5	3	27	4.25	657/1439	4.01	4.27	4.11	3.97	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	7	32	4.69	223/1425	4.44	4.21	4.12	3.93	4.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	6	32	4.62	340/1508	4.65	4.31	4.18	4.11	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	28	13	4.32	1231/1526	4.29	4.57	4.66	4.57	4.32
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	2	1	0	0	2	30	4.82	118/1490	4.76	4.29	4.11	4.02	4.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	40	4.95	111/1428	4.83	4.59	4.49	4.43	4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	5.00	1/1436	4.97	4.82	4.74	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	38	4.93	110/1427	4.82	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	40	4.95	82/1425	4.93	4.50	4.34	4.31	4.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	23	2	1	0	2	14	4.32	496/1291	4.25	3.73	4.05	3.97	4.32
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	140/1271	4.76	4.20	4.16	3.98	4.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	1	0	2	17	4.75	348/1276	4.75	4.20	4.33	4.14	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	118/1273	4.92	4.37	4.38	4.18	4.95
4. Were special techniques successful	22	10	2	0	0	4	4	3.80	****/922	4.00	3.96	4.02	3.87	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 100 07
Title:	Intro To Philosophy
Instructor:	Thomas,James G

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	47
Questionnaires:	42

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/198	****	****	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/208	****	****	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	****	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	****	4.37	4.30	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	5.00	4.51	4.44	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.67	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	****	5.00	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	5.00	4.43	4.33	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 100 07	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 47
Title: Intro To Philosophy		Questionnaires: 42
Instructor: Thomas,James G		

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

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	27	Required for Majors		4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8							
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General		18	Under-grad	42	Non-major	42
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	7	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives		10	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		4				
				?	7							

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 100 08
Title:	Intro To Philosophy
Instructor:	Thomas,James G

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	49
Questionnaires:	40

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	2	35	4.89	167/1528	4.75	4.42	4.31	4.16	4.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	35	4.92	93/1527	4.78	4.37	4.28	4.23	4.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	37	4.97	44/1333	4.91	4.50	4.34	4.26	4.97
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	1	0	0	5	30	4.75	227/1495	4.66	4.34	4.25	4.11	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	3	1	5	6	22	4.16	744/1439	4.01	4.27	4.11	3.97	4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	32	4.79	151/1425	4.44	4.21	4.12	3.93	4.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	5	31	4.74	210/1508	4.65	4.31	4.18	4.11	4.74
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	21	17	4.45	1122/1526	4.29	4.57	4.66	4.57	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	1	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	33/1490	4.76	4.29	4.11	4.02	4.96
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	38	5.00	1/1428	4.83	4.59	4.49	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	38	5.00	1/1436	4.97	4.82	4.74	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	37	4.97	42/1427	4.82	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.97
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	38	5.00	1/1425	4.93	4.50	4.34	4.31	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	21	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	253/1291	4.25	3.73	4.05	3.97	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	98/1271	4.76	4.20	4.16	3.98	4.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	133/1276	4.75	4.20	4.33	4.14	4.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1273	4.92	4.37	4.38	4.18	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	24	11	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/922	4.00	3.96	4.02	3.87	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 100 08
Title:	Intro To Philosophy
Instructor:	Thomas,James G

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	49
Questionnaires:	40

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/198	****	****	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/208	****	****	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	****	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	****	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	****	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	5.00	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	5.00	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.67	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	****	5.00	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	5.00	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 100 08
Title:	Intro To Philosophy
Instructor:	Thomas,James G

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	49
Questionnaires:	40

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	27	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	7	C	0	General	22	Under-grad	40	Non-major	40
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	11	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	6						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 100H 01
Title:	Intro To Phil-Honors
Instructor:	Yalowitz,Steven

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	10
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	0	6	4.33	835/1528	4.33	4.42	4.31	4.16	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	672/1527	4.44	4.37	4.28	4.23	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	294/1333	4.75	4.50	4.34	4.26	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	592/1495	4.44	4.34	4.25	4.11	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	239/1439	4.67	4.27	4.11	3.97	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	4	4	4.11	816/1425	4.11	4.21	4.12	3.93	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1508	5.00	4.31	4.18	4.11	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	4.00	1421/1526	4.00	4.57	4.66	4.57	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	530/1490	4.38	4.29	4.11	4.02	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1428	5.00	4.59	4.49	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	580/1436	4.89	4.82	4.74	4.70	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	4	4	4.11	1032/1427	4.11	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	475/1425	4.67	4.50	4.34	4.31	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1291	****	3.73	4.05	3.97	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1007/1271	3.67	4.20	4.16	3.98	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	591/1276	4.50	4.20	4.33	4.14	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	507/1273	4.67	4.37	4.38	4.18	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/922	****	3.96	4.02	3.87	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 100H 01
Title:	Intro To Phil-Honors
Instructor:	Yalowitz,Steven

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	10
Questionnaires:	9

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 146 1
Title:	Critical Thinking
Instructor:	Templeton,Roye

