

Course-Section: PHIL 100 0301
 Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: THOMAS, JAMES
 Enrollment: 44
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1283
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	59/1674	4.62	4.54	4.27	4.07	4.96	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	153/1674	4.68	4.58	4.23	4.16	4.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	105/1423	4.84	4.74	4.27	4.16	4.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	18	4.68	302/1609	4.59	4.55	4.22	4.05	4.68	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	4	2	7	2	9	3.42	1289/1585	4.27	4.31	3.96	3.88	3.42	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	12	10	4.28	631/1535	4.32	4.24	4.08	3.89	4.28	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	276/1651	4.62	4.49	4.18	4.10	4.72	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	20	5	4.20	1463/1673	4.61	4.63	4.69	4.67	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	110/1656	4.59	4.34	4.07	3.96	4.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	249/1586	4.81	4.64	4.43	4.37	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1585	4.95	4.91	4.69	4.60	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	121/1582	4.78	4.57	4.26	4.17	4.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	69/1575	4.80	4.63	4.27	4.17	4.96	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	15	1	0	1	0	8	4.40	379/1380	4.00	4.05	3.94	3.78	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	349/1520	4.63	4.20	4.01	3.76	4.59	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	444/1515	4.69	4.33	4.24	3.97	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	146/1511	4.88	4.50	4.27	4.00	4.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	10	0	2	0	0	5	4.14	420/ 994	4.07	3.71	3.94	3.73	4.14	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	3.97	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	****	4.39	4.10	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.91	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 13	Required for Majors 16	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B 10			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	8	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 26	Non-major 26
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 0			

