

Course-Section: PHIL 100 0101
 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	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	3	26	4.90	171/1576	4.45	4.40	4.30	4.11	4.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	61/1576	4.57	4.35	4.27	4.18	4.97	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	27	4.93	125/1342	4.78	4.53	4.32	4.19	4.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	173/1520	4.44	4.34	4.25	4.09	4.84	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to 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. Did written assignments 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. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	4	24	4.76	238/1547	4.61	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.76	
8. How many times 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. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1554	4.49	4.34	4.10	4.01	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	24	4.86	324/1488	4.80	4.56	4.47	4.41	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	28	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	0	1	27	4.96	69/1486	4.65	4.43	4.32	4.26	4.96	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	27	4.93	155/1489	4.79	4.56	4.32	4.22	4.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	16	2	0	0	1	8	4.18	593/1277	4.10	3.75	4.03	3.91	4.18	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	118/1279	4.51	4.31	4.17	3.96	4.93	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	0	1	12	4.71	458/1270	4.57	4.32	4.35	4.09	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1269	4.73	4.49	4.35	4.09	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	12	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 878	4.42	4.04	4.05	3.91	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 375	5.00	5.00	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	2						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	29	Non-major	29
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	1	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	2						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PHIL 100 0201
 Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: THOMAS, JAMES
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1208
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	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	4.82	208/1576	4.57	4.35	4.27	4.18	4.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	7	33	4.82	227/1342	4.78	4.53	4.32	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	4.09	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	27	4.51	390/1434	4.27	4.30	4.14	3.94	4.51	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	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	1	0	0	0	0	20	19	4.49	1103/1574	4.44	4.46	4.64	4.59	4.49	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	3	31	4.91	104/1554	4.49	4.34	4.10	4.01	4.91	
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	2	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	2	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	1	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	2	22	2	1	1	3	9	4.00	692/1277	4.10	3.75	4.03	3.91	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	152/1279	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	11	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	4.00	****/ 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															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	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															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	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	4.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	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	4.00	****/ 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	4.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: PHIL 100 0201
 Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: THOMAS, JAMES
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1208
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	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	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 100 0301
 Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY
 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	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	5	8	5	3.80	1325/1576	4.45	4.40	4.30	4.11	3.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	4	5	8	3.90	1237/1576	4.57	4.35	4.27	4.18	3.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	4	14	4.55	531/1342	4.78	4.53	4.32	4.19	4.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	1	4	2	2	3.56	1346/1520	4.44	4.34	4.25	4.09	3.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	14	4.55	335/1465	4.26	4.36	4.12	4.02	4.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	1093/1434	4.27	4.30	4.14	3.94	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	3	1	3	11	4.22	871/1547	4.61	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	469/1574	4.44	4.46	4.64	4.59	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	13	4	4.17	805/1554	4.49	4.34	4.10	4.01	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	810/1488	4.80	4.56	4.47	4.41	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	0	18	4.80	810/1493	4.92	4.82	4.73	4.65	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	10	7	4.20	1003/1486	4.65	4.43	4.32	4.26	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	17	4.75	378/1489	4.79	4.56	4.32	4.22	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	12	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	1020/1277	4.10	3.75	4.03	3.91	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	774/1279	4.51	4.31	4.17	3.96	4.09	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	860/1270	4.57	4.32	4.35	4.09	4.18	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	754/1269	4.73	4.49	4.35	4.09	4.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	5	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	589/ 878	4.42	4.04	4.05	3.91	3.83	
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	16	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	10	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 100 0501
 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

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	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	10	4.91	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	3.69	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	4.86	****/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	26	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	24	4.74	352/1486	4.65	4.43	4.32	4.26	4.74	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	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	4.09	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	4.00	****/ 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	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	5.00	5.00	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 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	5.00	****/ 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	****	

Course-Section: PHIL 100 0501
 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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected 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	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 100 0701
 Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: YALOWITZ, STEVE
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1211
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	3	4	6	6	3.65	1388/1576	4.45	4.40	4.30	4.11	3.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	9	6	4.00	1138/1576	4.57	4.35	4.27	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	531/1342	4.78	4.53	4.32	4.19	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	5	5	8	4.17	945/1520	4.44	4.34	4.25	4.09	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	5	3	10	4.05	824/1465	4.26	4.36	4.12	4.02	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute 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
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	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 was 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	4	1	0	0	6	7	2	3.73	1180/1554	4.49	4.34	4.10	4.01	3.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	547/1488	4.80	4.56	4.47	4.41	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	947/1493	4.92	4.82	4.73	4.65	4.74
3. Was lecture material 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 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 discussions contribute to 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 actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	860/1270	4.57	4.32	4.35	4.09	4.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	686/1269	4.73	4.49	4.35	4.09	4.45