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	39
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	8	5	2	4	2.90	1503/1528	3.03	4.42	4.31	4.16	2.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	6	5	2	5	3.00	1484/1527	3.18	4.37	4.28	4.23	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	4	4	4	3	4	2.95	1313/1333	3.40	4.50	4.34	4.26	2.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	2	2	2	0	3.00	1453/1495	3.08	4.34	4.25	4.11	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	7	6	4	3.43	1259/1439	3.52	4.27	4.11	3.97	3.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	19	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1425	3.20	4.21	4.12	3.93	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	6	9	4.00	1050/1508	3.88	4.31	4.18	4.11	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	10	4.48	1091/1526	4.34	4.57	4.66	4.57	4.48
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	6	4	3	2	1	2.25	1479/1490	2.23	4.29	4.11	4.02	2.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	1	4	5	8	3.67	1334/1428	3.78	4.59	4.49	4.43	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	3	8	2	6	3.45	1422/1436	3.83	4.82	4.74	4.70	3.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	4	6	4	1	5	2.85	1393/1427	3.00	4.39	4.32	4.27	2.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	9	3	3	3	2	2.30	1411/1425	2.38	4.50	4.34	4.31	2.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	7	5	1	2	0	1.87	1282/1291	2.17	3.73	4.05	3.97	1.87
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	10	4	3	2	1	2.00	1257/1271	2.03	4.20	4.16	3.98	2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	10	6	3	0	1	1.80	1271/1276	1.84	4.20	4.33	4.14	1.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	10	4	3	2	1	2.00	1268/1273	2.00	4.37	4.38	4.18	2.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/198	****	****	4.16	3.90	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 146 1
Title:	Critical Thinking
Instructor:	Templeton,Roye

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	39
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/208	****	****	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/194	****	****	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/194	****	****	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/176	****	****	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/76	****	5.00	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/74	****	5.00	4.31	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/76	****	4.67	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/43	****	5.00	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/36	****	5.00	4.43	4.33	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 146 1	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 39
Title: Critical Thinking		Questionnaires: 21
Instructor: Templeton,Roye		

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	4	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	15	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	3						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 146 2
Title:	Critical Thinking
Instructor:	Templeton,Roye

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	4	2	7	1	6	3.15	1471/1528	3.03	4.42	4.31	4.16	3.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	3	5	2	7	3.35	1431/1527	3.18	4.37	4.28	4.23	3.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	5	8	3.85	1116/1333	3.40	4.50	4.34	4.26	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	1440/1495	3.08	4.34	4.25	4.11	3.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	4	4	5	5	3.61	1148/1439	3.52	4.27	4.11	3.97	3.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	1317/1425	3.20	4.21	4.12	3.93	3.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	4	6	7	3.75	1231/1508	3.88	4.31	4.18	4.11	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	16	4	4.20	1332/1526	4.34	4.57	4.66	4.57	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	6	3	3	3	0	2.20	1481/1490	2.23	4.29	4.11	4.02	2.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	3	9	6	3.90	1263/1428	3.78	4.59	4.49	4.43	3.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	0	1	6	11	4.20	1340/1436	3.83	4.82	4.74	4.70	4.20
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	4	3	2	8	3	3.15	1362/1427	3.00	4.39	4.32	4.27	3.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	7	4	4	3	2	2.45	1406/1425	2.38	4.50	4.34	4.31	2.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	5	3	3	3	1	2.47	1260/1291	2.17	3.73	4.05	3.97	2.47
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	7	4	3	1	1	2.06	1256/1271	2.03	4.20	4.16	3.98	2.06
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	6	6	4	0	0	1.88	1269/1276	1.84	4.20	4.33	4.14	1.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	7	3	5	1	0	2.00	1268/1273	2.00	4.37	4.38	4.18	2.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	15	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/922	****	3.96	4.02	3.87	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 146 2
Title:	Critical Thinking
Instructor:	Templeton,Roye

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/43	****	5.00	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/36	****	5.00	4.43	4.33	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1 A 8	Required for Majors	1 Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0 B 5		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2 C 6	General	14 Under-grad 20 Non-major 20
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5 D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3 F 0	Electives	3 **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			0 P 0		
			0 I 0	Other	2
			0 ? 0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 150 2
Title:	Contemporary Moral Iss
Instructor:	Ealick,Greg

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	636/1528	4.59	4.42	4.31	4.16	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	818/1527	4.28	4.37	4.28	4.23	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1166/1333	4.15	4.50	4.34	4.26	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	5	6	4.33	746/1495	4.20	4.34	4.25	4.11	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	657/1439	4.30	4.27	4.11	3.97	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	3	6	4.08	839/1425	4.21	4.21	4.12	3.93	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	4	2	4	3.58	1297/1508	4.01	4.31	4.18	4.11	3.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	509/1526	4.94	4.57	4.66	4.57	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	0	6	3	4.10	845/1490	4.26	4.29	4.11	4.02	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	953/1428	4.66	4.59	4.49	4.43	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	1127/1436	4.86	4.82	4.74	4.70	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	991/1427	4.40	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	349/1425	4.76	4.50	4.34	4.31	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	902/1291	3.59	3.73	4.05	3.97	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	4	4	3.75	961/1271	4.38	4.20	4.16	3.98	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	2	2	2	5	3.67	1102/1276	4.39	4.20	4.33	4.14	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	776/1273	4.57	4.37	4.38	4.18	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	1	9	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/922	4.04	3.96	4.02	3.87	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 150 2
Title:	Contemporary Moral Iss
Instructor:	Ealick,Greg

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/198	****	****	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/208	****	****	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	****	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	****	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	****	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	5.00	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	5.00	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.67	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	****	5.00	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	5.00	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 150 2
Title:	Contemporary Moral Iss
Instructor:	Ealick,Greg

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	5	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 150 3
Title:	Contemporary Moral Iss
Instructor:	Ealick,Greg

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	390/1528	4.59	4.42	4.31	4.16	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	922/1527	4.28	4.37	4.28	4.23	4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	769/1333	4.15	4.50	4.34	4.26	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	2	5	4	3.92	1147/1495	4.20	4.34	4.25	4.11	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	419/1439	4.30	4.27	4.11	3.97	4.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	613/1425	4.21	4.21	4.12	3.93	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	2	6	3.77	1226/1508	4.01	4.31	4.18	4.11	3.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	453/1526	4.94	4.57	4.66	4.57	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	542/1490	4.26	4.29	4.11	4.02	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	459/1428	4.66	4.59	4.49	4.43	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1436	4.86	4.82	4.74	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	491/1427	4.40	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	12	4.77	335/1425	4.76	4.50	4.34	4.31	4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/1291	3.59	3.73	4.05	3.97	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	1	8	4.31	620/1271	4.38	4.20	4.16	3.98	4.31
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	565/1276	4.39	4.20	4.33	4.14	4.54
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	671/1273	4.57	4.37	4.38	4.18	4.46
4. Were special techniques successful	0	9	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	719/922	4.04	3.96	4.02	3.87	3.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 150 3
Title:	Contemporary Moral Iss
Instructor:	Ealick,Greg