Course-Section: PHIL 100 0401
 Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: THOMAS, JAMES
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1284
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	118/1674	4.62	4.54	4.27	4.07	4.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	23	4.77	259/1674	4.68	4.58	4.23	4.16	4.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	24	4.85	174/1423	4.84	4.74	4.27	4.16	4.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	0	4	19	4.71	272/1609	4.59	4.55	4.22	4.05	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	2	3	5	10	4.00	769/1585	4.27	4.31	3.96	3.88	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	3	1	0	4	14	4.14	797/1535	4.32	4.24	4.08	3.89	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	5	16	4.48	553/1651	4.62	4.49	4.18	4.10	4.48	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	18	7	4.28	1397/1673	4.61	4.63	4.69	4.67	4.28	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	118/1656	4.59	4.34	4.07	3.96	4.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	86/1586	4.81	4.64	4.43	4.37	4.96	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1585	4.95	4.91	4.69	4.60	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	121/1582	4.78	4.57	4.26	4.17	4.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1575	4.80	4.63	4.27	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	18	2	0	1	1	4	3.63	986/1380	4.00	4.05	3.94	3.78	3.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	2	14	4.65	309/1520	4.63	4.20	4.01	3.76	4.65	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	372/1515	4.69	4.33	4.24	3.97	4.76	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	266/1511	4.88	4.50	4.27	4.00	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	12	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 994	4.07	3.71	3.94	3.73	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 2	A 15	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 1 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 8	Under-grad 25 Non-major 26
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 1		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHIL 100 0501
 Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: DIXON, BEN
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1285
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	2	8	20	4.36	817/1674	4.62	4.54	4.27	4.07	4.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	10	19	4.39	750/1674	4.68	4.58	4.23	4.16	4.39	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	29	4.85	174/1423	4.84	4.74	4.27	4.16	4.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	0	0	12	13	4.38	673/1609	4.59	4.55	4.22	4.05	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	27	4.76	167/1585	4.27	4.31	3.96	3.88	4.76	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	1	7	11	8	3.86	1066/1535	4.32	4.24	4.08	3.89	3.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	4	25	4.64	361/1651	4.62	4.49	4.18	4.10	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	32	4.97	283/1673	4.61	4.63	4.69	4.67	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	12	12	4.38	548/1656	4.59	4.34	4.07	3.96	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	27	4.81	371/1586	4.81	4.64	4.43	4.37	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	30	4.94	397/1585	4.95	4.91	4.69	4.60	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	9	22	4.66	452/1582	4.78	4.57	4.26	4.17	4.66	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	3	27	4.72	423/1575	4.80	4.63	4.27	4.17	4.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	13	3	1	3	8	4	3.47	1053/1380	4.00	4.05	3.94	3.78	3.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	2	2	20	4.64	309/1520	4.63	4.20	4.01	3.76	4.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	432/1515	4.69	4.33	4.24	3.97	4.72	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	98/1511	4.88	4.50	4.27	4.00	4.96	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	18	0	2	0	3	2	3.71	****/ 994	4.07	3.71	3.94	3.73	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	30	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 95	****	****	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 99	****	****	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: PHIL 100 0501
 Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: DIXON, BEN
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1285
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	22	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	6	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	33	Non-major	33
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 100 0601
 Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: SENG, PHILLIP
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1286
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	9	14	4.48	639/1674	4.62	4.54	4.27	4.07	4.48	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	9	13	4.40	737/1674	4.68	4.58	4.23	4.16	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	132/1423	4.84	4.74	4.27	4.16	4.91	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	16	4.60	374/1609	4.59	4.55	4.22	4.05	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	6	14	4.36	452/1585	4.27	4.31	3.96	3.88	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	319/1535	4.32	4.24	4.08	3.89	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	3	17	4.44	613/1651	4.62	4.49	4.18	4.10	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	565/1673	4.61	4.63	4.69	4.67	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	8	11	4.43	493/1656	4.59	4.34	4.07	3.96	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	6	16	4.58	774/1586	4.81	4.64	4.43	4.37	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	664/1585	4.95	4.91	4.69	4.60	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	5	18	4.67	438/1582	4.78	4.57	4.26	4.17	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	19	4.71	440/1575	4.80	4.63	4.27	4.17	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	2	10	9	4.33	426/1380	4.00	4.05	3.94	3.78	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	397/1520	4.63	4.20	4.01	3.76	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	720/1515	4.69	4.33	4.24	3.97	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	507/1511	4.88	4.50	4.27	4.00	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	10	1	1	0	0	4	3.83	****/ 994	4.07	3.71	3.94	3.73	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	****	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	****	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: PHIL 100 0601
 Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: SENG, PHILLIP
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1286
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	8	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 100 0701
 Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: SENG, PHILLIP
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1287
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	9	9	4.35	829/1674	4.62	4.54	4.27	4.07	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	83/1674	4.68	4.58	4.23	4.16	4.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	335/1423	4.84	4.74	4.27	4.16	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	374/1609	4.59	4.55	4.22	4.05	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	136/1585	4.27	4.31	3.96	3.88	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	169/1535	4.32	4.24	4.08	3.89	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	175/1651	4.62	4.49	4.18	4.10	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	1040/1673	4.61	4.63	4.69	4.67	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	9	7	4.35	588/1656	4.59	4.34	4.07	3.96	4.35	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	389/1586	4.81	4.64	4.43	4.37	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	340/1585	4.95	4.91	4.69	4.60	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	313/1582	4.78	4.57	4.26	4.17	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	579/1575	4.80	4.63	4.27	4.17	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	3	8	8	4.15	576/1380	4.00	4.05	3.94	3.78	4.15	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	221/1520	4.63	4.20	4.01	3.76	4.76	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	301/1515	4.69	4.33	4.24	3.97	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	146/1511	4.88	4.50	4.27	4.00	4.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	10	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	474/ 994	4.07	3.71	3.94	3.73	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	3.97	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.33	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 13	Required for Majors 10
