INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY

Course-Section: PHIL 100 0201 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Instructor: SENG, PHILLIP Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Page 1239

Enrollment:	38				
Questionnaires:	23	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

84-150

Grad.

0

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

3

D

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

0

0

					Frequencies					Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	.1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	557/1670	4.32	4.39	4.31	4.23	4.61
-	_	ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	291/1666		4.34	4.27	4.30	4.77
		estions reflec			1	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	295/1406		4.55	4.32	4.31	4.77
	_	uations reflect			0	1	0	1	0	7	14	4.55	509/1615	4.35	4.41	4.24	4.17	4.55
				what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	2	18	4.57	359/1566		4.23	4.07	4.03	4.57
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	7	13	4.45	490/1528	4.27	4.24	4.12	4.00	4.45
		g system clearl		_	1	0	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	395/1650	4.45	4.24	4.22	4.28	4.64
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	2	18	2	4.00	1524/1667	4.39	4.39	4.67	4.61	4.00
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	8	12	4.60	324/1626	4.19	4.29	4.11	4.07	4.60
		Lectur																
1. Were t	he instru	prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	355/1559	4.63	4.63	4.46	4.47	4.85		
	<ol> <li>Were the instructor's lectures well prepared</li> <li>Did the instructor seem interested in the subject</li> </ol>							0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1560		4.84	4.72	4.68	5.00
				explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	549/1549		4.43	4.31	4.32	4.62
		es contribute t			2	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	116/1546	4.62	4.59	4.32	4.32	4.95
				your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	355/1323	3.55	3.42	4.00	3.91	4.48
		Discus	gion															
1. Did cl	ass disci			what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	221/1384	4.27	4.04	4.10	3.92	4.80
				ed to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	243/1378		4.22	4.29	4.09	4.91
				nd open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	281/1378		4.46	4.31	4.08	4.91
		echniques succe			12	10	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 904		3.50		3.94	***
	To the state of th							ution	า									
		11040	concy	DID	CI ID	uc101												
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Rea	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A 12		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s 1	.0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r r	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В 5														
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C 2	General							7	Under-g	rad 2	3	Non-	major	23
	_																	

Electives

Other

0

1

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course-Section: PHIL 100 0401 University of Maryland Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY Baltimore County Spring 2008

THOMAS, JAMES Instructor:

Enrollment: 49 Questionnaires: 36

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1240 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

	Questions							equer 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
						NA												
		Genera	al															
		ew insights,sk:			0	0	0	0	0	7	29	4.81	300/1670	4.32	4.39	4.31	4.23	4.81
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	5	31	4.86	207/1666	4.30	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.86
	_	estions reflec		_	0	0	0	0	0	1	35	4.97	58/1406	4.66	4.55	4.32	4.31	4.97
		ations reflect			0	3	0	1	0	6	26	4.73	317/1615	4.35	4.41	4.24	4.17	4.73
				what you learned	0	7	2	3	8	7	9		1220/1566	4.18	4.23	4.07	4.03	3.62
				o what you learned	0	3	1	2	2	13	15	4.18	769/1528	4.27	4.24	4.12	4.00	4.18
		g system clear		ined	0	0	0	0	2	10	24	4.61	417/1650	4.45	4.24	4.22	4.28	4.61
		was class cand			0	0	0	0	0	26	10		1354/1667	4.39	4.39	4.67	4.61	4.28
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the over	all teac	hing effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	47/1626	4.19	4.29	4.11	4.07	4.97
		Lectur					•		_			0.40./4.550						
		actor's lecture			0	0	0	0	1	Τ	34	4.92	248/1559	4.63	4.63	4.46	4.47	4.92
		ctor seem inter		3	0	0	0	0	1	0	35	4.94	358/1560	4.88	4.84	4.72	4.68	4.94
		xplained clearly you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	34 34	4.92 4.92	181/1549 208/1546	4.38 4.62	4.43 4.59	4.31	4.32	4.92 4.92		
		our understanding	2	24	1	0	2	3	34 4	3.90	820/1323	3.55	3.42	4.32		3.90		
5. Did au	laiovisuai	our understanding	۷	24	Τ	U	2	3	4	3.90	820/1323	3.55	3.42	4.00	3.91	3.90		
		Discus											004 /4004	4 00				
				what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	221/1384	4.27	4.04	4.10	3.92	4.80
				d to participate d open discussion	21 21	0	0	0	0	3	12 12	4.80	348/1378 386/1378	4.16 4.44	4.22	4.29 4.31	4.09 4.08	4.80
		ctor encourage chniques succe		a open alscussion	21	9	0	1	1	3 1	3		****/ 904	4.44	3.50	4.31	3.94	4.80
4. Wele S	special te	echniques succe	essiui		21	9	U	1	Т	1	3	4.00	/ 904	4.00	3.50	4.03	3.94	
		Labora	-															
				ground information		0	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were n	necessary	materials ava	ilable f	or lab activities	34	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 230	****	***	4.44	4.58	***
				Frequ	iency	Dis	tribu	ıtior	n									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Туј	oe			Majors		
00-27 28-55	0 1	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0 0	A 29 B 4		Red	quire	ed fo	or M	ajor	s 2	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	B 4 C 0		Cor	neral				1	0	IIndon a	, p	6	Mon	mo i oz	36
84-150	3 14	3.00-2.99	10	D 0		Gei	ier d l	-				· U	Under-g	Lau 3	U	NOI1-	major	30
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	Б 0 F 0		וק	ectiv	760				2	#### - 1	Meand +	here =	re not	enoud	h
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	U	P 0		11.1	CCLI	GD				4	respons				_	11
		I O		O+1	ner					1	I CSPOIIS	-5 CO D	c bigii	ıııcaı				
				? 0		001						_						

Course-Section: PHIL 100 0601 University of Maryland Page 1241
Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Instructor: YALOWITZ, STEVE Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 30

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questionnaires: 21

	Frequencies							Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	7	3	9	4.00	1216/1670	4.32	4.39	4.31	4.23	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	3	8	7	4.05	1167/1666	4.30	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	597/1406	4.66	4.55	4.32	4.31	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	1	2	8	4	4.00	1083/1615	4.35	4.41	4.24	4.17	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	4	5	8	3.85	1059/1566	4.18	4.23	4.07	4.03	3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	3	1	5	6	3.93	997/1528	4.27	4.24	4.12	4.00	3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	429/1650	4.45	4.24	4.22	4.28	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1667	4.39	4.39	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	4	12	4	4.00	953/1626	4.19	4.29	4.11	4.07	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	521/1559	4.63	4.63	4.46	4.47	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	725/1560	4.88	4.84	4.72	4.68	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	9	7	4.10	1104/1549	4.38	4.43	4.31	4.32	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	595/1546	4.62	4.59	4.32	4.32	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	13	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	1114/1323	3.55	3.42	4.00	3.91	3.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	4	2	6	4.00	820/1384	4.27	4.04	4.10	3.92	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	3	3	2	4	3.38		4.16	4.22	4.29	4.09	3.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	0	6	6	4.23	877/1378	4.44	4.46	4.31	4.08	4.23
4. Were special techniques successful	9	9	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 904	4.00	3.50	4.03	3.94	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	4	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				2	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 100 0701 INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY Instructor: YALOWITZ, STEVE

Title

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 18

22

University of Maryland Page 1242 Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Student Co	urse Evaluation	Questionnaire
------------	-----------------	---------------

Frequencies

				T. T.	cquci	1010			1110	CIUCCOI	COULDO	. DCpc	OLIDC	TC A C T	DCCC			
		Question	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vou	u gain ne	w insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	751/1670	4.32	4.39	4.31	4.23	4.44
		tor make clear			0	0	0	1	4	7	6		1199/1666	4.30		4.27		
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflect	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4		4.78	295/1406	4.66	4.55	4.32	4.31	4.78
4. Did oth	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	2	0	2	1	3	10	4.31	800/1615	4.35	4.41	4.24	4.17	4.31
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	4	10	4.11	780/1566	4.18	4.23	4.07	4.03	4.11
6. Did wri	itten ass	ignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0 1	2	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	706/1528	4.27	4.24	4.12	4.00	4.25
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	499/1650	4.45	4.24	4.22	4.28	4.56
8. How mar	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1667	4.39	4.39	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How wou	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	1	2	11	4	4.00	953/1626	4.19	4.29	4.11	4.07	4.00
		Lecture																
1 Were th	he instru	ctor's lecture		nrenared	0	0	Λ	0	0	4	1.4	4 78	486/1559	4 63	4 63	1 16	4 47	4 79
					0	0							911/1560				4.68	
	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject . Was lecture material presented and explained clear							0					900/1549	4.38			4.32	
		you learned	0	0	0	0	-	-										
				our understanding		13	2	1	1				1290/1323					
		1	2										,					
		Discus	sion															
				what you learned	10		1						1049/1384				3.92	3.63
				d to participate	10	0							1193/1378	4.16		4.29	4.09	
				d open discussion	10	0							937/1378		4.46			
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		11	5	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 904	4.00	3.50	4.03	3.94	****
				Fred	uency	, Die	trib	ntio	า									
				1100	[ucric]	DIL	CLID	acioi										
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	;			Rea	ason	s			Ty	pe			Majors	
00-27	A 7		 R <i>e</i>	anir	ed fo	 or M	aior		1	Graduat	 _	0	Maic	 or	0			
	00-27 6 0.00-0.99 1 A 7 28-55 4 1.00-1.99 1 B 8						qui	- Lu	J_ 11	ajoi		-	Gradade	_	J	11000		Ü
	56-83 2 2.00-2.99 1 C 2					Ge	nera	1				6	Under-g	rad 1	.8	Non-	-major	18
84-150						50						-			-		~ , - =	
Grad.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0						ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enouo	rh
				P 0									respons				_	
	I 0						her					0	-					
	? 0																	

Course-Section: PHIL 100 0801 University of Maryland INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY Baltimore County Instructor: SENG, PHILLIP

