

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 100 01
Title:	Intro To Philosophy
Instructor:	Thomas,James G

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	45
Questionnaires:	42

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	9	0	0	0	0	3	30	4.91	140/1520	4.65	4.42	4.31	4.14	4.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	9	0	0	0	1	0	32	4.94	80/1520	4.78	4.38	4.27	4.20	4.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	9	0	0	0	0	1	32	4.97	56/1291	4.84	4.55	4.33	4.24	4.97
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	9	2	0	0	0	3	28	4.90	106/1483	4.64	4.33	4.23	4.09	4.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	1	0	1	3	5	23	4.56	314/1417	4.48	4.21	4.08	4.02	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	7	25	4.67	235/1405	4.55	4.24	4.12	3.96	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	0	0	0	1	3	29	4.85	119/1504	4.52	4.31	4.16	4.13	4.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	0	0	0	24	9	4.27	1300/1519	4.45	4.57	4.70	4.71	4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	63/1495	4.63	4.22	4.11	4.01	4.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	1	1	29	4.90	199/1459	4.76	4.54	4.47	4.40	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	0	32	5.00	1/1460	4.96	4.79	4.74	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	1	31	4.97	65/1455	4.74	4.39	4.32	4.26	4.97
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	31	4.97	80/1456	4.86	4.43	4.34	4.26	4.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	17	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	256/1316	4.24	3.67	4.03	3.91	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	2	0	15	4.76	228/1243	4.55	4.20	4.17	3.98	4.76
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	188/1241	4.56	4.15	4.33	4.14	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	315/1236	4.75	4.36	4.40	4.19	4.82

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 100 01
Title:	Intro To Philosophy
Instructor:	Thomas,James G

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	45
Questionnaires:	42

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	25	7	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	****/889	3.62	3.65	4.02	3.89	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	25	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	20	Under-grad	42	Non-major	42
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	7	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	13						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 100 02
Title:	Intro To Philosophy
Instructor:	Thomas,James G

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	34

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	32	4.91	126/1520	4.65	4.42	4.31	4.14	4.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	5.00	1/1520	4.78	4.38	4.27	4.20	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	31	4.82	213/1291	4.84	4.55	4.33	4.24	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	2	2	28	4.70	286/1483	4.64	4.33	4.23	4.09	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	1	8	22	4.52	354/1417	4.48	4.21	4.08	4.02	4.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	2	28	4.73	190/1405	4.55	4.24	4.12	3.96	4.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	6	27	4.82	140/1504	4.52	4.31	4.16	4.13	4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	17	17	4.50	1129/1519	4.45	4.57	4.70	4.71	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	36/1495	4.63	4.22	4.11	4.01	4.96
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	5.00	1/1459	4.76	4.54	4.47	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	5.00	1/1460	4.96	4.79	4.74	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	5.00	1/1455	4.74	4.39	4.32	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	5.00	1/1456	4.86	4.43	4.34	4.26	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	15	1	0	3	1	14	4.42	383/1316	4.24	3.67	4.03	3.91	4.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	142/1243	4.55	4.20	4.17	3.98	4.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	100/1241	4.56	4.15	4.33	4.14	4.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	128/1236	4.75	4.36	4.40	4.19	4.94
4. Were special techniques successful	16	7	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	276/889	3.62	3.65	4.02	3.89	4.36

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 100 02
Title:	Intro To Philosophy
Instructor:	Thomas,James G

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	34

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/164	****	****	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.31	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 100 02
Title:	Intro To Philosophy
Instructor:	Thomas,James G

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	34

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 22	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General 20	Under-grad 34
84-150	14	3.00-3.49 9	D 0		Non-major 34
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 7	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 6		

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 100 03
Title:	Intro To Philosophy
Instructor:	Thomas,James G

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	44
Questionnaires:	30

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	27	4.90	140/1520	4.65	4.42	4.31	4.14	4.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	27	4.90	115/1520	4.78	4.38	4.27	4.20	4.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	29	4.97	56/1291	4.84	4.55	4.33	4.24	4.97
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	3	23	4.81	164/1483	4.64	4.33	4.23	4.09	4.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	2	4	8	12	3.83	994/1417	4.48	4.21	4.08	4.02	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	7	19	4.47	433/1405	4.55	4.24	4.12	3.96	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	7	19	4.52	426/1504	4.52	4.31	4.16	4.13	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	22	7	4.24	1321/1519	4.45	4.57	4.70	4.71	4.24
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	45/1495	4.63	4.22	4.11	4.01	4.96
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	234/1459	4.76	4.54	4.47	4.40	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	435/1460	4.96	4.79	4.74	4.68	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	184/1455	4.74	4.39	4.32	4.26	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	160/1456	4.86	4.43	4.34	4.26	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	20	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	****/1316	4.24	3.67	4.03	3.91	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	298/1243	4.55	4.20	4.17	3.98	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	188/1241	4.56	4.15	4.33	4.14	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	239/1236	4.75	4.36	4.40	4.19	4.89

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 100 03
Title:	Intro To Philosophy
Instructor:	Thomas,James G

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	44
Questionnaires:	30

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	21	4	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/889	3.62	3.65	4.02	3.89	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	24	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	16	Under-grad	30	Non-major	30
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	9	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 100 04
Title:	Intro To Philosophy
Instructor:	Pfeifer, Jessica