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B 5	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	Under-grad 20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Non-major 20
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	
					Electives 2
					Other 3
					#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PHIL 146 0101
 Title CRITICAL THINKING
 Instructor: TEMPLETON, ROYE
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1288
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	6	5	3.81	1378/1674	3.98	4.54	4.27	4.07	3.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	7	5	3.94	1233/1674	4.29	4.58	4.23	4.16	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	3	8	4.13	943/1423	4.41	4.74	4.27	4.16	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	963/1609	4.17	4.55	4.22	4.05	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	4	6	3.88	936/1585	4.04	4.31	3.96	3.88	3.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	1492/1535	3.29	4.24	4.08	3.89	2.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	231/1651	4.78	4.49	4.18	4.10	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	1	6	8	4.25	1420/1673	4.18	4.63	4.69	4.67	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	3	0	5	3	0	2.73	1604/1656	3.49	4.34	4.07	3.96	2.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	1	5	8	4.13	1237/1586	4.39	4.64	4.43	4.37	4.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	1328/1585	4.56	4.91	4.69	4.60	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	4	6	3	3.50	1406/1582	3.95	4.57	4.26	4.17	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	6	3	3	2	2.81	1526/1575	3.38	4.63	4.27	4.17	2.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	13	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/1380	****	4.05	3.94	3.78	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	5	3	5	0	1	2.21	1499/1520	2.26	4.20	4.01	3.76	2.21	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	6	4	2	1	1	2.07	1492/1515	2.47	4.33	4.24	3.97	2.07	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	7	3	5	0	0	1.87	1505/1511	2.12	4.50	4.27	4.00	1.87	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 95	****	****	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 99	****	****	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: PHIL 146 0101
 Title CRITICAL THINKING
 Instructor: TEMPLETON, ROYE
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1288
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	1	A	0	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	7	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	3						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 146 0201
 Title CRITICAL THINKING
 Instructor: TEMPLETON, ROYE
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1289
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	9	7	4.15	1066/1674	3.98	4.54	4.27	4.07	4.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	392/1674	4.29	4.58	4.23	4.16	4.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	335/1423	4.41	4.74	4.27	4.16	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	16	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1609	4.17	4.55	4.22	4.05	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	8	8	4.21	593/1585	4.04	4.31	3.96	3.88	4.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	1083/1535	3.29	4.24	4.08	3.89	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	175/1651	4.78	4.49	4.18	4.10	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	18	2	4.10	1525/1673	4.18	4.63	4.69	4.67	4.10	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	0	5	2	9	4.25	719/1656	3.49	4.34	4.07	3.96	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	678/1586	4.39	4.64	4.43	4.37	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	917/1585	4.56	4.91	4.69	4.60	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	2	2	14	4.40	777/1582	3.95	4.57	4.26	4.17	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	4	9	3.95	1177/1575	3.38	4.63	4.27	4.17	3.95	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	18	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1380	****	4.05	3.94	3.78	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	5	5	3	2	1	2.31	1490/1520	2.26	4.20	4.01	3.76	2.31	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	3	4	4	2	3	2.88	1448/1515	2.47	4.33	4.24	3.97	2.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	4	5	5	1	1	2.38	1485/1511	2.12	4.50	4.27	4.00	2.38	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	3.97	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	5	General	9	Under-grad	20	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 150 0101
 Title CONTEMPORARY MORAL ISS
 Instructor: DWYER, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1290
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1674	4.64	4.54	4.27	4.07	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1674	4.69	4.58	4.23	4.16	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1423	4.77	4.74	4.27	4.16	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	490/1609	4.34	4.55	4.22	4.05	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	326/1585	4.32	4.31	3.96	3.88	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1295/1535	3.82	4.24	4.08	3.89	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1651	4.62	4.49	4.18	4.10	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1673	4.94	4.63	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1540/1656	3.92	4.34	4.07	3.96	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1586	4.92	4.64	4.43	4.37	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1585	4.95	4.91	4.69	4.60	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	632/1582	4.63	4.57	4.26	4.17	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1575	4.87	4.63	4.27	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	303/1380	4.36	4.05	3.94	3.78	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	397/1520	4.20	4.20	4.01	3.76	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1024/1515	4.29	4.33	4.24	3.97	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1050/1511	4.54	4.50	4.27	4.00	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	988/ 994	2.94	3.71	3.94	3.73	1.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PHIL 150 0201
 Title CONTEMPORARY MORAL ISS
 Instructor: DWYER, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1291
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	11	19	4.42	735/1674	4.64	4.54	4.27	4.07	4.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	22	4.52	566/1674	4.69	4.58	4.23	4.16	4.52	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	26	4.73	298/1423	4.77	4.74	4.27	4.16	4.73		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	12	17	4.41	645/1609	4.34	4.55	4.22	4.05	4.41	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	13	13	4.13	682/1585	4.32	4.31	3.96	3.88	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	4	2	10	15	3.97	930/1535	3.82	4.24	4.08	3.89	3.97	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	4	24	4.48	553/1651	4.62	4.49	4.18	4.10	4.48	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	4	0	0	0	2	27	4.93	494/1673	4.94	4.63	4.69	4.67	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	5	6	15	4.30	667/1656	3.92	4.34	4.07	3.96	4.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	28	4.90	214/1586	4.92	4.64	4.43	4.37	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	30	4.94	397/1585	4.95	4.91	4.69	4.60	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	9	23	4.72	366/1582	4.63	4.57	4.26	4.17	4.72	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	3	26	4.77	327/1575	4.87	4.63	4.27	4.17	4.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	3	4	7	17	4.23	514/1380	4.36	4.05	3.94	3.78	4.23	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	9	7	14	4.00	810/1520	4.20	4.20	4.01	3.76	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	3	3	6	20	4.34	817/1515	4.29	4.33	4.24	3.97	4.34	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	6	25	4.75	414/1511	4.54	4.50	4.27	4.00	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	16	1	0	3	5	7	4.06	456/ 994	2.94	3.71	3.94	3.73	4.06	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	3.97	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	30	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	****	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 99	****	****	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****	

