

Course-Section: PHIL 100 0101
 Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: THOMAS, JAMES
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1114
 JUN 13, 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	4	23	4.79	256/1481	4.53	4.56	4.29	4.14	4.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	23	4.82	169/1481	4.63	4.57	4.23	4.18	4.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	57/1249	4.77	4.70	4.27	4.14	4.96	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	19	4.61	334/1424	4.55	4.55	4.21	4.06	4.61	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	7	1	3	6	5	3.05	1284/1396	4.10	4.25	3.98	3.89	3.05	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	9	14	4.33	474/1342	4.43	4.41	4.07	3.88	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	23	4.75	196/1459	4.56	4.50	4.16	4.17	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1480	4.65	4.48	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	174/1450	4.50	4.46	4.09	3.97	4.74	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	25	4.86	261/1409	4.78	4.65	4.42	4.36	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	200/1407	4.92	4.89	4.69	4.57	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	137/1399	4.74	4.54	4.26	4.23	4.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	59/1400	4.86	4.68	4.27	4.19	4.96	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	18	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	692/1179	4.23	3.95	3.96	3.85	3.90	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	158/1262	4.52	4.31	4.05	3.77	4.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	285/1259	4.68	4.43	4.29	4.06	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	130/1256	4.84	4.54	4.30	4.08	4.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	12	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	****/ 788	****	4.16	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.95	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 23	Required for Majors 10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1	B 4					
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	General 12	Under-grad	28	Non-major	28
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	8	D 0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0					
				I 0	Other 3				
				? 0					

Course-Section: PHIL 100 0201
 Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: THOMAS, JAMES
 Enrollment: 44
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1115
 JUN 13, 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	4	24	4.70	362/1481	4.53	4.56	4.29	4.14	4.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	29	4.97	46/1481	4.63	4.57	4.23	4.18	4.97	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1249	4.77	4.70	4.27	4.14	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	4	23	4.79	193/1424	4.55	4.55	4.21	4.06	4.79	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	3	4	3	7	9	3.58	1042/1396	4.10	4.25	3.98	3.89	3.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	2	5	19	4.65	198/1342	4.43	4.41	4.07	3.88	4.65	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	8	17	4.45	550/1459	4.56	4.50	4.16	4.17	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1480	4.65	4.48	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	40/1450	4.50	4.46	4.09	3.97	4.96	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	29	4.97	75/1409	4.78	4.65	4.42	4.36	4.97	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1407	4.92	4.89	4.69	4.57	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1399	4.74	4.54	4.26	4.23	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1400	4.86	4.68	4.27	4.19	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	18	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	340/1179	4.23	3.95	3.96	3.85	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	269/1262	4.52	4.31	4.05	3.77	4.65	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	127/1259	4.68	4.43	4.29	4.06	4.95	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	0	18	4.89	224/1256	4.84	4.54	4.30	4.08	4.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	12	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	****/ 788	****	4.16	4.00	3.80	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 25	Required for Majors 20	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	7	2.00-2.99 4	C 0	General 6	Under-grad 30 Non-major 30
84-150	11	3.00-3.49 14	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 2		

Course-Section: PHIL 100 0301
 Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: SENG, PHILLIP
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1116
 JUN 13, 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	8	15	4.52	531/1481	4.53	4.56	4.29	4.14	4.52	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	11	11	4.32	747/1481	4.63	4.57	4.23	4.18	4.32	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	647/1249	4.77	4.70	4.27	4.14	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	3	19	4.71	256/1424	4.55	4.55	4.21	4.06	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	16	4.56	263/1396	4.10	4.25	3.98	3.89	4.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	8	12	4.28	519/1342	4.43	4.41	4.07	3.88	4.28	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	7	17	4.64	298/1459	4.56	4.50	4.16	4.17	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	17	8	4.32	1165/1480	4.65	4.48	4.68	4.64	4.32	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	0	1	14	6	4.24	651/1450	4.50	4.46	4.09	3.97	4.24	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	514/1409	4.78	4.65	4.42	4.36	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	250/1407	4.92	4.89	4.69	4.57	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	7	16	4.70	335/1399	4.74	4.54	4.26	4.23	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	187/1400	4.86	4.68	4.27	4.19	4.87	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	0	4	5	10	4.32	397/1179	4.23	3.95	3.96	3.85	4.32	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	142/1262	4.52	4.31	4.05	3.77	4.87	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	509/1259	4.68	4.43	4.29	4.06	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	151/1256	4.84	4.54	4.30	4.08	4.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	11	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 788	****	4.16	4.00	3.80	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.80	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	12						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	3	General	7	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 100 0401
 Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: BRAUDE, STEPHEN
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1117
 JUN 13, 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	3	2	6	12	4.17	938/1481	4.53	4.56	4.29	4.14	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	16	4.58	422/1481	4.63	4.57	4.23	4.18	4.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	17	4.71	287/1249	4.77	4.70	4.27	4.14	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	959/1424	4.55	4.55	4.21	4.06	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	9	11	4.29	467/1396	4.10	4.25	3.98	3.89	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	17	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	649/1342	4.43	4.41	4.07	3.88	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	11	8	4.13	890/1459	4.56	4.50	4.16	4.17	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	11	12	4.46	1079/1480	4.65	4.48	4.68	4.64	4.46	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	12	5	4.16	732/1450	4.50	4.46	4.09	3.97	4.16	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	18	4.71	500/1409	4.78	4.65	4.42	4.36	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	21	4.83	659/1407	4.92	4.89	4.69	4.57	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	459/1399	4.74	4.54	4.26	4.23	4.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	312/1400	4.86	4.68	4.27	4.19	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	19	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	****/1179	4.23	3.95	3.96	3.85	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	1	3	1	5	3.50	995/1262	4.52	4.31	4.05	3.77	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	729/1259	4.68	4.43	4.29	4.06	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	571/1256	4.84	4.54	4.30	4.08	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99 0	B 14		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 8	C 3	General 6	Under-grad 24 Non-major 24
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 3	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHIL 100 0501
 Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: PFEIFER, JESSIC
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1118
 JUN 13, 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	8	17	4.56	505/1481	4.53	4.56	4.29	4.14	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	19	4.67	324/1481	4.63	4.57	4.23	4.18	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	5	19	4.79	211/1249	4.77	4.70	4.27	4.14	4.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	169/1424	4.55	4.55	4.21	4.06	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	5	18	4.44	346/1396	4.10	4.25	3.98	3.89	4.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	3	20	4.65	198/1342	4.43	4.41	4.07	3.88	4.65	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	24	4.81	155/1459	4.56	4.50	4.16	4.17	4.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1480	4.65	4.48	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	11	13	4.54	304/1450	4.50	4.46	4.09	3.97	4.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	150/1409	4.78	4.65	4.42	4.36	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1407	4.92	4.89	4.69	4.57	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	6	19	4.76	256/1399	4.74	4.54	4.26	4.23	4.76	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	166/1400	4.86	4.68	4.27	4.19	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	0	2	4	2	11	4.16	518/1179	4.23	3.95	3.96	3.85	4.16	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	345/1262	4.52	4.31	4.05	3.77	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	470/1259	4.68	4.43	4.29	4.06	4.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	173/1256	4.84	4.54	4.30	4.08	4.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	10	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/ 788	****	4.16	4.00	3.80	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHIL 100 0701
 Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: SENG, PHILLIP
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1119
 JUN 13, 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	7	16	4.44	626/1481	4.53	4.56	4.29	4.14	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	9	15	4.44	603/1481	4.63	4.57	4.23	4.18	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	23	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1249	4.77	4.70	4.27	4.14	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	9	13	4.36	607/1424	4.55	4.55	4.21	4.06	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	20	4.67	193/1396	4.10	4.25	3.98	3.89	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	9	16	4.52	296/1342	4.43	4.41	4.07	3.88	4.52	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	7	18	4.56	402/1459	4.56	4.50	4.16	4.17	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	22	4	4.11	1316/1480	4.65	4.48	4.68	4.64	4.11	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	8	13	4.36	515/1450	4.50	4.46	4.09	3.97	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	9	16	4.52	750/1409	4.78	4.65	4.42	4.36	4.52	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	22	4.78	785/1407	4.92	4.89	4.69	4.57	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	7	17	4.48	590/1399	4.74	4.54	4.26	4.23	4.48	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	19	4.67	421/1400	4.86	4.68	4.27	4.19	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	352/1179	4.23	3.95	3.96	3.85	4.39	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	182/1262	4.52	4.31	4.05	3.77	4.79	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	402/1259	4.68	4.43	4.29	4.06	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	256/1256	4.84	4.54	4.30	4.08	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	12	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 788	****	4.16	4.00	3.80	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 16	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 6	C 2	General 4	Under-grad 27 Non-major 27
