

Course Section: PHIL 100 0201
 Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: YALOWITZ, STEVE
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1278
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	8	3	3.88	1307/1669	4.45	4.48	4.23	4.02	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	8	2	3.56	1445/1666	4.42	4.40	4.19	4.11	3.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	7	2	5	3.63	1181/1421	4.62	4.63	4.24	4.11	3.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1617	4.19	4.36	4.15	3.99	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	6	3	3	3.33	1326/1555	3.91	4.29	4.00	3.92	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	659/1543	4.09	4.16	4.06	3.86	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	5	2	6	3.69	1310/1647	4.40	4.38	4.12	4.06	3.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	16	0	4.00	1530/1668	4.30	4.56	4.67	4.62	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	9	4	2	3.53	1343/1605	4.35	4.29	4.07	3.96	3.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	984/1514	4.62	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	1111/1551	4.86	4.82	4.66	4.55	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	6	3	5	3.69	1269/1503	4.54	4.49	4.24	4.17	3.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	5	6	4.06	1042/1506	4.68	4.57	4.26	4.17	4.06	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	939/1311	3.61	3.65	3.85	3.68	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	2	3	0	3.33	1233/1490	4.46	4.24	4.05	3.85	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1253/1502	4.56	4.42	4.26	4.06	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1155/1489	4.74	4.52	4.29	4.07	3.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1006	****	3.99	4.00	3.81	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 5	C 2	General 4	Under-grad 16 Non-major 16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 1		

Course Section: PHIL 100 0301
 Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: THOMAS, JAMES
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1279
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	1	7	22	4.70	345/1669	4.45	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	27	4.90	103/1666	4.42	4.40	4.19	4.11	4.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1421	4.62	4.63	4.24	4.11	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	2	24	4.85	137/1617	4.19	4.36	4.15	3.99	4.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	1	9	3	12	3.92	905/1555	3.91	4.29	4.00	3.92	3.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	3	4	6	15	4.18	747/1543	4.09	4.16	4.06	3.86	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	25	4.83	156/1647	4.40	4.38	4.12	4.06	4.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	23	6	4.21	1412/1668	4.30	4.56	4.67	4.62	4.21	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	0	3	21	4.72	194/1605	4.35	4.29	4.07	3.96	4.72	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	132/1514	4.62	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1551	4.86	4.82	4.66	4.55	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	88/1503	4.54	4.49	4.24	4.17	4.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1506	4.68	4.57	4.26	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	19	1	0	1	0	7	4.33	389/1311	3.61	3.65	3.85	3.68	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	113/1490	4.46	4.24	4.05	3.85	4.93	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	189/1502	4.56	4.42	4.26	4.06	4.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1489	4.74	4.52	4.29	4.07	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	9	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1006	****	3.99	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.86	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.86	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.92	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.61	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: PHIL 100 0301
 Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: THOMAS, JAMES
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1279
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	23	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	30	Non-major	30
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	12	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course Section: PHIL 100 0401
 Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: THOMAS, JAMES
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1280
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	1	7	25	4.73	306/1669	4.45	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	26	4.73	281/1666	4.42	4.40	4.19	4.11	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	33	5.00	1/1421	4.62	4.63	4.24	4.11	5.00		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	3	4	23	4.67	323/1617	4.19	4.36	4.15	3.99	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	1	2	6	2	17	4.14	665/1555	3.91	4.29	4.00	3.92	4.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	4	7	20	4.52	380/1543	4.09	4.16	4.06	3.86	4.52	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	4	25	4.61	367/1647	4.40	4.38	4.12	4.06	4.61	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	1	1	25	5	4.06	1498/1668	4.30	4.56	4.67	4.62	4.06	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	28	4.90	99/1605	4.35	4.29	4.07	3.96	4.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	28	4.90	189/1514	4.62	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	205/1551	4.86	4.82	4.66	4.55	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	28	4.90	126/1503	4.54	4.49	4.24	4.17	4.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	66/1506	4.68	4.57	4.26	4.17	4.97	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	15	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	373/1311	3.61	3.65	3.85	3.68	4.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	177/1490	4.46	4.24	4.05	3.85	4.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	286/1502	4.56	4.42	4.26	4.06	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	224/1489	4.74	4.52	4.29	4.07	4.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	20	6	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	****/1006	****	3.99	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.86	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.86	4.36	4.19	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.92	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.61	3.95	3.90	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 24	Required for Majors 19	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C 0	General 7	Under-grad 34	Non-major 34
84-150	17	3.00-3.49	12	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 3		
				? 1			

Course Section: PHIL 100 0501
 Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: SENG, PHILLIP
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1281
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	1	0	8	17	4.58	511/1669	4.45	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	7	17	4.58	472/1666	4.42	4.40	4.19	4.11	4.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	7	17	4.58	493/1421	4.62	4.63	4.24	4.11	4.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	16	0	2	2	2	4	3.80	1224/1617	4.19	4.36	4.15	3.99	3.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	2	21	4.56	301/1555	3.91	4.29	4.00	3.92	4.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	23	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/1543	4.09	4.16	4.06	3.86	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	3	20	4.52	469/1647	4.40	4.38	4.12	4.06	4.52	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	19	7	4.19	1425/1668	4.30	4.56	4.67	4.62	4.19	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	9	10	4.45	448/1605	4.35	4.29	4.07	3.96	4.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	2	3	20	4.58	715/1514	4.62	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	7	19	4.73	917/1551	4.86	4.82	4.66	4.55	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	9	14	4.42	686/1503	4.54	4.49	4.24	4.17	4.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	4	19	4.58	575/1506	4.68	4.57	4.26	4.17	4.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	2	3	7	5	4	3.29	1048/1311	3.61	3.65	3.85	3.68	3.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	546/1490	4.46	4.24	4.05	3.85	4.42	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	632/1502	4.56	4.42	4.26	4.06	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	434/1489	4.74	4.52	4.29	4.07	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	9	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/1006	****	3.99	4.00	3.81	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	3	General	6	Under-grad	27	Non-major	26
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course Section: PHIL 100 0601
 Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: PFEIFER, JESSIC
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1282
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	5	8	11	4.16	1026/1669	4.45	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.16	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	6	14	4.32	789/1666	4.42	4.40	4.19	4.11	4.32	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	19	4.60	466/1421	4.62	4.63	4.24	4.11	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	1	1	3	4	1	3.30	1459/1617	4.19	4.36	4.15	3.99	3.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	6	10	4	3.46	1265/1555	3.91	4.29	4.00	3.92	3.46	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	18	1	1	1	3	0	3.00	****/1543	4.09	4.16	4.06	3.86	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	2	4	16	4.42	634/1647	4.40	4.38	4.12	4.06	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	1	6	15	2	3.64	1630/1668	4.30	4.56	4.67	4.62	3.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	3	1	1	2	13	3	3.80	1172/1605	4.35	4.29	4.07	3.96	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	17	4.64	616/1514	4.62	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	567/1551	4.86	4.82	4.66	4.55	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	7	15	4.48	588/1503	4.54	4.49	4.24	4.17	4.48	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	18	4.60	547/1506	4.68	4.57	4.26	4.17	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	3	1	6	4	4	3.28	1051/1311	3.61	3.65	3.85	3.68	3.28	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	445/1490	4.46	4.24	4.05	3.85	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	859/1502	4.56	4.42	4.26	4.06	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	553/1489	4.74	4.52	4.29	4.07	4.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	12	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1006	****	3.99	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 17	Required for Majors 17
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 6	
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	4	C 0	General 5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D 0	Under-grad 25
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Non-major 25
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Electives 0
					Other 2