Course-Section: PHIL 150 0201
 Title CONTEMPORARY MORAL ISS
 Instructor: DWYER, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1291
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	7	General	7	Under-grad	32	Non-major	33
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 150 0301
 Title CONTEMPORARY MORAL ISS
 Instructor: DWYER, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1292
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	10	21	4.49	639/1674	4.64	4.54	4.27	4.07	4.49	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	12	21	4.54	530/1674	4.69	4.58	4.23	4.16	4.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	11	22	4.57	493/1423	4.77	4.74	4.27	4.16	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	6	14	13	4.12	1018/1609	4.34	4.55	4.22	4.05	4.12	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	7	6	21	4.34	472/1585	4.32	4.31	3.96	3.88	4.34	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	7	11	14	4.00	870/1535	3.82	4.24	4.08	3.89	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	4	10	20	4.37	713/1651	4.62	4.49	4.18	4.10	4.37	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	30	4.88	742/1673	4.94	4.63	4.69	4.67	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	1	13	14	4.46	437/1656	3.92	4.34	4.07	3.96	4.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	31	4.86	301/1586	4.92	4.64	4.43	4.37	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	32	4.91	510/1585	4.95	4.91	4.69	4.60	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	8	25	4.66	452/1582	4.63	4.57	4.26	4.17	4.66	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	29	4.83	257/1575	4.87	4.63	4.27	4.17	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	6	10	18	4.35	413/1380	4.36	4.05	3.94	3.78	4.35	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	3	14	13	4.09	780/1520	4.20	4.20	4.01	3.76	4.09	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	3	7	22	4.52	620/1515	4.29	4.33	4.24	3.97	4.52	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	4	29	4.88	278/1511	4.54	4.50	4.27	4.00	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	19	0	2	2	5	3	3.75	638/ 994	2.94	3.71	3.94	3.73	3.75	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	3.97	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	3	A 13	Required for Majors 18
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B 17	
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 2	General 8
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D 0	Under-grad 35
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Non-major 34
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 2	Electives 3
					Other 4