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	439/1520	4.65	4.42	4.31	4.14	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	283/1520	4.78	4.38	4.27	4.20	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	185/1291	4.84	4.55	4.33	4.24	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	2	0	3	12	4.47	535/1483	4.64	4.33	4.23	4.09	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	0	5	13	4.45	417/1417	4.48	4.21	4.08	4.02	4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	1	1	1	3	7	4.08	808/1405	4.55	4.24	4.12	3.96	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	2	15	4.60	331/1504	4.52	4.31	4.16	4.13	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	18	2	4.10	1405/1519	4.45	4.57	4.70	4.71	4.10
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	2	10	9	4.33	568/1495	4.63	4.22	4.11	4.01	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	664/1459	4.76	4.54	4.47	4.40	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	20	4.86	648/1460	4.96	4.79	4.74	4.68	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	374/1455	4.74	4.39	4.32	4.26	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	303/1456	4.86	4.43	4.34	4.26	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	3	6	12	4.27	518/1316	4.24	3.67	4.03	3.91	4.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	298/1243	4.55	4.20	4.17	3.98	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	635/1241	4.56	4.15	4.33	4.14	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	404/1236	4.75	4.36	4.40	4.19	4.75

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 100 04
Title:	Intro To Philosophy
Instructor:	Pfeifer, Jessica

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	6	8	2	2	1	1	2	2.88	851/889	3.62	3.65	4.02	3.89	2.88

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	12	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 100 05
Title:	Intro To Philosophy
Instructor:	Smith,Aaron Joh

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	6	9	4.21	964/1520	4.65	4.42	4.31	4.14	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	12	4.47	625/1520	4.78	4.38	4.27	4.20	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	2	14	4.61	432/1291	4.84	4.55	4.33	4.24	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	1	0	1	0	7	4.33	713/1483	4.64	4.33	4.23	4.09	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	171/1417	4.48	4.21	4.08	4.02	4.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	14	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1405	4.55	4.24	4.12	3.96	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	3	4	10	4.22	781/1504	4.52	4.31	4.16	4.13	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	1012/1519	4.45	4.57	4.70	4.71	4.61
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	470/1495	4.63	4.22	4.11	4.01	4.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	833/1459	4.76	4.54	4.47	4.40	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1460	4.96	4.79	4.74	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	581/1455	4.74	4.39	4.32	4.26	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	15	4.72	425/1456	4.86	4.43	4.34	4.26	4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	13	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	401/1316	4.24	3.67	4.03	3.91	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	516/1243	4.55	4.20	4.17	3.98	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	807/1241	4.56	4.15	4.33	4.14	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	1	0	8	4.50	649/1236	4.75	4.36	4.40	4.19	4.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 100 05
Title:	Intro To Philosophy
Instructor:	Smith,Aaron Joh

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	10	5	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/889	3.62	3.65	4.02	3.89	****

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	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	13						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	9	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	8	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 100 06
Title:	Intro To Philosophy
Instructor:	Smith,Aaron Joh

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	18	4.73	323/1520	4.65	4.42	4.31	4.14	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	184/1520	4.78	4.38	4.27	4.20	4.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	222/1291	4.84	4.55	4.33	4.24	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	361/1483	4.64	4.33	4.23	4.09	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	179/1417	4.48	4.21	4.08	4.02	4.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	16	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	121/1405	4.55	4.24	4.12	3.96	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	4	15	4.45	503/1504	4.52	4.31	4.16	4.13	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	15	4.68	933/1519	4.45	4.57	4.70	4.71	4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	351/1495	4.63	4.22	4.11	4.01	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	374/1459	4.76	4.54	4.47	4.40	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1460	4.96	4.79	4.74	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	487/1455	4.74	4.39	4.32	4.26	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	303/1456	4.86	4.43	4.34	4.26	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	13	2	2	0	1	4	3.33	1131/1316	4.24	3.67	4.03	3.91	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	378/1243	4.55	4.20	4.17	3.98	4.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	615/1241	4.56	4.15	4.33	4.14	4.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	328/1236	4.75	4.36	4.40	4.19	4.82

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 100 06	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 40
Title: Intro To Philosophy		Questionnaires: 22
Instructor: Smith,Aaron Joh		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	11	6	0	2	0	0	3	3.80	****/889	3.62	3.65	4.02	3.89	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	12	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 100 07
Title:	Intro To Philosophy
Instructor:	Smith,Aaron Joh

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	39
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	11	8	4.24	944/1520	4.65	4.42	4.31	4.14	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	485/1520	4.78	4.38	4.27	4.20	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	232/1291	4.84	4.55	4.33	4.24	4.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1483	4.64	4.33	4.23	4.09	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	15	4.57	306/1417	4.48	4.21	4.08	4.02	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	17	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1405	4.55	4.24	4.12	3.96	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	3	1	5	11	4.20	803/1504	4.52	4.31	4.16	4.13	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	899/1519	4.45	4.57	4.70	4.71	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	9	6	4.31	592/1495	4.63	4.22	4.11	4.01	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	772/1459	4.76	4.54	4.47	4.40	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	272/1460	4.96	4.79	4.74	4.68	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	761/1455	4.74	4.39	4.32	4.26	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	384/1456	4.86	4.43	4.34	4.26	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	12	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	383/1316	4.24	3.67	4.03	3.91	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	0	1	1	6	3.90	849/1243	4.55	4.20	4.17	3.98	3.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	882/1241	4.56	4.15	4.33	4.14	4.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	649/1236	4.75	4.36	4.40	4.19	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	11	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/889	3.62	3.65	4.02	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 100 07
Title:	Intro To Philosophy
Instructor:	Smith,Aaron Joh