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/208	****	****	4.27	4.23	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	5.00	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/74	****	5.00	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/76	****	4.67	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/43	****	5.00	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	5.00	4.43	4.33	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 150 3	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 20
Title: Contemporary Moral Iss		Questionnaires: 13
Instructor: Ealick,Greg		

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

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	8	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 150 4
Title:	Contemporary Moral Iss
Instructor:	Ealick,Greg

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	601/1528	4.59	4.42	4.31	4.16	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	760/1527	4.28	4.37	4.28	4.23	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	731/1333	4.15	4.50	4.34	4.26	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	313/1495	4.20	4.34	4.25	4.11	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	678/1439	4.30	4.27	4.11	3.97	4.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	1	3	7	4.00	891/1425	4.21	4.21	4.12	3.93	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	419/1508	4.01	4.31	4.18	4.11	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	453/1526	4.94	4.57	4.66	4.57	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	530/1490	4.26	4.29	4.11	4.02	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	588/1428	4.66	4.59	4.49	4.43	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	413/1436	4.86	4.82	4.74	4.70	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	589/1427	4.40	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	335/1425	4.76	4.50	4.34	4.31	4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	1237/1291	3.59	3.73	4.05	3.97	2.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	178/1271	4.38	4.20	4.16	3.98	4.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	257/1276	4.39	4.20	4.33	4.14	4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	301/1273	4.57	4.37	4.38	4.18	4.85
4. Were special techniques successful	1	8	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/922	4.04	3.96	4.02	3.87	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 150 4
Title:	Contemporary Moral Iss
Instructor:	Ealick,Greg

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/208	****	****	4.27	4.23	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	5.00	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.67	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.10	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	****	5.00	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	5.00	4.43	4.33	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 150 4
Title:	Contemporary Moral Iss
Instructor:	Ealick,Greg

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	14

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

84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0									
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives		4	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					
				P	0									
				I	0	Other		0						
				?	2									

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 150 5
Title:	Contemporary Moral Iss
Instructor:	Ealick,Greg

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	6	11	4.65	463/1528	4.59	4.42	4.31	4.16	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	3	9	4.18	979/1527	4.28	4.37	4.28	4.23	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	907/1333	4.15	4.50	4.34	4.26	4.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	6	6	3.88	1169/1495	4.20	4.34	4.25	4.11	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	647/1439	4.30	4.27	4.11	3.97	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	477/1425	4.21	4.21	4.12	3.93	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	0	3	3	8	4.13	933/1508	4.01	4.31	4.18	4.11	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1526	4.94	4.57	4.66	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	722/1490	4.26	4.29	4.11	4.02	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	459/1428	4.66	4.59	4.49	4.43	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	310/1436	4.86	4.82	4.74	4.70	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	882/1427	4.40	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	335/1425	4.76	4.50	4.34	4.31	4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	614/1291	3.59	3.73	4.05	3.97	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	349/1271	4.38	4.20	4.16	3.98	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	591/1276	4.39	4.20	4.33	4.14	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	543/1273	4.57	4.37	4.38	4.18	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	1	8	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	680/922	4.04	3.96	4.02	3.87	3.63

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 150 5
Title:	Contemporary Moral Iss
Instructor:	Ealick,Greg

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/208	****	****	4.27	4.23	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/76	****	5.00	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/74	****	5.00	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.67	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	****	5.00	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.53	4.51	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0 A 7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0 B 5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0 C 3	General	10	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1 D 0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 150 5
Title:	Contemporary Moral Iss
Instructor:	Ealick,Greg

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	17

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

Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives			2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant				
				P	0									
				I	0	Other			2					
				?	1									

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	43
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	20	4.69	390/1528	4.35	4.42	4.31	4.16	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	19	4.69	326/1527	4.20	4.37	4.28	4.23	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	237/1333	4.56	4.50	4.34	4.26	4.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	3	5	14	4.39	669/1495	4.17	4.34	4.25	4.11	4.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	9	10	3.96	895/1439	4.23	4.27	4.11	3.97	3.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	5	7	12	4.29	624/1425	3.79	4.21	4.12	3.93	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	1	5	17	4.35	667/1508	4.21	4.31	4.18	4.11	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1526	4.42	4.57	4.66	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	6	17	4.67	221/1490	4.24	4.29	4.11	4.02	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	3	21	4.69	588/1428	4.49	4.59	4.49	4.43	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	580/1436	4.90	4.82	4.74	4.70	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	283/1427	4.37	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	185/1425	4.70	4.50	4.34	4.31	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	17	0	1	3	1	4	3.89	849/1291	3.66	3.73	4.05	3.97	3.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	184/1271	4.54	4.20	4.16	3.98	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	290/1276	4.25	4.20	4.33	4.14	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	534/1273	4.56	4.37	4.38	4.18	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	15	8	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/922	3.50	3.96	4.02	3.87	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	43
Questionnaires:	26

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 16	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 15	Under-grad 26 Non-major 25
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 5	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 2		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 152 3
Title:	Intro To Moral Theory
Instructor:	Seng,Phillip S