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 100 0801
 Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1212
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	387/1576	4.45	4.40	4.30	4.11	4.68	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	16	4.74	301/1576	4.57	4.35	4.27	4.18	4.74	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	215/1342	4.78	4.53	4.32	4.19	4.84	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	487/1520	4.44	4.34	4.25	4.09	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to 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 written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	1	1	12	4.60	323/1434	4.27	4.30	4.14	3.94	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	445/1547	4.61	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	13	5	4.21	1353/1574	4.44	4.46	4.64	4.59	4.21	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	449/1554	4.49	4.34	4.10	4.01	4.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	484/1488	4.80	4.56	4.47	4.41	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1493	4.92	4.82	4.73	4.65	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	499/1486	4.65	4.43	4.32	4.26	4.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	448/1489	4.79	4.56	4.32	4.22	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	11	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	****/1277	4.10	3.75	4.03	3.91	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	445/1279	4.51	4.31	4.17	3.96	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	582/1270	4.57	4.32	4.35	4.09	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful	12	5	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 878	4.42	4.04	4.05	3.91	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 1	General 4	Under-grad 19 Non-major 19
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHIL 100 0901
 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

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	0	0	1	2	4	21	4.61	500/1576	4.45	4.40	4.30	4.11	4.61	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	4	22	4.71	324/1576	4.57	4.35	4.27	4.18	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	4	24	4.86	209/1342	4.78	4.53	4.32	4.19	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	14	1	0	0	3	10	4.50	511/1520	4.44	4.34	4.25	4.09	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	5	19	4.43	483/1465	4.26	4.36	4.12	4.02	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	16	1	1	0	5	5	4.00	878/1434	4.27	4.30	4.14	3.94	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	4	23	4.79	207/1547	4.61	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	23	5	4.18	1379/1574	4.44	4.46	4.64	4.59	4.18	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	2	6	14	4.55	363/1554	4.49	4.34	4.10	4.01	4.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	27	4.93	173/1488	4.80	4.56	4.47	4.41	4.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	223/1493	4.92	4.82	4.73	4.65	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	24	4.79	284/1486	4.65	4.43	4.32	4.26	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	205/1489	4.79	4.56	4.32	4.22	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	1	3	8	13	4.32	472/1277	4.10	3.75	4.03	3.91	4.32	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	296/1279	4.51	4.31	4.17	3.96	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	458/1270	4.57	4.32	4.35	4.09	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	332/1269	4.73	4.49	4.35	4.09	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	8	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	****/ 878	4.42	4.04	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.52	****	
Field Work															
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	17	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	30	Non-major	30
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 146 0101
 Title CRITICAL THINKING
 Instructor: TEMPLETON, ROYE
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1214
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	1	8	5	3.82	1308/1576	3.69	4.40	4.30	4.11	3.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	8	2	3.59	1372/1576	3.62	4.35	4.27	4.18	3.59	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	4	7	4.00	972/1342	4.09	4.53	4.32	4.19	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	1466/1520	2.95	4.34	4.25	4.09	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	4	6	3	3.41	1287/1465	3.49	4.36	4.12	4.02	3.41	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1434	****	4.30	4.14	3.94	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	1	13	4.59	434/1547	4.57	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	942/1574	4.21	4.46	4.64	4.59	4.65	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	2	6	4	0	3.00	1448/1554	3.03	4.34	4.10	4.01	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	5	5	7	4.12	1197/1488	4.08	4.56	4.47	4.41	4.12	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	1340/1493	4.15	4.82	4.73	4.65	4.29	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	4	5	6	2	3.35	1371/1486	3.44	4.43	4.32	4.26	3.35	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	4	4	2	4	3.00	1415/1489	3.13	4.56	4.32	4.22	3.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	5	2	5	3	0	2.40	1248/1277	2.53	3.75	4.03	3.91	2.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to 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 all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	7	3	2	1	0	1.77	1267/1270	1.83	4.32	4.35	4.09	1.77	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful	4	11	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 878	****	4.04	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 1	Required for Majors	10
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 6	General	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	1
			? 2		