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	39
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2 A 10	Required for Majors	1 Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0 B 10		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1 C 0	General	16 Under-grad 21 Non-major 21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4 D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2 F 0	Electives	2 **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	1
			? 1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	5	7	2	3.33	1458/1520	3.46	4.42	4.31	4.14	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	6	7	2	3.33	1420/1520	3.67	4.38	4.27	4.20	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	3	3	4	6	3.81	1073/1291	3.91	4.55	4.33	4.24	3.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	1	2	0	0	1	2.50	****/1483	3.14	4.33	4.23	4.09	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	3	1	4	7	3.50	1187/1417	3.72	4.21	4.08	4.02	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	****/1405	****	4.24	4.12	3.96	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	4	10	4.22	781/1504	4.14	4.31	4.16	4.13	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	632/1519	4.82	4.57	4.70	4.71	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	5	4	4	2	0	2.20	1491/1495	2.56	4.22	4.11	4.01	2.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	5	5	7	4.00	1230/1459	4.24	4.54	4.47	4.40	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	5	3	10	4.28	1330/1460	4.29	4.79	4.74	4.68	4.28
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	4	3	4	5	2	2.89	1419/1455	3.27	4.39	4.32	4.26	2.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	3	6	1	3	2.67	1440/1456	2.72	4.43	4.34	4.26	2.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	6	2	3	1	0	1.92	1311/1316	1.83	3.67	4.03	3.91	1.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	4	6	1	1	2.28	1235/1243	2.41	4.20	4.17	3.98	2.28
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	9	6	2	0	0	1.59	1238/1241	2.19	4.15	4.33	4.14	1.59
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	7	5	2	1	3	2.33	1230/1236	2.47	4.36	4.40	4.19	2.33
4. Were special techniques successful	1	16	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/889	****	3.65	4.02	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	39
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	6	5	4	3.59	1372/1520	3.46	4.42	4.31	4.14	3.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	8	5	4.00	1086/1520	3.67	4.38	4.27	4.20	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	2	9	4	4.00	974/1291	3.91	4.55	4.33	4.24	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	1	2	1	1	2	3.14	1432/1483	3.14	4.33	4.23	4.09	3.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	1	5	8	3.94	880/1417	3.72	4.21	4.08	4.02	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/1405	****	4.24	4.12	3.96	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	1	4	9	4.06	957/1504	4.14	4.31	4.16	4.13	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	840/1519	4.82	4.57	4.70	4.71	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	4	5	3	1	2.93	1437/1495	2.56	4.22	4.11	4.01	2.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	873/1459	4.24	4.54	4.47	4.40	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	2	2	11	4.29	1322/1460	4.29	4.79	4.74	4.68	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	4	4	3	6	3.65	1280/1455	3.27	4.39	4.32	4.26	3.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	6	4	4	1	2.76	1431/1456	2.72	4.43	4.34	4.26	2.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	7	2	2	1	0	1.75	1312/1316	1.83	3.67	4.03	3.91	1.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	5	2	4	3	1	2.53	1227/1243	2.41	4.20	4.17	3.98	2.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	6	1	5	1	2.80	1216/1241	2.19	4.15	4.33	4.14	2.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	5	2	4	2	2	2.60	1224/1236	2.47	4.36	4.40	4.19	2.60
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	39
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Field Work														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	7	General	10	Under-grad	18	Non-major	17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	1	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	2						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 150 1
Title:	Contemporary Moral Iss
Instructor:	Ealick,Greg

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	81
Questionnaires:	47

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	7	19	20	4.21	964/1520	4.21	4.42	4.31	4.14	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	21	18	4.15	989/1520	4.15	4.38	4.27	4.20	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	25	1	1	3	8	9	4.05	954/1291	4.05	4.55	4.33	4.24	4.05
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	3	4	19	20	4.22	842/1483	4.22	4.33	4.23	4.09	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	6	7	18	13	3.74	1052/1417	3.74	4.21	4.08	4.02	3.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	1	8	19	14	3.95	902/1405	3.95	4.24	4.12	3.96	3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	3	9	15	16	3.83	1167/1504	3.83	4.31	4.16	4.13	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	45	4.96	296/1519	4.96	4.57	4.70	4.71	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	3	3	20	11	4.05	856/1495	4.05	4.22	4.11	4.01	4.05
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	4	13	28	4.48	873/1459	4.48	4.54	4.47	4.40	4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	5	39	4.80	806/1460	4.80	4.79	4.74	4.68	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	4	14	26	4.39	772/1455	4.39	4.39	4.32	4.26	4.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	12	30	4.52	662/1456	4.52	4.43	4.34	4.26	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	33	1	1	1	4	4	3.82	****/1316	****	3.67	4.03	3.91	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	4	10	13	15	3.86	870/1243	3.86	4.20	4.17	3.98	3.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	5	11	5	20	3.84	1021/1241	3.84	4.15	4.33	4.14	3.84
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	3	5	10	25	4.33	789/1236	4.33	4.36	4.40	4.19	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	4	15	4	1	5	14	4	3.46	720/889	3.46	3.65	4.02	3.89	3.46