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	28

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	6	9	12	4.14	1036/1528	4.35	4.42	4.31	4.16	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	15	8	4.11	1044/1527	4.20	4.37	4.28	4.23	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	8	15	4.36	750/1333	4.56	4.50	4.34	4.26	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	5	10	10	4.20	903/1495	4.17	4.34	4.25	4.11	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	19	4.63	274/1439	4.23	4.27	4.11	3.97	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	8	7	9	3.85	1024/1425	3.79	4.21	4.12	3.93	3.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	2	5	19	4.52	438/1508	4.21	4.31	4.18	4.11	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	3	21	3	4.00	1421/1526	4.42	4.57	4.66	4.57	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	13	7	4.13	822/1490	4.24	4.29	4.11	4.02	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	6	20	4.64	669/1428	4.49	4.59	4.49	4.43	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	25	4.86	677/1436	4.90	4.82	4.74	4.70	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	6	13	9	4.11	1041/1427	4.37	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	9	17	4.54	633/1425	4.70	4.50	4.34	4.31	4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	15	3	1	2	1	6	3.46	1073/1291	3.66	3.73	4.05	3.97	3.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	319/1271	4.54	4.20	4.16	3.98	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	2	3	2	4	10	3.81	1040/1276	4.25	4.20	4.33	4.14	3.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	0	5	14	4.55	599/1273	4.56	4.37	4.38	4.18	4.55
4. Were special techniques successful	8	12	1	1	0	5	1	3.50	719/922	3.50	3.96	4.02	3.87	3.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 152 3
Title:	Intro To Moral Theory
Instructor:	Seng,Phillip S

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	28

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 152 5
Title:	Intro To Moral Theory
Instructor:	Smith,Aaron Joh

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	5	13	4.26	908/1528	4.35	4.42	4.31	4.16	4.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	8	8	3.96	1169/1527	4.20	4.37	4.28	4.23	3.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	15	4.48	606/1333	4.56	4.50	4.34	4.26	4.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	2	11	3	4.06	1020/1495	4.17	4.34	4.25	4.11	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	9	12	4.39	509/1439	4.23	4.27	4.11	3.97	4.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	2	2	4	4	2	3.14	1329/1425	3.79	4.21	4.12	3.93	3.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	3	4	9	5	3.76	1226/1508	4.21	4.31	4.18	4.11	3.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	21	2	4.09	1398/1526	4.42	4.57	4.66	4.57	4.09
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	15	4	4.05	884/1490	4.24	4.29	4.11	4.02	4.05
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	2	10	9	4.13	1157/1428	4.49	4.59	4.49	4.43	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	258/1436	4.90	4.82	4.74	4.70	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	10	9	4.27	899/1427	4.37	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	18	4.65	489/1425	4.70	4.50	4.34	4.31	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	16	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	1132/1291	3.66	3.73	4.05	3.97	3.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	1	5	12	4.35	584/1271	4.54	4.20	4.16	3.98	4.35
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	2	4	2	11	4.00	926/1276	4.25	4.20	4.33	4.14	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	345/1273	4.56	4.37	4.38	4.18	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	3	17	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/922	3.50	3.96	4.02	3.87	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 152 5
Title:	Intro To Moral Theory
Instructor:	Smith,Aaron Joh

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	5.00	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/74	****	5.00	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	4.67	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.08	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	****	5.00	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	5.00	4.43	4.33	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	2	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	17	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 152 5		Term - Fall 2010			Enrollment:	40							
Title:	Intro To Moral Theory					Questionnaires:	23							
Instructor:	Smith,Aaron Joh													
			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														

? 2

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 152 6
Title:	Intro To Moral Theory
Instructor:	Ealick,Greg

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	28

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	4	10	14	4.36	815/1528	4.35	4.42	4.31	4.16	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	14	10	4.07	1064/1527	4.20	4.37	4.28	4.23	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	20	4.68	383/1333	4.56	4.50	4.34	4.26	4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	5	8	12	4.19	912/1495	4.17	4.34	4.25	4.11	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	1	8	6	8	3.48	1226/1439	4.23	4.27	4.11	3.97	3.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	1	3	12	5	3.86	1008/1425	3.79	4.21	4.12	3.93	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	6	8	10	3.93	1118/1508	4.21	4.31	4.18	4.11	3.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1526	4.42	4.57	4.66	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	4	13	8	4.04	891/1490	4.24	4.29	4.11	4.02	4.04
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	4	8	14	4.26	1079/1428	4.49	4.59	4.49	4.43	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	22	4.78	886/1436	4.90	4.82	4.74	4.70	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	0	10	14	4.26	916/1427	4.37	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	5	20	4.63	529/1425	4.70	4.50	4.34	4.31	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	17	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	728/1291	3.66	3.73	4.05	3.97	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	2	4	11	4.39	563/1271	4.54	4.20	4.16	3.98	4.39
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	711/1276	4.25	4.20	4.33	4.14	4.39
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	599/1273	4.56	4.37	4.38	4.18	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	10	14	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/922	3.50	3.96	4.02	3.87	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 152 6
Title:	Intro To Moral Theory
Instructor:	Ealick,Greg

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	28

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/198	****	****	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/208	****	****	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/194	****	****	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/194	****	****	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/176	****	****	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/76	****	5.00	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/74	****	5.00	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/76	****	4.67	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/43	****	5.00	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/36	****	5.00	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 152 6
Title:	Intro To Moral Theory
Instructor:	Ealick,Greg

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	28

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	13	Under-grad	28	Non-major	27
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	7	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	27