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: PHIL 100 0801
 Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: EALICK, GREG E.
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1283
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	4	7	12	4.35	804/1669	4.45	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	15	6	4.17	975/1666	4.42	4.40	4.19	4.11	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	305/1421	4.62	4.63	4.24	4.11	4.74	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	3	7	11	4.23	831/1617	4.19	4.36	4.15	3.99	4.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	8	4	8	3.74	1079/1555	3.91	4.29	4.00	3.92	3.74	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	3	4	8	4	3.32	1328/1543	4.09	4.16	4.06	3.86	3.32	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	9	12	4.43	600/1647	4.40	4.38	4.12	4.06	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1668	4.30	4.56	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	8	9	4.37	551/1605	4.35	4.29	4.07	3.96	4.37	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	12	9	4.30	1052/1514	4.62	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	460/1551	4.86	4.82	4.66	4.55	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	6	13	4.45	637/1503	4.54	4.49	4.24	4.17	4.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	261/1506	4.68	4.57	4.26	4.17	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	17	3	0	0	1	2	2.83	1178/1311	3.61	3.65	3.85	3.68	2.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	389/1490	4.46	4.24	4.05	3.85	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	237/1502	4.56	4.42	4.26	4.06	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1489	4.74	4.52	4.29	4.07	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	7	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1006	****	3.99	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors 14
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 6	Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	General 5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D 0	Under-grad 23
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Non-major 23
				P 0	Electives 1
				I 0	Other 0
				? 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: PHIL 100 0901
 Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: EALICK, GREG E.
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1284
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	6	17	4.74	293/1669	4.45	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.74	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	16	4.65	372/1666	4.42	4.40	4.19	4.11	4.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	242/1421	4.62	4.63	4.24	4.11	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	11	9	4.32	739/1617	4.19	4.36	4.15	3.99	4.32	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	10	9	4.22	592/1555	3.91	4.29	4.00	3.92	4.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	9	9	4.17	747/1543	4.09	4.16	4.06	3.86	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	10	10	4.30	806/1647	4.40	4.38	4.12	4.06	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1668	4.30	4.56	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	7	13	4.65	249/1605	4.35	4.29	4.07	3.96	4.65	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	3	16	4.59	691/1514	4.62	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	256/1551	4.86	4.82	4.66	4.55	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	163/1503	4.54	4.49	4.24	4.17	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	394/1506	4.68	4.57	4.26	4.17	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	16	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	846/1311	3.61	3.65	3.85	3.68	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	380/1490	4.46	4.24	4.05	3.85	4.61	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	370/1502	4.56	4.42	4.26	4.06	4.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1489	4.74	4.52	4.29	4.07	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	13	2	1	0	0	2	2.80	****/1006	****	3.99	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.86	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.86	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.22	3.79	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.61	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.17	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 9
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 12	
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 1	General 7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	Under-grad 23
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Non-major 22
				P 0	
				I 0	Electives 1
				? 0	Other 5

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: PHIL 100Y 0101
 Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: EALICK, GREG E.
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1285
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	988/1669	4.20	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	814/1666	4.30	4.40	4.19	4.11	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	217/1421	4.80	4.63	4.24	4.11	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	831/1617	4.22	4.36	4.15	3.99	4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	5	4	4.10	709/1555	4.10	4.29	4.00	3.92	4.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	832/1543	4.10	4.16	4.06	3.86	4.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	367/1647	4.60	4.38	4.12	4.06	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.56	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	373/1605	4.50	4.29	4.07	3.96	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	584/1514	4.67	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.82	4.66	4.55	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	464/1503	4.60	4.49	4.24	4.17	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	286/1506	4.80	4.57	4.26	4.17	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1115/1311	3.00	3.65	3.85	3.68	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	0	1	6	4.00	849/1490	4.00	4.24	4.05	3.85	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	0	0	7	4.22	900/1502	4.22	4.42	4.26	4.06	4.22	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	753/1489	4.44	4.52	4.29	4.07	4.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	7	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1006	****	3.99	4.00	3.81	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 112	****	4.86	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.86	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.92	4.20	3.94	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: PHIL 146 0101
 Title CRITICAL THINKING
 Instructor: TEMPLETON, ROYE
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1286
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	3	2	9	4.06	1131/1669	4.17	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	3	11	4.44	648/1666	4.41	4.40	4.19	4.11	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	657/1421	4.52	4.63	4.24	4.11	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	801/1617	4.25	4.36	4.15	3.99	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	461/1555	4.30	4.29	4.00	3.92	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1138/1543	3.96	4.16	4.06	3.86	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	78/1647	4.80	4.38	4.12	4.06	4.94	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1668	4.97	4.56	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	4	5	4	3.79	1187/1605	3.75	4.29	4.07	3.96	3.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	727/1514	4.64	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	358/1551	4.77	4.82	4.66	4.55	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	879/1503	4.32	4.49	4.24	4.17	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	3	8	4.00	1069/1506	4.06	4.57	4.26	4.17	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	2	0	7	0	1	2.80	1186/1311	2.98	3.65	3.85	3.68	2.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	0	6	1	3	2.93	1372/1490	3.05	4.24	4.05	3.85	2.93	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	3	1	4	3	4	3.27	1370/1502	3.40	4.42	4.26	4.06	3.27	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	3	1	5	1	4	3.14	1384/1489	3.39	4.52	4.29	4.07	3.14	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.86	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	4.86	4.36	4.19	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	3	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	3						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course Section: PHIL 146 0201
 Title CRITICAL THINKING
 Instructor: TEMPLETON, ROYE
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1287
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	1	4	2	11	4.28	889/1669	4.17	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.28	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	715/1666	4.41	4.40	4.19	4.11	4.39	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	453/1421	4.52	4.63	4.24	4.11	4.61	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1617	4.25	4.36	4.15	3.99	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	5	9	4.22	584/1555	4.30	4.29	4.00	3.92	4.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	759/1543	3.96	4.16	4.06	3.86	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	302/1647	4.80	4.38	4.12	4.06	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	428/1668	4.97	4.56	4.67	4.62	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	1	5	5	3	3.71	1241/1605	3.75	4.29	4.07	3.96	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	489/1514	4.64	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.72	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	1	1	15	4.61	1097/1551	4.77	4.82	4.66	4.55	4.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	742/1503	4.32	4.49	4.24	4.17	4.39	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	4	10	4.11	1017/1506	4.06	4.57	4.26	4.17	4.11	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	2	1	4	5	1	3.15	1088/1311	2.98	3.65	3.85	3.68	3.15	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	4	2	3	5	3.18	1296/1490	3.05	4.24	4.05	3.85	3.18	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	4	2	5	5	3.53	1296/1502	3.40	4.42	4.26	4.06	3.53	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	2	2	2	5	6	3.65	1227/1489	3.39	4.52	4.29	4.07	3.65	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	15	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1006	****	3.99	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.86	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.86	4.36	4.19	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.61	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 9			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 3	General 8	Under-grad 18	Non-major 18
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D 2			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			

I	1	Other	0
?	0		

Course Section: PHIL 152 0201
 Title INTRO TO MORAL THEORY
 Instructor: DIXON, BEN
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1288
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	2	7	15	4.54	545/1669	4.64	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	10	12	4.42	676/1666	4.70	4.40	4.19	4.11	4.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	21	4.83	197/1421	4.84	4.63	4.24	4.11	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	2	8	10	4.40	641/1617	4.69	4.36	4.15	3.99	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	17	4.63	249/1555	4.32	4.29	4.00	3.92	4.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	1	2	7	8	4.05	863/1543	4.33	4.16	4.06	3.86	4.05	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	10	14	4.58	389/1647	4.70	4.38	4.12	4.06	4.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	18	5	4.17	1438/1668	4.40	4.56	4.67	4.62	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	288/1605	4.72	4.29	4.07	3.96	4.61	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	663/1514	4.75	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	512/1551	4.89	4.82	4.66	4.55	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	173/1503	4.80	4.49	4.24	4.17	4.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	225/1506	4.84	4.57	4.26	4.17	4.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	8	0	1	5	3	2	3.55	919/1311	3.48	3.65	3.85	3.68	3.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	251/1490	4.78	4.24	4.05	3.85	4.76	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	668/1502	4.69	4.42	4.26	4.06	4.47	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	299/1489	4.85	4.52	4.29	4.07	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	11	2	0	1	2	1	3.00	****/1006	****	3.99	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.17	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 15	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 3	Under-grad 25	Non-major 24
84-150	0	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 6		
				? 1			

Course Section: PHIL 152 0301
 Title INTRO TO MORAL THEORY
 Instructor: DIXON, BEN
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1289
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	5	13	4.48	633/1669	4.64	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.48	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	293/1666	4.70	4.40	4.19	4.11	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	184/1421	4.84	4.63	4.24	4.11	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	265/1617	4.69	4.36	4.15	3.99	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	100/1555	4.32	4.29	4.00	3.92	4.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	1	2	11	4.47	440/1543	4.33	4.16	4.06	3.86	4.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	250/1647	4.70	4.38	4.12	4.06	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	952/1668	4.40	4.56	4.67	4.62	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	328/1605	4.72	4.29	4.07	3.96	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	441/1514	4.75	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	307/1551	4.89	4.82	4.66	4.55	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	277/1503	4.80	4.49	4.24	4.17	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	225/1506	4.84	4.57	4.26	4.17	4.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	2	0	1	1	8	4.08	547/1311	3.48	3.65	3.85	3.68	4.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	141/1490	4.78	4.24	4.05	3.85	4.91	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	237/1502	4.69	4.42	4.26	4.06	4.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1489	4.85	4.52	4.29	4.07	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	7	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1006	****	3.99	4.00	3.81	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors 15	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 3	C 1	General 5	Under-grad 21 Non-major 21
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 3	
			? 0		

Course Section: PHIL 152 0401
 Title INTRO TO MORAL THEORY
 Instructor: SENG, PHILLIP
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1290
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	4	15	4.62	463/1669	4.64	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	527/1666	4.70	4.40	4.19	4.11	4.52	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	392/1421	4.84	4.63	4.24	4.11	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	242/1617	4.69	4.36	4.15	3.99	4.74	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	225/1555	4.32	4.29	4.00	3.92	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	7	9	4.00	895/1543	4.33	4.16	4.06	3.86	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	167/1647	4.70	4.38	4.12	4.06	4.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	8	4.38	1289/1668	4.40	4.56	4.67	4.62	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	358/1605	4.72	4.29	4.07	3.96	4.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	553/1514	4.75	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	825/1551	4.89	4.82	4.66	4.55	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	8	11	4.58	491/1503	4.80	4.49	4.24	4.17	4.58	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	446/1506	4.84	4.57	4.26	4.17	4.68	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	3	3	2	0	3	2.73	1201/1311	3.48	3.65	3.85	3.68	2.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	2	0	9	4.42	546/1490	4.78	4.24	4.05	3.85	4.42	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	880/1502	4.69	4.42	4.26	4.06	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	613/1489	4.85	4.52	4.29	4.07	4.58	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	****	3.99	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.42	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.86	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	4.86	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	4.92	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	4.61	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.08	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	2	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	4	
?	2			

Course Section: PHIL 152 0501
 Title INTRO TO MORAL THEORY
 Instructor: THOMAS, JAMES
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1291
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	5	21	4.74	281/1669	4.64	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.74	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	82/1666	4.70	4.40	4.19	4.11	4.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	25	4.89	164/1421	4.84	4.63	4.24	4.11	4.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	22	4.74	230/1617	4.69	4.36	4.15	3.99	4.74	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	2	1	7	5	8	3.70	1111/1555	4.32	4.29	4.00	3.92	3.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	3	8	12	4.39	525/1543	4.33	4.16	4.06	3.86	4.39	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	167/1647	4.70	4.38	4.12	4.06	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	14	10	4.36	1305/1668	4.40	4.56	4.67	4.62	4.36	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	50/1605	4.72	4.29	4.07	3.96	4.96	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	1	25	4.85	274/1514	4.75	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	24	4.85	650/1551	4.89	4.82	4.66	4.55	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	144/1503	4.80	4.49	4.24	4.17	4.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	25	4.89	188/1506	4.84	4.57	4.26	4.17	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	17	1	1	2	1	5	3.80	764/1311	3.48	3.65	3.85	3.68	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	184/1490	4.78	4.24	4.05	3.85	4.85	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	296/1502	4.69	4.42	4.26	4.06	4.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	338/1489	4.85	4.52	4.29	4.07	4.85	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	8	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/1006	****	3.99	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 112	****	4.86	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	4.86	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 105	****	4.92	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 98	****	4.61	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: PHIL 152 0501
 Title INTRO TO MORAL THEORY
 Instructor: THOMAS, JAMES
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1291
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	21	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	27	Non-major	27
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Course Section: PHIL 152 0601
 Title INTRO TO MORAL THEORY
 Instructor: THOMAS, JAMES
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1292
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	1	4	30	4.83	191/1669	4.64	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	32	4.91	92/1666	4.70	4.40	4.19	4.11	4.91	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	33	4.94	91/1421	4.84	4.63	4.24	4.11	4.94	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	0	1	3	27	4.84	146/1617	4.69	4.36	4.15	3.99	4.84	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	5	3	5	3	16	3.69	1118/1555	4.32	4.29	4.00	3.92	3.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	0	2	4	25	4.74	187/1543	4.33	4.16	4.06	3.86	4.74	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	1	6	26	4.60	367/1647	4.70	4.38	4.12	4.06	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	23	12	4.34	1321/1668	4.40	4.56	4.67	4.62	4.34	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	1	0	26	4.93	79/1605	4.72	4.29	4.07	3.96	4.93	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	29	4.85	274/1514	4.75	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	33	4.97	154/1551	4.89	4.82	4.66	4.55	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	32	4.94	76/1503	4.80	4.49	4.24	4.17	4.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	32	4.94	98/1506	4.84	4.57	4.26	4.17	4.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	22	3	2	1	1	5	3.25	1057/1311	3.48	3.65	3.85	3.68	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	71/1490	4.78	4.24	4.05	3.85	4.96	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	119/1502	4.69	4.42	4.26	4.06	4.96	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	252/1489	4.85	4.52	4.29	4.07	4.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	16	1	0	1	0	6	4.25	****/1006	****	3.99	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 29	Required for Majors	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General	10
84-150	15	3.00-3.49 11	D 0		Under-grad 36
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives	3
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	4
			? 0		

Course Section: PHIL 152H 0101
 Title INTRO TO MORAL THEORY
 Instructor: SENG, PHILLIP
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1293
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	0	3	4.50	590/1669	4.50	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	4.40	4.19	4.11	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.63	4.24	4.11	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	219/1617	4.75	4.36	4.15	3.99	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1555	5.00	4.29	4.00	3.92	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1497/1543	2.67	4.16	4.06	3.86	2.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	213/1647	4.75	4.38	4.12	4.06	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1382/1668	4.25	4.56	4.67	4.62	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1210/1605	3.75	4.29	4.07	3.96	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	799/1514	4.50	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.82	4.66	4.55	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.49	4.24	4.17	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.57	4.26	4.17	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	340/1490	4.67	4.24	4.05	3.85	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	486/1502	4.67	4.42	4.26	4.06	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	532/1489	4.67	4.52	4.29	4.07	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2	Under-grad	4	Non-major	4
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 152Y 0101
 Title INTRO TO MORAL THEORY
 Instructor: DIXON, BEN
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1294
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	2	3	4	4.00	1173/1669	4.00	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	777/1666	4.33	4.40	4.19	4.11	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	632/1421	4.44	4.63	4.24	4.11	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	770/1617	4.29	4.36	4.15	3.99	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	1	6	4.10	709/1555	4.10	4.29	4.00	3.92	4.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1043/1543	3.88	4.16	4.06	3.86	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	806/1647	4.30	4.38	4.12	4.06	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	1190/1668	4.50	4.56	4.67	4.62	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	139/1605	4.80	4.29	4.07	3.96	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	584/1514	4.67	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	843/1551	4.78	4.82	4.66	4.55	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	386/1503	4.67	4.49	4.24	4.17	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	326/1506	4.78	4.57	4.26	4.17	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	587/1311	4.00	3.65	3.85	3.68	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	340/1490	4.67	4.24	4.05	3.85	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	486/1502	4.67	4.42	4.26	4.06	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	348/1489	4.83	4.52	4.29	4.07	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1006	****	3.99	4.00	3.81	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: PHIL 210 0101
 Title PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION
 Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1295
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	2	1	4	8	16	4.13	1077/1669	4.13	4.48	4.23	4.34	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	6	8	14	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	4.40	4.19	4.29	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	18	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	356/1421	4.69	4.63	4.24	4.35	4.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	3	7	17	4.31	739/1617	4.31	4.36	4.15	4.24	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	0	5	23	4.52	332/1555	4.52	4.29	4.00	3.96	4.52	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	1	6	20	4.37	552/1543	4.37	4.16	4.06	4.10	4.37	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	3	5	7	6	9	3.43	1425/1647	3.43	4.38	4.12	4.19	3.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	23	4.77	952/1668	4.77	4.56	4.67	4.59	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	5	8	14	4.17	779/1605	4.17	4.29	4.07	4.15	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	4	3	8	13	3.97	1227/1514	3.97	4.57	4.39	4.39	3.97	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	4	24	4.79	806/1551	4.79	4.82	4.66	4.72	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	3	5	8	11	3.79	1215/1503	3.79	4.49	4.24	4.29	3.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	0	6	4	15	3.90	1179/1506	3.90	4.57	4.26	4.33	3.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	23	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1311	****	3.65	3.85	3.96	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	3	3	1	3	8	3.56	1135/1490	3.56	4.24	4.05	4.11	3.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	3	0	3	4	9	3.84	1154/1502	3.84	4.42	4.26	4.31	3.84	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	2	1	0	5	10	4.11	1006/1489	4.11	4.52	4.29	4.36	4.11	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	14	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1006	****	3.99	4.00	3.99	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 17	Required for Majors 14	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 1	B 12		
56-83	7	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General 7	Under-grad 31 Non-major 28
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 3	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 9	
			? 0		

Course Section: PHIL 248 0101
 Title INTRO SCIENTIF REASONI
 Instructor: SENG, PHILLIP
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1296
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	0	1	4	13	4.47	633/1669	4.47	4.48	4.23	4.34	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	15	4.63	399/1666	4.63	4.40	4.19	4.29	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	392/1421	4.67	4.63	4.24	4.35	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	2	16	4.68	300/1617	4.68	4.36	4.15	4.24	4.68	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	13	4.47	369/1555	4.47	4.29	4.00	3.96	4.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	478/1543	4.44	4.16	4.06	4.10	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	123/1647	4.89	4.38	4.12	4.19	4.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	6	4.32	1345/1668	4.32	4.56	4.67	4.59	4.32	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	201/1605	4.71	4.29	4.07	4.15	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	291/1514	4.84	4.57	4.39	4.39	4.84	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	307/1551	4.95	4.82	4.66	4.72	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	182/1503	4.84	4.49	4.24	4.29	4.84	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	3	14	4.61	534/1506	4.61	4.57	4.26	4.33	4.61	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	13	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	890/1311	3.60	3.65	3.85	3.96	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	1	10	4.58	400/1490	4.58	4.24	4.05	4.11	4.58	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.42	4.26	4.31	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.52	4.29	4.36	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	7	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	810/1006	3.40	3.99	4.00	3.99	3.40	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 19 Non-major 19
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 5	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 15	
			? 0		

Course Section: PHIL 251 0101
 Title ETH ISS SCI ENG&INF TE
 Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1297
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	2	2	8	9	4.14	1052/1669	4.04	4.48	4.23	4.34	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	10	4.24	908/1666	4.10	4.40	4.19	4.29	4.24	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	8	10	4.40	683/1421	4.34	4.63	4.24	4.35	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	11	4.29	770/1617	4.28	4.36	4.15	4.24	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	2	5	5	4	3.26	1354/1555	3.49	4.29	4.00	3.96	3.26	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	4	5	10	4.15	771/1543	4.25	4.16	4.06	4.10	4.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	5	9	5	3.81	1250/1647	3.73	4.38	4.12	4.19	3.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	952/1668	4.71	4.56	4.67	4.59	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	3	9	4	4.06	877/1605	3.84	4.29	4.07	4.15	4.06	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	4	9	7	4.05	1188/1514	3.66	4.57	4.39	4.39	4.05	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	862/1551	4.63	4.82	4.66	4.72	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	12	4	3.90	1168/1503	3.69	4.49	4.24	4.29	3.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	12	5	3.95	1121/1506	3.72	4.57	4.26	4.33	3.95	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	1	7	6	2	3.41	989/1311	3.42	3.65	3.85	3.96	3.41	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	9	5	3.90	956/1490	3.91	4.24	4.05	4.11	3.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	3	5	10	4.10	975/1502	4.20	4.42	4.26	4.31	4.10	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	3	8	8	4.15	980/1489	4.18	4.52	4.29	4.36	4.15	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	1	2	2	7	4	3.69	683/1006	3.84	3.99	4.00	3.99	3.69	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.20	****	
Self Paced															
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	4	A	11	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	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	8				
				?	1						

Course Section: PHIL 251 0201
 Title ETH ISS SCI ENG&INF TE
 Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1298
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	6	12	9	3.93	1253/1669	4.04	4.48	4.23	4.34	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	12	10	3.97	1150/1666	4.10	4.40	4.19	4.29	3.97
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	9	15	4.28	797/1421	4.34	4.63	4.24	4.35	4.28
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	8	5	16	4.28	780/1617	4.28	4.36	4.15	4.24	4.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	0	7	10	6	3.72	1087/1555	3.49	4.29	4.00	3.96	3.72
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	11	14	4.34	571/1543	4.25	4.16	4.06	4.10	4.34
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	9	8	8	3.66	1326/1647	3.73	4.38	4.12	4.19	3.66
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	8	20	4.66	1077/1668	4.71	4.56	4.67	4.59	4.66
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	1	3	6	8	6	3.63	1299/1605	3.84	4.29	4.07	4.15	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	3	5	3	10	4	3.28	1426/1514	3.66	4.57	4.39	4.39	3.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	3	6	15	4.50	1193/1551	4.63	4.82	4.66	4.72	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	3	1	6	11	4	3.48	1337/1503	3.69	4.49	4.24	4.29	3.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	4	3	8	7	3.48	1324/1506	3.72	4.57	4.26	4.33	3.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	11	2	1	4	3	4	3.43	983/1311	3.42	3.65	3.85	3.96	3.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	5	9	7	3.91	945/1490	3.91	4.24	4.05	4.11	3.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	1	11	10	4.30	846/1502	4.20	4.42	4.26	4.31	4.30
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	14	7	4.22	941/1489	4.18	4.52	4.29	4.36	4.22
4. Were special techniques successful	6	9	0	1	1	9	3	4.00	479/1006	3.84	3.99	4.00	3.99	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.42	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.71	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.59	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.86	4.38	4.59	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.86	4.36	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.22	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.92	4.20	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 98	****	4.61	3.95	4.20	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 16	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B 9			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	6	C 1	General 6	Under-grad 29	Non-major 29
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	12
?	0		

Course Section: PHIL 252 0201
 Title ETHICAL RESP IN COMP/I
 Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1299
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	5	10	4.67	389/1669	4.67	4.48	4.23	4.34	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	8	6	4.27	868/1666	4.27	4.40	4.19	4.29	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	863/1421	4.20	4.63	4.24	4.35	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	5	8	4.27	790/1617	4.27	4.36	4.15	4.24	4.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	0	2	3	4	3.64	1155/1555	3.64	4.29	4.00	3.96	3.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	580/1543	4.33	4.16	4.06	4.10	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	5	5	3	3.71	1295/1647	3.71	4.38	4.12	4.19	3.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	1125/1668	4.60	4.56	4.67	4.59	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	666/1605	4.27	4.29	4.07	4.15	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	923/1514	4.43	4.57	4.39	4.39	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	1055/1551	4.64	4.82	4.66	4.72	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	556/1503	4.50	4.49	4.24	4.29	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	496/1506	4.64	4.57	4.26	4.33	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	587/1311	4.00	3.65	3.85	3.96	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	501/1490	4.45	4.24	4.05	4.11	4.45	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	513/1502	4.64	4.42	4.26	4.31	4.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	280/1489	4.91	4.52	4.29	4.36	4.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	344/1006	4.33	3.99	4.00	3.99	4.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.42	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.74	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.71	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.59	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.86	4.38	4.59	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 97	****	4.86	4.36	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.22	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 105	****	4.92	4.20	4.63	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 98	****	4.61	3.95	4.20	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	5.00	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.67	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	

Course Section: PHIL 252 0201
 Title ETHICAL RESP IN COMP/I
 Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1299
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	3	A	7	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course Section: PHIL 321 0101
 Title HIST OF PHIL:ANCIENT
 Instructor: HITZ, ZENA
 Enrollment: 54
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1300
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	5	8	10	10	3.76	1371/1669	3.76	4.48	4.23	4.28	3.76	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	13	10	6	3.52	1462/1666	3.52	4.40	4.19	4.20	3.52	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	13	1	1	2	8	7	4.00	969/1421	4.00	4.63	4.24	4.25	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	4	9	11	5	3.42	1419/1617	3.42	4.36	4.15	4.22	3.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	12	15	4.24	567/1555	4.24	4.29	4.00	4.03	4.24	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	7	12	10	3.79	1115/1543	3.79	4.16	4.06	4.14	3.79	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	4	7	11	8	3.52	1389/1647	3.52	4.38	4.12	4.14	3.52	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	21	12	4.36	1305/1668	4.36	4.56	4.67	4.68	4.36	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	2	2	13	8	2	3.22	1464/1605	3.22	4.29	4.07	4.09	3.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	4	4	10	13	4.03	1190/1514	4.03	4.57	4.39	4.46	4.03	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	5	25	4.77	843/1551	4.77	4.82	4.66	4.70	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	4	5	13	6	3.48	1337/1503	3.48	4.49	4.24	4.28	3.48	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	3	6	9	11	3.77	1236/1506	3.77	4.57	4.26	4.30	3.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	28	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/1311	****	3.65	3.85	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	3	4	4	6	5	3.27	1255/1490	3.27	4.24	4.05	4.11	3.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	2	5	5	2	8	3.41	1338/1502	3.41	4.42	4.26	4.28	3.41	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	2	4	8	1	7	3.32	1348/1489	3.32	4.52	4.29	4.35	3.32	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	21	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1006	****	3.99	4.00	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 13
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 1	B 17		
56-83	9	2.00-2.99 2	C 2	General 3	Under-grad 33 Non-major 20
84-150	15	3.00-3.49 12	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 15	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 27	
			? 2		

Course Section: PHIL 321H 0101
 Title
 Instructor: HITZ, ZENA
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1301
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	1	4.00	1173/1669	4.00	4.48	4.23	4.28	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1466/1666	3.50	4.40	4.19	4.20	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1166/1421	3.67	4.63	4.24	4.25	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1251/1617	3.75	4.36	4.15	4.22	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	340/1555	4.50	4.29	4.00	4.03	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	895/1543	4.00	4.16	4.06	4.14	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1526/1647	3.00	4.38	4.12	4.14	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1329/1668	4.33	4.56	4.67	4.68	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1561/1605	2.50	4.29	4.07	4.09	2.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1082/1514	4.25	4.57	4.39	4.46	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1338/1551	4.25	4.82	4.66	4.70	4.25	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	879/1503	4.25	4.49	4.24	4.28	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	909/1506	4.25	4.57	4.26	4.30	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1328/1490	3.00	4.24	4.05	4.11	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1013/1502	4.00	4.42	4.26	4.28	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	1454/1489	2.67	4.52	4.29	4.35	2.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	923/1006	3.00	3.99	4.00	4.10	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: PHIL 327 0101
 Title AMERICAN PRAGMATISM
 Instructor: BRAUDE, STEPHEN
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1302
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	2	1	5	6	4.07	1124/1669	4.07	4.48	4.23	4.28	4.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	841/1666	4.29	4.40	4.19	4.20	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	493/1421	4.57	4.63	4.24	4.25	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	496/1617	4.50	4.36	4.15	4.22	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	195/1555	4.71	4.29	4.00	4.03	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	895/1543	4.00	4.16	4.06	4.14	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	962/1647	4.14	4.38	4.12	4.14	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	1	10	2	3.93	1581/1668	3.93	4.56	4.67	4.68	3.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	631/1605	4.31	4.29	4.07	4.09	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	616/1514	4.64	4.57	4.39	4.46	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	677/1551	4.85	4.82	4.66	4.70	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	5	7	4.38	742/1503	4.38	4.49	4.24	4.28	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	534/1506	4.62	4.57	4.26	4.30	4.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	11	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1311	****	3.65	3.85	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	816/1490	4.08	4.24	4.05	4.11	4.08	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	3	3	5	3.92	1106/1502	3.92	4.42	4.26	4.28	3.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	865/1489	4.33	4.52	4.29	4.35	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	11	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1006	****	3.99	4.00	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 7	General	5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	4
			? 1		

Course Section: PHIL 332 0101
 Title PHIL OF ASIAN MART ART
 Instructor: TEMPLETON, ROYE
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1303
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	3	0	0	5	12	4.15	1039/1669	4.15	4.48	4.23	4.28	4.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	5	9	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	4.40	4.19	4.20	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	1	3	7	7	3.80	1118/1421	3.80	4.63	4.24	4.25	3.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	3	2	8	4	3.47	1387/1617	3.47	4.36	4.15	4.22	3.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	1	2	14	4.30	516/1555	4.30	4.29	4.00	4.03	4.30	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	3	8	2	3	3.06	1401/1543	3.06	4.16	4.06	4.14	3.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	2	1	16	4.55	424/1647	4.55	4.38	4.12	4.14	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	807/1668	4.85	4.56	4.67	4.68	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	1	7	8	4.11	840/1605	4.11	4.29	4.07	4.09	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	2	16	4.65	600/1514	4.65	4.57	4.39	4.46	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	2	17	4.75	880/1551	4.75	4.82	4.66	4.70	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	8	11	4.40	719/1503	4.40	4.49	4.24	4.28	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	3	12	4.20	958/1506	4.20	4.57	4.26	4.30	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	3	4	6	6	3.65	854/1311	3.65	3.65	3.85	3.97	3.65	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	4	4	4	1	1	2.36	1453/1490	2.36	4.24	4.05	4.11	2.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	2	2	3	3	4	3.36	1352/1502	3.36	4.42	4.26	4.28	3.36	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	4	5	2	2	3.00	1398/1489	3.00	4.52	4.29	4.35	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	13	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	****	3.99	4.00	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 0	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 15		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 8	C 5	General 7	Under-grad 21 Non-major 18
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 4	
			? 0		

Course Section: PHIL 346 0101
 Title DEDUCTIVE SYSTEMS
 Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 63
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1304
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	7	36	4.72	318/1669	4.72	4.48	4.23	4.28	4.72	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	35	4.67	345/1666	4.67	4.40	4.19	4.20	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	5	5	34	4.66	405/1421	4.66	4.63	4.24	4.25	4.66	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	35	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	****/1617	****	4.36	4.15	4.22	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	3	8	10	18	4.10	709/1555	4.10	4.29	4.00	4.03	4.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	39	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	****/1543	****	4.16	4.06	4.14	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	9	12	24	4.28	828/1647	4.28	4.38	4.12	4.14	4.28	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	37	4.80	901/1668	4.80	4.56	4.67	4.68	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	5	11	23	4.46	423/1605	4.46	4.29	4.07	4.09	4.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	5	10	28	4.42	923/1514	4.42	4.57	4.39	4.46	4.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	1	41	4.84	677/1551	4.84	4.82	4.66	4.70	4.84	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	5	11	27	4.45	637/1503	4.45	4.49	4.24	4.28	4.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	5	7	31	4.47	693/1506	4.47	4.57	4.26	4.30	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	33	1	0	5	1	3	3.50	****/1311	****	3.65	3.85	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	3	0	3	5	12	4.00	849/1490	4.00	4.24	4.05	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	2	0	2	7	12	4.17	932/1502	4.17	4.42	4.26	4.28	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	1	1	4	4	13	4.17	966/1489	4.17	4.52	4.29	4.35	4.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	23	18	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	****/1006	****	3.99	4.00	4.10	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	45	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 32	Required for Majors	1 Graduate 0 Major 9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	13	2.00-2.99 10	C 3	General	9 Under-grad 46 Non-major 37
84-150	14	3.00-3.49 12	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives	1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	33
			? 0		

Course Section: PHIL 358 0101
 Title: BIOETHICS
 Instructor: DIXON, BEN
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1305
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	6	4	11	4.14	1064/1669	4.14	4.48	4.23	4.28	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	11	4.32	801/1666	4.32	4.40	4.19	4.20	4.32	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	17	4.64	429/1421	4.64	4.63	4.24	4.25	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	5	1	4	3.90	1168/1617	3.90	4.36	4.15	4.22	3.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	2	16	4.50	340/1555	4.50	4.29	4.00	4.03	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	0	7	1	5	3.64	1205/1543	3.64	4.16	4.06	4.14	3.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	14	4.55	435/1647	4.55	4.38	4.12	4.14	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	14	4.64	1096/1668	4.64	4.56	4.67	4.68	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	6	10	2	3.78	1195/1605	3.78	4.29	4.07	4.09	3.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	9	10	4.38	974/1514	4.38	4.57	4.39	4.46	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	880/1551	4.75	4.82	4.66	4.70	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	604/1503	4.48	4.49	4.24	4.28	4.48	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	4	13	4.43	744/1506	4.43	4.57	4.26	4.30	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	12	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	904/1311	3.57	3.65	3.85	3.97	3.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	490/1490	4.47	4.24	4.05	4.11	4.47	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	486/1502	4.67	4.42	4.26	4.28	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	196/1489	4.93	4.52	4.29	4.35	4.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	12	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1006	****	3.99	4.00	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 16	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 8	Under-grad 22 Non-major 18
84-150	9	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 8	
			? 0		

Title

Baltimore County

JAN 18, 2007

Instructor: DIXON, BEN

Fall 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 6

Questionnaires: 6

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	0	6	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.48	4.23	4.28	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	359/1666	4.67	4.40	4.19	4.20	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.63	4.24	4.25	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	496/1617	4.50	4.36	4.15	4.22	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	128/1555	4.83	4.29	4.00	4.03	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	298/1543	4.60	4.16	4.06	4.14	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	481/1647	4.50	4.38	4.12	4.14	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1125/1668	4.60	4.56	4.67	4.68	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	139/1605	4.80	4.29	4.07	4.09	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	308/1514	4.83	4.57	4.39	4.46	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.82	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	386/1503	4.67	4.49	4.24	4.28	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.57	4.26	4.30	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1311	5.00	3.65	3.85	3.97	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	389/1490	4.60	4.24	4.05	4.11	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.42	4.26	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.52	4.29	4.35	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	759/1006	3.50	3.99	4.00	4.10	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		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
			? 0		

Course Section: PHIL 370 0101
 Title PHIL AND PARAPSYCHOLOG
 Instructor: BRAUDE, STEPHEN
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1307
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	5	10	4.26	901/1669	4.26	4.48	4.23	4.28	4.26	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	9	4.37	740/1666	4.37	4.40	4.19	4.20	4.37	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	368/1421	4.68	4.63	4.24	4.25	4.68	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	1029/1617	4.00	4.36	4.15	4.22	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	104/1555	4.89	4.29	4.00	4.03	4.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1167/1543	3.71	4.16	4.06	4.14	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	15	4.68	281/1647	4.68	4.38	4.12	4.14	4.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	1030/1668	4.71	4.56	4.67	4.68	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	565/1605	4.35	4.29	4.07	4.09	4.35	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	663/1514	4.61	4.57	4.39	4.46	4.61	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.82	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	5	10	4.33	800/1503	4.33	4.49	4.24	4.28	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	471/1506	4.67	4.57	4.26	4.30	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	2	2	5	7	4.06	557/1311	4.06	3.65	3.85	3.97	4.06	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	3	1	1	9	4.14	778/1490	4.14	4.24	4.05	4.11	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	1	1	1	10	4.29	859/1502	4.29	4.42	4.26	4.28	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	478/1489	4.71	4.52	4.29	4.35	4.71	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.13	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	4.13	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 12			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 7	Under-grad 19	Non-major 15
84-150	8	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 8		
				? 1			

Course Section: PHIL 394 0101
 Title PHILOSOPHY OF BIOLOGY
 Instructor: EALICK, GREG E.
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1308
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	1	1	10	4.54	556/1669	4.54	4.48	4.23	4.28	4.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	1054/1666	4.08	4.40	4.19	4.20	4.08	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1421	****	4.63	4.24	4.25	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	465/1617	4.54	4.36	4.15	4.22	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	243/1555	4.64	4.29	4.00	4.03	4.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	534/1543	4.38	4.16	4.06	4.14	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	682/1647	4.38	4.38	4.12	4.14	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.56	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	725/1605	4.22	4.29	4.07	4.09	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	2	9	4.38	974/1514	4.38	4.57	4.39	4.46	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	677/1551	4.85	4.82	4.66	4.70	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	621/1503	4.46	4.49	4.24	4.28	4.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	534/1506	4.62	4.57	4.26	4.30	4.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1311	****	3.65	3.85	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	709/1490	4.23	4.24	4.05	4.11	4.23	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	381/1502	4.77	4.42	4.26	4.28	4.77	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.52	4.29	4.35	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	11	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1006	****	3.99	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.13	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.86	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 97	****	4.86	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.92	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.61	3.95	4.15	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: PHIL 400 0110
 Title INDEP STUDY IN PHIL
 Instructor: THOMAS, JAMES (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1309
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	1	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.48	4.23	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	4.75	4.40	4.19	4.22	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.63	4.24	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1617	4.67	4.36	4.15	4.22	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1555	4.75	4.29	4.00	4.08	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1543	5.00	4.16	4.06	4.18	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1647	4.50	4.38	4.12	4.14	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1668	4.75	4.56	4.67	4.70	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1605	4.67	4.29	4.07	4.16	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.57	4.39	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1551	4.67	4.82	4.66	4.73	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.49	4.24	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.57	4.26	4.29	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1311	5.00	3.65	3.85	3.88	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1490	4.75	4.24	4.05	4.26	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1502	4.67	4.42	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.52	4.29	4.52	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1006	5.00	3.99	4.00	4.21	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 55	5.00	5.00	4.34	5.00	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 42	5.00	5.00	4.31	5.00	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 46	5.00	5.00	4.45	4.92	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	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	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				
				?	0						

Course Section: PHIL 400 0110
 Title INDEP STUDY IN PHIL
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1310
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	0	1	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.48	4.23	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	4.75	4.40	4.19	4.22	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.63	4.24	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1617	4.67	4.36	4.15	4.22	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1555	4.75	4.29	4.00	4.08	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1543	5.00	4.16	4.06	4.18	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1647	4.50	4.38	4.12	4.14	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1668	4.75	4.56	4.67	4.70	5.00	
Lecture															
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1404/1551	4.67	4.82	4.66	4.73	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1490	4.75	4.24	4.05	4.26	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1502	4.67	4.42	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.52	4.29	4.52	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1006	5.00	3.99	4.00	4.21	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 55	5.00	5.00	4.34	5.00	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 42	5.00	5.00	4.31	5.00	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 46	5.00	5.00	4.45	4.92	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: PHIL 400 0301
 Title INDEP STUDY IN PHIL
 Instructor: YALOWITZ, STEVE
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1311
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	0	1	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.48	4.23	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	4.75	4.40	4.19	4.22	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.63	4.24	4.38	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	773/1555	4.75	4.29	4.00	4.08	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1043/1647	4.50	4.38	4.12	4.14	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1530/1668	4.75	4.56	4.67	4.70	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1605	4.67	4.29	4.07	4.16	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.57	4.39	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1551	4.67	4.82	4.66	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.49	4.24	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.57	4.26	4.29	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	849/1490	4.75	4.24	4.05	4.26	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1013/1502	4.67	4.42	4.26	4.46	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.52	4.29	4.52	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 112	5.00	4.86	4.38	4.74	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	4.86	4.36	4.69	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	46/ 98	4.00	4.61	3.95	3.86	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: PHIL 400 1101
 Title INDEP STUDY IN PHIL
 Instructor: DIXON, BEN
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1312
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	0	1	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.48	4.23	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1094/1666	4.75	4.40	4.19	4.22	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1029/1617	4.67	4.36	4.15	4.22	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1555	4.75	4.29	4.00	4.08	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1543	5.00	4.16	4.06	4.18	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1043/1647	4.50	4.38	4.12	4.14	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1668	4.75	4.56	4.67	4.70	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	918/1605	4.67	4.29	4.07	4.16	4.00	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1490	4.75	4.24	4.05	4.26	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: PHIL 405 0401
 Title HONORS INDEP STUDY-PHI
 Instructor: BRAUDE, STEPHEN
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1313
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	0	1	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.48	4.23	4.39	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.56	4.67	4.70	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1605	5.00	4.29	4.07	4.16	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 55	5.00	5.00	4.34	5.00	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 46	5.00	5.00	4.45	4.92	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	1	Non-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	1	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course Section: PHIL 452 0101
 Title ADV TOPICS IN ETHICS
 Instructor: DWYER, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1314
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	7	4.78	244/1669	4.78	4.48	4.23	4.39	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	494/1666	4.56	4.40	4.19	4.22	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.63	4.24	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	219/1617	4.75	4.36	4.15	4.22	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	301/1555	4.56	4.29	4.00	4.08	4.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	180/1543	4.75	4.16	4.06	4.18	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	583/1647	4.44	4.38	4.12	4.14	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1157/1668	4.56	4.56	4.67	4.70	4.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	194/1605	4.71	4.29	4.07	4.16	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	223/1514	4.89	4.57	4.39	4.45	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.82	4.66	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	653/1503	4.44	4.49	4.24	4.27	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	188/1506	4.89	4.57	4.26	4.29	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1311	****	3.65	3.85	3.88	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	177/1490	4.86	4.24	4.05	4.26	4.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.42	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.52	4.29	4.52	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1006	****	3.99	4.00	4.21	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	58/ 112	4.57	4.86	4.38	4.74	4.57	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	47/ 97	4.57	4.86	4.36	4.69	4.57	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	32/ 92	4.86	4.93	4.22	4.48	4.86	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	32/ 105	4.83	4.92	4.20	4.27	4.83	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	25/ 98	4.83	4.61	3.95	3.86	4.83	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: PHIL 470 0101
 Title PHILOSOPHY OF MIND
 Instructor: YALOWITZ, STEVE
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1315
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	9	4.41	719/1669	4.41	4.48	4.23	4.39	4.41	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	676/1666	4.41	4.40	4.19	4.22	4.41	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	441/1421	4.63	4.63	4.24	4.38	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	554/1617	4.46	4.36	4.15	4.22	4.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	5	8	4.12	698/1555	4.12	4.29	4.00	4.08	4.12	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	3	4	3	4	3.57	1236/1543	3.57	4.16	4.06	4.18	3.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	634/1647	4.41	4.38	4.12	4.14	4.41	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	1	13	2	4.06	1498/1668	4.06	4.56	4.67	4.70	4.06	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	737/1605	4.21	4.29	4.07	4.16	4.21	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	522/1514	4.71	4.57	4.39	4.45	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	358/1551	4.94	4.82	4.66	4.73	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	879/1503	4.25	4.49	4.24	4.27	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	693/1506	4.47	4.57	4.26	4.29	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	15	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1311	****	3.65	3.85	3.88	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	4	3	3	3.58	1124/1490	3.58	4.24	4.05	4.26	3.58	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	632/1502	4.50	4.42	4.26	4.46	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	532/1489	4.67	4.52	4.29	4.52	4.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.86	4.38	4.74	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.86	4.36	4.69	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.92	4.20	4.27	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	4	Under-grad	17	Non-major	6
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

Course Section: PHIL 472 0101
 Title ADV TOP:PHIL OF SCIENC
 Instructor: EALICK, GREG E.
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1316
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	0	5	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.48	4.23	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	181/1666	4.80	4.40	4.19	4.22	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.63	4.24	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.36	4.15	4.22	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	438/1555	4.40	4.29	4.00	4.08	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	180/1543	4.75	4.16	4.06	4.18	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	167/1647	4.80	4.38	4.12	4.14	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.56	4.67	4.70	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	918/1605	4.00	4.29	4.07	4.16	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.57	4.39	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	788/1551	4.80	4.82	4.66	4.73	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.49	4.24	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	286/1506	4.80	4.57	4.26	4.29	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1311	****	3.65	3.85	3.88	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	558/1490	4.40	4.24	4.05	4.26	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	336/1502	4.80	4.42	4.26	4.46	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.52	4.29	4.52	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	****	3.99	4.00	4.21	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 112	5.00	4.86	4.38	4.74	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	4.86	4.36	4.69	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	4.93	4.22	4.48	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 105	5.00	4.92	4.20	4.27	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 98	5.00	4.61	3.95	3.86	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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