Course-Section: PHIL 146 0201
 Title CRITICAL THINKING
 Instructor: TEMPLETON, ROYE
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1215
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	0	6	5	8	3.57	1424/1576	3.69	4.40	4.30	4.11	3.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	3	9	6	3.65	1349/1576	3.62	4.35	4.27	4.18	3.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect 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 other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	3	1	2	2	2	2.90	1489/1520	2.95	4.34	4.25	4.09	2.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	18	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/1434	****	4.30	4.14	3.94	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	2	2	17	4.55	480/1547	4.57	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	4	15	2	3.77	1538/1574	4.21	4.46	4.64	4.59	3.77	
9. How would you 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															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	1	5	1	14	4.04	1221/1488	4.08	4.56	4.47	4.41	4.04	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	3	1	2	4	13	4.00	1411/1493	4.15	4.82	4.73	4.65	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	1	8	3	8	3.52	1325/1486	3.44	4.43	4.32	4.26	3.52	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	4	4	4	7	3.26	1379/1489	3.13	4.56	4.32	4.22	3.26	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	6	4	6	6	1	2.65	1221/1277	2.53	3.75	4.03	3.91	2.65	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	9	3	1	4	2	2.32	1265/1279	2.43	4.31	4.17	3.96	2.32	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	9	5	4	0	1	1.89	1266/1270	1.83	4.32	4.35	4.09	1.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair 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 Work															
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	5	Under-grad	23	Non-major	22
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	9	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	2						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	2						

Course-Section: PHIL 150 0101
 Title CONTEMPORARY MORAL ISS
 Instructor: EALICK, GREG E.
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1216
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	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	8	4.06	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	3.88	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	3	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	
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	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	3.89	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	3.92	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	3.99	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	3.89	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	4.09	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	2	1	3	2	1	2.89	828/ 878	3.76	4.04	4.05	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	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	Required for Majors	12
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0		Graduate
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	General	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	Electives	2
			P		0
			I		0
			Other		3

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PHIL 150 0103
 Title CONTEMPORARY MORAL ISS
 Instructor: EALICK, GREG E.
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1218
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	9	1	4.10	1089/1576	4.23	4.40	4.30	4.11	4.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	6	1	3.60	1368/1576	3.89	4.35	4.27	4.18	3.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1209/1342	3.92	4.53	4.32	4.19	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	1041/1520	3.99	4.34	4.25	4.09	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	708/1465	4.20	4.36	4.12	4.02	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to 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 the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	1041/1547	3.89	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1574	4.98	4.46	4.64	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	5	1	3.78	1152/1554	3.94	4.34	4.10	4.01	3.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	6	3	0	3.20	1433/1488	4.09	4.56	4.47	4.41	3.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	810/1493	4.86	4.82	4.73	4.65	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	4	1	2	3.20	1392/1486	3.93	4.43	4.32	4.26	3.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	813/1489	4.55	4.56	4.32	4.22	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1277	3.50	3.75	4.03	3.91	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what 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 all students actively encouraged 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 the instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful	0	5	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	283/ 878	3.76	4.04	4.05	3.91	4.40	

Frequency Distribution

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

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected 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	B 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 responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHIL 152 0101
 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

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	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. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	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	4	0	0	1	0	2	16	4.74	435/1270	4.78	4.32	4.35	4.09	4.74	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	288/1269	4.89	4.49	4.35	4.09	4.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	12	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	464/ 878	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	3.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 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	3.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 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	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	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	3.00	****/ 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	3.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: PHIL 152 0101
 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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 152 0201
 Title INTRO TO MORAL THEORY
 Instructor: DIFATE, VICTOR
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1221
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	7	25	4.78	266/1576	4.77	4.40	4.30	4.11	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	28	4.84	194/1576	4.79	4.35	4.27	4.18	4.84	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	27	4.79	263/1342	4.87	4.53	4.32	4.19	4.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	197/1520	4.70	4.34	4.25	4.09	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute to 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 the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	6	24	4.64	375/1547	4.69	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	1	17	14	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	8	19	4.70	229/1554	4.83	4.34	4.10	4.01	4.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures 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 the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	31	4.97	223/1493	4.97	4.82	4.73	4.65	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	28	4.87	201/1486	4.88	4.43	4.32	4.26	4.87	
4. Did the lectures contribute to 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 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	1	4	6	16	4.37	429/1277	3.92	3.75	4.03	3.91	4.37	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute 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 all students actively encouraged 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 the instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful	8	8	0	1	5	2	9	4.12	440/ 878	4.06	4.04	4.05	3.91	4.12	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 0	A 20	Required for Majors 15	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 1	B 2		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 4	C 0	General 5	Under-grad 33 Non-major 33
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 6	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 1		