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	4	11	12	4.30	875/1528	4.35	4.42	4.31	4.16	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	10	11	4.19	970/1527	4.20	4.37	4.28	4.23	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	9	16	4.48	592/1333	4.56	4.50	4.34	4.26	4.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	5	10	7	4.00	1047/1495	4.17	4.34	4.25	4.11	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	1	22	4.69	213/1439	4.23	4.27	4.11	3.97	4.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	7	9	7	3.80	1056/1425	3.79	4.21	4.12	3.93	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	8	16	4.50	448/1508	4.21	4.31	4.18	4.11	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	3	19	3	4.00	1421/1526	4.42	4.57	4.66	4.57	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	12	10	4.33	579/1490	4.24	4.29	4.11	4.02	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	20	4.70	572/1428	4.49	4.59	4.49	4.43	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1436	4.90	4.82	4.74	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	7	16	4.44	713/1427	4.37	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	23	4.78	320/1425	4.70	4.50	4.34	4.31	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	18	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/1291	3.66	3.73	4.05	3.97	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	2	2	11	4.44	518/1271	4.54	4.20	4.16	3.98	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	3	3	9	4.25	805/1276	4.25	4.20	4.33	4.14	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	2	1	3	9	4.27	822/1273	4.56	4.37	4.38	4.18	4.27
4. Were special techniques successful	11	11	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	****/922	3.50	3.96	4.02	3.87	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 152 7	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 40
Title: Intro To Moral Theory		Questionnaires: 27
Instructor: Seng, Phillip S		

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 0	A 4 Required for Majors	1 Graduate	0 Major
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 13		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 2 General	15	Under-grad 27 Non-major 27
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0 Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0 Other	0	
			? 7		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 251 2
Title:	Ethical Issues in Sci &
Instructor:	Wilson,Richard

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	31
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	2	5	12	4.18	994/1528	4.06	4.42	4.31	4.34	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	13	4.45	656/1527	4.33	4.37	4.28	4.32	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	14	4.50	564/1333	4.43	4.50	4.34	4.40	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	295/1495	4.54	4.34	4.25	4.28	4.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	5	4	8	3.75	1064/1439	3.89	4.27	4.11	4.12	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	15	4.55	358/1425	4.22	4.21	4.12	4.11	4.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	2	8	9	3.95	1093/1508	3.68	4.31	4.18	4.19	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	566/1526	4.92	4.57	4.66	4.64	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	4	9	5	4.06	878/1490	3.95	4.29	4.11	4.11	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	6	4	10	4.20	1114/1428	4.18	4.59	4.49	4.48	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	516/1436	4.91	4.82	4.74	4.76	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	5	6	9	4.20	959/1427	3.93	4.39	4.32	4.33	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	6	11	4.30	894/1425	3.91	4.50	4.34	4.37	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	3	0	1	3	6	3.69	978/1291	3.58	3.73	4.05	4.14	3.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	6	3	1	6	4	2.95	1207/1271	3.51	4.20	4.16	4.21	2.95
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	4	0	5	1	10	3.65	1106/1276	3.67	4.20	4.33	4.37	3.65
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	3	5	3	7	3.63	1134/1273	3.90	4.37	4.38	4.43	3.63
4. Were special techniques successful	2	11	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	560/922	3.71	3.96	4.02	4.11	3.89

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 251 2
Title:	Ethical Issues in Sci &
Instructor:	Wilson, Richard

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	31
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	Frequencies							Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/208	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	****	4.67	4.27	4.15	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.95	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	3.68	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/43	****	****	5.00	4.43	3.95	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	5.00	4.53	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 251 2		Term - Fall 2010			Enrollment:	31							
Title:	Ethical Issues in Sci &					Questionnaires:	22							
Instructor:	Wilson, Richard													
			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														

? 3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 251 3
Title:	Ethical Issues in Sci &
Instructor:	Wilson,Richard

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	37
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	10	6	3.86	1251/1528	4.06	4.42	4.31	4.34	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	8	10	4.18	970/1527	4.33	4.37	4.28	4.32	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	0	5	14	4.36	741/1333	4.43	4.50	4.34	4.40	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	12	4.36	708/1495	4.54	4.34	4.25	4.28	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	2	1	4	4	4	3.47	1237/1439	3.89	4.27	4.11	4.12	3.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	9	8	4.05	865/1425	4.22	4.21	4.12	4.11	4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	4	8	7	2	3.23	1394/1508	3.68	4.31	4.18	4.19	3.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	566/1526	4.92	4.57	4.66	4.64	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	3	9	5	4.00	911/1490	3.95	4.29	4.11	4.11	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	4	6	9	4.05	1191/1428	4.18	4.59	4.49	4.48	4.05
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	516/1436	4.91	4.82	4.74	4.76	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	4	5	6	6	3.67	1259/1427	3.93	4.39	4.32	4.33	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	2	9	5	3.57	1282/1425	3.91	4.50	4.34	4.37	3.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	1	5	8	2	3.69	983/1291	3.58	3.73	4.05	4.14	3.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	4	7	5	3.94	832/1271	3.51	4.20	4.16	4.21	3.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	2	2	5	6	3.65	1110/1276	3.67	4.20	4.33	4.37	3.65
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	828/1273	3.90	4.37	4.38	4.43	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	0	2	2	2	4	3.80	596/922	3.71	3.96	4.02	4.11	3.80

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 251 3	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 37
Title: Ethical Issues in Sci &		Questionnaires: 22
Instructor: Wilson, Richard		

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 251 4
Title:	Ethical Issues in Sci &
Instructor:	Wilson,Richard