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 3	
			? 1		

Course-Section: PHIL 146 0101
 Title CRITICAL THINKING
 Instructor: TEMPLETON, ROYE
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1120
 JUN 13, 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	1	0	4	2	9	4.13	986/1481	4.18	4.56	4.29	4.14	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	693/1481	4.45	4.57	4.23	4.18	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	334/1249	4.66	4.70	4.27	4.14	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	13	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1424	4.60	4.55	4.21	4.06	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	564/1396	4.24	4.25	3.98	3.89	4.19	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1342	4.20	4.41	4.07	3.88	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	0	15	4.81	155/1459	4.79	4.50	4.16	4.17	4.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	13	2	4.00	1349/1480	4.00	4.48	4.68	4.64	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	7	4	2	3.50	1223/1450	3.55	4.46	4.09	3.97	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	4	5	6	4.00	1152/1409	4.24	4.65	4.42	4.36	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	823/1407	4.82	4.89	4.69	4.57	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	3	5	6	3.88	1110/1399	4.06	4.54	4.26	4.23	3.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	6	5	4	3.69	1176/1400	3.78	4.68	4.27	4.19	3.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	3	1	0	5	2	3.18	1016/1179	2.84	3.95	3.96	3.85	3.18	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	1	4	3	2	3.17	1108/1262	3.46	4.31	4.05	3.77	3.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	3	0	6	2	1	2.83	1195/1259	3.42	4.43	4.29	4.06	2.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	3	1	2	3	3	3.17	1156/1256	3.29	4.54	4.30	4.08	3.17	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	3	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 146 0201
 Title CRITICAL THINKING
 Instructor: TEMPLETON, ROYE
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1121
 JUN 13, 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	3	4	9	4.24	870/1481	4.18	4.56	4.29	4.14	4.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	493/1481	4.45	4.57	4.23	4.18	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	357/1249	4.66	4.70	4.27	4.14	4.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	334/1424	4.60	4.55	4.21	4.06	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	4	10	4.29	467/1396	4.24	4.25	3.98	3.89	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	592/1342	4.20	4.41	4.07	3.88	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	15	4.76	189/1459	4.79	4.50	4.16	4.17	4.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	4.00	1349/1480	4.00	4.48	4.68	4.64	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	1	6	6	2	3.60	1189/1450	3.55	4.46	4.09	3.97	3.60	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	2	12	4.47	800/1409	4.24	4.65	4.42	4.36	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	545/1407	4.82	4.89	4.69	4.57	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	846/1399	4.06	4.54	4.26	4.23	4.24	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	3	8	3.88	1095/1400	3.78	4.68	4.27	4.19	3.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	4	0	1	2	1	2.50	1128/1179	2.84	3.95	3.96	3.85	2.50	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	4	3	4	3.75	887/1262	3.46	4.31	4.05	3.77	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	3	2	6	4.00	895/1259	3.42	4.43	4.29	4.06	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	1	4	4	2	3.42	1122/1256	3.29	4.54	4.30	4.08	3.42	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	4	Under-grad	17	Non-major	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	9	27	4.62	450/1481	4.55	4.56	4.29	4.14	4.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	14	25	4.64	349/1481	4.68	4.57	4.23	4.18	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	29	4.72	278/1249	4.74	4.70	4.27	4.14	4.72	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	13	23	4.59	344/1424	4.46	4.55	4.21	4.06	4.59	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	4	8	11	15	3.90	808/1396	4.01	4.25	3.98	3.89	3.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	7	13	17	4.13	672/1342	4.06	4.41	4.07	3.88	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	14	19	4.28	749/1459	4.57	4.50	4.16	4.17	4.28	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	38	4.97	211/1480	4.93	4.48	4.68	4.64	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	4	11	18	4.42	445/1450	4.56	4.46	4.09	3.97	4.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	5	32	4.79	367/1409	4.76	4.65	4.42	4.36	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	37	4.97	150/1407	4.94	4.89	4.69	4.57	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	10	25	4.55	513/1399	4.70	4.54	4.26	4.23	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	6	32	4.84	208/1400	4.82	4.68	4.27	4.19	4.84	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	28	1	2	1	1	2	3.14	****/1179	4.00	3.95	3.96	3.85	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	10	14	4.44	400/1262	4.51	4.31	4.05	3.77	4.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	3	4	17	4.48	606/1259	4.73	4.43	4.29	4.06	4.48	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	264/1256	4.82	4.54	4.30	4.08	4.84	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	20	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 788	3.50	4.16	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.95	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	37	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 14	Required for Majors	22
28-55	14	1.00-1.99	B 18		Graduate 0
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		39
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11

Course-Section: PHIL 152 0201
 Title INTRO TO MORAL THEORY
 Instructor: EALICK, GREG E.
