Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY

Instructor: THOMAS, JAMES

Enrollment: 43
Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1207 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Questions			NR	NA	Fre	eque:	ncie:	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean	
			 General															
1 Di	d vou	asin ne	ew insights,skills f	rom this gourse	0	0	0	0	0	3	26	4.90	171/1576	4.45	4.40	4.30	4.11	4.90
			ctor make clear the		0	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	61/1576	4.57	4.35	4.27	4.18	4.97
			estions reflect the		0	0	0	0	0	2	27	4.93	125/1342	4.78	4.53	4.32	4.19	4.93
		_	lations reflect the		0	4	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	173/1520	4.44	4.34	4.25	4.09	4.84
5. Di	d assi	gned re	eadings contribute t	o what you learned	0	2	1	1	3	8	14	4.22	678/1465	4.26	4.36	4.12	4.02	4.22
6. Di	d writ	ten ass	signments contribute	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	21	4.66	279/1434	4.27	4.30	4.14	3.94	4.66
7. Wa	s the	grading	g system clearly exp	lained	0	0	0	1	0	4	24	4.76	238/1547	4.61	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.76
			was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	12	17	4.59	1018/1574	4.44	4.46	4.64	4.59	4.59
9. Ho	w woul	.d you g	grade the overall te	aching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1554	4.49	4.34	4.10	4.01	5.00
			Lecture															
			actor's lectures wel		1	0	0	0	0	4	24	4.86	324/1488	4.80	4.56	4.47	4.41	4.86
			ctor seem interested	_	1	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1493		4.82	4.73	4.65	5.00
			terial presented and		1	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	69/1486	4.65	4.43	4.32	4.26	4.96
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding				1 2	0	0	0	1	0	27	4.93	155/1489	4.79	4.56	4.32		4.93
5. Di						16	2	0	0	1	8	4.18	593/1277	4.10	3.75	4.03	3.91	4.18
	Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learned																	
					14	0	0	0	0	_			118/1279		4.31	4.17	3.96	4.93
			nts actively encoura		15	0	0	1	0	1	12	4.71		4.57	4.32	4.35	4.09	4.71 5.00
			ctor encourage fair echniques successful		15 15	0 12	0	0	0	0	14 2	5.00	1/1269 ****/ 878	4.73 4.42	4.49 4.04	4.35	4.09 3.91	5.00 ****
4. We	ere spe	CIAI LE	eciniques successiui		13	12	U	U	U	U	2	5.00	/ 6/6	4.42	4.04	4.05	3.91	
F 7.7.		F	Seminar		2.5	0	0	0	0	0	4	F 00	**** / 27F	F 00	F 00	4 01	2 70	
5. WE	ere cri	iceria i	for grading made cle	ar	25	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 375	5.00	5.00	4.01	3.78	
E 54			Field Work		2.2	0	0	0	0	0	7	F 00	****/ 326		****	4 02	2 (4	***
5. DI	.a coni	erences	s help you carry out	field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	^^^^/ 326	^^^		4.03	3.64	* * * *
F 77-			Self Paced		0.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	F 00	**** / 200		****	4 00	2 06	
5. WE	ere the	ere enou	ugh proctors for all	the students	27	0	U	U	U	0	2	5.00	****/ 382			4.08	3.86	
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credi	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-2	00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 17					Re	quir	ed f	or M	 ajor	s 1	2	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r	0
28-5	55	1	1.00-1.99 1	В 2			-			-						,		
56-8	33	5	2.00-2.99 3	C 0		Ge	nera	1				7	Under-g	rad 2	29	Non-	-major	29
84-1	84-150 6 3.00-3.49 7 D 0																	
Grad	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 8 F 1				El	ecti	ves				3	#### - 1					ſh	
	P 2											respons	es to k	e sign	ifican	ıt		
				I 0		Other					1							
				? 1														

Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY

Instructor: THOMAS, JAMES

Enrollment: 47 Questionnaires: 40 Spring 2009

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 1208 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

Questions N		NA	Fre	equei 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	10	30	4.75	301/1576	4.45	4.40	4.30	4.11	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	34	4.75	208/1576	4.45	4.40	4.30	4.11	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5 7	33	4.82	208/13/6	4.78	4.53	4.27	4.19	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	2	8	26	4.59	406/1520	4.44	4.34	4.25	4.19	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	4	0	6	6	19	4.03	839/1465	4.26	4.36	4.12	4.02	4.03
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	5	6		4.51	390/1434	4.27	4.30	4.14	3.94	4.51
7. Was the grading system clearly explained		0	0	0	1	8	30	4.74	249/1547	4.61	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.74
8. How many times was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	20	19		1103/1574		4.46	4.64	4.59	4.49
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		0	0	0	0	3			104/1554		4.34	4.10	4.01	
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	35	4.90	263/1488	4.80	4.56	4.47	4.41	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject		0	0	0	0	2	36	4.95	334/1493	4.92	4.82	4.73	4.65	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly		0	0	0	0	4	34	4.89	181/1486	4.65	4.43	4.32	4.26	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	0	2	37	4.95	116/1489	4.79	4.56	4.32	4.22	4.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding		22	2	1	1	3	9	4.00	692/1277	4.10	3.75	4.03	3.91	4.00
Discussion	0	_	-	-	_	_			450:					
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1		4.92	- ,	4.51	4.31	4.17	3.96	4.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	234/1270	4.57	4.32	4.35	4.09	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	0	0	0	1		4.92	250/1269	4.73	4.49	4.35	4.09	4.92 ****
4. Were special techniques successful	28	8	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 878	4.42	4.04	4.05	3.91	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	39	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar	2.0	0	0	0	0	-	•	4 00	****	****	****	4 50	4 50	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	0	0	0	0	1 1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39 39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79 ****/ 72	****	****	4.69 4.64	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.43 4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 375	5.00	5.00	4.01	3.78	****
Field Work														
	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4 20	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	39 39	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 48	****	****	4.48	4.20 4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	39	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 326	****	****	4.03	3.64	****
Self Paced														
Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	39 39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	39	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	39	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 382	****	****	4.08	3.86	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students														

Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY

Instructor: THOMAS, JAMES

Enrollment: 47
Questionnaires: 40

Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1208 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	29	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	17	Under-grad	40	Non-major	40
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-			
				?	0						

INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY

Title Instructor: SMITH, AARON

Enrollment: 34 Questionnaires: 21

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1209 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course  2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals  3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals  5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1 1 1 1	0 0 0 0 11	0 0 0 0	2 3 1 1	5 4 1 4	2	8 14 2	3.90 4.55 3.56	1325/1576 1237/1576 531/1342 1346/1520 335/1465	4.45 4.57 4.78 4.44 4.26	4.34	4.30 4.27 4.32 4.25 4.12	4.09	3.80 3.90 4.55 3.56 4.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1 1 1 3	12 2 0 0	0 0 0 0	1 3 0 0	3 1 0 1	2	11 18	4.22 4.90	- , -	4.44	4.30 4.38 4.46 4.34		3.94 4.10 4.59 4.01	4.22 4.90
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared  2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned  5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1 1 1 1	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	2 2 3 2 3	5 0 10 1 3	18 7 17	4.20 4.75	810/1488 810/1493 1003/1486 378/1489 1020/1277	4.80 4.92 4.65 4.79 4.10	4.43 4.56	4.73 4.32 4.32	4.41 4.65 4.26 4.22 3.91	4.80 4.20 4.75
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  4. Were special techniques successful			0 0 0	0 0 1 0	4 3 1 2	2 3 2 3	5 7	4.09 4.18 4.36 3.83	774/1279 860/1270 754/1269 589/ 878	4.57 4.73	4.31 4.32 4.49 4.04	4.17 4.35 4.35 4.05	4.09 4.09	
Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	5.00	4.01	3.78	5.00
Field Work  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  Self Paced	16	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	3.64	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	3.86	****
Frequence Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades	iency	, DIS	crib		n asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27 9 0.00-0.99 0 A 6 28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 12 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 5 C 1			quire		or Ma	jor	 s 1	5 0	Graduate Under-g		0	Majo Non-	r major	0 21
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 3 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 P 0 I 0 ? 0			ectiv her	ves				2	#### - I				_	h

Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY

DIFATE, VICTOR

Instructor:

Enrollment: 38 Questionnaires: 32

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1210 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

## 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		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	8	24	4.75	301/1576	4.45	4.40	4.30	4.11	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	28	4.88	173/1576	4.57	4.35	4.27	4.18	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	28	4.90	179/1342	4.78	4.53	4.32	4.19	4.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	21	0	0	0	1			138/1520	4.44	4.34	4.25	4.09	4.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	9	6	12		1152/1465	4.26	4.36	4.12	4.02	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	25	0	0	0	1	6		****/1434	4.27	4.30	4.14	3.94	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	25	4.75	238/1547	4.61	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	21	4.66	927/1574	4.44	4.46	4.64	4.59	4.66
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	0	9	15	4.63	298/1554	4.49	4.34	4.10	4.01	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5		4.84	355/1488	4.80	4.56	4.47	4.41	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	31	5.00	1/1493	4.92	4.82	4.73	4.65	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6		4.74	352/1486	4.65	4.43	4.32		4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0 2	2	29	4.94	136/1489	4.79	4.56	4.32	4.22	4.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	19	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	309/1277	4.10	3.75	4.03	3.91	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	262/1279	4.51	4.31	4.17	3.96	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	2	2	16	4.70	478/1270	4.57	4.32	4.35	4.09	4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	1	1	2	16	4.65	543/1269	4.73	4.49	4.35		4.65
4. Were special techniques successful	12	12	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 878	4.42	4.04	4.05	3.91	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.43	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	0	0	0	0	1	Τ	4.50	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0 1	2	5.00 4.50	****/ 72 ****/ 80	****	****	4.64 4.61	4.43	****
<ol> <li>Did presentations contribute to what you learned</li> <li>Were criteria for grading made clear</li> </ol>	30 30	0	0	0	0	0	1 2	5.00	****/ 375	5.00	5.00	4.01	4.55 3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	30	U	U	U	U	U	۷	5.00	/ 3/5	5.00	5.00	4.01	3.70	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	3.64	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	3.86	****

Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY

Instructor: DIFATE, VICTOR

Enrollment: 38
Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1210 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	A	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	 17	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	6	C	0	General	8	Under-grad	32	Non-major	32
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 100 0701 University of Maryland Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY Baltimore County Instructor: YALOWITZ, STEVE Spring 2009

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 20

34

University of Maryland Page 1211
Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009
Spring 2009 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		rom this course	0	0	1	3	4	6	6	3.65	1388/1576	4.45	4.40	4.30	4.11	3.65
1 5	or make clear the		0	0	0	1	4	9	6		1138/1576	4.57	4.35	4.27	4.18	4.00
	stions reflect the	=	0	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	531/1342	4.78	4.53	4.32	4.19	4.55
_	tions reflect the		0	2	0	0	5	5	8	4.17	945/1520	4.44	4.34	4.25	4.09	4.17
	dings contribute to	_	0	0	0	2	5	3	10	4.05	824/1465	4.26	4.36	4.12	4.02	4.05
_	-	to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	9	6	4.11	836/1434	4.27	4.30	4.14	3.94	4.11
	system clearly exp	-	0	0	0	0	4	4	12	4.40	690/1547	4.61	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.40
8. How many times wa	as class cancelled		0	0	0	0	1	17	2	4.05	1441/1574	4.44	4.46	4.64	4.59	4.05
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness				1	0	0	6	7	2	3.73	1180/1554	4.49	4.34	4.10	4.01	3.73
Lecture																
1. Were the instruct	tor's lectures well	l prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	547/1488	4.80	4.56	4.47	4.41	4.74
	or seem interested		1	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	947/1493	4.92	4.82	4.73	4.65	4.74
3. Was lecture mate	rial presented and	explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	7	9	4.32	911/1486	4.65	4.43	4.32	4.26	4.32
4. Did the lectures	contribute to what	t you learned	2	0	0	1	2	4	11	4.39	834/1489	4.79	4.56	4.32	4.22	4.39
5. Did audiovisual	techniques enhance	your understanding	3	13	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	****/1277	4.10	3.75	4.03	3.91	****
	Discussion															
1. Did class discus		n what you learned	9	0	0	3	2	2	4	3.64	1011/1279	4.51	4.31	4.17	3.96	3.64
2. Were all students		-	9	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	860/1270	4.57	4.32	4.35	4.09	4.18
3. Did the instructo	_		9	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	686/1269	4.73	4.49	4.35	4.09	4.45
		Frequ	iency	, Dist	trib	utio	n									
_																
Credits Earned				Rea	ason	s			Ty	pe			Majors	;		

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	А	7	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	4	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 100 0801 University of Maryland INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY WILSON, RICHARD

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 19

36

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1212

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

	Ouestionnaire

							Fr	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 1															
1 Did voi	u gain ne	w insights,ski	=	this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	387/1576	4.45	4.40	4.30	4.11	4.68
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	1	16	4.74	301/1576		4.35	4.27	4.18	4.74
		estions reflect			0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	215/1342		4.53	4.32	4.19	4.84
		ations reflect			0	2	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	487/1520	4.44	4.34	4.25	4.09	4.53
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	153/1465	4.26	4.36	4.12	4.02	4.84
6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contr	ibute to	what you learne	d 1	3	0	1	1	1	12	4.60	323/1434	4.27	4.30	4.14	3.94	4.60
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	y explai	ned	0	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	445/1547	4.61	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.58
8. How mar	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	1	13	5	4.21	1353/1574	4.44	4.46	4.64	4.59	4.21
9. How wor	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teach	ning effectivenes	s 5	1	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	449/1554	4.49	4.34	4.10	4.01	4.46
		Lecture	2															
1 Were th	he instru		_	repared	2	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	484/1488	4.80	4.56	4.47	4.41	4.76
					2	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1493		4.82	4.73	4.65	5.00
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clear				2	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	499/1486	4.65	4.43	4.32	4.26	4.65
		es contribute to			2	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	448/1489	4.79	4.56	4.32	4.22	4.71
			_	our understanding	4	-	0	2	1	0	1		****/1277	4.10	3.75	4.03	3.91	****
		-	-	3														
		Discus																
				what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	1	4		445/1279	4.51			3.96	4.50
				d to participate	12	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	582/1270	4.57	4.32	4.35	4.09	4.57
				d open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	332/1269	4.73	4.49	4.35	4.09	4.86
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succes	ssful		12	5	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 878	4.42	4.04	4.05	3.91	****
				Fre	quency	/ Dis	trib	ution	า									
					1													
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grade	S			Rea	ason	s			Ty	pe			Majors	}
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Re	quir	ed fo	or M	 ajor	s 1	.0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В 8			-			_						,		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 1		Ge	nera	1				4	Under-g	rad 1	9	Non-	-major	19
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D 0													-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		El	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ſh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot	her					1						
				? 0														

Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY

Instructor: PFEIFER, JESSIC

Enrollment:

41 Questionnaires: 30 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1213 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Question	S		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Ranl	2		Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	 1																
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	w insights,ski	lls from	m this course	2	0	0	1	2	4	21	4.61	500/15	576	4.45	4.40	4.30	4.11	4.61
2. Did th	ne instruc	tor make clear	the exp	pected goals	2	0	0	0	2	4	22	4.71	324/15	576	4.57	4.35	4.27	4.18	4.71
3. Did th	ne exam qu	estions reflec	t the ex	xpected goals	2	0	0	0	0	4	24	4.86	209/13	342	4.78	4.53	4.32	4.19	4.86
		ations reflect			2	14	1	0	0	3	10	4.50	511/15		4.44	4.34	4.25	4.09	4.50
				what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	5	19	4.43			4.26	4.36	4.12	4.02	4.43
				what you learned	2	16	1	1	0	5	5	4.00			4.27	4.30	4.14	3.94	4.00
		system clearl		ined	2	0	0	0	1	4	23	4.79	207/15		4.61	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.79
	-	was class canc		-1	2	0 1	0	0	0 2	23	5		1379/15		4.44	4.46	4.64	4.59	4.18
9. HOW WO	oura you g	rade the overa	II teacr	ning effectiveness	7	1	U	0	2	6	14	4.55	363/15	554	4.49	4.34	4.10	4.01	4.55
		Lectur																	
		ctor's lecture			1	0	0	0	0	2	27		173/14		4.80	4.56	4.47	4.41	4.93
		tor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	223/14		4.92	4.82	4.73	4.65	4.97
				xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	24	4.79	284/14		4.65	4.43	4.32	4.26	4.79
		s contribute t			2	0 2	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	205/14		4.79	4.56	4.32		4.89
5. Did at	udlovisuai	tecnniques en	nance yo	our understanding	3	2	U	1	3	8	13	4.32	472/12	2//	4.10	3.75	4.03	3.91	4.32
		Discus	sion																
				what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	296/12	279	4.51	4.31	4.17	3.96	4.71
				d to participate	16	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	,		4.57	4.32	4.35	4.09	4.71
		_		d open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	2		4.86	332/12		4.73	4.49	4.35	4.09	4.86
4. Were s	special te	chniques succe	sstul		16	8	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	****/ {	378	4.42	4.04	4.05	3.91	***
		Labora	tory																
2. Were	you provid	ed with adequa	te backo	ground information	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 2	240	****	****	4.35	4.29	***
		Semina	r																
1. Were a	assigned t	opics relevant	to the	announced theme	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	85	****	****	4.72	4.52	****
		Field	Work																
3. Was th	ne instruc	tor available		sultation	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****
		Self																	
	_	-		what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did st	tudy quest	ions make clea	r the ex	xpected goal	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	24	****	****	4.83	4.71	***
				Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	ution	ı										
G		G GD3		Developed Consider				D						m				36 - d	
Credits I	≝arneα 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons	3 				Тур	pe 			Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A 17		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s 1	6	Gradı	ıate	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В 7			_					_							0.5
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C 0		Gei	nera.	T				5	Under	r-gı	rad 3	30	Non-	major	30
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D 0								1	шппп		/aar = '	· la a se -			.la
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				1			Means tes to b			_	11
				I 0		∩+1	her					3	respo	וניניניניניניניניניניניניניניניניניניני	a LU L	e sign	ıııcdı	ıc	
				± 0		ULI						J							

? 0

Course-Section: PHIL 146 0101 University of Maryland Title CRITICAL THINKING

Baltimore County

Instructor: TEMPLETON, ROYE

Enrollment: 40 Questionnaires: 17 Spring 2009

Page 1214 JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Ctudent	Course	Fraluation	Ouestionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestronnarie

Questions				Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 5 1		Genera		. 1 .	•	0	-	0	-	0	_	2 00	1200/1556	2 60	4 40	4 20	4 11	2 00
_	_	v insights,ski			0	0	1 0	2	1 5	8	5 2		1308/1576		4.40	4.30	4.11	3.82
		or make clear	_		_	-	-	2	_	8	7		1372/1576		4.35	4.27	4.18	3.59
	_	estions reflec		_	0	0	0 1	1 1	5 2	4 1	1	4.00	972/1342			4.32	4.19 4.09	4.00
		ations reflect		what you learned		11 0	1	3	4	6	3		1466/1520 1287/1465		4.34	4.25	4.09	3.41
	_			_	0	14	0	0	1	1	1		****/1434		4.30	4.12		3.41 ****
		system clearl		o what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	13						3.94	
		vas class canc		Inea	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.59	434/1547		4.38	4.19	4.10	4.59
				EE	4	0	1	2	6	0	11	4.65	942/1574		4.46	4.64	4.59	4.65
9. HOW WO	uia you gi	rade the overa	II teaci	hing effectiveness	4	U	Т	2	ь	4	U	3.00	1448/1554	3.03	4.34	4.10	4.01	3.00
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instruc	ctor's lecture	s well ;	prepared	0	0	0	0	5	5	7	4.12	1197/1488	4.08	4.56	4.47	4.41	4.12
		or seem inter			0	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	1340/1493	4.15	4.82	4.73	4.65	4.29
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	4	5	6	2	3.35	1371/1486	3.44	4.43	4.32	4.26	3.35
		contribute t			0	0	3	4	4	2	4	3.00	1415/1489		4.56	4.32	4.22	3.00
				our understanding	0	2	5	2	5	3			1248/1277			4.03		
		4	2		_	_	_	_	-	_								
		Discus																
				what you learned	4	0	2	4	6	0	1	2.54	1246/1279	2.43	4.31	4.17	3.96	2.54
2. Were a	ll student	ts actively en	courage	d to participate	4	0	7	3	2	1	0	1.77	1267/1270	1.83	4.32	4.35	4.09	1.77
				d open discussion	4	0	6	3	1	3	0	2.08	1258/1269	1.99	4.49	4.35	4.09	2.08
4. Were s	pecial ted	chniques succe	ssful		4	11	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 878	****	4.04	4.05	3.91	****
		Labora	torv															
2. Were v	ou provide		-	ground information	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****
2	ou provide	ou wrom adogad	oc baon;	9104114 111101401011		Ü	ŭ	ŭ	_	Ü	Ü	3.00	, 210			1.55	1127	
		Field	Work															
				hat you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you	u clearly	understand yo	ur evalı	uation criteria	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	***	****	4.40	4.11	****
1 Did as	lf paged of	Self		what was laamad	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	****	1 60	1 11	****
				what you learned	16 16	0	0	1	0	0	0		/ 10	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
2. Dia sti	uay questi	ions make clea	r the ex	xpected goal	Τ6	U	U	1	U	U	U	2.00	****/ 24	* * * *	^ ^ ^ ^	4.83	4.71	
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
a 11. =								_					_					
Credits E	arneα 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту 	pe 			Majors 	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A 1		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s 1	.0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	В 6						J								
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C 6		Ger	nera:	1				3	Under-g	rad 1	.7	Non-	-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D 0									3	-			5	
				F 0		E16	ecti	ves				2	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
P 0												•	respons				_	, -
I O						O+1	her					1	Loppond	_~ r				
				<u>.</u> 0		0.01						-						

? 2

Course-Section: PHIL 146 0201 University of Maryland Title CRITICAL THINKING TEMPLETON, ROYE

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Instructor:	TEMP
Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	23

Page 1215 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

		Questions		NR	NA	Fr 1	eque: 2	ncie:	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General															
1. Did vo	u gain ne		s from this course	0	0	4	0	6	5	8	3.57	1424/1576	3.69	4.40	4.30	4.11	3.57
			ne expected goals	0	0	1	4	3	9	6		1349/1576		4.35	4.27	4.18	3.65
			the expected goals	0	1	2	0	2	6	12	4.18	886/1342	4.09	4.53	4.32	4.19	4.18
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect th	ne expected goals	0	13	3	1	2	2	2	2.90	1489/1520	2.95	4.34	4.25	4.09	2.90
			e to what you learned	0	2	1	3	6	5	6	3.57	1218/1465	3.49	4.36	4.12	4.02	3.57
			ute to what you learned	1	18	1	0	2	1	0		****/1434		4.30	4.14	3.94	****
		g system clearly e		1	0	1	0	2	2	17	4.55			4.38	4.19	4.10	4.55
		was class cancel		1	0	1	0	4	15	2		1538/1574		4.46	4.64	4.59	3.77
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overall	teaching effectiveness	6	1	3	1	5	6	1	3.06	1437/1554	3.03	4.34	4.10	4.01	3.06
		Lecture															
		actor's lectures w		0	0	2	1	5	1	14		1221/1488		4.56	4.47	4.41	4.04
			ted in the subject	0	0	3	1	2	4	13		1411/1493		4.82	4.73	4.65	4.00
			and explained clearly	0	0	3	1	8	3	8		1325/1486		4.43	4.32	4.26	3.52
	id the lectures contribute to what you learned id audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi				0	4	4	4	4	7		1379/1489		4.56	4.32	4.22	3.26
Did au	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi				0	6	4	6	6	1	2.65	1221/1277	2.53	3.75	4.03	3.91	2.65
		Discussion	<del></del>														
			e to what you learned	4	0	9	3	1	4	2		1265/1279		4.31	4.17	3.96	2.32
			uraged to participate	4	0	9	5	4	0			1266/1270		4.32	4.35	4.09	1.89
3. Did th	e instruc	ctor encourage fa	ir and open discussion	4	0	10	5	1	2	1	1.89	1266/1269	1.99	4.49	4.35	4.09	1.89
		Field Wor	= = =														
		ctor available for		22	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 44		****	4.73	4.71	****
	_	-	s your evaluations	22	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 45		****	4.57	4.72	***
5. Did co	nferences	s help you carry o	out field activities	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	3.64	****
		Self Pac															
			e to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	, 10		****	4.60	4.44	***
. Were y	our conta	acts with the inst	tructor helpful	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	***
			Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	strib	utio:	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	ason	S			Ту	ре			Majors	;
		0 00 0 00												·			
00-27	4		D A 3		Re	equir	ea I	שני אנ	ajor	s I	4	Graduat	е	0	Majo	)r.	1
28-55	4		D B 12 2 C 3		α.	enera	1				Е	IIndor -	d C	12	Morr	mo i o	22
56-83 84-150	1 2		2 C 3 9 D 1		G	enera	Т				5	Under-g	rau 2	23	non-	-major	22
64-150 Grad.	0		9 D I 4 F O		₽.	lecti	1700				0	#### -	Meane +	here -	re not	enous	rh
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	+ r 0 P 2		r.	TGCCT	veb				U	respons				_	111
I 0				O:	ther					4	respons	LO LO L	DIGI DIGI	ııı ıCal	10		
			? 2		U	CIICI					<u> </u>						
			; 4														

Title CONTEMPORARY MORAL ISS

Instructor: EALICK, GREG E.

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2009

Page 1216 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	Λ	0	Λ	0	3	4	9	4.38	818/1576	4.23	4.40	4.30	4.11	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	4	ρ		1100/1576	3.89	4.35	4.27	4.18	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	797/1342	3.92	4.53	4.32	4.19	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	5	6		1185/1520	3.99	4.34	4.25	4.09	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	10	4.38	537/1465	4.20	4.36	4.12	4.02	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	486/1434	4.16	4.30	4.14	3.94	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	3	2	8	4.36	737/1547	3.89	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1574	4.98	4.46	4.64	4.59	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	692/1554	3.94	4.34	4.10	4.01	4.27
J. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	J	U	U	U	2	-	J	1.2/	092/1334	3.71	1.31	4.10	1.01	1.2/
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	0	0	12	4.33	1048/1488	4.09	4.56	4.47	4.41	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	658/1493	4.86	4.82	4.73	4.65	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	1	3	9	4.27	951/1486	3.93	4.43	4.32	4.26	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	240/1489	4.55	4.56	4.32	4.22	4.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	10	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1020/1277	3.50	3.75	4.03	3.91	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	0	13	4.50	445/1279	4.16	4.31	4.17	3.96	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	3	1	12	4.56	589/1270	4.14	4.32	4.35	4.09	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	1	0	0	14	4.56	608/1269	4.57	4.49	4.35	4.09	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	0	11	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	464/ 878	3.76	4.04	4.05	3.91	4.00
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	3.86	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors					
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0				
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	7										
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	С	0	General	3	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16				
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0										
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h				
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant					
				I	0	Other	2	_							
				2	0										

Title CONTEMPORARY MORAL ISS

Instructor: EALICK, GREG E.

Enrollment: 22

Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1217 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncies	5		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	0	3	8	7	4.22	988/1576	4.23	4.40	4.30	4.11	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	10	4.28	920/1576		4.35	4.27	4.18	4.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	683/1342		4.53	4.32	4.19	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	3	9	4.24	880/1520		4.34	4.25	4.09	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	4	9	4.06	824/1465	4.20	4.36	4.12	4.02	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	4	8	4.06	857/1434	4.16	4.30	4.14	3.94	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	4	8	4.06	1006/1547		4.38	4.19	4.10	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1574	4.98	4.46	4.64	4.59	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	3	6	6	4.06	892/1554	3.94	4.34	4.10	4.01	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	666/1488	4.09	4.56	4.47	4.41	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1493	4.86	4.82	4.73	4.65	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	841/1486	3.93	4.43	4.32	4.26	4.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	420/1489	4.55	4.56	4.32	4.22	4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	14	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/1277	3.50	3.75	4.03	3.91	***
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	4	2	7	3.93	869/1279	4.16	4.31	4.17	3.96	3.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	2	3	3	6	3.73	1062/1270	4.14	4.32	4.35	4.09	3.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	386/1269	4.57	4.49	4.35		4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	2	1	3	2	1	2.89	828/ 878				3.91	2.89
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	***	****	4.69	4.52	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	***	4.61	4.55	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	3.86	****
7		- Di	1		_									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В 3	L4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				Р	0			responses to	be sid	nificant	
				I	0	Other	3	-	-	-	

? 0

Course-Section: PHIL 150 0103 University of Maryland Title CONTEMPORARY MORAL ISS

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1218

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 19

EALICK, GREG E.