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 150 1
Title:	Contemporary Moral Iss
Instructor:	Ealick,Greg

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	81
Questionnaires:	47

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	45	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	45	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	46	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 150 1
Title:	Contemporary Moral Iss
Instructor:	Ealick,Greg

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	81
Questionnaires:	47

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	2	A	24	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	2	B	17						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	29	Under-grad	47	Non-major	47
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	7	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	39
Questionnaires:	33

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	9	20	4.50	607/1520	4.47	4.42	4.31	4.14	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	7	23	4.55	527/1520	4.46	4.38	4.27	4.20	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	29	4.85	194/1291	4.67	4.55	4.33	4.24	4.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	3	4	4	19	4.30	747/1483	4.34	4.33	4.23	4.09	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	0	10	10	9	3.69	1083/1417	3.94	4.21	4.08	4.02	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	4	9	8	11	3.81	1034/1405	3.91	4.24	4.12	3.96	3.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	6	3	8	16	4.03	974/1504	4.21	4.31	4.16	4.13	4.03
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	31	4.94	414/1519	4.46	4.57	4.70	4.71	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	11	14	4.39	496/1495	4.40	4.22	4.11	4.01	4.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	5	24	4.63	680/1459	4.61	4.54	4.47	4.40	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	31	4.97	218/1460	4.88	4.79	4.74	4.68	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	7	23	4.66	463/1455	4.54	4.39	4.32	4.26	4.66
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	29	4.81	303/1456	4.72	4.43	4.34	4.26	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	21	2	2	0	4	1	3.00	1210/1316	3.59	3.67	4.03	3.91	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	0	3	17	4.55	378/1243	4.63	4.20	4.17	3.98	4.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	1	6	14	4.50	564/1241	4.48	4.15	4.33	4.14	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	1	3	17	4.64	534/1236	4.62	4.36	4.40	4.19	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	11	16	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	****/889	3.72	3.65	4.02	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	39
Questionnaires:	33

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	18	Under-grad	33	Non-major	33
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 152 2
Title:	Intro To Moral Theory
Instructor:	Thomas,James G

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	28

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	25	4.86	185/1520	4.47	4.42	4.31	4.14	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	24	4.79	214/1520	4.46	4.38	4.27	4.20	4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	25	4.82	213/1291	4.67	4.55	4.33	4.24	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	1	1	22	4.65	336/1483	4.34	4.33	4.23	4.09	4.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	4	3	2	4	10	3.57	1158/1417	3.94	4.21	4.08	4.02	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	5	19	4.39	515/1405	3.91	4.24	4.12	3.96	4.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	6	20	4.54	405/1504	4.21	4.31	4.16	4.13	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	3	20	4	4.04	1426/1519	4.46	4.57	4.70	4.71	4.04
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	36/1495	4.40	4.22	4.11	4.01	4.96
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	1	25	4.82	339/1459	4.61	4.54	4.47	4.40	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	25	4.86	675/1460	4.88	4.79	4.74	4.68	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	2	23	4.78	307/1455	4.54	4.39	4.32	4.26	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	25	4.86	257/1456	4.72	4.43	4.34	4.26	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	1	0	3	3	10	4.24	557/1316	3.59	3.67	4.03	3.91	4.24
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	200/1243	4.63	4.20	4.17	3.98	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	273/1241	4.48	4.15	4.33	4.14	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	264/1236	4.62	4.36	4.40	4.19	4.87
4. Were special techniques successful	14	9	0	0	4	0	1	3.40	****/889	3.72	3.65	4.02	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 152 2
Title:	Intro To Moral Theory
Instructor:	Thomas,James G

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	28

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/164	****	****	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/160	****	****	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/158	****	****	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/150	****	****	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 152 2
Title:	Intro To Moral Theory
Instructor:	Thomas,James G

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	28

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 24	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 14	Under-grad 28
84-150	10	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		Non-major 28
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 8	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 2	
			? 3		

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 152 3
Title:	Intro To Moral Theory
Instructor:	Ealick,Greg

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	31

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	13	16	4.42	740/1520	4.47	4.42	4.31	4.14	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	11	13	4.16	972/1520	4.46	4.38	4.27	4.20	4.16
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	20	4.52	535/1291	4.67	4.55	4.33	4.24	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	1	5	11	7	3.88	1135/1483	4.34	4.33	4.23	4.09	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	4	14	6	4	3.13	1324/1417	3.94	4.21	4.08	4.02	3.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	3	2	5	10	5	3.48	1206/1405	3.91	4.24	4.12	3.96	3.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	9	4	16	4.10	924/1504	4.21	4.31	4.16	4.13	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	237/1519	4.46	4.57	4.70	4.71	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	1	10	11	4.35	556/1495	4.40	4.22	4.11	4.01	4.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	12	16	4.39	984/1459	4.61	4.54	4.47	4.40	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	27	4.84	727/1460	4.88	4.79	4.74	4.68	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	9	18	4.42	748/1455	4.54	4.39	4.32	4.26	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	6	22	4.63	541/1456	4.72	4.43	4.34	4.26	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	16	2	2	7	0	4	3.13	1193/1316	3.59	3.67	4.03	3.91	3.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	405/1243	4.63	4.20	4.17	3.98	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	807/1241	4.48	4.15	4.33	4.14	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	649/1236	4.62	4.36	4.40	4.19	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	21	6	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/889	3.72	3.65	4.02	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 152 3
Title:	Intro To Moral Theory
Instructor:	Ealick,Greg