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1123
 JUN 13, 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	4	21	4.67	395/1481	4.55	4.56	4.29	4.14	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	21	4.70	274/1481	4.68	4.57	4.23	4.18	4.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	20	4.67	334/1249	4.74	4.70	4.27	4.14	4.67		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	6	18	4.58	364/1424	4.46	4.55	4.21	4.06	4.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	10	10	4.00	707/1396	4.01	4.25	3.98	3.89	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	6	10	10	4.07	713/1342	4.06	4.41	4.07	3.88	4.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	10	15	4.48	490/1459	4.57	4.50	4.16	4.17	4.48	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.48	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	13	11	4.40	473/1450	4.56	4.46	4.09	3.97	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	7	20	4.74	433/1409	4.76	4.65	4.42	4.36	4.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	400/1407	4.94	4.89	4.69	4.57	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	7	19	4.67	376/1399	4.70	4.54	4.26	4.23	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	22	4.81	239/1400	4.82	4.68	4.27	4.19	4.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	23	0	2	2	0	0	2.50	****/1179	4.00	3.95	3.96	3.85	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	427/1262	4.51	4.31	4.05	3.77	4.41	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	470/1259	4.73	4.43	4.29	4.06	4.65	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	419/1256	4.82	4.54	4.30	4.08	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	11	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	****/ 788	3.50	4.16	4.00	3.80	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 14	Required for Majors	14
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	B 13	Graduate	0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	10
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	27
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	2
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHIL 152 0301
 Title INTRO TO MORAL THEORY
 Instructor: DIXON, BEN
 Enrollment: 54
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1124
 JUN 13, 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	4	8	9	4.09	1012/1481	4.55	4.56	4.29	4.14	4.09	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	6	13	4.48	560/1481	4.68	4.57	4.23	4.18	4.48	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	310/1249	4.74	4.70	4.27	4.14	4.68	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	4	3	3	3.90	1087/1424	4.46	4.55	4.21	4.06	3.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	4	13	4.33	435/1396	4.01	4.25	3.98	3.89	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	974/1342	4.06	4.41	4.07	3.88	3.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	3	15	4.57	378/1459	4.57	4.50	4.16	4.17	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	871/1480	4.93	4.48	4.68	4.64	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	473/1450	4.56	4.46	4.09	3.97	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	705/1409	4.76	4.65	4.42	4.36	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	614/1407	4.94	4.89	4.69	4.57	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	417/1399	4.70	4.54	4.26	4.23	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	4	15	4.65	433/1400	4.82	4.68	4.27	4.19	4.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	3	2	4	8	4.00	590/1179	4.00	3.95	3.96	3.85	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	4	3	9	4.31	527/1262	4.51	4.31	4.05	3.77	4.31	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	294/1259	4.73	4.43	4.29	4.06	4.81	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	357/1256	4.82	4.54	4.30	4.08	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	8	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	604/ 788	3.50	4.16	4.00	3.80	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	22	Non-major	21
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 152 0401
 Title INTRO TO MORAL THEORY
 Instructor: THOMAS, JAMES
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1125
 JUN 13, 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	4	20	4.83	210/1481	4.55	4.56	4.29	4.14	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	103/1481	4.68	4.57	4.23	4.18	4.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	160/1249	4.74	4.70	4.27	4.14	4.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	20	4.75	217/1424	4.46	4.55	4.21	4.06	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	0	7	2	9	3.80	877/1396	4.01	4.25	3.98	3.89	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	3	3	14	4.27	527/1342	4.06	4.41	4.07	3.88	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	51/1459	4.57	4.50	4.16	4.17	4.96	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.48	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1450	4.56	4.46	4.09	3.97	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	94/1409	4.76	4.65	4.42	4.36	4.96	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1407	4.94	4.89	4.69	4.57	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	65/1399	4.70	4.54	4.26	4.23	4.96	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	73/1400	4.82	4.68	4.27	4.19	4.96	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	19	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1179	4.00	3.95	3.96	3.85	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	138/1262	4.51	4.31	4.05	3.77	4.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1259	4.73	4.43	4.29	4.06	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1256	4.82	4.54	4.30	4.08	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	11	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	****/ 788	3.50	4.16	4.00	3.80	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 21	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 4	C 0	General 7	Under-grad 24 Non-major 24
84-150	14	3.00-3.49 10	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 1	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHIL 210 0101
 Title PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION
 Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1126
 JUN 13, 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	1	7	9	16	4.21	896/1481	4.21	4.56	4.29	4.40	4.21	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	6	9	15	4.09	963/1481	4.09	4.57	4.23	4.29	4.09	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	4	12	15	4.28	718/1249	4.28	4.70	4.27	4.36	4.28	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	3	14	13	4.33	645/1424	4.33	4.55	4.21	4.28	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	6	7	19	4.41	380/1396	4.41	4.25	3.98	3.94	4.41	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	7	10	16	4.27	527/1342	4.27	4.41	4.07	4.05	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	7	11	8	6	3.33	1318/1459	3.33	4.50	4.16	4.17	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	3	13	13	3	3.50	1454/1480	3.50	4.48	4.68	4.68	3.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	2	17	9	4.17	712/1450	4.17	4.46	4.09	4.15	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	3	10	17	4.21	1055/1409	4.21	4.65	4.42	4.47	4.21	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	30	4.91	500/1407	4.91	4.89	4.69	4.78	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	6	13	11	3.94	1067/1399	3.94	4.54	4.26	4.29	3.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	10	19	4.39	716/1400	4.39	4.68	4.27	4.34	4.39	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	28	1	2	1	0	0	2.00	****/1179	****	3.95	3.96	4.05	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	2	5	2	3	3.31	1070/1262	3.31	4.31	4.05	4.11	3.31	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	2	0	2	3	6	3.85	1007/1259	3.85	4.43	4.29	4.34	3.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	692/1256	4.38	4.54	4.30	4.28	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	21	10	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 788	****	4.16	4.00	3.98	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 1	A 13	Required for Majors 16	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 3	C 3	General 8	Under-grad 34 Non-major 34