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PHIL 152 0201
 Title INTRO TO MORAL THEORY
 Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1293
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	7	6	13	4.23	979/1674	4.52	4.54	4.27	4.07	4.23	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	10	10	4.08	1097/1674	4.59	4.58	4.23	4.16	4.08	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	8	13	4.27	836/1423	4.65	4.74	4.27	4.16	4.27	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	1	4	5	9	4.00	1094/1609	4.47	4.55	4.22	4.05	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	2	6	13	4.26	548/1585	4.12	4.31	3.96	3.88	4.26	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	2	0	6	4	7	3.74	1162/1535	4.35	4.24	4.08	3.89	3.74	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	2	6	8	7	3.64	1385/1651	4.36	4.49	4.18	4.10	3.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	2	15	7	4.21	1457/1673	4.61	4.63	4.69	4.67	4.21	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	1	3	9	8	4.14	849/1656	4.61	4.34	4.07	3.96	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	7	7	8	3.96	1335/1586	4.56	4.64	4.43	4.37	3.96	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	284/1585	4.99	4.91	4.69	4.60	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	6	7	10	4.17	1016/1582	4.61	4.57	4.26	4.17	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	3	6	12	4.17	1030/1575	4.69	4.63	4.27	4.17	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	17	0	2	1	1	2	3.50	****/1380	****	4.05	3.94	3.78	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	4	2	3	2	4	3.00	1353/1520	4.33	4.20	4.01	3.76	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	5	2	4	3	1	2.53	1469/1515	4.16	4.33	4.24	3.97	2.53	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	4	0	4	2	5	3.27	1368/1511	4.54	4.50	4.27	4.00	3.27	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	13	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 994	3.33	3.71	3.94	3.73	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.33	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	6	General	8	Under-grad	26	Non-major	26
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PHIL 152 0401
 Title INTRO TO MORAL THEORY
 Instructor: EALICK, GREG E.
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1294
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	342/1674	4.52	4.54	4.27	4.07	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	379/1674	4.59	4.58	4.23	4.16	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	310/1423	4.65	4.74	4.27	4.16	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	0	0	8	12	4.60	374/1609	4.47	4.55	4.22	4.05	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	352/1585	4.12	4.31	3.96	3.88	4.48	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	355/1535	4.35	4.24	4.08	3.89	4.52	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	231/1651	4.36	4.49	4.18	4.10	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1673	4.61	4.63	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	207/1656	4.61	4.34	4.07	3.96	4.72	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	474/1586	4.56	4.64	4.43	4.37	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1585	4.99	4.91	4.69	4.60	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	246/1582	4.61	4.57	4.26	4.17	4.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	225/1575	4.69	4.63	4.27	4.17	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	17	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1380	****	4.05	3.94	3.78	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	267/1520	4.33	4.20	4.01	3.76	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	301/1515	4.16	4.33	4.24	3.97	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	146/1511	4.54	4.50	4.27	4.00	4.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	11	2	0	1	0	3	3.33	811/ 994	3.33	3.71	3.94	3.73	3.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 95	****	****	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	****	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: PHIL 152 0401
 Title INTRO TO MORAL THEORY
 Instructor: EALICK, GREG E.
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1294
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	24	Non-major	23
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 152 0501
 Title INTRO TO MORAL THEORY
 Instructor: THOMAS, JAMES
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1295
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	5	24	4.70	367/1674	4.52	4.54	4.27	4.07	4.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	96/1674	4.59	4.58	4.23	4.16	4.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	92/1423	4.65	4.74	4.27	4.16	4.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	25	4.86	141/1609	4.47	4.55	4.22	4.05	4.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	12	2	1	5	1	9	3.78	1032/1585	4.12	4.31	3.96	3.88	3.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	5	23	4.76	169/1535	4.35	4.24	4.08	3.89	4.76	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	25	4.77	220/1651	4.36	4.49	4.18	4.10	4.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	22	7	4.24	1427/1673	4.61	4.63	4.69	4.67	4.24	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	95/1656	4.61	4.34	4.07	3.96	4.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	23	4.82	354/1586	4.56	4.64	4.43	4.37	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1585	4.99	4.91	4.69	4.60	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	121/1582	4.61	4.57	4.26	4.17	4.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	69/1575	4.69	4.63	4.27	4.17	4.96	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	23	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/1380	****	4.05	3.94	3.78	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	120/1520	4.33	4.20	4.01	3.76	4.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1515	4.16	4.33	4.24	3.97	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1511	4.54	4.50	4.27	4.00	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	18	8	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 994	3.33	3.71	3.94	3.73	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 23	Required for Majors 17	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 7	C 1	General 6	Under-grad 30 Non-major 30
84-150	13	3.00-3.49 9	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 4	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHIL 152 0601
 Title INTRO TO MORAL THEORY
 Instructor: EALICK, GREG
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1296
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	9	14	4.44	703/1674	4.52	4.54	4.27	4.07	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	17	4.67	379/1674	4.59	4.58	4.23	4.16	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	19	4.68	363/1423	4.65	4.74	4.27	4.16	4.68	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	4	5	14	4.43	598/1609	4.47	4.55	4.22	4.05	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	10	9	3.96	824/1585	4.12	4.31	3.96	3.88	3.96	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	2	10	10	4.36	548/1535	4.35	4.24	4.08	3.89	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	4	15	4.28	832/1651	4.36	4.49	4.18	4.10	4.28	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1673	4.61	4.63	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	8	15	4.65	266/1656	4.61	4.34	4.07	3.96	4.65	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	7	18	4.72	581/1586	4.56	4.64	4.43	4.37	4.72	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1585	4.99	4.91	4.69	4.60	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	5	17	4.52	610/1582	4.61	4.57	4.26	4.17	4.52	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	343/1575	4.69	4.63	4.27	4.17	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	20	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	****/1380	****	4.05	3.94	3.78	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	2	16	4.70	274/1520	4.33	4.20	4.01	3.76	4.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	4	2	13	4.30	857/1515	4.16	4.33	4.24	3.97	4.30	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	146/1511	4.54	4.50	4.27	4.00	4.95	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	16	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 994	3.33	3.71	3.94	3.73	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	****	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	****	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: PHIL 152 0601
 Title INTRO TO MORAL THEORY
 Instructor: EALICK, GREG
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1296
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	4	A	10	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	25	Non-major	24
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 248 0101
 Title INTRO SCIENTIF REASONI
 Instructor: SENG, PHILLIP
 Enrollment: 44
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1297
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	5	14	4.41	768/1674	4.51	4.54	4.27	4.32	4.41	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	303/1674	4.71	4.58	4.23	4.26	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	238/1423	4.77	4.74	4.27	4.36	4.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	385/1609	4.68	4.55	4.22	4.23	4.59	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	2	18	4.71	191/1585	4.70	4.31	3.96	3.91	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	2	5	12	4.35	558/1535	4.30	4.24	4.08	4.03	4.35	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	1	18	4.76	220/1651	4.80	4.49	4.18	4.20	4.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	944/1673	4.57	4.63	4.69	4.67	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	561/1656	4.19	4.34	4.07	4.10	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	453/1586	4.69	4.64	4.43	4.48	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	786/1585	4.91	4.91	4.69	4.76	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	236/1582	4.83	4.57	4.26	4.35	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	20	4.86	214/1575	4.85	4.63	4.27	4.39	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	19	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1380	****	4.05	3.94	4.03	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	6	10	4.20	700/1520	4.35	4.20	4.01	4.03	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	1	1	17	4.65	493/1515	4.82	4.33	4.24	4.28	4.65	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	244/1511	4.95	4.50	4.27	4.28	4.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	312/ 994	4.01	3.71	3.94	3.98	4.35	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 13	Required for Majors	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	3
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 22
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHIL 248 0201
 Title INTRO SCIENTIF REASONI
 Instructor: SENG, PHILLIP
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1298
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	471/1674	4.51	4.54	4.27	4.32	4.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	338/1674	4.71	4.58	4.23	4.26	4.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	250/1423	4.77	4.74	4.27	4.36	4.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	212/1609	4.68	4.55	4.22	4.23	4.77	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	204/1585	4.70	4.31	3.96	3.91	4.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	667/1535	4.30	4.24	4.08	4.03	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	151/1651	4.80	4.49	4.18	4.20	4.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	1325/1673	4.57	4.63	4.69	4.67	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	0	4	5	4.00	955/1656	4.19	4.34	4.07	4.10	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	738/1586	4.69	4.64	4.43	4.48	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1585	4.91	4.91	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	208/1582	4.83	4.57	4.26	4.35	4.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	246/1575	4.85	4.63	4.27	4.39	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1380	****	4.05	3.94	4.03	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	397/1520	4.35	4.20	4.01	4.03	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1515	4.82	4.33	4.24	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1511	4.95	4.50	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	676/ 994	4.01	3.71	3.94	3.98	3.67	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHIL 251 0101
 Title ETH ISS SCI ENG&INF TE
 Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1299
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	22	4.69	380/1674	4.69	4.54	4.27	4.32	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	8	17	4.45	673/1674	4.45	4.58	4.23	4.26	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	6	21	4.71	310/1423	4.71	4.74	4.27	4.36	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	21	4.69	292/1609	4.69	4.55	4.22	4.23	4.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	4	2	4	5	8	3.48	1245/1585	3.48	4.31	3.96	3.91	3.48	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	7	19	4.54	346/1535	4.54	4.24	4.08	4.03	4.54	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	5	7	15	4.21	924/1651	4.21	4.49	4.18	4.20	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	3	21	4	4.04	1553/1673	4.04	4.63	4.69	4.67	4.04	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	8	14	4.44	465/1656	4.44	4.34	4.07	4.10	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	13	13	4.31	1094/1586	4.31	4.64	4.43	4.48	4.31	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.91	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	11	15	4.43	748/1582	4.43	4.57	4.26	4.35	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	24	4.76	359/1575	4.76	4.63	4.27	4.39	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	1	1	4	5	8	3.95	744/1380	3.95	4.05	3.94	4.03	3.95	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	274/1520	4.70	4.20	4.01	4.03	4.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	543/1515	4.60	4.33	4.24	4.28	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	845/1511	4.30	4.50	4.27	4.28	4.30	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	1	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	186/ 994	4.56	3.71	3.94	3.98	4.56	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 1	A 20	Required for Majors	16
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 1	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 6	C 0	General	4
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		Under-grad 29
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	6
			? 1		