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	27
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	4	7	4.14	1036/1528	4.06	4.42	4.31	4.34	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	795/1527	4.33	4.37	4.28	4.32	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	10	4.43	676/1333	4.43	4.50	4.34	4.40	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	407/1495	4.54	4.34	4.25	4.28	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	433/1439	3.89	4.27	4.11	4.12	4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	1	0	10	4.07	845/1425	4.22	4.21	4.12	4.11	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	3	0	2	7	3.85	1178/1508	3.68	4.31	4.18	4.19	3.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	453/1526	4.92	4.57	4.66	4.64	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	2	5	2	3.80	1118/1490	3.95	4.29	4.11	4.11	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	1	2	9	4.29	1058/1428	4.18	4.59	4.49	4.48	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	413/1436	4.91	4.82	4.74	4.76	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	4	1	1	8	3.93	1144/1427	3.93	4.39	4.32	4.33	3.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	1	8	3.86	1183/1425	3.91	4.50	4.34	4.37	3.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	2	0	2	1	3	3.38	1102/1291	3.58	3.73	4.05	4.14	3.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	3	2	4	3.64	1022/1271	3.51	4.20	4.16	4.21	3.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	1	3	1	5	3.73	1076/1276	3.67	4.20	4.33	4.37	3.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	1	2	2	5	3.82	1054/1273	3.90	4.37	4.38	4.43	3.82
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	1	1	2	3	2	3.44	755/922	3.71	3.96	4.02	4.11	3.44

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 251 4
Title:	Ethical Issues in Sci &
Instructor:	Wilson,Richard

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	27
Questionnaires:	14

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 320 01
Title:	Topics In Hist Of Phil
Instructor:	Wilson,Richard

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	4	13	4.76	293/1528	4.76	4.42	4.31	4.34	4.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	368/1527	4.67	4.37	4.28	4.27	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	147/1333	4.91	4.50	4.34	4.34	4.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	247/1495	4.73	4.34	4.25	4.28	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	59/1439	4.94	4.27	4.11	4.13	4.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	96/1425	4.88	4.21	4.12	4.17	4.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	12	4.53	428/1508	4.53	4.31	4.18	4.17	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	900/1526	4.69	4.57	4.66	4.68	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	198/1490	4.69	4.29	4.11	4.11	4.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	478/1428	4.75	4.59	4.49	4.48	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	310/1436	4.94	4.82	4.74	4.74	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	477/1427	4.63	4.39	4.32	4.31	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	349/1425	4.75	4.50	4.34	4.34	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	728/1291	4.00	3.73	4.05	4.09	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	549/1271	4.40	4.20	4.16	4.19	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	395/1276	4.70	4.20	4.33	4.37	4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	562/1273	4.60	4.37	4.38	4.40	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	386/922	4.20	3.96	4.02	4.02	4.20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 320 01
Title:	Topics In Hist Of Phil
Instructor:	Wilson,Richard

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	17

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	17	Non-major	16
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 321 1
Title:	Hist Of Phil: Ancient
Instructor:	Smith, Aaron Joh

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	54
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	6	17	4.54	601/1528	4.54	4.42	4.31	4.34	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	15	10	4.35	806/1527	4.35	4.37	4.28	4.27	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	17	4.58	489/1333	4.58	4.50	4.34	4.34	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	0	10	7	4.28	820/1495	4.28	4.34	4.25	4.28	4.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	9	16	4.58	314/1439	4.58	4.27	4.11	4.13	4.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	3	3	11	3	3.70	1121/1425	3.70	4.21	4.12	4.17	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	8	13	4.31	722/1508	4.31	4.31	4.18	4.17	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	19	6	4.24	1294/1526	4.24	4.57	4.66	4.68	4.24
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	13	9	4.29	627/1490	4.29	4.29	4.11	4.11	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	20	4.77	459/1428	4.77	4.59	4.49	4.48	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	24	4.88	580/1436	4.88	4.82	4.74	4.74	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	8	18	4.69	378/1427	4.69	4.39	4.32	4.31	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	22	4.81	277/1425	4.81	4.50	4.34	4.34	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	22	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/1291	****	3.73	4.05	4.09	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	4	2	7	4.00	780/1271	4.00	4.20	4.16	4.19	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	531/1276	4.57	4.20	4.33	4.37	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	458/1273	4.71	4.37	4.38	4.40	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	11	14	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/922	****	3.96	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 321 1
Title:	Hist Of Phil: Ancient
Instructor:	Smith, Aaron Joh

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	54
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	5.00	4.51	4.02	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	5.00	4.31	3.86	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.67	4.27	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	4.27	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1 A 13	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0 B 9						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	1 C 1	General	3	Under-grad	26	Non-major	19
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4 D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7 F 0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	2				
			? 2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 327 01
Title:	American Pragmatism
Instructor:	Braude,Stephen

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	28
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	601/1528	4.54	4.42	4.31	4.34	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	1202/1527	3.92	4.37	4.28	4.27	3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	447/1333	4.62	4.50	4.34	4.34	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	1	2	5	3.73	1267/1495	3.73	4.34	4.25	4.28	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	344/1439	4.54	4.27	4.11	4.13	4.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	553/1425	4.36	4.21	4.12	4.17	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	5	7	4.31	722/1508	4.31	4.31	4.18	4.17	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	1036/1526	4.54	4.57	4.66	4.68	4.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	822/1490	4.13	4.29	4.11	4.11	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	588/1428	4.69	4.59	4.49	4.48	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	709/1436	4.85	4.82	4.74	4.74	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	683/1427	4.46	4.39	4.32	4.31	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	4	8	4.38	830/1425	4.38	4.50	4.34	4.34	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	2	0	0	2	1	3.00	1194/1291	3.00	3.73	4.05	4.09	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	780/1271	4.00	4.20	4.16	4.19	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	926/1276	4.00	4.20	4.33	4.37	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	637/1273	4.50	4.37	4.38	4.40	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/922	****	3.96	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 327 01	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 28
Title: American Pragmatism		Questionnaires: 13
Instructor: Braude,Stephen		

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	13	Non-major	8
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 332 1
Title:	Phil Of Asian Mart Arts
Instructor:	Templeton,Roye