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	31

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/164	****	****	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/160	****	****	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/158	****	****	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/150	****	****	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 152 3	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 40
Title: Intro To Moral Theory		Questionnaires: 31
Instructor: Ealick,Greg		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
Self Paced															
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	3	A	18	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	21	Under-grad	31	Non-major	31
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
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	2				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 152 4
Title:	Intro To Moral Theory
Instructor:	Seng,Phillip S

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	30

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	10	15	4.33	838/1520	4.47	4.42	4.31	4.14	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	7	18	4.48	611/1520	4.46	4.38	4.27	4.20	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	20	4.50	546/1291	4.67	4.55	4.33	4.24	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	2	8	16	4.54	464/1483	4.34	4.33	4.23	4.09	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	26	4.90	80/1417	3.94	4.21	4.08	4.02	4.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	1	4	8	12	3.89	969/1405	3.91	4.24	4.12	3.96	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	8	18	4.52	426/1504	4.21	4.31	4.16	4.13	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	23	6	4.21	1349/1519	4.46	4.57	4.70	4.71	4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	0	12	15	4.46	404/1495	4.40	4.22	4.11	4.01	4.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	6	21	4.62	680/1459	4.61	4.54	4.47	4.40	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	25	4.86	648/1460	4.88	4.79	4.74	4.68	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	5	4	19	4.41	748/1455	4.54	4.39	4.32	4.26	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	6	21	4.62	553/1456	4.72	4.43	4.34	4.26	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	0	7	3	5	5	3.40	1106/1316	3.59	3.67	4.03	3.91	3.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	2	16	4.60	339/1243	4.63	4.20	4.17	3.98	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	564/1241	4.48	4.15	4.33	4.14	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	2	2	16	4.70	467/1236	4.62	4.36	4.40	4.19	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	10	7	4	1	3	0	5	3.08	818/889	3.72	3.65	4.02	3.89	3.08

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 152 4
Title:	Intro To Moral Theory
Instructor:	Seng, Phillip S

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	30

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.31	****
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 152 4
Title:	Intro To Moral Theory
Instructor:	Seng, Phillip S

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	30

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	3	A	10	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	11	Under-grad	30	Non-major	30
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	9	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 152 5
Title:	Intro To Moral Theory
Instructor:	Hitz,Zena N

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	29

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	6	7	15	4.24	934/1520	4.47	4.42	4.31	4.14	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	11	13	4.32	822/1520	4.46	4.38	4.27	4.20	4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	1	3	23	4.68	376/1291	4.67	4.55	4.33	4.24	4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	11	14	4.34	702/1483	4.34	4.33	4.23	4.09	4.34
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	5	18	4.41	461/1417	3.94	4.21	4.08	4.02	4.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	10	7	11	3.97	890/1405	3.91	4.24	4.12	3.96	3.97
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	3	7	9	9	3.86	1142/1504	4.21	4.31	4.16	4.13	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	20	8	4.17	1365/1519	4.46	4.57	4.70	4.71	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	6	12	5	3.83	1075/1495	4.40	4.22	4.11	4.01	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	10	18	4.59	736/1459	4.61	4.54	4.47	4.40	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	26	4.90	570/1460	4.88	4.79	4.74	4.68	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	9	17	4.45	711/1455	4.54	4.39	4.32	4.26	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	22	4.69	478/1456	4.72	4.43	4.34	4.26	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	18	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	603/1316	3.59	3.67	4.03	3.91	4.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	256/1243	4.63	4.20	4.17	3.98	4.72
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	3	6	15	4.40	666/1241	4.48	4.15	4.33	4.14	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	2	7	15	4.40	725/1236	4.62	4.36	4.40	4.19	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	4	6	12	4.36	276/889	3.72	3.65	4.02	3.89	4.36

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 152 5
Title:	Intro To Moral Theory
Instructor:	Hitz,Zena N

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	29

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/164	****	****	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/160	****	****	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/158	****	****	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/150	****	****	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 152 5
Title:	Intro To Moral Theory
Instructor:	Hitz,Zena N

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	29

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 1	A 8	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 1	B 18		Major 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 2	General 20	Under-grad 29
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		Non-major 29
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives 2	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 0		

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 251 1
Title:	Ethical Issues in Sci &
Instructor:	Wilson,Richard

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	62
Questionnaires:	42

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	2	6	15	16	4.08	1076/1520	4.08	4.42	4.31	4.36	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	10	12	16	4.10	1022/1520	4.10	4.38	4.27	4.34	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	1	10	10	17	4.05	949/1291	4.05	4.55	4.33	4.44	4.05
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	6	10	22	4.36	691/1483	4.36	4.33	4.23	4.28	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	9	5	2	5	10	8	3.47	1202/1417	3.47	4.21	4.08	4.14	3.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	7	11	20	4.26	656/1405	4.26	4.24	4.12	4.13	4.26
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	3	10	10	16	4.00	999/1504	4.00	4.31	4.16	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	1	1	0	3	32	4.73	887/1519	4.73	4.57	4.70	4.64	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	1	8	17	5	3.84	1075/1495	3.84	4.22	4.11	4.16	3.84
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	2	1	9	12	13	3.89	1288/1459	3.89	4.54	4.47	4.52	3.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	6	30	4.74	942/1460	4.74	4.79	4.74	4.80	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	3	9	9	16	3.95	1127/1455	3.95	4.39	4.32	4.39	3.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	1	6	11	18	4.03	1085/1456	4.03	4.43	4.34	4.46	4.03
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	4	2	3	9	10	9	3.64	1003/1316	3.64	3.67	4.03	4.18	3.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	9	14	13	3.97	790/1243	3.97	4.20	4.17	4.22	3.97
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	3	1	7	12	14	3.89	993/1241	3.89	4.15	4.33	4.38	3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	2	11	23	4.49	664/1236	4.49	4.36	4.40	4.45	4.49
4. Were special techniques successful	6	13	2	0	6	7	8	3.83	589/889	3.83	3.65	4.02	3.99	3.83

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 251 1
Title:	Ethical Issues in Sci &
Instructor:	Wilson,Richard

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	62
Questionnaires:	42

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	38	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/164	****	****	4.15	4.57	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	39	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.40	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	39	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/160	****	****	4.45	4.74	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	40	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/158	****	****	4.36	4.63	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	40	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/150	****	****	4.05	4.59	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.34	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	39	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.34	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.37	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	40	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/31	****	****	4.15	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	40	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/23	****	****	4.48	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	40	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	40	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	4.53	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.60	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	40	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.87	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	40	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	4.93	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 251 1
Title:	Ethical Issues in Sci &
Instructor:	Wilson,Richard

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	62
Questionnaires:	42

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	40	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.85	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	40	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	4.86	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	22	Required for Majors	27	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	42	Non-major	41
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	9	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	0				
				?	9						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 321 1
Title:	Hist Of Phil: Ancient
Instructor:	Hitz, Zena N

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	61
Questionnaires:	33

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	14	16	4.41	755/1520	4.41	4.42	4.31	4.33	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	9	18	4.41	723/1520	4.41	4.38	4.27	4.26	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	1	2	8	17	4.46	606/1291	4.46	4.55	4.33	4.32	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	3	6	11	11	3.97	1055/1483	3.97	4.33	4.23	4.25	3.97
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	12	19	4.53	338/1417	4.53	4.21	4.08	4.07	4.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	10	18	4.41	506/1405	4.41	4.24	4.12	4.13	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	3	8	8	11	3.81	1184/1504	3.81	4.31	4.16	4.15	3.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	13	19	4.59	1034/1519	4.59	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.59
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	4	21	5	3.97	943/1495	3.97	4.22	4.11	4.07	3.97
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	9	21	4.59	724/1459	4.59	4.54	4.47	4.47	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	28	4.88	622/1460	4.88	4.79	4.74	4.72	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	9	21	4.56	569/1455	4.56	4.39	4.32	4.31	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	7	22	4.56	620/1456	4.56	4.43	4.34	4.32	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	23	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	****/1316	****	3.67	4.03	4.08	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	3	7	6	4.00	766/1243	4.00	4.20	4.17	4.16	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	1	0	2	4	10	4.29	741/1241	4.29	4.15	4.33	4.34	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	632/1236	4.53	4.36	4.40	4.41	4.53
4. Were special techniques successful	17	9	2	0	2	1	2	3.14	****/889	****	3.65	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 321 1
Title:	Hist Of Phil: Ancient
Instructor:	Hitz, Zena N

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	61
Questionnaires:	33

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	3.90	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.91	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.40	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	4.70	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1 A 5	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0 B 18						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	4 C 5	General	2	Under-grad	33	Non-major	22
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2 D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10 F 0	Electives	6	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	2				
			? 3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	36
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	543/1520	4.56	4.42	4.31	4.33	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	7	8	4.17	972/1520	4.17	4.38	4.27	4.26	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	325/1291	4.72	4.55	4.33	4.32	4.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	768/1483	4.29	4.33	4.23	4.25	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	264/1417	4.63	4.21	4.08	4.07	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	506/1405	4.40	4.24	4.12	4.13	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	476/1504	4.47	4.31	4.16	4.15	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	632/1519	4.88	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	684/1495	4.23	4.22	4.11	4.07	4.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	2	2	10	4.25	1093/1459	4.25	4.54	4.47	4.47	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	1	14	4.75	903/1460	4.75	4.79	4.74	4.72	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	2	2	10	4.25	920/1455	4.25	4.39	4.32	4.31	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	4	10	4.38	821/1456	4.38	4.43	4.34	4.32	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	12	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/1316	****	3.67	4.03	4.08	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	2	2	2	4	3.80	903/1243	3.80	4.20	4.17	4.16	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	1	2	1	5	3.80	1036/1241	3.80	4.15	4.33	4.34	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	852/1236	4.20	4.36	4.40	4.41	4.20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	36
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	8	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/889	****	3.65	4.02	4.02	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 350 01
Title:	Ethical Theory
Instructor:	Seng, Phillip S

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	33
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	17	4.67	399/1520	4.67	4.42	4.31	4.33	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	15	4.50	584/1520	4.50	4.38	4.27	4.26	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	17	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	204/1291	4.83	4.55	4.33	4.32	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	17	4.67	324/1483	4.67	4.33	4.23	4.25	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	18	4.75	156/1417	4.75	4.21	4.08	4.07	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	5	15	4.52	364/1405	4.52	4.24	4.12	4.13	4.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	7	13	4.33	656/1504	4.33	4.31	4.16	4.15	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	14	4.58	1045/1519	4.58	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	8	13	4.55	315/1495	4.55	4.22	4.11	4.07	4.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	8	15	4.65	632/1459	4.65	4.54	4.47	4.47	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	272/1460	4.96	4.79	4.74	4.72	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	7	16	4.70	413/1455	4.70	4.39	4.32	4.31	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	246/1456	4.87	4.43	4.34	4.32	4.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	374/1316	4.44	3.67	4.03	4.08	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	156/1243	4.87	4.20	4.17	4.16	4.87
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	1	0	13	4.60	476/1241	4.60	4.15	4.33	4.34	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	341/1236	4.80	4.36	4.40	4.41	4.80

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: PHIL 350 01	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 33
Title: Ethical Theory		Questionnaires: 24
Instructor: Seng, Phillip S		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	9	13	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/889	****	3.65	4.02	4.02	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	24	Non-major	17
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 358 1
Title:	Bioethics
Instructor:	Wilson, Richard

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	5	0	1	1	4	6	8	3.95	1168/1520	3.95	4.42	4.31	4.33	3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	6	7	7	4.05	1054/1520	4.05	4.38	4.27	4.26	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	14	1	2	0	2	1	3.00	****/1291	****	4.55	4.33	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	2	3	5	10	4.15	906/1483	4.15	4.33	4.23	4.25	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	1	3	2	3	4	7	3.53	1177/1417	3.53	4.21	4.08	4.07	3.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	1	4	13	4.40	506/1405	4.40	4.24	4.12	4.13	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	2	3	4	5	6	3.50	1318/1504	3.50	4.31	4.16	4.15	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	1	0	17	2	4.00	1435/1519	4.00	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	5	6	3	3.86	1060/1495	3.86	4.22	4.11	4.07	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	2	2	6	4	5	3.42	1400/1459	3.42	4.54	4.47	4.47	3.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	1	1	2	1	13	4.33	1303/1460	4.33	4.79	4.74	4.72	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	2	6	6	3	3.44	1335/1455	3.44	4.39	4.32	4.31	3.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	3	2	3	7	4	3.37	1347/1456	3.37	4.43	4.34	4.32	3.37
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	692/1316	4.07	3.67	4.03	4.08	4.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	****/1243	****	4.20	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	****/1241	****	4.15	4.33	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/1236	****	4.36	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	0	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	****/889	****	3.65	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 358 1
Title:	Bioethics
Instructor:	Wilson,Richard

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/164	****	****	4.15	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.15	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/160	****	****	4.45	4.47	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/158	****	****	4.36	4.31	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/150	****	****	4.05	3.98	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.55	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.82	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	3.90	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.91	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 358 1
Title:	Bioethics
Instructor:	Wilson, Richard

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.40	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	4.70	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	25	Non-major	20
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	8						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 372 01
Title:	Philosophy Of Science
Instructor:	Pfeifer, Jessica

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	29
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	4	15	4.60	479/1520	4.60	4.42	4.31	4.33	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	513/1520	4.55	4.38	4.27	4.26	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	290/1291	4.75	4.55	4.33	4.32	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	7	11	4.35	691/1483	4.35	4.33	4.23	4.25	4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	6	9	4.10	743/1417	4.10	4.21	4.08	4.07	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	3	2	12	4.33	575/1405	4.33	4.24	4.12	4.13	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	9	10	4.45	503/1504	4.45	4.31	4.16	4.15	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	16	4	4.20	1349/1519	4.20	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	1	1	8	4	3.87	1052/1495	3.87	4.22	4.11	4.07	3.87
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	463/1459	4.75	4.54	4.47	4.47	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	272/1460	4.95	4.79	4.74	4.72	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	0	8	10	4.25	920/1455	4.25	4.39	4.32	4.31	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	4	15	4.60	579/1456	4.60	4.43	4.34	4.32	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	3	1	2	3	5	3.43	1096/1316	3.43	3.67	4.03	4.08	3.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	385/1243	4.54	4.20	4.17	4.16	4.54
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	493/1241	4.58	4.15	4.33	4.34	4.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	505/1236	4.67	4.36	4.40	4.41	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	349/889	4.22	3.65	4.02	4.02	4.22

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 372 01
Title:	Philosophy Of Science
Instructor:	Pfeifer, Jessica

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	29
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/164	****	****	4.15	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.15	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/160	****	****	4.45	4.47	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/158	****	****	4.36	4.31	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/150	****	****	4.05	3.98	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.55	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.82	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	3.90	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.91	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 372 01
Title:	Philosophy Of Science
Instructor:	Pfeifer, Jessica

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	29
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.40	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	4.70	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0 Major 4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 13		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 20 Non-major 16
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 9	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 399 1
Title:	Topics in Philosophy
Instructor:	Templeton, Roye

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	5	2	3.58	1372/1520	3.58	4.42	4.31	4.33	3.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	5	4	0	3.08	1459/1520	3.08	4.38	4.27	4.26	3.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	2	5	1	3.17	1252/1291	3.17	4.55	4.33	4.32	3.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	4	4	1	1	2.73	1466/1483	2.73	4.33	4.23	4.25	2.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	7	2	3.75	1040/1417	3.75	4.21	4.08	4.07	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	4	4	3	0	2.75	1371/1405	2.75	4.24	4.12	4.13	2.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	5	3	3.75	1214/1504	3.75	4.31	4.16	4.15	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	532/1519	4.92	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	1	4	1	3.50	1288/1495	3.50	4.22	4.11	4.07	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	616/1459	4.67	4.54	4.47	4.47	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	1268/1460	4.40	4.79	4.74	4.72	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	1075/1455	4.00	4.39	4.32	4.31	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	4	2	3.50	1311/1456	3.50	4.43	4.34	4.32	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	2	1	2	5	0	3.00	1210/1316	3.00	3.67	4.03	4.08	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	6	0	4	0	1	2.09	1237/1243	2.09	4.20	4.17	4.16	2.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	3	3	4	1	0	2.27	1234/1241	2.27	4.15	4.33	4.34	2.27
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	5	3	2	0	1	2.00	1231/1236	2.00	4.36	4.40	4.41	2.00
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.15	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 399 1
Title:	Topics in Philosophy
Instructor:	Templeton, Roye

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.55	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.82	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	3.90	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.60	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	12	Non-major	9
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 400 5
Title:	Indep Study In Phil
Instructor:	Ealick,Greg

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	2
Questionnaires:	2

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.42	4.31	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	584/1520	4.50	4.38	4.27	4.32	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.33	4.23	4.33	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.31	4.16	4.21	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.57	4.70	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1495	5.00	4.22	4.11	4.21	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1230/1459	4.00	4.54	4.47	4.54	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1394/1460	4.00	4.79	4.74	4.78	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1075/1455	4.00	4.39	4.32	4.37	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1094/1456	4.00	4.43	4.34	4.41	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 452 1
Title:	Adv Topics In Ethics
Instructor:	Ealick,Greg

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	288/1520	4.75	4.42	4.31	4.44	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	681/1520	4.44	4.38	4.27	4.32	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	442/1291	4.60	4.55	4.33	4.38	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	222/1483	4.75	4.33	4.23	4.33	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	211/1417	4.69	4.21	4.08	4.12	4.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	197/1405	4.71	4.24	4.12	4.25	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	140/1504	4.81	4.31	4.16	4.21	4.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.57	4.70	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	181/1495	4.71	4.22	4.11	4.21	4.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	584/1459	4.69	4.54	4.47	4.54	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	381/1460	4.94	4.79	4.74	4.78	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	425/1455	4.69	4.39	4.32	4.37	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	14	4.75	384/1456	4.75	4.43	4.34	4.41	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	635/1316	4.14	3.67	4.03	4.12	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	115/1243	4.92	4.20	4.17	4.42	4.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	415/1241	4.67	4.15	4.33	4.56	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.36	4.40	4.64	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 452 1
Title:	Adv Topics In Ethics
Instructor:	Ealick,Greg

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	4	8	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	822/889	3.00	3.65	4.02	4.26	3.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	11
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 498 1
Title:	Adv Topics in Phil
Instructor:	Yalowitz,Steven

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	13
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	399/1520	4.67	4.42	4.31	4.44	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	226/1520	4.78	4.38	4.27	4.32	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	157/1291	4.89	4.55	4.33	4.38	4.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	493/1483	4.50	4.33	4.23	4.33	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	229/1417	4.67	4.21	4.08	4.12	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	313/1405	4.57	4.24	4.12	4.25	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	91/1504	4.89	4.31	4.16	4.21	4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	6	1	3.89	1490/1519	3.89	4.57	4.70	4.70	3.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	568/1495	4.33	4.22	4.11	4.21	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.54	4.47	4.54	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1460	5.00	4.79	4.74	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	184/1455	4.89	4.39	4.32	4.37	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	223/1456	4.89	4.43	4.34	4.41	4.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	164/1243	4.86	4.20	4.17	4.42	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	502/1241	4.57	4.15	4.33	4.56	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.36	4.40	4.64	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/889	****	3.65	4.02	4.26	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 498 1
Title:	Adv Topics in Phil
Instructor:	Yalowitz,Steven

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	13
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	3.43	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.67	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0 Major 8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 9 Non-major 1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	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 1	
			? 0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 499 1
Title:	Adv Topics in Phil
Instructor:	Smith,Aaron

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	479/1520	4.60	4.42	4.31	4.44	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	1086/1520	4.00	4.38	4.27	4.32	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1291	****	4.55	4.33	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	713/1483	4.33	4.33	4.23	4.33	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	119/1417	4.80	4.21	4.08	4.12	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	385/1405	4.50	4.24	4.12	4.25	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	694/1504	4.30	4.31	4.16	4.21	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.57	4.70	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	520/1495	4.38	4.22	4.11	4.21	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	374/1459	4.80	4.54	4.47	4.54	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1460	5.00	4.79	4.74	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	401/1455	4.70	4.39	4.32	4.37	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	453/1456	4.70	4.43	4.34	4.41	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1316	****	3.67	4.03	4.12	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	4	4	4.11	732/1243	4.11	4.20	4.17	4.42	4.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	713/1241	4.33	4.15	4.33	4.56	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	781/1236	4.33	4.36	4.40	4.64	4.33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 499 1
Title:	Adv Topis in Phil
Instructor:	Smith,Aaron

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	1	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/889	****	3.65	4.02	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

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