Course-Section: PHIL 152 0301
 Title INTRO TO MORAL THEORY
 Instructor: THOMAS, JAMES
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1222
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
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	24	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	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 1	A 28	Required for Majors 18	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 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 responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 2	
			? 2		

Course-Section: PHIL 152 0501
 Title INTRO TO MORAL THEORY
 Instructor: SENG, PHILLIP
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1223
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	5	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	8	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	4.09	4.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	22	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	3	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	4.14	1398/1574	4.31	4.46	4.64	4.59	4.14	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	180/1554	4.83	4.34	4.10	4.01	4.77	
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	14	0	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	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 15	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 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 responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHIL 152 0601
 Title INTRO TO MORAL THEORY
 Instructor: THOMAS, JAMES
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1224
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	32	4.86	195/1576	4.77	4.40	4.30	4.11	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	33	4.92	136/1576	4.79	4.35	4.27	4.18	4.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	5.00	1/1342	4.87	4.53	4.32	4.19	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	32	4.89	149/1520	4.70	4.34	4.25	4.09	4.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to 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 written assignments contribute to 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 the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	5	30	4.75	238/1547	4.69	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	24	12	4.33	1262/1574	4.31	4.46	4.64	4.59	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	33	4.97	35/1554	4.83	4.34	4.10	4.01	4.97	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures 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 the instructor seem interested in 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 lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	33	4.97	52/1486	4.88	4.43	4.32	4.26	4.97	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	34	5.00	1/1489	4.89	4.56	4.32	4.22	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	15	0	1	4	2	11	4.28	515/1277	3.92	3.75	4.03	3.91	4.28	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute 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 students actively encouraged 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 the instructor encourage fair and 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 techniques successful	23	9	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 878	4.06	4.04	4.05	3.91	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	3.78	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 23	Required for Majors	18
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	9
84-150	11	3.00-3.49 13	D 0		Under-grad 36
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	2
			? 2		

Course-Section: PHIL 251 0101
 Title ETH ISS SCI ENG&INF TE
 Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1225
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	1019/1576	4.27	4.40	4.30	4.35	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	968/1576	4.39	4.35	4.27	4.32	4.22	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	879/1342	4.41	4.53	4.32	4.41	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	805/1520	4.48	4.34	4.25	4.26	4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute 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 the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1145/1547	4.05	4.38	4.19	4.22	3.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	665/1574	4.73	4.46	4.64	4.62	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	504/1554	4.51	4.34	4.10	4.05	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	945/1488	4.42	4.56	4.47	4.44	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	607/1493	4.85	4.82	4.73	4.75	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	468/1486	4.51	4.43	4.32	4.29	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	637/1489	4.47	4.56	4.32	4.31	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	1020/1277	3.75	3.75	4.03	4.01	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.31	4.17	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.32	4.35	4.30	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.49	4.35	4.29	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.04	4.05	3.92	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHIL 251 0102
 Title ETH ISS SCI ENG&INF TE
 Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1226
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5							
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	9	17	4.33	861/1576	4.27	4.40	4.30	4.35	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	8	20	4.57	528/1576	4.39	4.35	4.27	4.32	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	5	21	4.62	455/1342	4.41	4.53	4.32	4.41	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	6	21	4.66	348/1520	4.48	4.34	4.25	4.26	4.66
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	0	2	2	6	12	4.27	626/1465	4.14	4.36	4.12	4.09	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	7	19	4.47	448/1434	4.34	4.30	4.14	4.06	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	5	9	14	4.21	893/1547	4.05	4.38	4.19	4.22	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	19	4.66	927/1574	4.73	4.46	4.64	4.62	4.66
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	0	6	15	4.59	323/1554	4.51	4.34	4.10	4.05	4.59
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	11	14	4.39	1002/1488	4.42	4.56	4.47	4.44	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	3	23	4.81	784/1493	4.85	4.82	4.73	4.75	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	4	7	16	4.36	871/1486	4.51	4.43	4.32	4.29	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	8	16	4.39	823/1489	4.47	4.56	4.32	4.31	4.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	2	1	3	7	11	4.00	692/1277	3.75	3.75	4.03	4.01	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	****/1279	5.00	4.31	4.17	4.14	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1270	5.00	4.32	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1269	5.00	4.49	4.35	4.29	****
4. Were special techniques successful	25	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 878	5.00	4.04	4.05	3.92	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.78	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.83	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.80	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	4.21	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 20	Required for Majors	5
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	B 7	Graduate	1
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	29
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	22