Course-Section: PHIL 321 0101
 Title HIST OF PHIL:ANCIENT
 Instructor: EALICK, GREG E.
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1300
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	9	18	4.52	594/1674	4.52	4.54	4.27	4.26	4.52	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	13	13	4.39	750/1674	4.39	4.58	4.23	4.21	4.39	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	19	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	335/1423	4.70	4.74	4.27	4.27	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	20	4.59	397/1609	4.59	4.55	4.22	4.27	4.59	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	9	17	4.45	378/1585	4.45	4.31	3.96	3.95	4.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	10	16	4.45	454/1535	4.45	4.24	4.08	4.15	4.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	6	5	15	4.18	956/1651	4.18	4.49	4.18	4.16	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	283/1673	4.97	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	0	8	15	4.54	352/1656	4.54	4.34	4.07	4.07	4.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	8	19	4.52	847/1586	4.52	4.64	4.43	4.42	4.52	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	26	4.90	591/1585	4.90	4.91	4.69	4.66	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	0	8	19	4.52	621/1582	4.52	4.57	4.26	4.26	4.52	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	21	4.62	551/1575	4.62	4.63	4.27	4.25	4.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	25	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/1380	****	4.05	3.94	4.01	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	8	10	4.47	431/1520	4.47	4.20	4.01	4.09	4.47	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	611/1515	4.53	4.33	4.24	4.32	4.53	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	488/1511	4.68	4.50	4.27	4.34	4.68	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	16	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 994	****	3.71	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	4.24	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	****	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 18	Required for Majors	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 10		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 29
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