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 8	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 7	
			? 3		

Course-Section: PHIL 251 0101
 Title: ETH ISS SCI ENG&INF TE
 Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1127
 JUN 13, 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	5	11	11	4.11	1006/1481	4.11	4.56	4.29	4.40	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	4	11	10	4.07	971/1481	4.07	4.57	4.23	4.29	4.07	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	10	17	17	4.57	432/1249	4.57	4.70	4.27	4.36	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	9	17	4.59	344/1424	4.59	4.55	4.21	4.28	4.59	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	2	3	2	4	9	3.75	918/1396	3.75	4.25	3.98	3.94	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	3	6	17	4.41	405/1342	4.41	4.41	4.07	4.05	4.41	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	1	3	6	6	10	3.81	1125/1459	3.81	4.50	4.16	4.17	3.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	3	7	12	4	3.56	1451/1480	3.56	4.48	4.68	4.68	3.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	6	10	7	3.88	989/1450	3.88	4.46	4.09	4.15	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	6	9	3	8	3.32	1327/1409	3.32	4.65	4.42	4.47	3.32	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	23	4.79	766/1407	4.79	4.89	4.69	4.78	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	5	8	6	8	3.54	1231/1399	3.54	4.54	4.26	4.29	3.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	9	9	8	3.79	1130/1400	3.79	4.68	4.27	4.34	3.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	1	0	6	7	5	3.79	773/1179	3.79	3.95	3.96	4.05	3.79	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	****/1262	****	4.31	4.05	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	****/1259	****	4.43	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	****/1256	****	4.54	4.30	4.28	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	22	1	0	3	0	2	0	2.80	****/ 788	****	4.16	4.00	3.98	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	5.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.53	4.83	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.72	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.55	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	23	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	27	Non-major	28
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 322 0101
 Title HIST OF PHIL:MODERN
 Instructor: BRAUDE, STEPHEN
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1128
 JUN 13, 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	3	11	12	4.22	883/1481	4.22	4.56	4.29	4.29	4.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	10	11	4.11	950/1481	4.11	4.57	4.23	4.23	4.11	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	9	16	4.44	573/1249	4.44	4.70	4.27	4.28	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	762/1424	4.23	4.55	4.21	4.27	4.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	4	7	4	11	3.74	926/1396	3.74	4.25	3.98	4.00	3.74	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	2	1	3	5	6	3.71	1018/1342	3.71	4.41	4.07	4.12	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	6	5	13	4.00	961/1459	4.00	4.50	4.16	4.17	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	7	11	9	4.07	1331/1480	4.07	4.48	4.68	4.65	4.07	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	12	8	4.22	672/1450	4.22	4.46	4.09	4.10	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	6	17	4.50	762/1409	4.50	4.65	4.42	4.43	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	5	18	4.64	986/1407	4.64	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	4	9	11	4.29	792/1399	4.29	4.54	4.26	4.27	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	4	19	4.64	444/1400	4.64	4.68	4.27	4.28	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	20	2	1	0	1	1	2.60	****/1179	****	3.95	3.96	4.02	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	3	5	4	3.85	836/1262	3.85	4.31	4.05	4.14	3.85	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	875/1259	4.08	4.43	4.29	4.34	4.08	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	3	3	6	4.08	872/1256	4.08	4.54	4.30	4.34	4.08	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	11	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 788	****	4.16	4.00	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 1 Major 6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 6	C 5	General 3	Under-grad 26 Non-major 21
84-150	18	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 20	
			? 2		

Course-Section: PHIL 322H 0101
 Title HIST OF PHIL:MODERN
 Instructor: BRAUDE, STEPHEN
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1129
 JUN 13, 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	3	4.29	805/1481	4.29	4.56	4.29	4.29	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	434/1481	4.57	4.57	4.23	4.23	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	172/1249	4.86	4.70	4.27	4.28	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	863/1424	4.14	4.55	4.21	4.27	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	707/1396	4.00	4.25	3.98	4.00	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	755/1342	4.00	4.41	4.07	4.12	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	378/1459	4.57	4.50	4.16	4.17	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1429/1480	3.83	4.48	4.68	4.65	3.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	546/1450	4.33	4.46	4.09	4.10	4.33	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	261/1409	4.86	4.65	4.42	4.43	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	899/1407	4.71	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	311/1399	4.71	4.54	4.26	4.27	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	361/1400	4.71	4.68	4.27	4.28	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	590/1179	4.00	3.95	3.96	4.02	4.00	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	708/1262	4.00	4.31	4.05	4.14	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	588/1259	4.50	4.43	4.29	4.34	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	773/1256	4.25	4.54	4.30	4.34	4.25	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHIL 346 0101
 Title DEDUCTIVE SYSTEMS
 Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1130