Title

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 24

41

Spring 2008

Page 1243

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

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

		Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	10	11	4.33	902/1670	4.32	4.39	4.31	4.23	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	13	4.38	821/1666	4.30	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	16	4.63	471/1406	4.66	4.55	4.32	4.31	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	13	4.38	724/1615	4.35	4.41	4.24	4.17	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	16	4.54	369/1566	4.18	4.23	4.07	4.03	4.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	ed 0	0	0	0	5	5	14	4.38	590/1528	4.27	4.24	4.12	4.00	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	8	15	4.58	457/1650	4.45	4.24	4.22	4.28	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	5	18	0	3.71	1641/1667	4.39	4.39	4.67	4.61	3.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	ss 4	0	0	0	3	8	9	4.30	670/1626	4.19	4.29	4.11	4.07	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	16	4.63	739/1559	4.63	4.63	4.46	4.47	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	673/1560	4.88	4.84	4.72	4.68	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	2	18	4.54	634/1549	4.38	4.43	4.31	4.32	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	18	4.67	520/1546	4.62	4.59	4.32	4.32	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9 0	3	3	0	4	3	11	3.90	820/1323	3.55	3.42	4.00	3.91	3.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	560/1384	4.27	4.04	4.10	3.92	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	2	2	2	7	4.08	943/1378	4.16	4.22	4.29	4.09	4.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	n 11	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	840/1378	4.44	4.46	4.31	4.08	4.31
4. Were special techniques successful	11	9	0	2	2	0	0	2.50	****/ 904	4.00	3.50	4.03	3.94	***
Fre	equency	/ Dis	strib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade	es			Rea	ason	ıs			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27 5 0.00-0.99 0 A 7		Re	 quir	ed f	or M	 Iajor	s 1	 .5	Graduat	 e	0	 Majo	 r	0

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	 7	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1	В	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	5	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: PHIL 100 0901 University of Maryland Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY Baltimore County Spring 2008

Instructor: HITZ, ZENA

Enrollment: 36 Questionnaires: 22

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1244

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

		Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	1	6	5	8	3.73	1458/1670	4.32	4.39	4.31	4.23	3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	5	4	9	3.73	1424/1666	4.30	4.34	4.27	4.30	3.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	836/1406	4.66	4.55	4.32	4.31	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	3	5	10	4.15	981/1615	4.35	4.41	4.24	4.17	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	5	14	4.41	491/1566	4.18	4.23	4.07	4.03	4.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	2	4	13	4.45	504/1528	4.27	4.24	4.12	4.00	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	2	1	4	7	6	3.70	1388/1650	4.45	4.24	4.22	4.28	3.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	8	4.36	1287/1667	4.39	4.39	4.67	4.61	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	3	2	7	4	5	3.29	1480/1626	4.19	4.29	4.11	4.07	3.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	5	4	9	3.86	1374/1559	4.63	4.63	4.46	4.47	3.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	725/1560	4.88	4.84	4.72	4.68	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	6	10	4	3.76	1303/1549	4.38	4.43	4.31	4.32	3.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	6	9	4.00	1139/1546	4.62	4.59	4.32	4.32	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	18	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1323	3.55	3.42	4.00	3.91	***
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	2	0	4	7	4.00	820/1384	4.27	4.04	4.10	3.92	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	2	2	9	4.29	842/1378	4.16	4.22	4.29	4.09	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	1	0	3	9	4.29	850/1378	4.44	4.46	4.31	4.08	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	1	1	2	2	7	4.00	461/ 904	4.00	3.50	4.03	3.94	4.00
Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	4	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3	_			
				?	0						

Baltimore County

University of Maryland Page 1245 AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions			NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	gain ne	w insights,ski		this course	0	0	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	862/1670	4.18	4.39	4.31	4.23	4.37
2. Did the	instruc	tor make clear	the exp	ected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	390/1666	4.31	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.68
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	632/1406	4.39	4.55	4.32	4.31	4.47
4. Did oth	er evalu	ations reflect	the exp	ected goals	0	15	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1615	4.25	4.41	4.24	4.17	****
5. Did ass	igned re	adings contrib	ute to w	hat you learned	0	0	0	2	1	5	11	4.32	579/1566	4.10	4.23	4.07	4.03	4.32
6. Did wri	tten ass	ignments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	17	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1528	3.25	4.24	4.12	4.00	****
7. Was the	grading	system clearl	y explai	.ned	0	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	246/1650	4.61	4.24	4.22	4.28	4.79
8. How man	y times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	693/1667	4.45	4.39	4.67	4.61	4.89
9. How wou	ıld you g	rade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	3	1	2	0	1	8	4	3.80	1220/1626	3.51	4.29	4.11	4.07	3.80
		Lectur	е															
		ctor's lecture	_	-	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	291/1559		4.63	4.46	4.47	4.89
		tor seem inter			0	0	0	1	1	3	14	4.58	1188/1560		4.84	4.72	4.68	4.58
		_		plained clearly	0	0	1	1	2	6	9		1104/1549		4.43	4.31	4.32	4.11
		s contribute t			0	0	1	2	1	7	8		1139/1546		4.59	4.32	4.32	4.00
5. Did aud	liovisual	techniques en	hance yo	our understanding	0	6	7	1	1	2	2	2.31	1287/1323	2.54	3.42	4.00	3.91	2.31
		Discus			7	0												
	. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned						6	3	1	0	2		1359/1384		4.04	4.10	3.92	2.08
	. Were all students actively encouraged to participate			7	0	4	2	0	3	3		1322/1378		4.22	4.29	4.09	2.92	
3. Did the	3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion			7	0	4	1	3	2	2	2.75	1333/1378	2.34	4.46	4.31	4.08	2.75	
		Labora	tory															
2. Were yo	u provid	ed with adequa	te backs	ground information	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	***
		Field	Work															
1. Did fie	ld exper			nat you learned	17	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
	_			ation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
_	_	tor available			17	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what	degree	could you disc	uss your	evaluations	17	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
		Self	Paced															
1. Did sel	f-paced			hat you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	4.59	****
	_	ions make clea		_	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
		cts with the i		_	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27		5.00	4.54	4.46	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	ı									
Credits Ea	- wn od	Cum CDA		Ermostad Crados				Dos					m.	<b></b>			Madawa	
credits Ea		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades					sons				Ту 	 Þe			Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A 4		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s 1	.5	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55																		
56-83 1 2.00-2.99 2 C 4						Gei	nera:	L				3	Under-g	rad 1	.9	Non-	major	19
84-150 3 3.00-3.49 4 D 0												0			,			,
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0						EΙθ	ectiv	ves				0	#### -				_	n
				P 0		<u> </u>	ı					0	respons	es to b	e sign	ııııcar	1T	
I 0 Other									2									

? 1

Course-Section: PHIL 146 0101

Title CRITICAL THINKING

Instructor: TEMPLETON, ROYE Enrollment: 30 Questionnaires: 19

Baltimore County

Spring 2008 TEMPLETON, ROYE 35

Enrollment:

Course-Section: PHIL 146 0201 University of Maryland Page 1246 AUG 6, 2008 Title CRITICAL THINKING Instructor: Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	16	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

		-			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	_	6	_	4 00	1216/1670	4.18	4.39	4.31	4.23	4.00
	•	0	1	1	2	4	7		1282/1666	4.10	4.34	4.31	4.23	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	10							
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	-	-	1	3	۷ ۰	10	4.31	,		4.55	4.32	4.31	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	874/1615	4.25	4.41	4.24	4.17	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	Ţ	Ţ	3	5	6		1039/1566	4.10	4.23	4.07	4.03	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	2	0	Ι	1		1399/1528	3.25	4.24	4.12	4.00	3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	11	4.44		4.61	4.24	4.22	4.28	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	14	1		1524/1667	4.45	4.39	4.67	4.61	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	2	2	2	7	1	3.21	1505/1626	3.51	4.29	4.11	4.07	3.21
Lecture														
	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4 56	001/1550	4 72	1 (2	1 10	4 47	4 56
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	Ţ	12	4.56	821/1559		4.63	4.46	4.47	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	Τ	Τ	2	12		1197/1560	4.57	4.84	4.72	4.68	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	3	6	4		1338/1549	3.90	4.43	4.31	4.32	3.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	4	5	4		1345/1546		4.59	4.32	4.32	3.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	3	0	3	2	1	2.78	1245/1323	2.54	3.42	4.00	3.91	2.78
Discussion														
	1	0	_	2	_	2	1	0 47	1220/1204	2 20	1 0 1	4 10	2 02	0 47
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	2	2		Τ		1339/1384	2.28	4.04	4.10	3.92	2.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	6	4	4	1	0		1368/1378	2.46	4.22	4.29	4.09	2.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	3	4	Ţ	0		1370/1378		4.46	4.31	4.08	1.93
4. Were special techniques successful	Τ	14	Τ	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 904	****	3.50	4.03	3.94	****
Frequ	lency	Dist	trib	ation	n									

# requency Distribution

Credits Earned Cu		Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	5	General	3	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-			
				2	2						

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

Page 1247 Baltimore County Spring 2008 AUG 6, 2008 Title Job IRBR3029 Instructor: EALICK, GREG E. (Instr. A)

Enrollment:	20			
Questionnaires:	18	Student Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

	Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	7	7	4 11	1150/1670	4.37	4.39	4.31	4.23	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	9	4.28	943/1666	4.33	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	644/1406		4.55	4.32	4.31	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	7	6		1055/1615	4.36	4.41	4.24	4.17	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	3	3	7		1257/1566		4.23	4.07	4.03	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		0	1	2	2	9	4		1170/1528		4.24	4.12	4.00	3.72
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	. 0	0	0	2	0	8	8	4.22	938/1650		4.24	4.22	4.28	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	712/1667	4.92	4.39	4.67	4.61	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		0	0	0	1	11	4	4.19	808/1626		4.29	4.11	4.07	4.01
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	U	U	U		11	-	4.10	000/1020	7.20	7.29	4.11	4.07	1.01
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	2	14	4.61	755/1559	4.76	4.63	4.46	4.47	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	2	15	4.67	1090/1560	4.89	4.84	4.72	4.68	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	762/1549	4.47	4.43	4.31	4.32	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	520/1546	4.73	4.59	4.32	4.32	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	14	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/1323	4.00	3.42	4.00	3.91	****
Discussion														
	2	0	1	2	2	_	2	2 40	1141/1384	3.42	4.04	4.10	3.92	2 40
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	2	3	3	10	4.40	718/1378	4.10	4.04	4.10	4.09	3.40 4.40
		0	0	0	0 2	3 4	9		692/1378	4.10	4.22	4.29	4.09	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	-	0	1	1	4	9	4.47	,					4.4/
4. Were special techniques successful	3	12	U	Τ	1	U	Τ	3.33	****/ 904	3.33	3.50	4.03	3.94	
Freq	trib	utio	n											
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	ıs			Ty	pe			Majors	