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	32
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	5	5	7	5	4	2.92	1499/1528	2.92	4.42	4.31	4.34	2.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	7	8	4	3	2.81	1504/1527	2.81	4.37	4.28	4.27	2.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	10	7	2	3	4	2.38	1325/1333	2.38	4.50	4.34	4.34	2.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	4	6	8	3	1	2.59	1481/1495	2.59	4.34	4.25	4.28	2.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	5	7	9	3.65	1130/1439	3.65	4.27	4.11	4.13	3.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	11	5	7	2	1	2.12	1417/1425	2.12	4.21	4.12	4.17	2.12
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	6	8	10	3.96	1084/1508	3.96	4.31	4.18	4.17	3.96
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	25	4.88	601/1526	4.88	4.57	4.66	4.68	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	8	5	4	4	2	2.43	1468/1490	2.43	4.29	4.11	4.11	2.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	3	1	5	14	4.04	1191/1428	4.04	4.59	4.49	4.48	4.04
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	2	4	7	11	4.00	1382/1436	4.00	4.82	4.74	4.74	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	9	3	8	3	3.04	1375/1427	3.04	4.39	4.32	4.31	3.04
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	7	5	6	3	2.88	1385/1425	2.88	4.50	4.34	4.34	2.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	4	5	6	7	3.61	1024/1291	3.61	3.73	4.05	4.09	3.61
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	13	3	2	2	1	1.81	1264/1271	1.81	4.20	4.16	4.19	1.81
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	14	4	4	0	0	1.55	1272/1276	1.55	4.20	4.33	4.37	1.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	13	4	3	1	1	1.77	1272/1273	1.77	4.37	4.38	4.40	1.77
4. Were special techniques successful	4	21	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/922	****	3.96	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 332 1
Title:	Phil Of Asian Mart Arts
Instructor:	Templeton,Roye

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	32
Questionnaires:	26

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	12	General	11	Under-grad	26	Non-major	24
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	11	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 346 1
Title:	Deductive Systems
Instructor:	Wilson,Richard

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	34
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	567/1528	4.57	4.42	4.31	4.34	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	12	4.43	688/1527	4.43	4.37	4.28	4.27	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	13	4.52	542/1333	4.52	4.50	4.34	4.34	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	207/1495	4.78	4.34	4.25	4.28	4.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	2	8	7	4.00	851/1439	4.00	4.27	4.11	4.13	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	543/1425	4.38	4.21	4.12	4.17	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	7	3	11	4.09	979/1508	4.09	4.31	4.18	4.17	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	16	4.70	890/1526	4.70	4.57	4.66	4.68	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	4	5	9	4.28	651/1490	4.28	4.29	4.11	4.11	4.28
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	8	11	4.30	1045/1428	4.30	4.59	4.49	4.48	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	774/1436	4.83	4.82	4.74	4.74	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	7	13	4.43	727/1427	4.43	4.39	4.32	4.31	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	8	14	4.57	600/1425	4.57	4.50	4.34	4.34	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	15	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	****/1291	****	3.73	4.05	4.09	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	365/1271	4.60	4.20	4.16	4.19	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	506/1276	4.60	4.20	4.33	4.37	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	4	0	6	4.20	857/1273	4.20	4.37	4.38	4.40	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	14	5	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/922	****	3.96	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 346 1
Title:	Deductive Systems
Instructor:	Wilson, Richard

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	34
Questionnaires:	23

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	23	Non-major	22
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 368 01
Title:	Aesthetics
Instructor:	Seng, Phillip S

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	128/1528	4.92	4.42	4.31	4.34	4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	248/1527	4.77	4.37	4.28	4.27	4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1333	5.00	4.50	4.34	4.34	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	217/1495	4.77	4.34	4.25	4.28	4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1439	5.00	4.27	4.11	4.13	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	175/1425	4.75	4.21	4.12	4.17	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	284/1508	4.67	4.31	4.18	4.17	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	1061/1526	4.50	4.57	4.66	4.68	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	122/1490	4.80	4.29	4.11	4.11	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	335/1428	4.83	4.59	4.49	4.48	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	464/1436	4.92	4.82	4.74	4.74	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	297/1427	4.75	4.39	4.32	4.31	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	146/1425	4.92	4.50	4.34	4.34	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	253/1291	4.60	3.73	4.05	4.09	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	319/1271	4.67	4.20	4.16	4.19	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	750/1276	4.33	4.20	4.33	4.37	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	312/1273	4.83	4.37	4.38	4.40	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/922	****	3.96	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 368 01	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 26
Title: Aesthetics		Questionnaires: 13
Instructor: Seng, Phillip S		

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2				
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General	2	Under-grad 13	Non-major 11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 1	D 0				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives	6	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			P 0				
			I 0	Other	0		
			? 2				

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 373 01
Title:	Metaphysics
Instructor:	Thomas,James G

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	34
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	3	22	4.88	175/1528	4.88	4.42	4.31	4.34	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	93/1527	4.92	4.37	4.28	4.27	4.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1333	5.00	4.50	4.34	4.34	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	177/1495	4.80	4.34	4.25	4.28	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	18	4.60	292/1439	4.60	4.27	4.11	4.13	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	21	4.76	167/1425	4.76	4.21	4.12	4.17	4.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	3	19	4.67	284/1508	4.67	4.31	4.18	4.17	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	11	4.44	1122/1526	4.44	4.57	4.66	4.68	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.29	4.11	4.11	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	270/1428	4.88	4.59	4.49	4.48	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	464/1436	4.92	4.82	4.74	4.74	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	1	20	4.78	256/1427	4.78	4.39	4.32	4.31	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	291/1425	4.79	4.50	4.34	4.34	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	1	1	2	2	10	4.19	594/1291	4.19	3.73	4.05	4.09	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	140/1271	4.90	4.20	4.16	4.19	4.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	190/1276	4.90	4.20	4.33	4.37	4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	235/1273	4.90	4.37	4.38	4.40	4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	189/922	4.57	3.96	4.02	4.02	4.57