I	0	Other	23
?	0		

Course-Section: PHIL 321H 0101
 Title
 Instructor: EALICK, GREG
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1301
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	458/1674	4.63	4.54	4.27	4.26	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	931/1674	4.25	4.58	4.23	4.21	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.74	4.27	4.27	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	222/1609	4.75	4.55	4.22	4.27	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	251/1585	4.63	4.31	3.96	3.95	4.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	105/1535	4.88	4.24	4.08	4.15	4.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	1246/1651	3.88	4.49	4.18	4.16	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.63	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	331/1656	4.57	4.34	4.07	4.07	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	784/1586	4.57	4.64	4.43	4.42	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.91	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	366/1582	4.71	4.57	4.26	4.26	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	225/1575	4.86	4.63	4.27	4.25	4.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	810/1520	4.00	4.20	4.01	4.09	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	759/1515	4.40	4.33	4.24	4.32	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	358/1511	4.80	4.50	4.27	4.34	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 994	****	3.71	3.94	3.96	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 1		0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		8
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	6

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PHIL 346 0101
 Title DEDUCTIVE SYSTEMS
 Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1302
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	17	4.64	432/1674	4.64	4.54	4.27	4.26	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	16	4.60	460/1674	4.60	4.58	4.23	4.21	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	214/1423	4.79	4.74	4.27	4.27	4.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	343/1609	4.64	4.55	4.22	4.27	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	2	8	11	4.32	502/1585	4.32	4.31	3.96	3.95	4.32	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	19	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	****/1535	****	4.24	4.08	4.15	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	6	15	4.40	673/1651	4.40	4.49	4.18	4.16	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	12	4.48	1224/1673	4.48	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.48	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	6	11	4.33	615/1656	4.33	4.34	4.07	4.07	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	618/1586	4.70	4.64	4.43	4.42	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	22	4.91	510/1585	4.91	4.91	4.69	4.66	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	4	15	4.55	589/1582	4.55	4.57	4.26	4.26	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	311/1575	4.78	4.63	4.27	4.25	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	16	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	****/1380	****	4.05	3.94	4.01	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	****/1520	****	4.20	4.01	4.09	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	****/1515	****	4.33	4.24	4.32	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	****/1511	****	4.50	4.27	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	****	3.71	3.94	3.96	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 18	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 1	B 5		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 4	Under-grad 25 Non-major 23
84-150	9	3.00-3.49 10	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 15	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHIL 355 0101
 Title POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: BERKOVITZ, JOSE
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1303
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	11	8	4.24	979/1674	4.24	4.54	4.27	4.26	4.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	13	4.43	705/1674	4.43	4.58	4.23	4.21	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	250/1423	4.76	4.74	4.27	4.27	4.76	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	4	6	9	4.26	839/1609	4.26	4.55	4.22	4.27	4.26	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	3	4	9	3.95	851/1585	3.95	4.31	3.96	3.95	3.95	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	0	3	7	5	3.94	976/1535	3.94	4.24	4.08	4.15	3.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	0	5	12	4.42	643/1651	4.42	4.49	4.18	4.16	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.63	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	9	6	4.17	827/1656	4.17	4.34	4.07	4.07	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	7	13	4.52	837/1586	4.52	4.64	4.43	4.42	4.52	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	567/1585	4.90	4.91	4.69	4.66	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	5	7	8	4.05	1109/1582	4.05	4.57	4.26	4.26	4.05	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	14	4.48	730/1575	4.48	4.63	4.27	4.25	4.48	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	17	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1380	****	4.05	3.94	4.01	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	8	4	6	3.65	1098/1520	3.65	4.20	4.01	4.09	3.65	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	5	3	11	4.20	944/1515	4.20	4.33	4.24	4.32	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	414/1511	4.75	4.50	4.27	4.34	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	12	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	657/ 994	3.71	3.71	3.94	3.96	3.71	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	5	Under-grad	21	Non-major	15
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 358 0101
 Title BIOETHICS
 Instructor: DIXON, BEN
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1304
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	655/1674	4.47	4.54	4.27	4.26	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	207/1674	4.81	4.58	4.23	4.21	4.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	79/1423	4.94	4.74	4.27	4.27	4.94	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	490/1609	4.50	4.55	4.22	4.27	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	126/1585	4.82	4.31	3.96	3.95	4.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	3	4	7	4.07	844/1535	4.07	4.24	4.08	4.15	4.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	1	13	4.59	419/1651	4.59	4.49	4.18	4.16	4.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.63	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	548/1656	4.38	4.34	4.07	4.07	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	1074/1586	4.33	4.64	4.43	4.42	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	981/1585	4.73	4.91	4.69	4.66	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	481/1582	4.64	4.57	4.26	4.26	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	1	9	4.55	646/1575	4.55	4.63	4.27	4.25	4.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	4	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1009/1380	3.57	4.05	3.94	4.01	3.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	281/1520	4.69	4.20	4.01	4.09	4.69	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	463/1515	4.69	4.33	4.24	4.32	4.69	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	346/1511	4.81	4.50	4.27	4.34	4.81	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	12	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 994	****	3.71	3.94	3.96	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 1	B 2		Graduate 1
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General	4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	6
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHIL 373 0101
 Title METAPHYSICS
 Instructor: THOMAS, JAMES
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1305
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	5	25	4.77	276/1674	4.77	4.54	4.27	4.26	4.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	6	24	4.71	325/1674	4.71	4.58	4.23	4.21	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	19	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	298/1423	4.73	4.74	4.27	4.27	4.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	1	28	4.90	121/1609	4.90	4.55	4.22	4.27	4.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	5	22	4.58	277/1585	4.58	4.31	3.96	3.95	4.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	8	22	4.73	184/1535	4.73	4.24	4.08	4.15	4.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	8	23	4.74	242/1651	4.74	4.49	4.18	4.16	4.74	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	23	6	4.13	1511/1673	4.13	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.13	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	131/1656	4.85	4.34	4.07	4.07	4.85	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	171/1586	4.93	4.64	4.43	4.42	4.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	453/1585	4.93	4.91	4.69	4.66	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	161/1582	4.89	4.57	4.26	4.26	4.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	181/1575	4.89	4.63	4.27	4.25	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	19	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	666/1380	4.00	4.05	3.94	4.01	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	330/1520	4.62	4.20	4.01	4.09	4.62	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	104/1515	4.95	4.33	4.24	4.32	4.95	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.50	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	12	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	374/ 994	4.22	3.71	3.94	3.96	4.22	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	4.24	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.30	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 22	Required for Majors 5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 7	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C 0	General 14
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	6	D 0	Under-grad 32
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F 0	Non-major 21
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 1	Other 11
					#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PHIL 399 0101 (8008)
 Title
 Instructor:
 Enrollment: 0
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 6
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	768/1674	****	3.99	4.27	4.07	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	737/1674	****	4.11	4.23	4.16	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	697/1423	****	4.51	4.27	4.16	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	374/1609	****	3.97	4.22	4.05	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	136/1585	****	3.78	3.96	3.88	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	508/1535	****	4.03	4.08	3.89	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	175/1651	****	3.77	4.18	4.10	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	1566/1673	****	4.58	4.69	4.67	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	381/1656	****	4.07	4.07	3.96	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1586	****	4.34	4.43	4.37	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1585	****	4.73	4.69	4.60	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	246/1582	****	4.17	4.26	4.17	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	279/1575	****	4.09	4.27	4.17	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1380	****	4.17	3.94	3.78	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	986/1520	****	3.57	4.01	3.76	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	2.80	1455/1515	****	3.72	4.24	3.97	2.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	1420/1511	****	3.92	4.27	4.00	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 994	****	3.96	3.94	3.73	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHIL 420 0101
 Title CONTINENTAL PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1306
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	607/1674	4.50	4.54	4.27	4.42	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	9	4.33	830/1674	4.33	4.58	4.23	4.31	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	636/1423	4.45	4.74	4.27	4.34	4.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	2	12	4.53	466/1609	4.53	4.55	4.22	4.30	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	5	12	4.56	295/1585	4.56	4.31	3.96	4.01	4.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	223/1535	4.69	4.24	4.08	4.18	4.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	7	5	4	3.65	1385/1651	3.65	4.49	4.18	4.23	3.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	11	6	4.35	1347/1673	4.35	4.63	4.69	4.67	4.35	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	805/1656	4.19	4.34	4.07	4.19	4.19	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	3	1	4	9	4.12	1243/1586	4.12	4.64	4.43	4.46	4.12	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	340/1585	4.94	4.91	4.69	4.76	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	3	3	8	4.06	1099/1582	4.06	4.57	4.26	4.31	4.06	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	4	9	4.29	923/1575	4.29	4.63	4.27	4.35	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	666/1380	4.00	4.05	3.94	4.04	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	810/1520	4.00	4.20	4.01	4.18	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	746/1515	4.42	4.33	4.24	4.40	4.42	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	507/1511	4.67	4.50	4.27	4.45	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 994	****	3.71	3.94	4.19	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors	1 Graduate 0 Major 5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 1	B 5		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General	5 Under-grad 18 Non-major 13
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	9
			? 1		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PHIL 445 0101
 Title PHILOSOPHY OF LANGUAGE
 Instructor: EALICK, GREG E.
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1307
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	186/1674	4.87	4.54	4.27	4.42	4.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	433/1674	4.63	4.58	4.23	4.31	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.74	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	136/1609	4.88	4.55	4.22	4.30	4.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	12	4.63	251/1585	4.63	4.31	3.96	4.01	4.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	146/1535	4.79	4.24	4.08	4.18	4.79	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	372/1651	4.63	4.49	4.18	4.23	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	494/1673	4.94	4.63	4.69	4.67	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	310/1656	4.60	4.34	4.07	4.19	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	2	13	4.69	633/1586	4.69	4.64	4.43	4.46	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.91	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	599/1582	4.53	4.57	4.26	4.31	4.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	268/1575	4.81	4.63	4.27	4.35	4.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	14	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1380	****	4.05	3.94	4.04	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	572/1520	4.33	4.20	4.01	4.18	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	543/1515	4.60	4.33	4.24	4.40	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	436/1511	4.73	4.50	4.27	4.45	4.73	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	3
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 0		

Title

Baltimore County

JAN 21, 2006

Instructor: Berkovitz,

Fall 2005

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 0

Questionnaires: 7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	916/1674	****	3.99	4.27	4.07	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	495/1674	****	4.11	4.23	4.16	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	493/1423	****	4.51	4.27	4.16	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	490/1609	****	3.97	4.22	4.05	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	530/1585	****	3.78	3.96	3.88	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	767/1535	****	4.03	4.08	3.89	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	832/1651	****	3.77	4.18	4.10	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1673	****	4.58	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	794/1656	****	4.07	4.07	3.96	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	301/1586	****	4.34	4.43	4.37	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1585	****	4.73	4.69	4.60	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	748/1582	****	4.17	4.26	4.17	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	612/1575	****	4.09	4.27	4.17	4.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	397/1520	****	3.57	4.01	3.76	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	629/1515	****	3.72	4.24	3.97	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1050/1511	****	3.92	4.27	4.00	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.00	4.41	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	3.29	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.43	4.14	3.69	****	

Frequency Distribution

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