Credits Earned Cur		Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	8	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	18	Non-major	17
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				2	1						

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

Page 1248 Title AUG 6, 2008 Instructor: EALICK, GREG E. (Instr. B)
Enrollment: 20 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

FILL OT THICHE.	20		
Questionnaires:	18	Student Course Evalu	ation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	7	7	4.11	1150/1670	4.37	4.39	4.31	4.23	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	9	4.28	943/1666	4.33	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	644/1406	4.65	4.55	4.32	4.31	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	7	6	4.06	1055/1615	4.36	4.41	4.24	4.17	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	3	3	7	3.56	1257/1566	3.77	4.23	4.07	4.03	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	9	4	3.72	1170/1528	4.06	4.24	4.12	4.00	3.72
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	8	8	4.22	938/1650	4.31	4.24	4.22	4.28	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	712/1667	4.92	4.39	4.67	4.61	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	1191/1626	4.29	4.29	4.11	4.07	4.01
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/1559	4.76	4.63	4.46	4.47	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1560	4.89	4.84	4.72	4.68	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1549	4.47	4.43	4.31	4.32	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1546	4.73	4.59	4.32	4.32	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1323	4.00	3.42	4.00	3.91	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	3	3	5	3	3.40	1141/1384	3.42	4.04	4.10	3.92	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	2	0	3	10	4.40	718/1378	4.10	4.22	4.29	4.09	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	692/1378	4.61	4.46	4.31	4.08	4.47
4. Were special techniques successful	3	12	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 904	3.33	3.50	4.03	3.94	****
Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Ty	pe			Majors	

Credits E	Credits Earned			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	8	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	18	Non-major	17
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PHIL 150 0102 Title

University of Maryland CONTEMPORARY MORAL ISS Baltimore County EALICK, GREG E. Spring 2008

Instructor: Enrollment: 20

Questionnaires: 18

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1249 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Ouestions			MD	<b>NT</b> 70	Fre	-	ncies 3	3	5		tructor	Course	_	-	Level	Sect		
		Question	s 		NK 	NA				- 4		Mean	Rank 	mean 	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	ı gain ne	w insights,ski	lls from	this course	1	0	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	876/1670	4.37	4.39	4.31	4.23	4.35
		tor make clear			1	0	1	2	2	5	7	3.88	1331/1666	4.33	4.34	4.27	4.30	3.88
		estions reflec			2	8	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	212/1406	4.65	4.55	4.32	4.31	4.88
		ations reflect			1	1	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	724/1615	4.36	4.41	4.24	4.17	4.38
	_	_		hat you learned	1	0	2	2	1	6	6		1181/1566	3.77	4.23	4.07	4.03	3.71
		_		what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	7	6	3.94		4.06	4.24	4.12	4.00	3.94
		system clearly		ned	1	0	0	2	3	5	7		1135/1650		4.24	4.22	4.28	4.00
		was class canc			1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1667		4.39	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How wou	ıld you g	rade the overa	ll teach	ing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	865/1626	4.29	4.29	4.11	4.07	4.13
		Lectur	_															
		ctor's lecture			1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	503/1559	4.76	4.63	4.46	4.47	4.76
		tor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	647/1560	4.89	4.84	4.72	4.68	4.88
				plained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	7	6		1087/1549	4.47	4.43	4.31	4.32	4.13
		es contribute t			1	0 15	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	619/1546	4.73	4.59	4.32	4.32	4.59
5. Did aud	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding						0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1323	4.00	3.42	4.00	3.91	****
	Discussion																	
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to w	hat you learned	1	0	3	1	3	7	3	3.35	1163/1384	3.42	4.04	4.10	3.92	3.35
				to participate	1	0	5	0	1	1	10		1145/1378	4.10	4.22	4.29	4.09	3.65
3. Did the	e instruc	tor encourage	fair and	open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	550/1378	4.61	4.46	4.31	4.08	4.65
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		1	14	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 904	3.33	3.50	4.03	3.94	****
		Semina	r															
1. Were as	ssigned t	opics relevant	to the	announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	***	4.65	4.67	***
4. Did pre	esentatio	ons contribute	to what	you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re:	asons				Ту	ne			Majors	
	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expedied Gra									, 								
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s 1	.5	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В 9								_	_		_			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 2		Gei	nera:	L				1	Under-g	rad 1	8	Non-	major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D 0								0			,			,
Grad.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0					EΙ	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1					n
	P 0				0. 1	ı					1	respons	es to b	e sign	ııtıcan	ıt		
	I 0				Oti	her					1							
				? 0														

Course-Section: PHIL 150 0103 University of Maryland Title CONTEMPORARY MORAL ISS Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: EALICK, GREG E.

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 10

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Spring 2008

Page 1250

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	809/1670	4.37	4.39	4.31	4.23	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	622/1666	4.33	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	226/1406	4.65	4.55	4.32	4.31	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	446/1615	4.36	4.41	4.24	4.17	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	2	2	2	3.33	1373/1566	3.77	4.23	4.07	4.03	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	733/1528	4.06	4.24	4.12	4.00	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	361/1650	4.31	4.24	4.22	4.28	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1667	4.92	4.39	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	126/1626	4.29	4.29	4.11	4.07	4.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1559	4.76	4.63	4.46	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1560	4.89	4.84	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	294/1549	4.47	4.43	4.31	4.32	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1546	4.73	4.59	4.32	4.32	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	3	1	1	2.67	1323/1384	3.42	4.04	4.10	3.92	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	0	3	4	3.89	1064/1378	4.10	4.22	4.29	4.09	3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	417/1378	4.61	4.46	4.31	4.08	4.78

## Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHIL 150 0104

Title CONTEMPORARY MORAL ISS

Instructor: EALICK, GREG E.

Enrollment:

Spring 2008 19 Questionnaires: 7

Page 1251 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0  2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0	IR  0 0 0	0 0	1 	2	3	4	5 	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0	0	0	0											
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0	0	0	0											
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0	0	-		0	0	1	6	4.86	253/1670	4.37	4.39	4.31	4.23	4.86
	0		0	0	0	2	5	4.71	355/1666	4.33	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.71
3. Did the exam questions refrect the expected quars 0	0	2	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	495/1406	4.65	4.55	4.32	4.31	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0	U	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	326/1615	4.36	4.41	4.24	4.17	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	258/1566	3.77	4.23	4.07	4.03	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	260/1528	4.06	4.24	4.12	4.00	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0	0	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	690/1650	4.31	4.24	4.22	4.28	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled 0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	768/1667	4.92	4.39	4.67	4.61	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	531/1626	4.29	4.29	4.11	4.07	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	673/1559	4.76	4.63	4.46	4.47	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1560	4.89	4.84	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	683/1549	4.47	4.43	4.31	4.32	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	520/1546	4.73	4.59	4.32	4.32	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1	1	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	692/1323	4.00	3.42	4.00	3.91	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	651/1384	3.42	4.04	4.10	3.92	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	915/1378	4.10	4.22	4.29	4.09	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	481/1378	4.61	4.46	4.31	4.08	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful 0	0	4	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	779/ 904	3.33	3.50	4.03	3.94	3.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	***	4.19	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 6	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 6	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 6	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 6	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****
Frequenc	су	Dist	ribu	tion	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	sons	;			Тур	pe			Majors	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	L	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4	-					
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
					1						

### Course-Section: PHIL 152 0101 University of Maryland Page 1252 Title INTRO TO MORAL THEORY Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: THOMAS, JAMES

Enrollment: 43 Questionnaires: 33

Spring 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Fre	equei	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain new	insights,skills fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	29	4.82	290/1670	4.48	4.39	4.31	4.23	4.82
2. Did the instructor	r make clear the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	30	4.91	173/1666	4.49	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.91
3. Did the exam quest	tions reflect the e	expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	31	4.94	134/1406	4.65	4.55	4.32	4.31	4.94
4. Did other evaluat:	ions reflect the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	27	4.79	263/1615	4.52	4.41	4.24	4.17	4.79
5. Did assigned read:	ings contribute to	what you learned	0	1	1	2	5	10	14	4.06	814/1566	4.00	4.23	4.07	4.03	4.06
6. Did written assign	nments contribute t	o what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	9	20	4.53	398/1528	4.35	4.24	4.12	4.00	4.53
7. Was the grading s	ystem clearly expla	ined	1	0	0	0	2	8	22	4.63	,	4.28	4.24	4.22	4.28	4.63
8. How many times was	s class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	30	3	4.09	1477/1667	3.91	4.39	4.67	4.61	4.09
9. How would you grad	de the overall tead	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	30	4.94	81/1626	4.50	4.29	4.11	4.07	4.94
	Lecture															
1. Were the instruct		prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	29	4.88	323/1559	4.64	4.63	4.46	4.47	4.88
2. Did the instructor			1	0	0	0	0	0	32	5.00	1/1560	4.94	4.84	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture mater		_	0	0	0	0	0	1	32		,	4.68	4.43	4.31	4.32	4.97
4. Did the lectures	_		0	0	0	0	0	2	31	4.94	162/1546	4.70	4.59	4.32	4.32	4.94
5. Did audiovisual to		-	1	22	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	423/1323	3.46	3.42	4.00	3.91	4.40
	_,															
1 Did die die ee	Discussion		1 2	0	_	0	^	0	0.0	F 00	1 /1204	4 55	4 0 4	4 10	2 00	F 00
1. Did class discuss:		-	13	0	0	0	0	1	20	5.00	1/1384 146/1378		4.04	4.10	3.92	5.00
2. Were all students			13	0	0	0	0	1	19 20	4.95	1/1378	4.67 4.79	4.22 4.46	4.29 4.31	4.09 4.08	4.95 5.00
3. Did the instructor 4. Were special techn		a open discussion	13 14	0 14	0	0	0	0	20		1/13/8 ****/ 904		3.50	4.31	3.94	5.00
4. were special tech	niques successiui		14	14	U	U	U	U	5	5.00	***/ 904	3./1	3.50	4.03	3.94	
		Frequ	ıency	Dist	rib	ution	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Туј	pe			Majors	

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	Α	29	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	6	C	0	General	10	Under-grad	33	Non-major	33
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	12	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

### Course-Section: PHIL 152 0301 University of Maryland Page 1253 Baltimore County Spring 2008 AUG 6, 2008 Title INTRO TO MORAL THEORY Job IRBR3029

Instructor: FERRY, MICHAEL

Enrollment: 43 Questionnaires: 34

Ctudont	Courac	Erraluation	Questionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

								_		T.,		<b>G</b>	D t-	TIME	T 1	G
	One of the orange		NTD	373	Fre	-	ncie	:S	_		ructor	Course	-	-	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	Τ	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain new	insights, skills fr	om this course	1	0	1	0	7	12	13	4.09	1167/1670	4.48	4.39	4.31	4.23	4.09
2. Did the instruct	or make clear the e	xpected goals	1	0	0	0	5	13	15	4.30	908/1666	4.49	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.30
3. Did the exam que	stions reflect the	expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	9	22	4.61	495/1406	4.65	4.55	4.32	4.31	4.61
4. Did other evalua	tions reflect the e	xpected goals	1	7	0	0	4	10	12	4.31	813/1615	4.52	4.41	4.24	4.17	4.31
5. Did assigned read	dings contribute to	what you learned	1	0	0	3	7	5	18	4.15	743/1566	4.00	4.23	4.07	4.03	4.15
6. Did written assi	gnments contribute	to what you learned	1	1	0	0	14	5	13	3.97	955/1528	4.35	4.24	4.12	4.00	3.97
7. Was the grading	system clearly expl	ained	1	0	0	0	10	5	18	4.24	914/1650	4.28	4.24	4.22	4.28	4.24
8. How many times wa	as class cancelled		1	1	0	0	7	23	2	3.84	1618/1667	3.91	4.39	4.67	4.61	3.84
9. How would you gra	How would you grade the overall teaching effective						3	21	3	3.93	1089/1626	4.50	4.29	4.11	4.07	3.93
	Lecture															
1. Were the instruc	tor's lectures well	prepared	3	0	0	0	1	8	22	4.68	656/1559	4.64	4.63	4.46	4.47	4.68
2. Did the instruct	or seem interested	in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	4	26	4.81	855/1560	4.94	4.84	4.72	4.68	4.81
3. Was lecture mate	rial presented and	explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	7	21	4.63	525/1549	4.68	4.43	4.31	4.32	4.63
4. Did the lectures	contribute to what	you learned	3	0	0	0	2	4	25	4.74	420/1546	4.70	4.59	4.32	4.32	4.74
5. Did audiovisual	techniques enhance	your understanding	5	25	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1323	3.46	3.42	4.00	3.91	****
	Discussion															
1. Did class discus	sions contribute to	what vou learned	9	0	0	0	4	10	11	4.28	651/1384	4.55	4.04	4.10	3.92	4.28
		_	9	0	1	0	2	8	14	4.36	763/1378	4.67	4.22	4.29	4.09	4.36
	Were all students actively encouraged to participa Did the instructor encourage fair and open discuss							5	20	4.80	386/1378	4.79	4.46	4.31	4.08	4.80
	Were special techniques successful							7	5	3.71	653/ 904	3.71	3.50	4.03	3.94	3.71
		Frequ	iency	Dist	cribu	utio	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	ason	ıs			Ty	pe			Majors	\$

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	В	16						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	С	1	General	5	Under-grad	34	Non-major	34
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4	-			
				2	3						

### Course-Section: PHIL 152 0501 University of Maryland Page 1254 Title INTRO TO MORAL THEORY Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: THOMAS, JAMES

Enrollment: 43 Questionnaires: 29

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Spring 2008

							Fr	equei	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fr	om this course	0	0	0	1	0	2	26	4.83	281/1670	4.48	4.39	4.31	4.23	4.83
2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1666	4.49	4.34	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the	e exam qu	uestions reflect	t the	expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1406	4.65	4.55	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did oth	her eval	uations reflect	the e	xpected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	182/1615	4.52	4.41	4.24	4.17	4.89
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	3	3	3	4	4	12	3.73	1159/1566	4.00	4.23	4.07	4.03	3.73
6. Did wr	itten as:	signments contr	ibute	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	5	20	4.55	383/1528	4.35	4.24	4.12	4.00	4.55
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly	y expl	ained	0	0	0	1	0	0	28	4.90	166/1650	4.28	4.24	4.22	4.28	4.90
8. How mar	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	20	9	4.31	1326/1667	3.91	4.39	4.67	4.61	4.31
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll tea	ching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1626	4.50	4.29	4.11	4.07	5.00
		Lectur																
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1559	4.64	4.63	4.46	4.47	5.00	
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1560		4.84	4.72	4.68	5.00
				explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1549		4.43	4.31	4.32	5.00
		es contribute to			1	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1546	4.70	4.59	4.32	4.32	5.00
				your understanding	2	17	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	507/1323	3.46	3.42	4.00	3.91	4.30
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1384	4.55	4.04	4.10	3.92	5.00
				ed to participate	20	0	0	0	0	0	9		1/1378			4.29	4.09	5.00
		_	_	nd open discussion	20	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1378	4.79	4.46	4.31	4.08	5.00
		echniques succe		-	19	5	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	****/ 904	3.71	3.50	4.03	3.94	****
			Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	ution	n										
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	<b>.</b>	
									. <b>-</b>									
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 22		Re	quir	ed fo	or M	ajor	s 1	8	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55 56-83	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 7		a	nera	1				_	IInder-a		9	Man	-maior	29

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	22	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	29	Non-major	29
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4	_			
				2	Λ						

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

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Frequencies

Instructor

Page 1255

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Instructor: TITCHENER, JOHN Enrollment: 34 Questionnaires: 17 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rar	nk	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1																
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	- lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	2	10	5	4.18	1082/1	1670	4.48	4.39	4.31	4.23	4.18
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	1	5	8	3	3.76	1403/1	1666	4.49	4.34	4.27	4.30	3.76
		estions reflec			0	0	1	1	1	7	7	4.06	1027/1	1406	4.65	4.55	4.32	4.31	4.06
		ations reflect			0	8	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	1018/1	1615	4.52	4.41	4.24	4.17	4.11
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	4			820/1			4.23		4.03	4.06
				o what you learned	0	13	0	0	0	3			****/]			4.24		4.00	****
		g system clearl		ined	0	0	3	1	4	5			1516/1			4.24		4.28	3.35
		was class canc			0	0	0	1	8	8			1655/1				4.67		3.41
9. How wou	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	1	0	0	2	8	4	4.14	854/1	1626	4.50	4.29	4.11	4.07	4.14
		Lectur	е																
1. Were th	he instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	1	3	7	5	4.00	1280/1	1559		4.63		4.47	4.00
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	358/1	1560	4.94	4.84	4.72	4.68	4.94
			xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	1087/1	1549	4.68	4.43	4.31	4.32	4.13	
		es contribute t	-	1	0	0	1	2	7	6	4.13	1087/1	1546	4.70	4.59	4.32	4.32	4.13	
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	10	3	2	1	0	0	1.67	1311/1	1323	3.46	3.42	4.00	3.91	1.67
		Discus																	
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	3	0	1	0	3	5	5	3.93	909/1	1384	4.55	4.04	4.10	3.92	3.93
2. Were al	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	3	0	1	0	0	5	8	4.36	774/1	1378	4.67	4.22	4.29	4.09	4.36
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	3	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	795/1	1378	4.79	4.46	4.31	4.08	4.36
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		4	12	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	904	3.71	3.50	4.03	3.94	****
		Labora	torv																
2. Were yo	ou provid			ground information	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
		Field	Work																
1. Did fie	eld exper			hat you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
				uation criteria	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	n										
Caradita Da		Gram GD3		The section of the section				Da		_					_			Ma	
Credits Ea	arnea 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				кеа	ason	.s 				Тур	ре 			Majors 	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Re	quir	ed fo	or M	ajor	S	8	Grad	duate	2	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	В 8								_	_		_	_			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 3		Ge	nera	L				6	Unde	er-gr	rad 1	.7	Non-	-major	17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0								0	,, ,, ,,		_	,			,
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0			Means t			_	ın
				P 0		٠.,						0	resp	ponse	es to b	e sigr	nificar	1t	
				I 0		Ot.	her					2							
				? 1															

Course-Section: PHIL 210 0101 University of Maryland Title PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD

Enrollment: 43 Questionnaires: 23

Spring 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 1256

responses to be significant

		Question	s		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		 Genera																
1 Did vou	ı gəin new	Genera insights,ski		m this source	0	0	0	1	5	5	12	4 22	1038/1670	4.22	4.39	4.31	4.32	4.22
		or make clear			0	0	0	2	3	6	12		1015/1666		4.34	4.27	4.27	4.22
		stions reflec		_	0	5	0	0	1	5		4.61			4.55	4.32	4.39	4.61
	_	tions reflect		_	0	5	0	2	0	5	11		712/1615		4.41	4.24	4.29	4.39
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	7	13		460/1566		4.23	4.07	4.00	4.43
	_	_		o what you learned	0	3	0	1	1	4	14	4.55	383/1528	4.55	4.24	4.12	4.11	4.55
		system clearl		-	0	0	2	4	2	9	6	3.57	1442/1650	3.57	4.24	4.22	4.20	3.57
8. How man	ny times w	as class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	1	19	3	4.09	1482/1667	4.09	4.39	4.67	4.64	4.09
9. How wou	ıld you gr	ade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	2	2	8	9	4.14	854/1626	4.14	4.29	4.11	4.06	4.14
		Lectur	е															
1. Were th	ne instruc	tor's lecture	prepared	2	0	0	0	3	7	11	4.38	1042/1559	4.38	4.63	4.46	4.40	4.38	
2. Did the	e instruct	or seem inter	n the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	298/1560	4.95	4.84	4.72	4.73	4.95	
3. Was led	cture mate	rial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	3	0	0	0	6	3	11	4.25	977/1549	4.25	4.43	4.31	4.25	4.25
4. Did the	e lectures	contribute t	o what	you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	457/1546	4.71	4.59	4.32	4.30	4.71
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	3	17	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1323	****	3.42	4.00	4.08	***
		Discus																
				what you learned	17	0	1	0	1	1		3.83	,		4.04	4.10	4.07	3.83
				d to participate	17	0	0	0	0	3		4.50			4.22	4.29	4.25	4.50
3. Did the	instruct	or encourage	fair an	d open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	354/1378	4.83	4.46	4.31	4.26	4.83
				Frequ	iency	Dist	tribu	ıtior	ı									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	А 9		Red	quire	ed fo	or M	 ajor		9	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	3	
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	в 11			_			-						_		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Ger	nera:	L				8	Under-g	rad 2	3	Non-	-major	20
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	6	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				2	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	rh

Other

Ρ

I

0

0

0

Course-Section: PHIL 248 0101 University of Maryland Page 1257 Title INTRO SCIENTIF REASONI Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008

Instructor: SENG, PHILLIP

Enrollment: 48 Questionnaires: 45

Spring 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque:	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	5	12	26	4.36	876/1670		4.39	4.31	4.32	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	12	30	4.60	490/1666		4.34	4.27	4.27	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	38	4.80	261/1406		4.55	4.32	4.39	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	13	29	4.61	434/1615		4.41	4.24	4.29	4.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	6	7	26	4.16	743/1566		4.23	4.07	4.00	4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		24	1	1	2	3	12	4.26	697/1528		4.24	4.12	4.11	4.26
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	1	0	0	0	2	5	37	4.80	237/1650		4.24	4.22	4.20	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	13	24	7		1615/1667		4.39	4.67	4.64	3.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	0	3	9	27	4.44	515/1626	4.44	4.29	4.11	4.06	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	38	4.84	371/1559	4.84	4.63	4.46	4.40	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	6	37	4.82	829/1560		4.84	4.72	4.73	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	6	36	4.75	366/1549		4.43	4.31	4.25	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	6	35	4.73	445/1546		4.59	4.32	4.30	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	0	0	5 5	0	23	4.73	326/1323		3.42			
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	О	U	U	Э	8	23	4.50	320/1323	4.50	3.42	4.00	4.08	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	179/1384	4.89	4.04	4.10	4.07	4.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	316/1378	4.83	4.22	4.29	4.25	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	354/1378	4.83	4.46	4.31	4.26	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	27	10	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	****/ 904	****	3.50	4.03	4.01	****
Laboratory							_							
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	44	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 232 ****/ 239		****	4.19 4.21	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	. 44	U	U	U	U	0	1	5.00	^^^^/ 239	* * * * *	* * * * *	4.21	4.33	
Freq	uency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	s 			Ту	pe 			Majors	
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 31		Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	7	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 8														
56-83 4 2.00-2.99 3 C 0		Ger	nera	l				5	Under-g	rad 4	5	Non-	-major	45
84-150 14 3.00-3.49 6 D 0														
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 12 F 0		El	ecti	ves				3	#### -				_	ıh
P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
I 0		Ot1	her				2	21						

Course-Section: PHIL 251 0101 University of Maryland Title ETH ISS SCI ENG&INF TE

Instructor:

WILSON, RICHARD

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1258

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 41 Questionnaires: 30 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

2				2										
			Fr	eque	ncie	S		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	4	4	9	12	3.90	1344/1670	4.14	4.39	4.31	4.32	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	12	12	4.24	979/1666	4.22	4.34	4.27	4.27	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	7	9	13	4.10	997/1406	4.10	4.55	4.32	4.39	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	5	10	12	4.14	990/1615	4.33	4.41	4.24	4.29	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	9	4	6	3.84	1068/1566	3.65	4.23	4.07	4.00	3.84
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	6	9	14	4.28	688/1528	4.30	4.24	4.12	4.11	4.28
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	4	10	7	7	3.43	1490/1650	3.48	4.24	4.22	4.20	3.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	24	4	4.14	1444/1667	4.27	4.39	4.67	4.64	4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	0	7	10	7	4.00	953/1626	4.11	4.29	4.11	4.06	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	4	5	10	7	3 57	1451/1559	3.81	4.63	4.46	4.40	3.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	26	4.89			4.84	4.72	4.73	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	3	5	13	5		1345/1549		4.43	4.31	4.25	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	4	5	9	8		1313/1546		4.59	4.32	4.30	3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	4	3	7	3	3		1227/1323		3.42	4.00		2.90
3. Did addiovibual teciminques cimanee your understanding		O	•	,	,	,	3	2.50	122//1323	3.10	3.12	1.00	1.00	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	4	2	4	4	8		1122/1384		4.04	4.10	4.07	3.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	2	7	5	7	3.68	1134/1378		4.22	4.29	4.25	3.68
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	1	7	4	9	3.86	1067/1378		4.46	4.31	4.26	3.86
4. Were special techniques successful	8	10	0	1	5	4	2	3.58	702/ 904	3.40	3.50	4.03	4.01	3.58
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.25	****
Frequ	lency	7 Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	.s			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27 4 0.00-0.99 0 A 18			quir	 ed f		aior		3	Graduat		0	Majo		0
28-55 4 1.00-1.99 1 B 9		1.0	·4uil	cu I	OI II	۱۰۰ س	2	5	Gradat	_	•	ria je	-	J

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 18	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	В 9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C 1	General	2	Under-grad	30	Non-major	30
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P 0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I O	Other	21				
				2 0						

Course-Section: PHIL 251 0102 University of Maryland Page 1259 Baltimore County Spring 2008 AUG 6, 2008 Title ETH ISS SCI ENG&INF TE Job IRBR3029

WILSON, RICHARD Instructor:

Enrollment: 36 Questionnaires: 21

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_		4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	8	11	4.38	835/1670	4.14	4.39	4.31	4.32	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	8	10		1037/1666			4.27	4.27	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	13	6	4.10	1003/1406	4.10	4.55	4.32	4.39	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	3	3	13	4.53	530/1615	4.33	4.41	4.24	4.29	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	3	0	3	5	4	3.47	1310/1566	3.65	4.23	4.07	4.00	3.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	6	11	4.33	631/1528	4.30	4.24	4.12	4.11	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	6	4	5	6	3.52	1454/1650	3.48	4.24	4.22	4.20	3.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	12	8	4.40	1256/1667	4.27	4.39	4.67	4.64	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	2	7	8	4.22	762/1626	4.11	4.29	4.11	4.06	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	2	9	8	4.05	1270/1559	3.81	4.63	4.46	4.40	4.05
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	17		929/1560			4.72	4.73	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	3	7	9	4.15	1061/1549	3.91	4.43	4.31	4.25	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	6	11	4.19	1032/1546	3.95	4.59	4.32	4.30	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	1	2	4	4	2	3.31	1107/1323	3.10	3.42	4.00	4.08	3.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	3	7	6	3 84	957/1384	3 65	4 04	4 10	4.07	3.84
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	5	5			951/1378		4.22	4.29	4.25	4.05
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	2	3	9			1058/1378					
4. Were special techniques successful	3	9	1	2	2	2	2		799/ 904					
Frequ	encv	Dist	ribı	ıtior	า									
a l'i a la cara	<i>y</i>	2100			-									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	16	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	1			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 322 0101 University of Maryland
Title HIST OF PHIL:MODERN Baltimore County
Instructor: BRAUDE, STEPHEN Spring 2008

Enrollment: 62
Questionnaires: 44

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Page 1260 AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

		- <u>-</u>				Instructor	Cours	_		UMBC Level			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean Ranl	Mear	n Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General													
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	3	14	8	17	3.80 1419/16	70 3.80	4.39	4.31	4.24	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	5	10	13	14	3.73 1424/16	66 3.73	4.34	4.27	4.18	3.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	1	8	12	20	4.02 1045/1	06 4.02	4.55	4.32	4.22	4.02
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	24	0	2	8	6	3	3.53 1442/16	15 3.53	3 4.41	4.24	4.18	3.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	3	11	6	18	3.61 1225/1	66 3.63	4.23	4.07	4.04	3.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	23	2	3	5	6	4	3.35 1357/1	28 3.35	4.24	4.12	4.07	3.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	6	11	7	8	11	3.16 1559/16	50 3.16	4.24	4.22	4.12	3.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	4	25	13	4.16 1430/16	67 4.16	4.39	4.67	4.67	4.16
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	1	5	22	8	3.95 1055/10	26 3.95	4.29	4.11	4.06	3.95
Lecture													
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	0	3	7	30	4.50 896/1	59 4.50	4.63	4.46	4.40	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	3	37	4.83 777/1	60 4.83	4.84	4.72	4.67	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	1	4	17	17	4.05 1129/1	49 4.05	4.43	4.31	4.25	4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	4	9	25	4.24 1002/1	46 4.24	4.59	4.32	4.24	4.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	21	6	2	6	4	3	2.81 1241/13	23 2.83	3.42	4.00	3.99	2.81
Discussion													
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	5	2	5	3	10	3.44 1125/13	84 3.4	4.04	4.10	4.12	3.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	1	3	3	2	14	4.09 939/13	78 4.09	4.22	4.29	4.30	4.09
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	1	5	2	16	4.38 777/13	78 4.38	4.46	4.31	4.33	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	21	21	0	0	0	1	1	4.50 ****/	04 ***	3.50	4.03	4.03	****
Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utic	n								
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	ıs			Туре			Majors	\$
00.07								0					

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	15						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	6	C	9	General	8	Under-grad	44	Non-major	38
84-150	17	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	23				
				2	Λ						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: PHIL 322H 0101 Title HIST OF PHIL: MODERN Spring 2008 BRAUDE, STEPHEN Instructor: Enrollment: 4

Questionnaires: 4

Page 1261 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

04	a	T 1 +	0
Student	course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

		Ouestion	estions			NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			- 															
		Genera	1															
		w insights,ski			0	0	0	0	1	1	2		,		4.39	4.31	4.24	4.25
		tor make clear	_	_	0	0	0	0	0	4	0		1199/1666		4.34	4.27	4.18	4.00
	_	estions reflec		_	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50			4.55	4.32	4.22	4.50
		ations reflect			0	1	0	0	1	2			1380/1615		4.41	4.24	4.18	3.67
	_	_		what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3		226/1566		4.23	4.07	4.04	4.75
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	1		899/1528		4.24	4.12	4.07	4.00
		system clearl		ned	0	0	0	2	1	1	0		1610/1650		4.24	4.22	4.12	2.75
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	3	1		1368/1667		4.39	4.67	4.67	
9. How wou	ıld you g	rade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.29	4.11	4.06	4.00
		Lectur	_	_	_	_	_		_		_							
		ctor's lecture	_	_	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	. ,		4.63		4.40	4.75
		tor seem inter			0	0	0	0	1	1	2		1411/1560		4.84	4.72	4.67	4.25
		_		xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	2		. ,		4.43	4.31	4.25	4.25
		s contribute t	_		0	0	0	0	0	2			715/1546		4.59	4.32	4.24	
5. Did auc	diovisual	techniques en	hance yo	our understanding	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1179/1323	3.00	3.42	4.00	3.99	3.00
1 5 1 1		Discus			_	0	0	0	•	-	0	4 00	000/1201	4 00	4 0 4	4 10	4 10	4 00
				what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1		4.00	,		4.04		4.12	
		_	_	l to participate l open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1		4.00	970/1378 1/1378		4.22	4.29 4.31	4.30	4.00
3. DIG LINE	e Instruc	ctor encourage	Lair and	open discussion	3	U	U	U	U	U	Т	5.00	1/13/8	5.00	4.40	4.31	4.33	5.00
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	า									
				- 1														
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Re	guir	ed fo	or Ma		 3	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 1			1			- 5	-	-		_	•	5 -	_	_
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge.	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	major	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D 0				_				-	011001 9		-	2.021		-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		E1	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoua	h
	-		-	P 0								-	respons				_	
				I O		Ot:	her					4			5			
				? 0			-											
				•														

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Course-Section: PHIL 346 0101 University of Maryland Page 1262 Title DEDUCTIVE SYSTEMS AUG 6, 2008 Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD Job IRBR3029

Frequencies

NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean

Instructor

Rank

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Mean Mean Mean Mean

Enrollment:	54	
Questionnaires:	34	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions

		 Genera																	
1 Did 110	u anin r	Genera new insights,ski	_	om thia ao	11770	0	0	3	0	7	6	18	1 06	1189/1670	1 06	4.39	1 21	4.24	4.06
		ictor make clear				1	0	2	1	2	10	18		979/1666			4.27	4.18	4.24
		questions reflec				0	0	1	0	3	7	23		597/1406	4.50		4.32	4.22	4.50
		luations reflect				0	27	0	1	0	3	3		****/1615	****		4.24	4.18	****
		readings contrib				0	6	3	2	6	4	13		1122/1566	3.79	4.23	4.07	4.04	3.79
		ssignments contr				0	27	2	1	0		2		****/1528	****	4.24	4.12	4.07	****
		ng system clearl			a roarmoa	1	0	2	1	6	6	18		1055/1650	4.12	4.24	4.22		4.12
		was class canc				0	0	0	0	0	26			1381/1667			4.67	4.67	4.24
		grade the overa		ching effe	ctiveness	3	0	1	5	6	11			1323/1626			4.11		3.65
	2	J		3															
1. Were t	_	1	0	1	0	5	13			1205/1559	4.18		4.46	4.40	4.18				
2. Did th		1 2	0	2	0	4	6			1376/1560	4.33		4.72	4.67					
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned							0	2	4	5	9			1294/1549	3.78		4.31	4.25	3.78
				-		1	0	3			10			1106/1546	4.09		4.32	4.24	4.09
5. Did au	udiovisua	al techniques en	hance y	your under	standing	2	29	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1323	****	3.42	4.00	3.99	****
		Discus	sion																
1. Did cl	ass disc	cussions contrib		what vou	learned	20	0	4	0	3	3	4	3.21	1212/1384	3.21	4.04	4.10	4.12	3.21
		ents actively en		-		20	0	2	1	5	3			1259/1378	3.29	4.22	4.29	4.30	3.29
		actor encourage				20	0	3	0					1248/1378	3.36		4.31	4.33	3.36
		echniques succe				20	13	0	0		1			****/ 904				4.03	****
	-	-																	
					Frequ	ıency	Dist	tribu	utior	1									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expect	ed Grades				Rea	ason	s			Тур	е			Majors	;
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	 17		Rec	quire		 or M	aior		4	 Graduate		0	Majo	 r	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7		1101	1422			w) 0 =	_	-	OI dada o			1100 ) 0	-	
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	5		Ger	neral	L				5	Under-gr	ad 3	34	Non-	major	31
84-150 10 3.00-3.49 7 D 0													-					5	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 9 F 0						Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - M	leans t	here a	re not	enoue	h	
P 0													response					•	
I O				0		Oth	ner				1	8			. 5				
? 0					0							_	-						
				•	-														

Baltimore County

Course-Section: PHIL 350 0101

32

ETHICAL THEORY

FERRY, MICHAEL

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 23

Spring 2008

University of Maryland Page 1263 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions			NR	NA	Fre	eque: 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean		
		General																
1 Did s	zou gain ne	ew insights,skil		m this course	0	0	0	2	3	7	11	4 17	1082/1670	4 17	4.39	4.31	4.24	4.17
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	4	5	13	4.30			4.34	4.27	4.18	4.30
		estions reflect			0	0	0	3	2	4		4.26				4.32	4.22	4.26
		ations reflect			0	15	0	0	1	1	6	4.63			4.41	4.24	4.18	4.63
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	8	13	4.48	-,		4.23	4.07	4.04	4.48
	-	_		what you learned what you learned	0	16	0	1	1	2	3	4.00		4.00	4.24	4.12	4.07	4.00
		g system clearly			0	0	0	2	3	3			794/1650		4.24	4.22	4.12	4.35
		was class cance		inea	0	0	0	1	4	16	2		1621/1667	3.83	4.39	4.67	4.67	3.83
9. How w	would vou c	was class cance grade the overal	ll teac	ning effectiveness	2	0	0	3	4	11			1312/1626				4.06	
		,		5	_	_	-	-	_		_		,					
		Lecture		_														
		actor's lectures			2	0	1	1	1	6	12		1136/1559	4.29	4.63	4.46	4.40	4.29
		ctor seem intere		_	2	0	0	0	1	6	14		1150/1560	4.62	4.84	4.72	4.67	4.62
		_		xplained clearly	2	0	1	1	2	8	9		1108/1549	4.10		4.31	4.25	4.10
4. Did t	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned . Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandir				2	0	1	0	2	4	14		822/1546		4.59	4.32	4.24	4.43
5. Did a	audiovisual	l techniques enh	nance y	our understanding	2	16	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	****/1323	****	3.42	4.00	3.99	***
	Discussion																	
1 Did c	Discussion  Did class discussions contribute to what you learned					0	1	1	3	4	8	4.00	820/1384	4.00	4.04	4.10	4.12	4.00
				d to participate	6 6	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	836/1378	4.29	4.22	4.29	4.30	4.29
		_	_	d open discussion	6	0	0	1	2	3	11	4.41	741/1378	4.41	4.46	4.31	4.33	4.41
		echniques succes		d Open discussion	6	15	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 904	****	3.50	4.03	4.03	****
1. WCIC	Special co	cominques succes	BLUI		O	13	_	O	Ü	Ü	_	3.00	, 501		3.30	1.05	1.03	
		Laborat	cory															
2. Were	you provid	ded with adequat	e back	ground information	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	****
		Field W	Jork															
1. Did f	field exper	rience contribut		nat vou learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
		v understand you			22	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	***
_,	,	7											,					
		Self F																
				what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did s	study quest	cions make clear	the e	xpected goal	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3
	00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 4					Red	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	7	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	7
	28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 7						_				_	_	_	_				
	56-83 1 2.00-2.99 5 C 9				Gei	nera.	T				2	Under-g	rad 2	23	Non-	-major	16	
	84-150 5 3.00-3.49 2 D 1				_						_			_				
Grad.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 6 F 0				Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1				_	jh	
	Р 0										_	respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	nt		
				I 0		Otl	her				1	.1						
	? 1																	

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008 Page 1264

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Non-major 3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: PHIL 350H 0101

10

ETHICAL THEORY

FERRY, MICHAEL

Title

56-83

Grad.

84-150

0

0

2.00-2.99

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

0

0

1

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Ouestionnaires: 3

			Fr	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	479/1670	4.67	4.39	4.31	4.24	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	870/1666	4.33	4.34	4.27	4.18	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.55	4.32	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	379/1615	4.67	4.41	4.24	4.18	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	559/1566	4.33	4.23	4.07	4.04	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1447/1528	3.00	4.24	4.12	4.07	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	361/1650	4.67	4.24	4.22	4.12	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.00	4.39	4.67	4.67	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.29	4.11	4.06	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	673/1559	4.67	4.63	4.46	4.40	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.84	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	900/1549	4.33	4.43	4.31	4.25	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	520/1546	4.67	4.59	4.32	4.24	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1179/1323	3.00	3.42	4.00	3.99	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	324/1384	4.67	4.04	4.10	4.12	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	970/1378	4.00	4.22	4.29	4.30	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.46	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	820/ 904	3.00	3.50	4.03	4.03	3.00
Freq	uency	, Dis	trib	utio	n									
Chadita Farned Chim CDA Franctical Chadian				D.c.		_			m				Mo i or	
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades					asons				Ту:	pe 			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 0	Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major						0							
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1														

General

Electives

Other

1

0

Under-grad 3

### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

C

D 0

F

Ρ

I

0

0

0

0

0

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Course-Section: PHIL 368 0101 University of Maryland Page 1265 AUG 6, 2008 Title AESTHETICS Instructor: TITCHENER, JOHN Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Fvaluation	Ouestionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestronnarie

Enrollment:

56-83

Grad.

84-150

3

4

2.00-2.99

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

3

0

Questionnaires: 11

29

						-			Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 al															
1. Did vo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	1	4	4	2	3.64	1498/1670	3.64	4.39	4.31	4.24	3.64
_	-	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	1142/1666	4.09	4.34	4.27	4.18	4.09
		uestions reflec		_	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	860/1406	4.27	4.55	4.32	4.22	4.27
		uations reflect			1	0	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	1234/1615	3.90	4.41	4.24	4.18	3.90
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	oute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	317/1566	4.64	4.23	4.07	4.04	4.64
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contr	ribute	to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	760/1528	4.20	4.24	4.12	4.07	4.20
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	ly expla	ained	0	0	0	1	6	2	2	3.45	1481/1650	3.45	4.24	4.22	4.12	3.45
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivened					0	0	0	1	9	0	1	3.09	1660/1667	3.09	4.39	4.67	4.67	3.09
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	all tea	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	499/1626	4.44	4.29	4.11	4.06	4.44
	Lecture																	
1. Were t	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	3	2	5	4.20	1199/1559	4.20	4.63	4.46	4.40	4.20
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	rested	in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.84	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presente	ed and	explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	1027/1549	4.20	4.43	4.31	4.25	4.20
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	595/1546	4.60	4.59	4.32	4.24	4.60
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques er	nhance	your understanding	2	3	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	1155/1323	3.17	3.42	4.00	3.99	3.17
		Discus	ssion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	oute to	what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	498/1384	4.44	4.04	4.10	4.12	4.44
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively er	ncourage	ed to participate	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	481/1378	4.67	4.22	4.29	4.30	4.67
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair a	nd open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	417/1378	4.78	4.46	4.31	4.33	4.78
4. Were s	special to	echniques succe	essful		2	6	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	671/ 904	3.67	3.50	4.03	4.03	3.67
				Frequ	ıency	/ Dist	trib	utio	n									
Crodita E	radits Farned Cum CDA Expected Grade							Do		-			т	<b>~</b>			Majors	
crearcs F	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades							ason	> 			Ту:	 he			majors	, . – – – –	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99		A 3	Required for Majors					1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	4		
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B 7	G1							0	TT	1	1			-

General

Other

Electives

2

3

5

Under-grad 11

### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Non-major

С

D

F

Ρ

I

?

1

0

0

0

0

0

Course-Section: PHIL 372 0101 University of Maryland PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE

Page 1266 Baltimore County Spring 2008 AUG 6, 2008 Title Job IRBR3029 Instructor: EALICK, GREG E.

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	9

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

	Ouestions			NID	3.7.7	Fre	_	ncies		5		ructor		Dept		Level	Sect	
		Question	.s 		NK	NA				4		Mean	Rank	mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	611/1670	4.56	4.39	4.31	4.24	4.56
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	870/1666	4.33	4.34	4.27	4.18	4.33
4. Did oth	her evalı	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	189/1615	4.89	4.41	4.24	4.18	4.89
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	210/1566	4.78	4.23	4.07	4.04	4.78
6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	131/1528	4.89	4.24	4.12	4.07	4.89
7. Was the	e grading	system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	499/1650	4.56	4.24	4.22	4.12	4.56
8. How mar	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.39	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How wou	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	207/1626	4.75	4.29	4.11	4.06	4.75
	Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared																	
	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject				0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	307/1559		4.63	4.46	4.40	4.89
	<ol> <li>Did the instructor seem interested in the subject</li> <li>Was lecture material presented and explained clearly</li> </ol>					0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1560		4.84	4.72	4.67	5.00
		-		-	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	. ,	4.56	4.43	4.31	4.25	4.56
		es contribute t			0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1546		4.59	4.32	4.24	5.00
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	8	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1323	****	3.42	4.00	3.99	****
		Discus	gion															
1 Did als	acc dica			what you learned	5	0	0	0	Λ	1	2	4.75	257/1384	4.75	4.04	4.10	4.12	4.75
				d to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	400/1378		4.22	4.29	4.30	4.75
				d open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1378		4.46	4.31		5.00
5. Dia che	c IIIbci uc	cor encourage	rair an	a open arseassion	5	O	O	O	O	O	•	3.00	1/13/0	3.00	1.10	1.51	1.55	3.00
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А б					or Ma			3	Graduat		0	Majo		0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3		Red	datte	su I	JT IMG	JOLE	>	3	Graduat	=	U	Majc	,T	U
56-83				C 0		Ger	nera:	1				3	Under-q	rad	9	Non-	major	9
56-83 3 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 1 D 0				Gei	iici a.	_				5	onder g	Laa		14011	ilia joi	,		
Grad.					E14	ectiv	zes.				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h	
oraa.	91au. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0									-	respons				_			
					O±1	her					3	10000115		.c bigi				
	I 0					001						_						

University of Maryland Page 1267
Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire	

Course-Section: PHIL 373 0101

METAPHYSICS

49

THOMAS, JAMES

Title

Instructor:
Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 34

					Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Question	ns		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Gener																
1 Did vo	u dain ne	Genera w insights,sk		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	8	26	4.76	350/1670	4.76	4 39	4.31	4.24	4.76
		ctor make clea			0	0	0	0	1	4	29	4.82	241/1666		4.34	4.27	4.18	4.82
		estions refle			1	23	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	261/1406		4.55	4.32	4.22	4.80
		ations reflec			0	2	0	0	2	5	25	4.72	326/1615			4.24	4.18	4.72
				what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	11	18	4.32	569/1566		4.23	4.07	4.04	4.32
				o what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	28	4.76	211/1528		4.24	4.12	4.07	4.76
		system clear			0	0	0	0	3	6	25	4.65	383/1650		4.24	4.22	4.12	4.65
8. How max	ny times	was class can	celled		0	0	0	0	0	31	3	4.09	1482/1667	4.09	4.39	4.67	4.67	4.09
9. How wo	uld you	grade the over	all teac	hing effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.29	4.11	4.06	5.00
		Lectu:	re															
1. Were t	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor goom interested in the subject				2	0	0	0	0	1	31	4.97	111/1559	4.97	4.63	4.46	4.40	4.97
	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject				2	0	0	0	0	0	32	5.00	1/1560		4.84	4.72	4.67	5.00
	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly				2	0	0	0	0	4	28	4.88	229/1549		4.43	4.31	4.25	4.88
4. Did th	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned				2	0	0	0	0	1	31	4.97	93/1546	4.97	4.59	4.32	4.24	4.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					2	11	1	0	2	3	15	4.48	355/1323	4.48	3.42	4.00	3.99	4.48
		Discu	ssion															
1. Did cl.	ass disci			what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	210/1384	4.82	4.04	4.10	4.12	4.82
				d to participate	17	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1378		4.22	4.29	4.30	5.00
				d open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.46	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succ	essful	-	17	14	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 904	****	3.50	4.03	4.03	***
		Labora	atory															
1. Did th	e lab ind		-	of the material	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	***	4.19	4.04	***
1. Were a	ssigned t	Semina copics relevan		announced theme	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.30	****
1	.DDIJIIGG (	Jopios Tolovan	0 00 0110			-	-	-	-	Ü	_	3.00	,			1.05	1.50	
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	tribu	ution	ı									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GP	A	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	}
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 24		Re	quire	ed fo	or Ma	 ajor	`s	4	Graduat	 .е	0	Majo	r or	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 4			-			-						J -		
56-83 1 2.00-2.99 5 C 2				Ge	nera:	L			1	.4	Under-9	rad 3	34	Non-	major	30		
84-150 19 3.00-3.49 11 D 0																		
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 10 F 0				El	ectiv	ves				3	#### -					jh		
	P 2										respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt			
				I 0		Ot]	her				1	.2						
				3 0														

Course-Section: PHIL 390 0101 Title

PHILOSOPHY OF SPORT

Instructor: TEMPLETON, ROYE

Enrollment: 26 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1268 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

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

Questions			NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean		
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vou	gain ne	w insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	929/1670	4.31	4.39	4.31	4.24	4.31
		tor make clear			0	0	0	2	0	5	9	4.31	895/1666		4.34	4.27	4.18	4.31
		estions reflec			0	0	0	1	1	7	7	4.25	876/1406		4.55	4.32	4.22	4.25
		ations reflect			0	2	1	0	1	4	8	4.29			4.41	4.24	4.18	4.29
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	460/1566	4.44	4.23	4.07	4.04	4.44
				o what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	2	9	4.27	697/1528	4.27	4.24	4.12	4.07	4.27
		system clearl			0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	338/1650		4.24	4.22	4.12	4.69
8. How man	y times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	2	8	6	4.25	1368/1667	4.25	4.39	4.67	4.67	4.25
9. How wou	ld you g	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	637/1626	4.33	4.29	4.11	4.06	4.33
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	e instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.63	4.46	4.40	5.00
		tor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	948/1560	4.75	4.84	4.72	4.67	4.75
3. Was lec	ture mat	erial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	683/1549	4.50	4.43	4.31	4.25	4.50
4. Did the	lecture	s contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	643/1546	4.56	4.59	4.32	4.24	4.56
				our understanding	0	0	1	1	2	5	7	4.00	692/1323	4.00	3.42	4.00	3.99	4.00
1 Did cla	what you learned	5	0	4	0	1	1	5	3 27	1194/1384	3.27	4.04	4.10	4.12	3.27			
				d to participate	5	0	2	2	1	4	2		1278/1378		4.22	4.29	4.30	3.18
				d open discussion	5	0	1	2	1	3	4		1156/1378		4.46	4.31	4.33	3.64
		chniques succe		a open arseassion	5	9	0	0	0	2	0		****/ 904		3.50			****
1. Were bp	cciui cc	cinitques succe	DDIGI		3		Ü	J	O	_	Ü	1.00	, 501		3.30	1.05	1.05	
		Labora	tory															
2. Were yo	u provid	ed with adequa	te back	ground information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	****
		_																
		Semina	_					_	_	_								
				ividual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did res	earcn pr	ojects contrib	ute to	what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.50	***
		Field	Work															
1. Did fie	ld exper			hat you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
				uation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
,		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,											,					
		Self	Paced															
1. Did sel	f-paced	system contrib	ute to	what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	3.33	***
2. Did stu	dy quest	ions make clea	r the e	xpected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
				_			,											
	Frequ	lency	DIS	tribu	ıtıor	1												
Credits Ea	Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors				
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 1 A 5															0			0
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 1 A 5 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 8						кес	4utr.e	eu ro	or Ma	Jors	S S	3	Graduat	C	0	Majo	)T	U
28-55						Cer	neral	1				7	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non	major	16
56-83 3 2.00-2.99 5 C 2 84-150 3 3.00-3.49 4 D 0						Gel	icra.	L				,	onder -9	rau I	. 0	NOII-	iiia jut	10
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0						וק.	ectiv	700				0	#### -	Meane +	here =	re not	enoug	h
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0						57.0	-C L I \	d C				U	respons				_	11
						O+1	ner					4	respons	L	c bigi	cal		
I 0 Other											-							

Course-Section: PHIL 400 0111 University of Mary Title INDEP STUDY IN PHIL Baltimore Count Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD Spring 2008

I 0

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 4

10

University of Maryland Page 1269
Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

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

							Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did yo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.39	4.31	4.45	5.00
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1666	4.75	4.34	4.27	4.35	5.00
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.41	4.24	4.37	5.00
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1566	4.75	4.23	4.07	4.17	5.00
6. Did wr	itten as:	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.24	4.12	4.26	5.00
7. Was the	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.24	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How man	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.39	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1626	4.75	4.29	4.11	4.28	5.00
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.63	4.46	4.58	5.00	
		in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.84	4.72	4.80	5.00		
				explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.43	4.31	4.43	5.00
		es contribute t			2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.59	4.32	4.43	5.00
		Discus	gion															
1 Did cl	agg digg			what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.04	4.10	4.32	5.00
				ed to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378		4.22	4.29	4.55	5.00
				nd open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1378		4.46	4.31	4.60	5.00
				Frequ	enas	. Diet	-rih	1+ i 01	n									
				riequ	terrey	DIS		10101	.1									
Credits E	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	1			
00-27	A 4		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	 3	0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r or	1			
28-55	2 0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0 0	в 0						J						5 -		
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0						Gei	nera	l				0	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	major	3
84-150 2 3.00-3.49 1 D 0																	-	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0						Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	rh
	P 0															mificant		
			_							F				-				

Other

3

Course-Section: PHIL 400 0601 University of Maryland Title INDEP STUDY IN PHIL Baltimore County Instructor: EALICK, GREG E. Spring 2008

Enrollment: 2

Questionnaires: 2

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1670			4.31	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	622/1666	4.75	4.34	4.27	4.35	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.41	4.24	4.37	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	389/1566	4.75	4.23	4.07	4.17	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.39	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	403/1626	4.75	4.29	4.11	4.28	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.63	4.46	4.58	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.84	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.43	4.31	4.43	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546		4.59	4.32	4.43	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	5.00	4.64	5.00	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 27	5.00	5.00	4.54	5.00	5.00

Page 1270

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

## Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section:	PHIL 405 0401	University of Maryland	Page 1271
Title	HONORS INDEP STUDY-PHI	Baltimore County	AUG 6, 2008
Instructor:	PFEIFER, JESSIC	Spring 2008	Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 1
Questionnaires: 1

_			
Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	cies	3		Instr	uctor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.39	4.31	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.34	4.27	4.35	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.41	4.24	4.37	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.23	4.07	4.17	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.24	4.12	4.26	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.39	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.29	4.11	4.28	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	5.00	4.64	5.00	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 27	5.00	5.00	4.54	5.00	5.00

## Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHIL 445 0101 University of Maryland Title PHILOSOPHY OF LANGUAGE Baltimore County

Baltimore County
Spring 2008

Page 1272 AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: EALICK, GREG E.

Enrollment: 24

Enrollment: 24
Ouestionnaires: 11

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean General 0 0 0 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 4 7 4.64 518/1670 4.64 4.39 4.31 4.45 4.64 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 6 4 4.27 943/1666 4.27 4.34 4.27 4.35 4.27 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 8 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 423/1406 4.67 4.55 4.32 4.48 4.67 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 2 0 0 1 2 6 4.56 499/1615 4.56 4.41 4.24 4.37 4.56 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 0 0 1 9 4.55 369/1566 4.55 4.23 4.07 4.17 4.55 0 2 0 9 4.64 323/1528 4.64 4.24 4.12 4.26 4.64 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 3 8 4.73 298/1650 4.73 4.24 4.22 4.28 4.73 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 11 5.00 1/1667 5.00 4.39 4.67 4.73 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 0 4 4 4.50 403/1626 4.50 4.29 4.11 4.28 4.50 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 1 10 4.91 276/1559 4.91 4.63 4.46 4.58 4.91 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 11 5.00 1/1560 5.00 4.84 4.72 4.80 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 2 9 4.82 284/1549 4.82 4.43 4.31 4.43 4.82 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 11 5.00 1/1546 5.00 4.59 4.32 4.43 5.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 10 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/1323 \*\*\*\* 3.42 4.00 4.10 \*\*\*\* Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 2 1 2 5 4.00 820/1384 4.00 4.04 4.10 4.32 4.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 3 7 4.70 459/1378 4.70 4.22 4.29 4.55 4.70 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 1 9 4.90 281/1378 4.90 4.46 4.31 4.60 4.90 4. Were special techniques successful 1 8 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 \*\*\*\*/ 904 \*\*\*\* 3.50 4.03 4.22 \*\*\*\* Seminar 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 87 \*\*\*\* \*\*\* 4.65 4.80 \*\*\*\* 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 79 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.64 4.60 \*\*\*\* 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 75 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.57 4.56 \*\*\*\* 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 79 \*\*\*\* \*\*\* 4.45 4.53 \*\*\*\* 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\* 80 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 3.97 3.67 \*\*\*\* Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 28 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.64 5.00 \*\*\*\* 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 27 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.54 5.00 \*\*\*\* 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 10 0 0 Frequency Distribution C

Credits E	arned	ned Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5							
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	11	Non-major	3	
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough		
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant.		
				I	0	Other	10					
				2	0							

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Course-Section: PHIL 452 0101 University of Maryland Page 1273 Title ADV TOPICS IN ETHICS AUG 6, 2008 Instructor: FERRY, MICHAEL Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	17
0	1 🗆

Questionnaires: 15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions							Fre	eque	ncies	5		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions General id you gain new insights,skills from this course					NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne			m this course	0	0	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	1128/1670	4.13	4.39	4.31	4.45	4.13
2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	5	4	6		1161/1666	4.07	4.34	4.27	4.35	4.07
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	261/1406	4.80	4.55	4.32	4.48	4.80
		uations reflect			0	6	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	775/1615	4.33	4.41	4.24	4.37	4.33
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	11	4.53	374/1566	4.53	4.23	4.07	4.17	4.53
				o what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	631/1528	4.33	4.24	4.12	4.26	4.33
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	806/1650	4.33	4.24	4.22	4.28	4.33
8. How man	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	5	9	1	3.73	1636/1667	3.73	4.39	4.67	4.73	3.73
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll tead	hing effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	704/1626	4.27	4.29	4.11	4.28	4.27
		Lectur	·e															
1. Were th	he instru	uctor's lecture	_	prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	858/1559	4.53	4.63	4.46	4.58	4.53
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	1		4.93			4.84	4.72	4.80	4.93
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	0	2	11	4.85	257/1549	4.85	4.43	4.31	4.43	4.85
4. Did the	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	1	5	9	4.53	679/1546	4.53	4.59	4.32	4.43	4.53
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	348/1384	4.64	4.04	4.10	4.32	4.64
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	4	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	431/1378	4.73	4.22	4.29	4.55	4.73
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair ar	d open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	375/1378	4.82	4.46	4.31	4.60	4.82
		Semina	ır															
1. Were as	ssigned t	topics relevant	to the	e announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.80	***
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Expected Grades				Pe:	asons	2			Ty	ne			Majors				
							, 											
00-27							quire	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 1		Gei	nera:	1				3	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non-	-major	5
84-150 6 3.00-3.49 2 D 0																		
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0						Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1				_	h
Р 0													respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
I 0							ner					7						

? 0

Course-Section: PHIL 471 0101 University of Maryland Title FREEDOM, DETERMIMISM, RE Baltimore County Spring 2008

Instructor: YALOWITZ, STEVE

Enrollment: 17

Questionnaires: 9 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Questions						Fro	eque: 2	ncies	s 4	5		ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Question	5 			NA				<del>-1</del>		меан	Ralik	меан	Mean	меан	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	w insights,ski		n this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	338/1670	4.78	4.39	4.31	4.45	4.78
_	-	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	415/1666	4.67	4.34	4.27	4.35	4.67
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	205/1406	4.89	4.55	4.32	4.48	4.89
4. Did oth	her evalı	ations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	290/1615	4.75	4.41	4.24	4.37	4.75
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contrib	ute to v	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	210/1566	4.78	4.23	4.07	4.17	4.78
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	504/1528	4.44	4.24	4.12	4.26	4.44
7. Was the	e grading	system clearl	y explai	ined	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	255/1650	4.78	4.24	4.22	4.28	4.78
	-	was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.39	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How wor	uld you 🤉	grade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	308/1626	4.63	4.29	4.11	4.28	4.63
		Lectur																
		ctor's lecture	_	-	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	307/1559		4.63	4.46	4.58	4.89
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	1	8	4.89	647/1560	4.89	4.84	4.72	4.80	4.89
	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly . Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	3	5	4.63	537/1549	4.63	4.43	4.31	4.43	4.63
			_		0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	253/1546	4.89	4.59	4.32	4.43	4.89
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques en	hance yo	our understanding	0	7	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1323	****	3.42	4.00	4.10	****
1 5 1 1		Discus			0	0	0	0	0	2		4 55	200/1204	4 55	4 0 4	4 10	4 20	4 55
				what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3		4.57	,		4.04	4.10	4.32	
		_	_	d to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	6		295/1378	4.86	4.22	4.29	4.55	4.86
3. Dia the	e instruc	ctor encourage	iair and	d open discussion	2	U	U	U	0	0	7	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.46	4.31	4.60	5.00
				Frequ	000	. Dia	- m i b		<b>-</b>									
				rrequ	lency	DIS	LLID	ut10	[]									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Туј	рe			Majors		
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7							ed f	or Ma	aiors	 3	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r r	4
	28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0						1			,	-	•		_	-	5	_	=
56-83						Gei	nera	1				5	Under-q	rad	9	Non-	major	5
84-150												-			-		5	-
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0					Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h	
P 0													respons				_	
	I 0						ner					4			5-			
	I 0 ? 0																	

Page 1274

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

#### Course-Section: PHIL 481 0101 University of Maryland Page 1275 Title ANCIENT PHILOSOPHY Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: HITZ, ZENA 3

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 3

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies				Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course			0	0	0	1	2	4.67	479/1670	4.67	4.39	4.31	4.45	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1452/1666	3.67	4.34	4.27	4.35	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1057/1406	4.00	4.55	4.32	4.48	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1380/1615	3.67	4.41	4.24	4.37	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1566		4.23	4.07	4.17	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	631/1528	4.33	4.24	4.12	4.26	4.33
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	0	0	0	1	1	0	1		1521/1650		4.24	4.22	4.28	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1022/1667	4.67	4.39	4.67	4.73	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.29	4.11	4.28	4.50
<u> </u>														
Lecture			_	•			_							
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	673/1559		4.63	4.46	4.58	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1			1090/1560		4.84	4.72	4.80	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	2		488/1549		4.43	4.31	4.43	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	520/1546	4.67	4.59	4.32	4.43	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.04	4.10	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378		4.22	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378		4.46	4.31	4.60	5.00
	-	-	-	-	_	-	_		, ==					
Frequency Distribution														
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades		Reasons					Type			Majors				

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