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 373 01	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 34
Title: Metaphysics		Questionnaires: 25
Instructor: Thomas, James G		

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	20	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	25	Non-major	24
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	9	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 394 01
Title:	Philosophy Of Biology
Instructor:	Ealick,Greg

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	19
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	835/1528	4.33	4.42	4.31	4.34	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	477/1527	4.58	4.37	4.28	4.27	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	830/1333	4.25	4.50	4.34	4.34	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	445/1495	4.55	4.34	4.25	4.28	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	485/1439	4.42	4.27	4.11	4.13	4.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	766/1425	4.17	4.21	4.12	4.17	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	681/1508	4.33	4.31	4.18	4.17	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.57	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	616/1490	4.30	4.29	4.11	4.11	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	637/1428	4.67	4.59	4.49	4.48	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	464/1436	4.92	4.82	4.74	4.74	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	297/1427	4.75	4.39	4.32	4.31	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	475/1425	4.67	4.50	4.34	4.34	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1291	****	3.73	4.05	4.09	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	507/1271	4.44	4.20	4.16	4.19	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	750/1276	4.33	4.20	4.33	4.37	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1273	5.00	4.37	4.38	4.40	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/922	****	3.96	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 394 01
Title:	Philosophy Of Biology
Instructor:	Ealick,Greg

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	19
Questionnaires:	12

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	12	Non-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 400 6
Title:	Indep Study In Phil
Instructor:	Wilson,Richard

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	9
Questionnaires:	2

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1140/1528	4.00	4.42	4.31	4.39	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	575/1527	4.50	4.37	4.28	4.30	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1047/1495	4.00	4.34	4.25	4.33	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1439	5.00	4.27	4.11	4.20	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.21	4.12	4.26	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1508	5.00	4.31	4.18	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.57	4.66	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.29	4.11	4.19	5.00
Lecture														
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.82	4.74	4.75	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/43	5.00	5.00	4.43	4.63	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/36	5.00	5.00	4.43	4.38	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 400 6	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 9
Title: Indep Study In Phil		Questionnaires: 2
Instructor: Wilson,Richard		

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

	I	0	Other					1
	?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 405 1
Title:	Honors Indep Study-Phil
Instructor:	Yalowitz,Steven

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	2
Questionnaires:	2

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.42	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1527	5.00	4.37	4.28	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1495	5.00	4.34	4.25	4.33	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1439	5.00	4.27	4.11	4.20	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.21	4.12	4.26	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.57	4.66	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.29	4.11	4.19	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1271	5.00	4.20	4.16	4.33	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1276	5.00	4.20	4.33	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1273	5.00	4.37	4.38	4.55	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/43	5.00	5.00	4.43	4.63	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/31	5.00	5.00	4.53	4.17	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/36	5.00	5.00	4.43	4.38	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 405 1	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 2
Title: Honors Indep Study-Phil		Questionnaires: 2
Instructor: Yalowitz,Steven		

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

Self Paced														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives		0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					
				P	0									
				I	0	Other		0						
				?	2									

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 454 01
Title:	Animals & The Envrnmnt
Instructor:	Ealick,Greg

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	11
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	2	8	4.80	238/1528	4.80	4.42	4.31	4.39	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	575/1527	4.50	4.37	4.28	4.30	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1333	5.00	4.50	4.34	4.37	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	102/1495	4.90	4.34	4.25	4.33	4.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	292/1439	4.60	4.27	4.11	4.20	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	249/1425	4.67	4.21	4.12	4.26	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	972/1508	4.10	4.31	4.18	4.24	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.57	4.66	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	156/1490	4.75	4.29	4.11	4.19	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1428	5.00	4.59	4.49	4.54	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.82	4.74	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	138/1427	4.90	4.39	4.32	4.37	4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.50	4.34	4.37	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	4	1	1	3.50	1061/1291	3.50	3.73	4.05	4.10	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	365/1271	4.60	4.20	4.16	4.33	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	302/1276	4.80	4.20	4.33	4.49	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	1059/1273	3.80	4.37	4.38	4.55	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/922	****	3.96	4.02	4.23	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 454 01
Title:	Animals & The Envrnmnt
Instructor:	Ealick,Greg

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	11
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/76	5.00	5.00	4.51	4.83	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/74	5.00	5.00	4.31	4.42	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.26	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	28/76	4.67	4.67	4.27	4.42	4.67
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	4.23	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 470 01
Title:	Philosophy Of Mind
Instructor:	Yalowitz,Steven

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	16
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	183/1528	4.88	4.42	4.31	4.39	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	143/1527	4.88	4.37	4.28	4.30	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1333	5.00	4.50	4.34	4.37	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1495	5.00	4.34	4.25	4.33	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1439	5.00	4.27	4.11	4.20	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	249/1425	4.67	4.21	4.12	4.26	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	191/1508	4.75	4.31	4.18	4.24	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	1380/1526	4.13	4.57	4.66	4.71	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	156/1490	4.75	4.29	4.11	4.19	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1428	5.00	4.59	4.49	4.54	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.82	4.74	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	165/1427	4.88	4.39	4.32	4.37	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.50	4.34	4.37	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1291	****	3.73	4.05	4.10	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	446/1271	4.50	4.20	4.16	4.33	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	439/1276	4.67	4.20	4.33	4.49	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1273	5.00	4.37	4.38	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	467/922	4.00	3.96	4.02	4.23	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 470 01	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 16
Title: Philosophy Of Mind		Questionnaires: 8
Instructor: Yalowitz,Steven		

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

Frequency Distribution

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