 JUN 13, 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	1	0	2	0	3	6	30	4.51	540/1481	4.51	4.56	4.29	4.29	4.51	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	5	13	20	4.28	801/1481	4.28	4.57	4.23	4.23	4.28	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	4	10	24	4.46	548/1249	4.46	4.70	4.27	4.28	4.46	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	25	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	645/1424	4.33	4.55	4.21	4.27	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	6	2	1	7	7	16	4.03	687/1396	4.03	4.25	3.98	4.00	4.03	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	31	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	****/1342	****	4.41	4.07	4.12	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	4	8	10	15	3.75	1154/1459	3.75	4.50	4.16	4.17	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	4	15	18	3	3.50	1454/1480	3.50	4.48	4.68	4.65	3.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	2	0	0	6	13	11	4.17	722/1450	4.17	4.46	4.09	4.10	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	6	15	17	4.23	1043/1409	4.23	4.65	4.42	4.43	4.23	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	1	3	32	4.78	766/1407	4.78	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	2	4	14	17	4.16	920/1399	4.16	4.54	4.26	4.27	4.16	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	10	25	4.62	468/1400	4.62	4.68	4.27	4.28	4.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	27	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	****/1179	****	3.95	3.96	4.02	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	30	0	2	1	4	1	4	3.33	1059/1262	3.33	4.31	4.05	4.14	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	30	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	729/1259	4.33	4.43	4.29	4.34	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	30	0	1	0	0	3	8	4.42	669/1256	4.42	4.54	4.30	4.34	4.42	
4. Were special techniques successful	30	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 788	****	4.16	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	3.96	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.11	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: PHIL 346 0101
 Title DEDUCTIVE SYSTEMS
 Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1130
 JUN 13, 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	21	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	7	C	5	General	6	Under-grad	42	Non-major	37
84-150	18	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	28				
				?	4						

Course-Section: PHIL 350 0101
 Title ETHICAL THEORY
 Instructor: DWYER, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1131
 JUN 13, 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	0	2	10	4.62	450/1481	4.62	4.56	4.29	4.29	4.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	574/1481	4.46	4.57	4.23	4.23	4.46	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	298/1249	4.69	4.70	4.27	4.28	4.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	485/1424	4.46	4.55	4.21	4.27	4.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	9	4.38	395/1396	4.38	4.25	3.98	4.00	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	283/1342	4.54	4.41	4.07	4.12	4.54	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	332/1459	4.62	4.50	4.16	4.17	4.62	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	10	2	4.08	1331/1480	4.08	4.48	4.68	4.65	4.08	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	259/1450	4.60	4.46	4.09	4.10	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	417/1409	4.75	4.65	4.42	4.43	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.89	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	671/1399	4.42	4.54	4.26	4.27	4.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	421/1400	4.67	4.68	4.27	4.28	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	760/1179	3.80	3.95	3.96	4.02	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	437/1262	4.40	4.31	4.05	4.14	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	588/1259	4.50	4.43	4.29	4.34	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	428/1256	4.70	4.54	4.30	4.34	4.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	604/ 788	3.50	4.16	4.00	4.07	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHIL 368 0101
 Title AESTHETICS
 Instructor: SENG, PHILLIP
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1132
 JUN 13, 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	5	9	4.53	522/1481	4.53	4.56	4.29	4.29	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	9	6	4.40	661/1481	4.40	4.57	4.23	4.23	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	498/1249	4.50	4.70	4.27	4.28	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	334/1424	4.60	4.55	4.21	4.27	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	419/1396	4.36	4.25	3.98	4.00	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	534/1342	4.27	4.41	4.07	4.12	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	520/1459	4.47	4.50	4.16	4.17	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	9	5	4.27	1208/1480	4.27	4.48	4.68	4.65	4.27	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	389/1450	4.46	4.46	4.09	4.10	4.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	275/1409	4.85	4.65	4.42	4.43	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	636/1407	4.85	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	445/1399	4.62	4.54	4.26	4.27	4.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	208/1400	4.85	4.68	4.27	4.28	4.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	426/1179	4.27	3.95	3.96	4.02	4.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	264/1262	4.67	4.31	4.05	4.14	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	643/1259	4.44	4.43	4.29	4.34	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	457/1256	4.67	4.54	4.30	4.34	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	7	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 788	****	4.16	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	3.96	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.13	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.88	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	5
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	6
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHIL 372 0101
 Title PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE
 Instructor: PFEIFER, JESSIC
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1133
 JUN 13, 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	5	20	4.73	316/1481	4.73	4.56	4.29	4.29	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	23	4.85	155/1481	4.85	4.57	4.23	4.23	4.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	57/1249	4.96	4.70	4.27	4.28	4.96	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	161/1424	4.85	4.55	4.21	4.27	4.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	18	4.65	201/1396	4.65	4.25	3.98	4.00	4.65	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	7	17	4.71	158/1342	4.71	4.41	4.07	4.12	4.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	81/1459	4.92	4.50	4.16	4.17	4.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	281/1480	4.96	4.48	4.68	4.65	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	7	13	4.65	224/1450	4.65	4.46	4.09	4.10	4.65	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	7	19	4.73	450/1409	4.73	4.65	4.42	4.43	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	200/1407	4.96	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	22	4.77	256/1399	4.77	4.54	4.26	4.27	4.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	59/1400	4.96	4.68	4.27	4.28	4.96	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	17	2	0	2	1	4	3.56	877/1179	3.56	3.95	3.96	4.02	3.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	264/1262	4.67	4.31	4.05	4.14	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	127/1259	4.94	4.43	4.29	4.34	4.94	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	130/1256	4.94	4.54	4.30	4.34	4.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	145/ 788	4.63	4.16	4.00	4.07	4.63	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.36	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.43	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 13	Required for Majors 2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 5	Graduate 1