Course-Section: PHIL 322 0101
 Title HIST OF PHIL:MODERN
 Instructor: BRAUDE, STEPHEN
 Enrollment: 75
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1227
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
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	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	4.12	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected 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	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 346 0101
 Title DEDUCTIVE SYSTEMS
 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

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	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	3.88	818/1277	3.88	3.75	4.03	4.11	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	4.67	****/ 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	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.16	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 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	5.00	****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	4.12	****
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	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.23	****
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	4.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	4.24	****

Course-Section: PHIL 346 0101
 Title DEDUCTIVE SYSTEMS
 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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected 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	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 350 0101
 Title ETHICAL THEORY
 Instructor: DIXON, BEN
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1229
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	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	4.00	1138/1576	4.00	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	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	4.00	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	4.33	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	3.86	1096/1554	3.86	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	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	9
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	6

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

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

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	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	5.00	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	5.00	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	4.83	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	0	0	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	5.00	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	5.00	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	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHIL 355 0101
 Title POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: SENG, PHILLIP
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1231
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from 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 instructor make clear the expected 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 exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	510/1342	4.57	4.53	4.32	4.30	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	1	0	1	8	4.27	837/1520	4.27	4.34	4.25	4.25	4.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute to 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 grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	4	3	5	3.67	1276/1547	3.67	4.38	4.19	4.21	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	3	4.20	1367/1574	4.20	4.46	4.64	4.61	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	395/1554	4.50	4.34	4.10	4.09	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	4	2	7	4.07	1212/1488	4.07	4.56	4.47	4.47	4.07	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	986/1493	4.71	4.82	4.73	4.70	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	5	3	6	4.07	1078/1486	4.07	4.43	4.32	4.32	4.07	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	1035/1489	4.14	4.56	4.32	4.34	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	12	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1277	****	3.75	4.03	4.11	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	2	7	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	3	1	6	4.30	805/1270	4.30	4.32	4.35	4.42	4.30	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	584/1269	4.60	4.49	4.35	4.41	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	415/ 878	4.17	4.04	4.05	4.09	4.17	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHIL 368 0101
 Title AESTHETICS
 Instructor: SENG, PHILLIP
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1232
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from 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 instructor make clear the expected 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 exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	333/1342	4.73	4.53	4.32	4.30	4.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	270/1520	4.74	4.34	4.25	4.25	4.74	
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute to 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 grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	575/1547	4.47	4.38	4.19	4.21	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	18	1	4.05	1441/1574	4.05	4.46	4.64	4.61	4.05	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	307/1554	4.62	4.34	4.10	4.09	4.62	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures 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	2	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	607/1493	4.88	4.82	4.73	4.70	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	499/1486	4.65	4.43	4.32	4.32	4.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	116/1489	4.94	4.56	4.32	4.34	4.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	278/1277	4.56	3.75	4.03	4.11	4.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	189/1279	4.87	4.31	4.17	4.20	4.87	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	435/1270	4.73	4.32	4.35	4.42	4.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	386/1269	4.80	4.49	4.35	4.41	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	11	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 878	****	4.04	4.05	4.09	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 11	Under-grad 19 Non-major 17
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 1		
			I 0	Other 2	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHIL 371 0101
 Title: EPISTEMOLOGY
 Instructor: EALICK, GREG E.
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1233
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new 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	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	851/1576	4.33	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1342	****	4.53	4.32	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	429/1520	4.57	4.34	4.25	4.25	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	424/1465	4.47	4.36	4.12	4.09	4.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	574/1434	4.36	4.30	4.14	4.15	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	5	3	6	4.07	992/1547	4.07	4.38	4.19	4.21	4.07	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	328/1574	4.93	4.46	4.64	4.61	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	463/1554	4.45	4.34	4.10	4.09	4.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well 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 instructor seem interested 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 material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	951/1486	4.27	4.43	4.32	4.32	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	742/1489	4.47	4.56	4.32	4.34	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	13	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1277	****	3.75	4.03	4.11	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	543/1279	4.42	4.31	4.17	4.20	4.42	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	827/1270	4.25	4.32	4.35	4.42	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair 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 techniques successful	4	9	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 878	****	4.04	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.32	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 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 Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	7	Under-grad	15	Non-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 not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 372 0101
 Title PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE
 Instructor: PFEIFER, JESSIC
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1234
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	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	0	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	5.00	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	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	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	B 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 responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 7	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHIL 391 0101
 Title PHILOSOPHY OF SEX
 Instructor: TEMPLETON, ROYE
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1235
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	8	7	3.90	1241/1576	3.90	4.40	4.30	4.30	3.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	6	6	5	3.48	1405/1576	3.48	4.35	4.27	4.28	3.48	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the 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 other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	3	5	6	3	3.39	1405/1520	3.39	4.34	4.25	4.25	3.39	
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute to 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 grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	445/1547	4.57	4.38	4.19	4.21	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	5	13	3	3.90	1522/1574	3.90	4.46	4.64	4.61	3.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching 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 the instructor's lectures well 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	0	1	1	5	14	4.52	1193/1493	4.52	4.82	4.73	4.70	4.52	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	5	12	4.40	821/1486	4.40	4.43	4.32	4.32	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	3	6	7	3.65	1286/1489	3.65	4.56	4.32	4.34	3.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	5	1	4	7	3.47	1033/1277	3.47	3.75	4.03	4.11	3.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	6	0	0	4	1	2.45	1255/1279	2.45	4.31	4.17	4.20	2.45	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	5	3	0	1	2	2.27	1257/1270	2.27	4.32	4.35	4.42	2.27	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	4	1	2	1	3	2.82	1234/1269	2.82	4.49	4.35	4.41	2.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	7	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/ 878	****	4.04	4.05	4.09	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 3	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 4	C 8	General 10	Under-grad 21 Non-major 19
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 6	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 4	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHIL 400 0601
 Title INDEP STUDY IN PHIL
 Instructor: EALICK, GREG E.
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1236
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	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	B 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 responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	1
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHIL 400 0901
 Title INDEP STUDY IN PHIL
 Instructor: THOMAS, JAMES
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1237
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	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	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	4.09	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	3.86	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	5.00	1/1574	5.00	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	821/1486	4.40	4.43	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	4.56	4.32	4.38	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	1267/1277	2.00	3.75	4.03	4.04	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															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.77	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.64	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 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	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHIL 454 0101
 Title ANIMALS AND THE ENVIRO
 Instructor: DIXON, BEN
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1239
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	541/1576	4.57	4.40	4.30	4.46	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	910/1576	4.29	4.35	4.27	4.35	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.53	4.32	4.46	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	768/1520	4.33	4.34	4.25	4.38	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.36	4.12	4.22	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	345/1434	4.57	4.30	4.14	4.30	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	445/1547	4.57	4.38	4.19	4.24	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1177/1574	4.43	4.46	4.64	4.69	4.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	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	4.67	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	
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	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHIL 470 0101
 Title PHILOSOPHY OF MIND
 Instructor: EALICK, GREG E.
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1240
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	347/1576	4.71	4.40	4.30	4.46	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	187/1576	4.86	4.35	4.27	4.35	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.53	4.32	4.46	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	167/1520	4.86	4.34	4.25	4.38	4.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	159/1465	4.83	4.36	4.12	4.22	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	138/1434	4.83	4.30	4.14	4.30	4.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	657/1547	4.43	4.38	4.19	4.24	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.46	4.64	4.69	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.34	4.10	4.24	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	355/1488	4.83	4.56	4.47	4.55	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	271/1486	4.80	4.43	4.32	4.41	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	309/1489	4.80	4.56	4.32	4.38	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1277	****	3.75	4.03	4.04	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute 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 all students actively encouraged 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 instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	4.04	4.05	4.33	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHIL 471 0101
 Title FREEDOM, DETERMINISM, RE
 Instructor: YALOWITZ, STEVE
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1241
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from 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 make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	851/1576	4.33	4.35	4.27	4.35	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	531/1342	4.56	4.53	4.32	4.46	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	826/1520	4.29	4.34	4.25	4.38	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	571/1465	4.33	4.36	4.12	4.22	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	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 system clearly explained	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 cancelled	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 the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	827/1554	4.14	4.34	4.10	4.24	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	278/1488	4.89	4.56	4.47	4.55	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	868/1493	4.78	4.82	4.73	4.80	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	981/1486	4.22	4.43	4.32	4.41	4.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	766/1489	4.44	4.56	4.32	4.38	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1277	****	3.75	4.03	4.04	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what 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 encouraged 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 techniques successful	0	7	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 878	****	4.04	4.05	4.33	****	

Frequency Distribution

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