Questionnaires: 10

Instructor:

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

								_	ncies	3			tructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 I															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,skil	_	this course	0	0	0	0	0	9	1	4.10	1089/1576	4.23	4.40	4.30	4.11	4.10
		ctor make clear			0	0	1	0	2	6	1		1368/1576		4.35	4.27	4.18	3.60
		uestions reflect			0	4	1	0	1	3	1		1209/1342		4.53	4.32	4.19	3.50
	_	uations reflect		_	0	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	1041/1520	3.99	4.34	4.25	4.09	4.00
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contribu	ıte to v	hat you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	708/1465	4.20	4.36	4.12	4.02	4.20
				what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	625/1434	4.16	4.30	4.14	3.94	4.30
7. Was th	he grading	g system clearly	/ explai	ned	0	0	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	1041/1547	3.89	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.00
8. How ma	any times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1574	4.98	4.46	4.64	4.59	5.00
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	5	1	3.78	1152/1554	3.94	4.34	4.10	4.01	3.78
		T	_															
1	Lecture Were the instructor's lectures well prepared					0	0	1	_	2	^	2 20	1422/1400	4 00	4 56	4 47	4 41	2 00
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject		_	0	0	0	1	6	3			1433/1488			4.47		3.20	
	<del>-</del>		_	0	0	0	0	0	2			810/1493		4.82	4.73		4.80	
	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly . Did the lectures contribute to what you learned				0	0	0	3 0	4 2	1 2			1392/1486		4.43	4.32		3.20 4.40
				our understanding	0 1	-	0	1	0	0			813/1489 ****/1277			4.32	4.22	
5. DIG at	udiovisua.	r techniques em	lance yo	our understanding	Т	8	U	Τ	U	U	U	2.00	~~~/12//	3.50	3.75	4.03	3.91	
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass discu	ussions contribu	ite to v	hat you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	219/1279	4.16	4.31	4.17	3.96	4.80
2. Were a	all studer	nts actively end	couraged	l to participate	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	478/1270	4.14	4.32	4.35	4.09	4.70
3. Did th	he instruc	ctor encourage i	fair and	l open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	278/1269	4.57	4.49	4.35	4.09	4.90
4. Were s	special te	echniques succes	ssful		0	5	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	283/ 878	3.76	4.04	4.05	3.91	4.40
				Frequ	ency	7 Dist	tribı	ıtio	n									
				1														
Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	Reasons Type								Majors	1				
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Red	 auire	ed f	or Ma	aior	 s	8	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 5								-		-	-	) •		-
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 2		Ger	nera:	L				1	Under-g	rad 1	.0	Non-	major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0									5				3	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enou	h
				P 0									respons				_	
				I 0		Oth	her					1	-		5			
	? 1																	

Course-Section: PHIL 150 0104 Title

CONTEMPORARY MORAL ISS

Instructor: EALICK, GREG E.

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 13

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1219 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	<u> </u>					Instructor		Course Dept				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	2	6	5	4.23	976/1576	4.23	4.40	4.30	4.11	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	3	4	3.62	1364/1576	3.89	4.35	4.27	4.18	3.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	2	1	2	3	3.44	1233/1342	3.92	4.53	4.32	4.19	3.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	1	7	3.85	1205/1520	3.99	4.34	4.25	4.09	3.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	738/1465	4.20	4.36	4.12	4.02	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	3	6	3.85	1039/1434	4.16	4.30	4.14	3.94	3.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	3	0	1	5	3.17	1432/1547	3.89	4.38	4.19	4.10	3.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	375/1574	4.98	4.46	4.64	4.59	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1227/1554	3.94	4.34	4.10	4.01	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	1	3	7	4.15	1176/1488	4.09	4.56	4.47	4.41	4.15
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	888/1493	4.86	4.82	4.73	4.65	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	2	4	5	3.85	1218/1486	3.93	4.43	4.32	4.26	3.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	969/1489	4.55	4.56	4.32	4.22	4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1277	3.50	3.75	4.03	3.91	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	1	3	4	3.42	1101/1279	4.16	4.31	4.17	3.96	3.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	4	2	4	3.58	1119/1270	4.14	4.32	4.35	4.09	3.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	2	4	5	4.00	928/1269	4.57	4.49	4.35	4.09	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	9	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 878	3.76	4.04	4.05	3.91	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	3	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Title INTRO TO MORAL THEORY

Instructor: SENG, PHILLIP

Enrollment: 34

Questionnaires: 23

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1220 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Fre			Frequencies			Instructor		Course	Dept.	UMBC.	Level	Sect	
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
******														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	227/1576	4.77	4.40	4.30	4.11	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	208/1576	4.79	4.35	4.27	4.18	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	161/1342	4.87	4.53	4.32	4.19	4.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	4	16	4.43	631/1520	4.70	4.34	4.25	4.09	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	21	4.87	143/1465	4.49	4.36	4.12	4.02	4.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	4	1	16	4.26	670/1434	4.47	4.30	4.14	3.94	4.26
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	179/1547	4.69	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	17	6	4.26	1317/1574	4.31	4.46	4.64	4.59	4.26
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	180/1554	4.83	4.34	4.10	4.01	4.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	124/1488	4.93	4.56	4.47	4.41	4.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1493	4.97	4.82	4.73	4.65	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	261/1486	4.88	4.43	4.32	4.26	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	97/1489	4.89	4.56	4.32	4.22	4.96
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	15	2	2	1	1	2	2.88	1196/1277	3.92	3.75	4.03	3.91	2.88
Discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	1.0	4 70	026/1070	176	1 21	1 17	2 06	4 70
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0			1	2	16	4.79	236/1279	4.76	4.31	4.17	3.96	4.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4 4	0	0	1 0	0	2	16 17	4.74	435/1270 288/1269	4.78 4.89	4.32 4.49	4.35 4.35	4.09 4.09	4.74 4.89
	4	12	0	1	1	2			464/ 878					
4. Were special techniques successful	4	12	U	1	1	2	3	4.00	404/ 8/8	4.06	4.04	4.05	3.91	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	3.78	****
11 ··· 1														
Field Work	00	0	0	0	1	^	0	2 00	****			4 40	4 00	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48 ****/ 44	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	1	0	0		,	****		4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	1 1	0	0		****/ 45 ****/ 326	****	****	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	U	U	U	1	U	U	3.00	^^^^/ 326			4.03	3.64	* * * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 382	****	****	4.08	3.86	****
<u> </u>														

Title INTRO TO MORAL THEORY

Instructor: SENG, PHILLIP

Enrollment: 34
Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1220 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	Credits Earned Cum. GP.			Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	А	8	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	11							
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23	
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h	
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	3	-				
				?	0							

Course-Section: PHIL 152 0201 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County INTRO TO MORAL THEORY Instructor: DIFATE, VICTOR

JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

1

Page 1221

Enrollment:	40		-
Questionnaires:	33	Student Course	Evaluation Questionnaire

I

?

0

1

		0			<b>1</b> TD	373		equer			-		ructor	Course	_		Level	
		Question	s 		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	- lls fro	m this course	1	0	0	0	0	7	25	4.78	266/1576	4.77	4.40	4.30	4.11	4.78
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	1	3	28	4.84	194/1576	4.79	4.35	4.27	4.18	4.84
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	27	4.79	263/1342	4.87	4.53	4.32	4.19	4.79
4. Did ot	ther eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	8	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	197/1520	4.70	4.34	4.25	4.09	4.80
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	9	20	4.50	366/1465	4.49	4.36	4.12	4.02	4.50
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	12	0	0	3	2	16	4.62	314/1434	4.47	4.30	4.14	3.94	4.62
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	3	6	24	4.64	375/1547	4.69	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.64
8. How ma	any times	was class cand	elled		0	1	0	0	1	17	14	4.41	1202/1574	4.31	4.46	4.64	4.59	4.41
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	8	19	4.70	229/1554	4.83	4.34	4.10	4.01	4.70
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	29	4.91	248/1488	4.93	4.56	4.47	4.41	4.91
2. Did th	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	1	31	4.97	223/1493	4.97	4.82	4.73	4.65	4.97
3. Was le	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	0	1	2	28	4.87	201/1486	4.88	4.43	4.32	4.26	4.87
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	29	4.88	228/1489	4.89	4.56	4.32	4.22	4.88
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	5	0	1	4	6	16	4.37	429/1277	3.92	3.75	4.03	3.91	4.37
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	296/1279	4.76	4.31	4.17	3.96	4.72
2. Were a	all stude:	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	8	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	355/1270	4.78	4.32	4.35	4.09	4.80
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	432/1269	4.89	4.49	4.35	4.09	4.76
4. Were s	special t	echniques succe	ssful		8	8	0	1	5	2	9	4.12	440/ 878	4.06	4.04	4.05	3.91	4.12
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	ı									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Ty	pe			Majors	;
													<u>.</u> 					
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A 20		Red	quir	ed fo	or M	ajor	s 1	.5	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B 2		_						_	1	, .				
56-83						Gei	nera	L				5	Under-g	rad 3	3	Non-	-major	33
	84-150 0 3.00-3.49 6 D 1											•						
Grad.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0					Electives 3 #### - Means there are					_	ıh						
	P 0											_	respons	es to b	e sign	nificant		

Other

Course-Section: PHIL 152 0301 University of Maryland Title INTRO TO MORAL THEORY THOMAS, JAMES

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1222

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 48 Questionnaires: 39

Instructor:

Ctudent	('Ollivea	Evaluation	Olipetion	naira

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	cructor	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	0	5	33	4.79	254/1576	4.77	4.40	4.30	4.11	4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	3	34	4.84	194/1576	4.79	4.35	4.27	4.18	4.84
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	35	4.92	143/1342	4.87	4.53	4.32	4.19	4.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	0	1	5	29	4.80	197/1520	4.70	4.34	4.25	4.09	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	9	2	1	3	4	18	4.25	647/1465	4.49	4.36	4.12	4.02	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	7	27	4.61	323/1434	4.47	4.30	4.14	3.94	4.61
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	5	29	4.66	351/1547	4.69	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.66
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	22	15	4.41	1202/1574	4.31	4.46	4.64	4.59	4.41
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	2	31	4.94	81/1554	4.83	4.34	4.10	4.01	4.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	35	4.97	75/1488	4.93	4.56	4.47	4.41	4.97
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	34	4.94	334/1493	4.97	4.82	4.73	4.65	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	2	33	4.94	103/1486	4.88	4.43	4.32	4.26	4.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	34	4.94	116/1489	4.89	4.56	4.32	4.22	4.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	10	2	3	4	3	13	3.88	812/1277	3.92	3.75	4.03	3.91	3.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2.4	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1279	4.76	4.31	4.17	3.96	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1270	4.78	4.32	4.35	4.09	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1269	4.89	4.49	4.35	4.09	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	24	7	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	****/ 878	4.06	4.04	4.05	3.91	****

Credits	Earned	arned Cum. GPA			d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	 А	28	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	0	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0							
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	11	Under-grad	39	Non-major	39	
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	6	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	1	Electives	5	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı	
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	2					
				?	2							

Course-Section: PHIL 152 0501 University of Maryland Title INTRO TO MORAL THEORY

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Instructor: SENG, PHILLIP Enrollment: 38

Questionnaires: 29

Page 1223 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Evaluation	

			Fre	equer	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	1	0	Λ	Λ	2	_	20	4.61	500/1576	4.77	4.40	4.30	4.11	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	Ω	18	4.54	568/1576	4.79	4.35	4.27	4.18	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	21	4.71	345/1342	4.87	4.53	4.32	4.19	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	0	2	6	16	4.58	418/1520	4.70	4.34	4.25	4.19	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	7.0	4.75	206/1465	4.49	4.36	4.12	4.02	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	5	5	17	4.32	604/1434	4.47	4.30	4.14	3.94	4.32
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	1	2	22	4.61	411/1547	4.69	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	4	16	8		1398/1574	4.31	4.46	4.19	4.59	4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	_ <del>1</del>	10	17	4.77	180/1554		4.34	4.10	4.01	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	O		U	U	U	5	Ι/	4.//	100/1554	4.03	4.34	4.10	4.01	4.//
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	23	4.85	324/1488	4.93	4.56	4.47	4.41	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	445/1493	4.97	4.82	4.73	4.65	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	6	21	4.78	311/1486	4.88	4.43	4.32	4.26	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	5	20	4.67	500/1489	4.89	4.56	4.32	4.22	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	16	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	593/1277	3.92	3.75	4.03	3.91	4.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	381/1279	4.76	4.31	4.17	3.96	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	612/1270	4.78	4.32	4.35	4.09	4.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion			0	0	0	3	12	4.80	386/1269	4.89	4.49	4.35	4.09	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	14	10	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/ 878	4.06	4.04	4.05	3.91	****

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	А	13	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	2	
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	7							
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	6	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	29	Non-major	27	
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	1					
				?	0							

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

THOMAS, JAMES

Instructor:

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1224

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 43 Questionnaires: 36 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Questions						Fre	equer 2		s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	 .1															
1 Did v	zou gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	32	4.86	195/1576	4.77	4.40	4.30	4.11	4.86
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	3	33	4.92	136/1576	4.79	4.35	4.27	4.18	4.92
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	0	36	5.00	1/1342	4.87	4.53	4.32	4.19	5.00
		uations reflect			0	1	0	0	1	2	32	4.89	149/1520	4.70	4.34	4.25	4.09	4.89
				what you learned	0	6	1	3	3	8	15	4.10	798/1465	4.49	4.36	4.12	4.02	4.10
6. Did w	ritten ass	signments contr	ribute t	o what you learned	0	2	0	0	4	8	22	4.53	383/1434	4.47	4.30	4.14	3.94	4.53
7. Was t	he grading	g system clearl	ly expla	ined	0	0	1	0	0	5	30	4.75	238/1547	4.69	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.75
8. How m	many times	was class cand	celled		0	0	0	0	0	24	12	4.33	1262/1574	4.31	4.46	4.64	4.59	4.33
9. How w	ould you	grade the overa	all tead	thing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	33	4.97	35/1554	4.83	4.34	4.10	4.01	4.97
		Lectur	re															
1. Were	the instru	uctor's lecture	es well	prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	33	4.97	75/1488	4.93	4.56	4.47	4.41	4.97
2. Did t	he instru	ctor seem inter	rested i	n the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	34	5.00	1/1493	4.97	4.82	4.73	4.65	5.00
3. Was 1	ecture mat	terial presente	ed and e	explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	33	4.97	52/1486	4.88	4.43	4.32	4.26	4.97
		es contribute t			2	0	0	0	0	0	34	5.00	1/1489	4.89	4.56	4.32	4.22	5.00
5. Did a	udiovisua	l techniques er	nhance y	our understanding	3	15	0	1	4	2	11	4.28	515/1277	3.92	3.75	4.03	3.91	4.28
		Discus	ssion															
1. Did c	class disc	ussions contrib	oute to	what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	312/1279	4.76	4.31	4.17	3.96	4.69
2. Were	all studer	nts actively er	ncourage	ed to participate	23	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	317/1270	4.78	4.32	4.35	4.09	4.85
3. Did t	he instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	d open discussion	23	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1269	4.89	4.49	4.35	4.09	5.00
4. Were	special to	echniques succe	essful		23	9	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 878	4.06	4.04	4.05	3.91	****
		Semina	ar															
5. Were	criteria 1	for grading mad	de clear		35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	3.78	****
				Frequ	ıency	/ Dist	trib	ution	ı									
Credits	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Ту	oe			Majors	}			
00-27 28-55	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 23 B 4		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s 1	8	Graduat	9	0	Majo	or	0
28-55 56-83	1 5	1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99	0 0	B 4 C 0		C.	nera	1				9	Under-g	, d	6	N	mo i o	36
84-150	5 11	3.00-3.49	13	D 0		Gei	nera.	т				)	onder-g.	Lau 3	U	NOI1-	-major	30
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	Б 0		בום	ecti	760				1	#### - 1	Meane +	here a	re not	enous	rh
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	10	P 0		11.1	CCLI	v CD				_	respons					111
				I O		O+1	her					2	T CPPOIIS		c bigi	LILICAL		
				? 2		001						_						
				·														

Course-Section: PHIL 251 0101 University of Maryland Title ETH ISS SCI ENG&INF TE Baltimore County Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 10

35

JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Page 1225

		Ouestionnaire	

	Ouestions								ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	_			
		Question	S		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		om this course	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	1019/1576	4.27	4.40	4.30	4.35	4.20
_	_	ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	968/1576		4.35	4.27	4.32	4.22
		uestions reflec		1 3	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	879/1342		4.53	4.32	4.41	4.20
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	805/1520	4.48	4.34	4.25	4.26	4.30
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	3	5	4.00	850/1465	4.14	4.36	4.12	4.09	4.00
6. Did wr	itten as:	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	716/1434	4.34	4.30	4.14	4.06	4.22
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1145/1547	4.05	4.38	4.19	4.22	3.90
8. How max	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	665/1574	4.73	4.46	4.64	4.62	4.80
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	504/1554	4.51	4.34	4.10	4.05	4.43
		Lectur	e															
1. Were ti	he instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	945/1488	4.42	4.56	4.47	4.44	4.44
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89			4.82	4.73	4.75	4.89
				explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	468/1486		4.43	4.32	4.29	4.67
					1	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	,			4.32		4.56
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understan						1	0	3	2	2		1020/1277		3.75	4.03		3.50
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc			what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.31	4.17	4.14	5.00
				ed to participate	7		0	0	0	0	3		,		4.32	4.35	4.30	5.00
				nd open discussion	7		0	0	0	0	3		1/1269		4.49	4.35	4.29	5.00
		echniques succe			7	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/ 878		4.04	4.05		5.00
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arnod	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				D.O.	asons	,			Ty	no			Majors	,
Expected Grand Expected Grand										<i>-</i>			ту					, 
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	5	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В 3														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Ge	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	.0	Non-	major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### -				_	gh
				Р 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot:	her					6						

Course-Section: PHIL 251 0102 University of Maryland Title ETH ISS SCI ENG&INF TE

WILSON, RICHARD

Instructor:

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1226

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 34 Questionnaires: 30 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Questions						Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC.	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 54		General	-	+10 -1	0	0	1	1	2	9	17	4 22	061/1576	4 07	4 40	4 20	4 25	4 22
		ew insights,skil ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	2	8	17 20	4.33	861/1576 528/1576	4.27 4.39	4.40	4.30	4.35	4.33
		uestions reflect		1 5	0	1	0	0	3	o 5	21	4.62	455/1342	4.41	4.53	4.32	4.41	4.62
		uations reflect			0	1	0	0	2	6	21	4.66	348/1520	4.48	4.34	4.25	4.26	4.66
				what you learned	2	6	0	2	2	6	12	4.27	626/1465	4.14	4.36	4.12	4.09	4.2
				to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	7	19	4.47	448/1434	4.34	4.30	4.14	4.06	4.4
		g system clearly		-	0	1	1	0	5	9	14	4.21	-, -	4.05	4.38	4.19	4.22	4.2
		was class cance		illea	1	0	0	0	0	10	19	4.66	927/1574	4.73	4.46	4.64	4.62	4.6
	-			hing effectiveness	8	0	0	1	0	6	15	4.59	323/1554		4.34	4.10	4.05	4.5
. 110W WO	ara you	grade ene overdr	.i ccac	airing cricocrychebb	O	Ü	Ü	_	J	Ü	13	1.35	323, 1331	1.51	1.51	1.10	1.03	1.5
		Lecture																
		uctor's lectures			2	0	0	0	3	11	14		1002/1488	4.42	4.56	4.47	4.44	4.3
		ctor seem intere		_	3	0	0	0	1	3	23	4.81	784/1493	4.85	4.82	4.73	4.75	4.8
		-		explained clearly	2	0	0	1	4	7	16	4.36	871/1486	4.51	4.43	4.32	4.29	4.3
		es contribute to		-	2	0	0	1	3	8	16	4.39	823/1489	4.47	4.56	4.32	4.31	4.3
. Did au	diovisua	l techniques enh	ance y	our understanding	3	3	2	1	3	7	11	4.00	692/1277	3.75	3.75	4.03	4.01	4.0
		Discuss	sion															
l. Did cla	ass disc			what you learned	25	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	****/1279	5.00	4.31	4.17	4.14	***
				ed to participate	25	0	0	0	1	1	3		****/1270	5.00	4.32	4.35	4.30	***
				nd open discussion	25	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1269	5.00	4.49	4.35	4.29	***
		echniques succes		-	25	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 878	5.00	4.04	4.05	3.92	***
		Seminar																
1 Were a	agianed :			announced theme	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.78	***
				lividual attention	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.72	***
				what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.83	***
		ons contribute t			29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00		****	****	4.61	4.80	***
		for grading made			29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	4.21	***
				E		- D	la-		_									
				Frequ	ency	DIS	CLID	ucio	11									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ty	pe			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 20		Re	guir	ed f	or M	 ajor	s	5	Graduat	 e	1	Majo	or	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В 7						- 5	-					) -		,
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	6	C 1		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	19	Non-	major	30
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D 0									5				3	
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		El	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot!	her				2	2	-					
				2 0														

Course-Section: PHIL 322 0101 University of Maryland Title HIST OF PHIL: MODERN

Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme

4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned

5. Were criteria for grading made clear

2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 30 0

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor: BRAUDE, STEPHEN Enrollment: 75

Ouestionnaires: 31

Page 1227 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 85 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.72 4.67 \*\*\*\*

1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 79 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.69 4.69 \*\*\*\*

0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 80 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.61 4.22 \*\*\*\*

0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 375 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.01 4.12 \*\*\*\*

			Fre	-	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	1	0	2	1	4	12	11	3.97	1185/1576	3.97	4.40	4.30	4.30	3.97
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	8	7	13	4.00	1138/1576	4.00	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	0	2	5	21	4.43	671/1342	4.43	4.53	4.32	4.30	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	19	2	0	1	2	5	3.80	1232/1520	3.80	4.34	4.25	4.25	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	2	6	8	10	3.60	1208/1465	3.60	4.36	4.12	4.09	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	19	2	2	1	1	5	3.45	1233/1434	3.45	4.30	4.14	4.15	3.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	7	5	16	4.13	947/1547	4.13	4.38	4.19	4.21	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	12	15	2	3.66	1546/1574	3.66	4.46	4.64	4.61	3.66
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	1	2	13	7	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.34	4.10	4.09	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	1	5	22	4.53	834/1488	4.53	4.56	4.47	4.47	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	2	3	24	4.63	1089/1493	4.63	4.82	4.73	4.70	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	1	2	10	14	4.14	1047/1486	4.14	4.43	4.32	4.32	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	1	4	21	4.45	766/1489	4.45	4.56	4.32	4.34	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	23	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	****/1277	****	3.75	4.03	4.11	***
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	3	1	2	5	5	3.50	1064/1279	3.50	4.31	4.17	4.20	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	3	2	3	2	6	3.38	1161/1270	3.38	4.32	4.35	4.42	3.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	2	2	4	7	3.88	999/1269	3.88	4.49	4.35	4.41	3.88
4. Were special techniques successful	15	15	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.04	4.05	4.09	***

#### Frequency Distribution

30 0

0

0

0

0 0

30 0

30

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	3	C	6	General	9	Under-grad	31	Non-major	28
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	-	-	-	
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: PHIL 346 0101 University of Maryland Title DEDUCTIVE SYSTEMS Baltimore County

Baltimore Count Spring 2009

Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD

Enrollment: 52
Questionnaires: 22

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1228 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	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	1	0	1	2	1	8	9	4.05	1124/1576	4.05	4.40	4.30	4.30	4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	5	11	4.14	1040/1576	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	4	3	13	4.29	812/1342	4.29	4.53	4.32	4.30	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	859/1520	4.25	4.34	4.25	4.25	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	4	3	10	4.05	824/1465	4.05	4.36	4.12	4.09	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	14	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1033/1434	3.86	4.30	4.14	4.15	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	6	2	10	3.81	1219/1547	3.81	4.38	4.19	4.21	3.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	11	8	4.42	1177/1574	4.42	4.46	4.64	4.61	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	1	1	3	4	5	3.79	1145/1554	3.79	4.34	4.10	4.09	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	1	6	12	4.29	1087/1488	4.29	4.56	4.47	4.47	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	0	1	18	4.62	1113/1493	4.62	4.82	4.73	4.70	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	3	3	11	4.05	1085/1486	4.05	4.43	4.32	4.32	4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	3	3	12	4.10	1070/1489	4.10	4.56	4.32	4.34	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	12	1	0	1	3		3.88	818/1277		3.75	4.03		3.88
									,					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	3	1	5	3.90	899/1279	3.90	4.31	4.17	4.20	3.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	928/1270	4.00	4.32	4.35	4.42	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	2	0	4	3	3.89	997/1269	3.89	4.49	4.35	4.41	3.89
4. Were special techniques successful	12	7	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 878	****	4.04	4.05	4.09	****
		•		•	-	_	_		,					
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.24	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.48	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.16	***
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.17	***
									,					
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	***	****	4.72	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	4.12	****
The state of the s									,					
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	***	****	4.48	4.37	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.23	****
1. 11. Someoff more you carry out from accryttics		J	5	3	J	J	_	2.00	, 320			1.00	1.23	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 382	****	****	4.08	4.24	****
J. HOLD CHOUSE PLOCECIES FOR ALL CHE SCARCILES		U	J	9	0	_	U	1.00	/ 502			1.00	1.41	

Course-Section: PHIL 346 0101
Title DEDUCTIVE SYSTEMS

Title DEDUCTIVE SYSTEM Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD

Enrollment: 52
Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1228 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	1			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13	-		_	
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 350 0101 Title ETHICAL THEORY Instructor: DIXON, BEN

30

Enrollment:

Questionnaires:

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1229 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

9	Student.	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		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	Ο	Ω	Λ	Λ	5	1	3	3 78	1337/1576	3.78	4.40	4.30	4.30	3.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	3	4		1138/1576		4.35	4.27	4.28	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	0	2	1		1132/1342	3.75	4.53	4.32	4.30	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	891/1520	4.22	4.34	4.25	4.25	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	454/1465	4.44	4.36	4.12	4.09	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	270/1434	4.67	4.30	4.14	4.15	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	4		1041/1547	4.00	4.38	4.19	4.21	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	4	4		1262/1574	4.33	4.46	4.64	4.61	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	0	5	1		1096/1554		4.34	4.10	4.09	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	1192/1488	4.13	4.56	4.47	4.47	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	908/1493	4.75	4.82	4.73	4.70	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	851/1486	4.38	4.43	4.32	4.32	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	845/1489	4.38	4.56	4.32	4.34	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	445/1279	4.50	4.31	4.17	4.20	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.32	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.49	4.35	4.41	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 878	****	4.04	4.05	4.09	****
Frequ	iency	Dist	crib	utio	n									

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

Course-Section: PHIL 350H 0101 Title ETHICAL THEORY

Instructor: DIXON, BEN

Enrollment: 11 Questionnaires: 6 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1230 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	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	0	6	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.40	4.30	4.30	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1576		4.35	4.27	4.28	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1342		4.53	4.32	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	179/1520		4.34	4.25	4.25	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.36	4.12	4.09	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.30	4.14	4.15	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	167/1547	4.83	4.38	4.19	4.21	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1459/1574	4.00	4.46	4.64	4.61	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.34	4.10	4.09	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	Λ	Λ	1	5	4.83	355/1488	4.83	4.56	4.47	4.47	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1493		4.82	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1486		4.43	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.56	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1277	5.00	3.75	4.03	4.11	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.31	4.17	4.20	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.32	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.49	4.35	4.41	5.00

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

Course-Section: PHIL 355 0101 University of Maryla Title POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY Baltimore County Instructor: SENG, PHILLIP Spring 2009

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 15

29

University of Maryland Page 1231
Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009
Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Frequencies			Instructor		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	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	1	3	2	9	4.27	940/1576	4.27	4.40	4.30	4.30	4.27
2. Did the	ne instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	5	3	7	4.13	1049/1576	4.13	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.13
3. Did the	ne exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	1	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	510/1342	4.57	4.53	4.32	4.30	4.57
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	4	1	1	0	1	8	4.27	837/1520	4.27	4.34	4.25	4.25	4.27
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	264/1465	4.67	4.36	4.12	4.09	4.67
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	727/1434	4.21	4.30	4.14	4.15	4.21
7. Was the	ne grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	3	4	3	5	3.67	1276/1547	3.67	4.38	4.19	4.21	3.67
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	12	3	4.20	1367/1574	4.20	4.46	4.64	4.61	4.20
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	395/1554	4.50	4.34	4.10	4.09	4.50
		Lectur	e															
1 Were t	he instr	actor's lecture		prepared	1	0	0	1	4	2	7	4 07	1212/1488	4.07	4 56	4.47	4.47	4.07
					1	0	0	0	1	2	11		,		4.82	4.73	4.70	4.71
	<ol><li>Did the instructor seem interested in the subject</li><li>Was lecture material presented and explained clearly</li></ol>					0	0	0	5	3	6		1078/1486		4.43	4.32	4.32	4.07
		es contribute t		1	1	0	0	1	3	3	7		1035/1489		4.56	4.32	4.34	4.14
				our understanding	2		0	1	0	0	0		****/1277		3.75		4.11	****
		Discus	aion															
1 Did al	aga diga			what you learned		0	0	1	Λ	2	7	4.50	445/1279	4.50	4.31	4.17	4.20	4.50
				d to participate	5	0	0	0	3	1		4.30	805/1279		4.32	4.35	4.42	4.30
				d open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	7		584/1269	4.60	4.49	4.35	4.41	4.60
		echniques succe		a open arscassion	5	4	1	0	0	1	4		415/ 878		4.04	4.05	4.09	4.17
				Frequ	ıency	7 Dis	trib	utioi	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 A 5		Re	quir	ed fo	 or M	ajor		3	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 7						J						3		
56-83						Ge	nera	1				5	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non-	major	13
84-150													J				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enou	ıh
				P 0									#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					
I 0					Other 4													

? 1

Course-Section: PHIL 368 0101 University of Maryland Page 1232
Title AESTHETICS Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009
Instructor: SENG, PHILLIP Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 33

Frequencies

Instructor

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Questionnaires: 19 Student Course Evaluation Question
---

								cquc.	11010			1110	LIUCCOI	COULDO	DCPC	OTIDO	TCVCI	DCCC
		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		m this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	541/1576	4.58	4.40	4.30	4.30	4.58
2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	11	4.58	515/1576	4.58	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.58
3. Did the	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	8	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	333/1342	4.73	4.53	4.32	4.30	4.73
4. Did otl	her evalı	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	270/1520	4.74	4.34	4.25	4.25	4.74
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	73/1465	4.95	4.36	4.12	4.09	4.95
6. Did wr	itten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	435/1434	4.47	4.30	4.14	4.15	4.47
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	575/1547	4.47	4.38	4.19	4.21	4.47
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	18	1	4.05	1441/1574	4.05	4.46	4.64	4.61	4.05
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	307/1554	4.62	4.34	4.10	4.09	4.62
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	666/1488	4.67	4.56	4.47	4.47	4.67
	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	2	15	4.88	607/1493				4.70	
3. Was led	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearl						0	0	0	6	11	4.65	499/1486	4.65	4.43	4.32	4.32	4.65
4. Did the	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	116/1489	4.94	4.56	4.32	4.34	4.94
5. Did aud	<ol> <li>Did the rectures contribute to what you rearned</li> <li>Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding</li> </ol>					0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	278/1277	4.56	3.75	4.03	4.11	4.56
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc			what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	189/1279	4.87	4.31	4.17	4.20	4.87
				d to participate	4	0	0	0	1			4.73			4.32		4.42	
				d open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	386/1269	4.80	4.49	4.35	4.41	4.80
		echniques succe		-	4	11	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 878	****	4.04	4.05	4.09	****
				Freq	iency	v Dis	trib	utio	n									
				-		, 510	. 01 12	u 0 1 0.										
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons Type						pe			Majors	<b>!</b>		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Required for Majors 2 Graduate					0	Majo	or	2				
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 7														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ge	nera	1			1	.1	Under-g	rad 1	.9	Non-	-major	17
84-150	34-150 4 3.00-3.49 3 D 0			D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives						0	#### - I	Means t	here a	re not	: enoug	ſh	
				P 1					responses to be significant									
				I 0		Ot	her					2						
				? 0														

Course-Section: PHIL 371 0101 University of Maryland Title EPISTEMOLOGY Instructor:

Baltimore County Spring 2009 EALICK, GREG E.

Ρ

Ι

0

0

0

Enrollment: 30 Questionnaires: 15

Page 1233 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnair
--

	Questions		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
	General															
1 Did you gain ne	ew insights, skills	from this course	0	0	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	861/1576	4.33	4.40	4.30	4.30	4.33
	ctor make clear the		0	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	851/1576		4.35	4.27	4.28	4.33
	estions reflect th		0	14	0	0	1	0	0		****/1342		4.53	4.32	4.30	****
_	ations reflect the		1	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	429/1520		4.34	4.25	4.25	4.57
		to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	424/1465		4.36	4.12	4.09	4.47
_		te to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	574/1434		4.30	4.14	4.15	4.36
	g system clearly ex	_	1	0	0	0	5	3	6	4.07	992/1547		4.38	4.19	4.21	4.07
	was class cancelle	-	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	328/1574		4.46	4.64	4.61	4.93
_		teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	463/1554		4.34	4.10	4.09	4.45
	Lecture															
1. Were the instru	actor's lectures we	ell prepared	1	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	970/1488	4.43	4.56	4.47	4.47	4.43
2. Did the instruc	ctor seem intereste	ed in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	947/1493	4.73	4.82	4.73	4.70	4.73
3. Was lecture mat	terial presented an	nd explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	951/1486	4.27	4.43	4.32	4.32	4.27
	es contribute to wh		0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	742/1489	4.47	4.56	4.32	4.34	4.47
		ce your understanding	1	13	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1277	****	3.75	4.03	4.11	****
	Discussion															
1. Did class discu	. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned				0	0	2	3	7	4.42	543/1279	4.42	4.31	4.17	4.20	4.42
2. Were all studer	. Were all students actively encouraged to participate				0	0	3	3	6	4.25	827/1270	4.25	4.32	4.35	4.42	4.25
		r and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	596/1269	4.58	4.49	4.35	4.41	4.58
4. Were special te	echniques successfu	ıl	4	9	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 878	****	4.04	4.05	4.09	****
	Laboratory	Ý														
2. Were you provid	ded with adequate b	packground information	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.32	****
	Seminar															
2. Was the instruc	ctor available for	individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****
	Field Wor	ζ														
		to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****
	· -	evaluation criteria	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	***
	ctor available for		14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 44		****	4.73	4.63	***
4. To what degree	could you discuss	your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
	Self Pace	ed														
1. Did self-paced	system contribute	to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****
	acts with the inst		14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	***
		Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades						Rea	asons	\$			Т∨	pe			Majors	;
00-27 3 28-55 0	00-27 3 0.00-0.99 0 A 4 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 5				quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	S	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	2
56-83 1 2.00-2.99 1 C 1				General					7	Under-grad 15				-major	13	
84-150 1 3.00-3.49 0 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0					Electives 0 #### - Means there are						re not	not enough				

Other

4

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

Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1234

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: PFEIFER, JESSIC
Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies			Instructor		Course Dept				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	11	4.63	471/1576	4.63	4.40	4.30	4.30	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	713/1576	4.44	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	125/1342	4.94	4.53	4.32	4.30	4.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	320/1520	4.69	4.34	4.25	4.25	4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	587/1465	4.31	4.36	4.12	4.09	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	4	7	4.13	816/1434	4.13	4.30	4.14	4.15	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	527/1547	4.50	4.38	4.19	4.21	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	16	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.00	4.46	4.64	4.61	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	371/1554	4.53	4.34	4.10	4.09	4.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	309/1488	4.87	4.56	4.47	4.47	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	468/1486	4.67	4.43	4.32	4.32	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	136/1489	4.93	4.56	4.32	4.34	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	0	2	1	1	2	3.50	1020/1277	3.50	3.75	4.03	4.11	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	Ο	1	1	3	5	4.20	712/1279	4.20	4.31	4.17	4.20	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	805/1270	4.30	4.32	4.35	4.42	4.30
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1269		4.49	4.35	4.41	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	799/ 878	3.00	4.04	4.05	4.09	3.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reason				Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	5	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 1	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Spring 2009

Page 1235

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: TEMPLETON, ROYE Enrollment: Questionna

Title

Course-Section: PHIL 391 0101

PHILOSOPHY OF SEX

	3-				
naires:	21	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

		Ouestion	a		MD	NT7	Fr 1	eque: 2	ncie 3	s 1	_		tructor	Course	-		Level	
		Question	s 		NK	NA						Mean	Rank 	mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	a gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	1	1	4	8	7	3.90	1241/1576	3.90	4.40	4.30	4.30	3.90
		ctor make clear			0	0	2	2	6	6	5	3.48	1405/1576	3.48	4.35	4.27	4.28	3.48
3. Did the	e exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	0	0	2	7	6	6	3.76	1128/1342	3.76	4.53	4.32	4.30	3.76
4. Did oth	ner evalī	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	3	1	3	5	6	3	3.39	1405/1520	3.39	4.34	4.25	4.25	3.39
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	5	12	4.38	529/1465	4.38	4.36	4.12	4.09	4.38
6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	1	4	1	8	3	4	3.10	1360/1434	3.10	4.30	4.14	4.15	3.10
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	445/1547	4.57	4.38	4.19	4.21	4.57
8. How man	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	5	13	3	3.90	1522/1574	3.90	4.46	4.64	4.61	3.90
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll tead	hing effectiveness	1	0	2	0	8	6	4	3.50	1303/1554	3.50	4.34	4.10	4.09	3.50
	Lecture																	
1. Were th	ne instri	actor's lecture		prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	324/1488	4.86	4.56	4.47	4.47	4.86
	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	1	1	5	14		1193/1493		4.82	4.73		4.52
	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearl					0	0	1	2	5	12	4.40			4.43	4.32	4.32	4.40
	s. was recture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	3	1	3	6	7		1286/1489		4.56	4.32	4.34	3.65
				our understanding	1 1	1	2	5	1	4	7	3.47	1033/1277	3.47	3.75	4.03	4.11	3.47
		Discus	gion															
1 Did als	ace diea			what you learned	10	0	6	0	0	4	1	2 45	1255/1279	2.45	4.31	4.17	4.20	2.45
				d to participate	10	0	5	3	0	1	2		1257/1270		4.32	4.35	4.42	2.43
				d open discussion	10	0	4	1	2	1	2		1234/1269	2.82	4.49	4.35	4.41	2.82
		echniques succe		d open discussion	10	7	1	1	0	1	1		****/ 878		4.04	4.05	4.09	****
4. Were ap	peciai ce	sciniiques succe	ssiui		10	,			U			3.00	, 070		1.01	4.05	4.00	
				Frequ	ıency	7 Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra							Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Re	 quir	ed f	or M	 aior		6	Graduate 0			Majo	 or	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 9								-		-	-	) -		_
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C 8		Ge	nera	1			1	0	Under-q	rad 2	21	Non-	-major	19
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	D 1		30						-					5	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives					1	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enous	7h		
	-	2.22 2.00	_	P 0									respons				_	,
				I O		Ot.	her					4	respond		91			
				3 0														

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

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 2

3

Page 1236 JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

	Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course Dept		t 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	1	4.50	637/1576	4.75	4.40	4.30	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1138/1576	4.50	4.35	4.27	4.35	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.34	4.25	4.38	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.36	4.12	4.22	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1041/1547	4.50	4.38	4.19	4.24	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.46	4.64	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.34	4.10	4.24	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	870/1488	4.50	4.56	4.47	4.55	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	678/1486	4.50	4.43	4.32	4.41	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.56	4.32	4.38	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.31	4.17	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.32	4.35	4.53	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.49	4.35	4.55	5.00
Encom		. Diat	- w i bı	.+ :	_									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	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	1	Under-grad	2	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 400 0901 University of Maryland Page 1237 JUL 2, 2009 INDEP STUDY IN PHIL Baltimore County

Title Spring 2009 Instructor: THOMAS, JAMES Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	2	
Questionnaires:	2	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	4.75	4.40	4.30	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	4.50	4.35	4.27	4.35	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.53	4.32	4.46	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.34	4.25	4.38	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.36	4.12	4.22	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.30	4.14	4.30	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1547	4.50	4.38	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.46	4.64	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.34	4.10	4.24	5.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	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	2	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				2	1						

Course-Section: PHIL 445 0101

Title PHILOSOPHY OF LANGUAGE

Instructor: EALICK, GREG E.

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 11

ICK, GREG E. Spring 2009

Page 1238 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	928/1576	4.27	4.40	4.30	4.46	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	4	5		1082/1576	4.09	4.35	4.27	4.35	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	1	3	2		1089/1342	3.86	4.53	4.32	4.46	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	837/1520	4.27	4.34	4.25	4.38	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	718/1465	4.18	4.36	4.12	4.22	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	243/1434	4.70	4.30	4.14	4.30	4.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	727/1547	4.36	4.38	4.19	4.24	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11		1/1574		4.46	4.64	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	5	3	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.34	4.10	4.24	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	750/1488	4.60	4.56	4.47	4.55	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	784/1493	4.82	4.82	4.73	4.80	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40		4.40		4.32	4.41	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	309/1489	4.80		4.32	4.38	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	1	1	1	0	0		1267/1277				4.04	
5. Dia additivistati teetiiniques chinanee your anderstanding	_	,	_	_	_	O	Ü	2.00	1207/1277	2.00	3.75	1.05	1.01	2.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	802/1279	4.00	4.31	4.17	4.31	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	505/1270	4.67	4.32	4.35	4.53	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	870/1269	4.17	4.49	4.35	4.55	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 878	***	4.04	4.05	4.33	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.45	****
Seminar					_		_					4 = 0	4	
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.77	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.64	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.52	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.70	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.30	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	***	****	4.73	4.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****
•	-		-	-	-	-	·							
From	anas	n Diet	rib	1+ i 01	1									

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

? 0

Course-Section: PHIL 454 0101 University of Maryland Title ANIMALS AND THE ENVIRO Baltimore County

Instructor: DIXON, BEN

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 7

Spring 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 1239

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	വാല	ncies	=		Tnet	ructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	T.evel	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	-	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4 57	E 41 /1E76	4 57	4.40	4.30	1 10	4 57
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.57	541/1576		4.40		4.46 4.35	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0 4	0	0	0	0	3		910/1576 1/1342	4.29 5.00	4.53	4.27 4.32	4.35	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	-	4	0	0	0		3	5.00	768/1520	4.33	4.34			5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4 0	7				4.34	4.25 4.12	4.38	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	•	•	0	•	0		5.00	1/1465 345/1434	5.00 4.57				
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57 4.57	0 -0 /0 -	4.57	4.30	4.14	4.30	4.57 4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	-	_	4		445/1547		4.38	4.19	4.24	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	•	0	0	0	4	3		1177/1574	4.43	4.46	4.64	4.69	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	U	U	U	U	4	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.34	4.10	4.24	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	1233/1488	4.00	4.56	4.47	4.55	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	734/1493	4.83	4.82	4.73	4.80	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	678/1486	4.50	4.43	4.32	4.41	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	4		500/1489	4.67	4.56	4.32	4.38	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	692/1277	4.00	3.75	4.03	4.04	4.00
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	Τ.	-1	U	U	U	4	U	4.00	092/12//	4.00	3.75	4.03	4.04	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	262/1279	4.75	4.31	4.17	4.31	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	636/1270	4.50	4.32	4.35	4.53	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	444/1269	4.75	4.49	4.35	4.55	4.75
5. Fix the instituted theoritage fair and open affeats in		Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	-	_	1.75	111, 1200	11,75		1.55	1.55	11.75
Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Spring 2009

Page 1240 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	7	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
2	•				2

Course-Section: PHIL 470 0101

12

PHILOSOPHY OF MIND

EALICK, GREG E.

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

							Fr	eque	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 vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	347/1576	4.71	4.40	4.30	4.46	4.71
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	187/1576	4.86	4.35	4.27	4.35	4.86
		estions reflec			2	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.53	4.32	4.46	5.00
		uations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	167/1520	4.86	4.34	4.25	4.38	4.86
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	159/1465	4.83	4.36	4.12	4.22	4.83
	-	-		o what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	138/1434	4.83	4.30	4.14	4.30	4.83
		g system clearl		2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	657/1547	4.43	4.38	4.19	4.24	4.43
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.46	4.64	4.69	5.00
	-			hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.34	4.10	4.24	5.00
		Lectur	0															
1 Word +	ho inatr	actor's lecture	_	propared	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	355/1488	4.83	4.56	4.47	4.55	4.83
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.80	5.00
				explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	271/1486	4.80	4.43	4.73	4.41	4.80
		es contribute t			2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	309/1489	4.80	4.56	4.32	4.38	4.80
				our understanding	1	5	0	0	1	0	0		****/1277	****	3.75	4.03	4.04	****
J. DIG au	ulovisual	r techniques en	nance y	our understanding		3	U	U		U	U	3.00	/12//		3.75	4.03	4.04	
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.31	4.17	4.31	5.00
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.32	4.35	4.53	5.00
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.49	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful	_	1	4	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	4.04	4.05	4.33	4.00
				Frequ	iency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re 	asons	5 			Ту]	pe 			Majors	; 
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Gei	nera	1				2	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	-major	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti <sup>.</sup>	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nifican	nt	
				I 0		Ot1	her					4	_		_			
				? 1														

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

YALOWITZ, STEVE

Instructor:

Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1241

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 12
Questionnaires: 9 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							_	ncies	5	_		ructor		e Dept			
	Question	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	Genera	 1															
1. Did you gain new i		=	this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	568/1576	4.56	4.40	4.30	4.46	4.56
2. Did the instructor	J ,			0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	851/1576		4.35	4.27	4.35	4.33
3. Did the exam quest		_	_	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	531/1342	4.56	4.53	4.32	4.46	4.56
4. Did other evaluation				0	2	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	826/1520	4.29	4.34	4.25	4.38	4.29
5. Did assigned readi		_	-	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	571/1465	4.33	4.36	4.12	4.22	4.33
6. Did written assign	_		-	. 0	1	0	0	4	3	1	3.63	1162/1434	3.63	4.30	4.14	4.30	3.63
7. Was the grading sy			-	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	871/1547	4.22	4.38	4.19	4.24	4.22
8. How many times was	class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	1	8	0	3.89	1525/1574	3.89	4.46	4.64	4.69	3.89
9. How would you grade	e the overa	ll teach	ing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	827/1554	4.14	4.34	4.10	4.24	4.14
	<b>-</b> .																
1. Were the instructor	Lecture			0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.89	278/1488	4.89	4 56	4 47	4.55	4.89
2. Did the instructor		_	-	0	0	0	0	0	7	7		868/1493		4.56 4.82	4.47 4.73	4.80	4.78
3. Was lecture materia			-	0	0	0	0	1	Z 5	3	4.76			4.62	4.73	4.41	4.76
4. Did the lectures co	-			0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	766/1489	4.44	4.56	4.32	4.38	4.44
5. Did audiovisual te		_		0	8	0	0	1	0	0		****/1277		3.75	4.03	4.04	****
J. Dia addiovibadi ee	ciniiques ein	lance yo	ar anacrocanarny	O	O	O	O	_	O	O	3.00	/ 12//		3.73	1.05	1.01	
	Discus	sion															
1. Did class discussi	ons contrib	ite to w	hat you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	510/1279	4.44	4.31	4.17	4.31	4.44
2. Were all students	actively end	couraged	to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	279/1270	4.89	4.32	4.35	4.53	4.89
3. Did the instructor	encourage :	fair and	open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.49	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techn	iques succe	ssful		0	7	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 878	***	4.04	4.05	4.33	****
			Fred	nienas	/ Dis	tri h	1+ i 01	2									
			ried	[uenc]	DIS	CLID	10101	.1									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	5
00-27 0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Re	guire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	;	1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r •	7
28-55 0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2			-			_						3 -		
56-83 0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	major	2
84-150 3	3.00-3.49	1	D 0									_				-	
Grad. 0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		El	ecti	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	jh
			P 0									respons	es to k	oe sign	nifican	ıt	
			I 0		Ot!	her					6						
			3 0														