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	6	C 1	Major 9
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D 0	General 3
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Under-grad 25
				P 0	Non-major 17
				I 0	Electives 1
				? 2	Other 16
					#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PHIL 390 0101
 Title PHILOSOPHY OF SPORT
 Instructor: TEMPLETON, ROYE
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1134
 JUN 13, 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	1	6	4.86	196/1481	4.86	4.56	4.29	4.29	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	264/1481	4.71	4.57	4.23	4.23	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	0	5	4.14	824/1249	4.14	4.70	4.27	4.28	4.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	840/1424	4.17	4.55	4.21	4.27	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	1188/1396	3.29	4.25	3.98	4.00	3.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	474/1342	4.33	4.41	4.07	4.12	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	224/1459	4.71	4.50	4.16	4.17	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	1193/1480	4.29	4.48	4.68	4.65	4.29	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	164/1450	4.75	4.46	4.09	4.10	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.65	4.42	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	614/1407	4.86	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	801/1399	4.29	4.54	4.26	4.27	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	521/1400	4.57	4.68	4.27	4.28	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	739/1179	3.83	3.95	3.96	4.02	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	0	1	3	3.83	842/1262	3.83	4.31	4.05	4.14	3.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	2	0	1	3	0	2.83	1195/1259	2.83	4.43	4.29	4.34	2.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	2	0	2	1	1	2.83	1200/1256	2.83	4.54	4.30	4.34	2.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	4.16	4.00	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

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	2	0	5	11	4.39	698/1481	****	4.74	4.29	4.14	4.39	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	14	4.61	386/1481	****	4.64	4.23	4.18	4.61	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1249	****	4.58	4.27	4.14	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	271/1424	****	4.56	4.21	4.06	4.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	11	4.39	395/1396	****	4.48	3.98	3.89	4.39	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	364/1342	****	4.20	4.07	3.88	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	14	4.61	332/1459	****	4.50	4.16	4.17	4.61	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	421/1480	****	4.53	4.68	4.64	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	1	6	9	4.35	525/1450	****	4.56	4.09	3.97	4.35	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	466/1409	****	4.79	4.42	4.36	4.72	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	659/1407	****	4.54	4.69	4.57	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	2	14	4.61	445/1399	****	4.69	4.26	4.23	4.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	15	4.67	421/1400	****	4.78	4.27	4.19	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	129/1179	****	4.38	3.96	3.85	4.76	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	345/1262	****	4.36	4.05	3.77	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	489/1259	****	4.67	4.29	4.06	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	1	1	13	4.56	538/1256	****	4.62	4.30	4.08	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	13	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 788	****	4.32	4.00	3.80	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 10	Under-grad 18 Non-major 18
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 1		
			I 0	Other 3	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHIL 400 0901
 Title INDEP STUDY IN PHIL
 Instructor: THOMAS, JAMES
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1135
 JUN 13, 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	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.56	4.29	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.57	4.23	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.70	4.27	4.44	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.55	4.21	4.35	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.25	3.98	4.09	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.41	4.07	4.21	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.50	4.16	4.25	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.48	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1450	5.00	4.46	4.09	4.28	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.65	4.42	4.51	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.89	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.54	4.26	4.36	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.68	4.27	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1179	5.00	3.95	3.96	4.07	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.31	4.05	4.33	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.43	4.29	4.57	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.54	4.30	4.60	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 788	5.00	4.16	4.00	4.26	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHIL 405H 0101
 Title
 Instructor: PFEIFER, JESSIC
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1136
 JUN 13, 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	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.56	4.29	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.57	4.23	4.32	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.55	4.21	4.35	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.25	3.98	4.09	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.41	4.07	4.21	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.48	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1450	5.00	4.46	4.09	4.28	5.00	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.65	4.42	4.51	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.89	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.54	4.26	4.36	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.68	4.27	4.38	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHIL 454 0101
 Title ANIMALS & THE ENVRNMNT
 Instructor: DIXON, BEN
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1137
 JUN 13, 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	4	10	4.41	665/1481	4.41	4.56	4.29	4.45	4.41	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	779/1481	4.29	4.57	4.23	4.32	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.70	4.27	4.44	5.00		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	334/1424	4.60	4.55	4.21	4.35	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	131/1396	4.76	4.25	3.98	4.09	4.76	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	206/1342	4.64	4.41	4.07	4.21	4.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	253/1459	4.69	4.50	4.16	4.25	4.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	1006/1480	4.59	4.48	4.68	4.74	4.59	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	672/1450	4.21	4.46	4.09	4.28	4.21	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	9	7	4.29	1007/1409	4.29	4.65	4.42	4.51	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	2	13	4.59	1046/1407	4.59	4.89	4.69	4.79	4.59	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	733/1399	4.35	4.54	4.26	4.36	4.35	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	624/1400	4.47	4.68	4.27	4.38	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	13	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	****/1179	****	3.95	3.96	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	9	5	4.27	563/1262	4.27	4.31	4.05	4.33	4.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	451/1259	4.67	4.43	4.29	4.57	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.54	4.30	4.60	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	13	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 788	****	4.16	4.00	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHIL 458 0101
 Title FEMINIST PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: DWYER, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1138
 JUN 13, 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	5	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.56	4.29	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.57	4.23	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.70	4.27	4.44	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.55	4.21	4.35	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	111/1396	4.80	4.25	3.98	4.09	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.41	4.07	4.21	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.50	4.16	4.25	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.48	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1450	5.00	4.46	4.09	4.28	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.65	4.42	4.51	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.89	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	212/1399	4.80	4.54	4.26	4.36	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.68	4.27	4.38	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.31	4.05	4.33	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1259	****	4.43	4.29	4.57	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1256	****	4.54	4.30	4.60	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 68	5.00	5.00	4.49	4.68	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 69	5.00	5.00	4.53	4.64	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.53	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHIL 470 0101
 Title PHILOSOPHY OF MIND
 Instructor: EALICK, GREG E.
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1139
 JUN 13, 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	1	15	4.82	218/1481	4.82	4.56	4.29	4.45	4.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	715/1481	4.35	4.57	4.23	4.32	4.35	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	405/1249	4.60	4.70	4.27	4.44	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	232/1424	4.73	4.55	4.21	4.35	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	131/1396	4.76	4.25	3.98	4.09	4.76	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	106/1342	4.82	4.41	4.07	4.21	4.82	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	719/1459	4.31	4.50	4.16	4.25	4.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.48	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	159/1450	4.77	4.46	4.09	4.28	4.77	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	500/1409	4.71	4.65	4.42	4.51	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.89	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	671/1399	4.41	4.54	4.26	4.36	4.41	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	166/1400	4.88	4.68	4.27	4.38	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	14	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1179	****	3.95	3.96	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	197/1262	4.77	4.31	4.05	4.33	4.77	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	0	1	11	4.62	499/1259	4.62	4.43	4.29	4.57	4.62	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	264/1256	4.85	4.54	4.30	4.60	4.85	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	11	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 788	****	4.16	4.00	4.26	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.68	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.53	4.64	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.49	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.53	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.10	****	

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 6		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	7
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 1		

Course-Section: PHIL 472 0101
 Title ADV TOP:PHIL OF SCIENC
 Instructor: BERKOVITZ, JOSE
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1140
 JUN 13, 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	1	14	4.93	111/1481	4.93	4.56	4.29	4.45	4.93	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	142/1481	4.87	4.57	4.23	4.32	4.87	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	203/1249	4.80	4.70	4.27	4.44	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	406/1424	4.54	4.55	4.21	4.35	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	209/1396	4.64	4.25	3.98	4.09	4.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	11	4.57	257/1342	4.57	4.41	4.07	4.21	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	298/1459	4.64	4.50	4.16	4.25	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	912/1480	4.71	4.48	4.68	4.74	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	79/1450	4.92	4.46	4.09	4.28	4.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	334/1409	4.80	4.65	4.42	4.51	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.89	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	212/1399	4.80	4.54	4.26	4.36	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	187/1400	4.87	4.68	4.27	4.38	4.87	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	526/1179	4.14	3.95	3.96	4.07	4.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	295/1262	4.60	4.31	4.05	4.33	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	422/1259	4.70	4.43	4.29	4.57	4.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.54	4.30	4.60	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	7	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 788	****	4.16	4.00	4.26	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.68	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.53	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B 3	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Non-major 11
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 1	Electives 1
					Other 10

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant