

Course-Section: PHIL 100 0201
 Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: SENG, PHILLIP
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1239
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	2	5	16	4.61	557/1670	4.32	4.39	4.31	4.23	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	291/1666	4.30	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	295/1406	4.66	4.55	4.32	4.31	4.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	7	14	4.55	509/1615	4.35	4.41	4.24	4.17	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	2	18	4.57	359/1566	4.18	4.23	4.07	4.03	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	7	13	4.45	490/1528	4.27	4.24	4.12	4.00	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	395/1650	4.45	4.24	4.22	4.28	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	18	2	4.00	1524/1667	4.39	4.39	4.67	4.61	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	8	12	4.60	324/1626	4.19	4.29	4.11	4.07	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	355/1559	4.63	4.63	4.46	4.47	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1560	4.88	4.84	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	549/1549	4.38	4.43	4.31	4.32	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	116/1546	4.62	4.59	4.32	4.32	4.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	355/1323	3.55	3.42	4.00	3.91	4.48
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	221/1384	4.27	4.04	4.10	3.92	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	243/1378	4.16	4.22	4.29	4.09	4.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	281/1378	4.44	4.46	4.31	4.08	4.91
4. Were special techniques successful	12	10	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 904	4.00	3.50	4.03	3.94	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHIL 100 0401
 Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: THOMAS, JAMES
 Enrollment: 49
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1240
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	7	29	4.81	300/1670	4.32	4.39	4.31	4.23	4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	31	4.86	207/1666	4.30	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	35	4.97	58/1406	4.66	4.55	4.32	4.31	4.97
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	0	6	26	4.73	317/1615	4.35	4.41	4.24	4.17	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	2	3	8	7	9	3.62	1220/1566	4.18	4.23	4.07	4.03	3.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	2	13	15	4.18	769/1528	4.27	4.24	4.12	4.00	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	10	24	4.61	417/1650	4.45	4.24	4.22	4.28	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	26	10	4.28	1354/1667	4.39	4.39	4.67	4.61	4.28
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	47/1626	4.19	4.29	4.11	4.07	4.97
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	34	4.92	248/1559	4.63	4.63	4.46	4.47	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	35	4.94	358/1560	4.88	4.84	4.72	4.68	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	34	4.92	181/1549	4.38	4.43	4.31	4.32	4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	34	4.92	208/1546	4.62	4.59	4.32	4.32	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	24	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	820/1323	3.55	3.42	4.00	3.91	3.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	221/1384	4.27	4.04	4.10	3.92	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	348/1378	4.16	4.22	4.29	4.09	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	386/1378	4.44	4.46	4.31	4.08	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	21	9	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	****/ 904	4.00	3.50	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.58	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 29	Required for Majors 21	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 10	Under-grad 36 Non-major 36
84-150	14	3.00-3.49 10	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHIL 100 0601
 Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: YALOWITZ, STEVE
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1241
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	7	3	9	4.00	1216/1670	4.32	4.39	4.31	4.23	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	3	8	7	4.05	1167/1666	4.30	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	597/1406	4.66	4.55	4.32	4.31	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	1	2	8	4	4.00	1083/1615	4.35	4.41	4.24	4.17	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	4	5	8	3.85	1059/1566	4.18	4.23	4.07	4.03	3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	3	1	5	6	3.93	997/1528	4.27	4.24	4.12	4.00	3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	429/1650	4.45	4.24	4.22	4.28	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1667	4.39	4.39	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	4	12	4	4.00	953/1626	4.19	4.29	4.11	4.07	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	521/1559	4.63	4.63	4.46	4.47	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	725/1560	4.88	4.84	4.72	4.68	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	9	7	4.10	1104/1549	4.38	4.43	4.31	4.32	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	595/1546	4.62	4.59	4.32	4.32	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	13	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	1114/1323	3.55	3.42	4.00	3.91	3.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	4	2	6	4.00	820/1384	4.27	4.04	4.10	3.92	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	3	3	2	4	3.38	1233/1378	4.16	4.22	4.29	4.09	3.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	0	6	6	4.23	877/1378	4.44	4.46	4.31	4.08	4.23
4. Were special techniques successful	9	9	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 904	4.00	3.50	4.03	3.94	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 2					
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 5	General	4	Under-grad	21	Non-major 21
84-150	2	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	0			
				? 0					

Course-Section: PHIL 100 0701
 Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: YALOWITZ, STEVE
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1242
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	751/1670	4.32	4.39	4.31	4.23	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	7	6	4.00	1199/1666	4.30	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	295/1406	4.66	4.55	4.32	4.31	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	1	3	10	4.31	800/1615	4.35	4.41	4.24	4.17	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	4	10	4.11	780/1566	4.18	4.23	4.07	4.03	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	706/1528	4.27	4.24	4.12	4.00	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	499/1650	4.45	4.24	4.22	4.28	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1667	4.39	4.39	4.67	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	2	11	4	4.00	953/1626	4.19	4.29	4.11	4.07	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	486/1559	4.63	4.63	4.46	4.47	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	911/1560	4.88	4.84	4.72	4.68	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	900/1549	4.38	4.43	4.31	4.32	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	655/1546	4.62	4.59	4.32	4.32	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	13	2	1	1	1	0	2.20	1290/1323	3.55	3.42	4.00	3.91	2.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	3	1	3	3.63	1049/1384	4.27	4.04	4.10	3.92	3.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	1	1	3	2	3.50	1193/1378	4.16	4.22	4.29	4.09	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	937/1378	4.44	4.46	4.31	4.08	4.13	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	5	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 904	4.00	3.50	4.03	3.94	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	6	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 100 0801
 Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: SENG, PHILLIP
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1243
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	10	11	4.33	902/1670	4.32	4.39	4.31	4.23	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	13	4.38	821/1666	4.30	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	16	4.63	471/1406	4.66	4.55	4.32	4.31	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	13	4.38	724/1615	4.35	4.41	4.24	4.17	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	16	4.54	369/1566	4.18	4.23	4.07	4.03	4.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	5	14	4.38	590/1528	4.27	4.24	4.12	4.00	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	8	15	4.58	457/1650	4.45	4.24	4.22	4.28	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	5	18	0	3.71	1641/1667	4.39	4.39	4.67	4.61	3.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	8	9	4.30	670/1626	4.19	4.29	4.11	4.07	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	16	4.63	739/1559	4.63	4.63	4.46	4.47	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	673/1560	4.88	4.84	4.72	4.68	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	2	18	4.54	634/1549	4.38	4.43	4.31	4.32	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	18	4.67	520/1546	4.62	4.59	4.32	4.32	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	3	0	4	3	11	3.90	820/1323	3.55	3.42	4.00	3.91	3.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	560/1384	4.27	4.04	4.10	3.92	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	2	2	2	7	4.08	943/1378	4.16	4.22	4.29	4.09	4.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	840/1378	4.44	4.46	4.31	4.08	4.31
4. Were special techniques successful	11	9	0	2	2	0	0	2.50	****/ 904	4.00	3.50	4.03	3.94	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 15	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1	B 10					
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 4	General	5	Under-grad	24	Non-major 24
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D 0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				P 0					
				I 0	Other	1			
				? 1					

Course-Section: PHIL 100 0901
 Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: HITZ, ZENA
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1244
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	6	5	8	3.73	1458/1670	4.32	4.39	4.31	4.23	3.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	5	4	9	3.73	1424/1666	4.30	4.34	4.27	4.30	3.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	836/1406	4.66	4.55	4.32	4.31	4.31	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	3	5	10	4.15	981/1615	4.35	4.41	4.24	4.17	4.15	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	5	14	4.41	491/1566	4.18	4.23	4.07	4.03	4.41	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	2	4	13	4.45	504/1528	4.27	4.24	4.12	4.00	4.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	2	1	4	7	6	3.70	1388/1650	4.45	4.24	4.22	4.28	3.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	8	4.36	1287/1667	4.39	4.39	4.67	4.61	4.36	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	3	2	7	4	5	3.29	1480/1626	4.19	4.29	4.11	4.07	3.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	5	4	9	3.86	1374/1559	4.63	4.63	4.46	4.47	3.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	725/1560	4.88	4.84	4.72	4.68	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	6	10	4	3.76	1303/1549	4.38	4.43	4.31	4.32	3.76	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	6	9	4.00	1139/1546	4.62	4.59	4.32	4.32	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	18	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1323	3.55	3.42	4.00	3.91	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	2	0	4	7	4.00	820/1384	4.27	4.04	4.10	3.92	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	2	2	9	4.29	842/1378	4.16	4.22	4.29	4.09	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	1	0	3	9	4.29	850/1378	4.44	4.46	4.31	4.08	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	1	1	2	2	7	4.00	461/ 904	4.00	3.50	4.03	3.94	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHIL 146 0101
 Title CRITICAL THINKING
 Instructor: TEMPLETON, ROYE
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1245
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	862/1670	4.18	4.39	4.31	4.23	4.37	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	390/1666	4.31	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	632/1406	4.39	4.55	4.32	4.31	4.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1615	4.25	4.41	4.24	4.17	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	5	11	4.32	579/1566	4.10	4.23	4.07	4.03	4.32	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	17	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1528	3.25	4.24	4.12	4.00	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	246/1650	4.61	4.24	4.22	4.28	4.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	693/1667	4.45	4.39	4.67	4.61	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	2	0	1	8	4	3.80	1220/1626	3.51	4.29	4.11	4.07	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	291/1559	4.73	4.63	4.46	4.47	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	3	14	4.58	1188/1560	4.57	4.84	4.72	4.68	4.58	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	2	6	9	4.11	1104/1549	3.90	4.43	4.31	4.32	4.11	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	7	8	4.00	1139/1546	3.81	4.59	4.32	4.32	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	7	1	1	2	2	2.31	1287/1323	2.54	3.42	4.00	3.91	2.31	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	6	3	1	0	2	2.08	1359/1384	2.28	4.04	4.10	3.92	2.08	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	4	2	0	3	3	2.92	1322/1378	2.46	4.22	4.29	4.09	2.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	4	1	3	2	2	2.75	1333/1378	2.34	4.46	4.31	4.08	2.75	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	4.59	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	5.00	4.54	4.46	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A 4	Required for Majors 15
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 9	
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 4	General 3
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Non-major 19
				P 0	
				I 0	
				Other	2
				?	1

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PHIL 146 0201
 Title CRITICAL THINKING
 Instructor: TEMPLETON, ROYE
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1246
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	6	5	4.00	1216/1670	4.18	4.39	4.31	4.23	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	4	7	3.94	1282/1666	4.31	4.34	4.27	4.30	3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	10	4.31	823/1406	4.39	4.55	4.32	4.31	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	874/1615	4.25	4.41	4.24	4.17	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	5	6	3.88	1039/1566	4.10	4.23	4.07	4.03	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	1399/1528	3.25	4.24	4.12	4.00	3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	11	4.44	675/1650	4.61	4.24	4.22	4.28	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	14	1	4.00	1524/1667	4.45	4.39	4.67	4.61	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	2	2	2	7	1	3.21	1505/1626	3.51	4.29	4.11	4.07	3.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	1	12	4.56	821/1559	4.73	4.63	4.46	4.47	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	2	12	4.56	1197/1560	4.57	4.84	4.72	4.68	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	3	6	4	3.69	1338/1549	3.90	4.43	4.31	4.32	3.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	4	5	4	3.63	1345/1546	3.81	4.59	4.32	4.32	3.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	3	0	3	2	1	2.78	1245/1323	2.54	3.42	4.00	3.91	2.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	2	5	2	1	2.47	1339/1384	2.28	4.04	4.10	3.92	2.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	6	4	4	1	0	2.00	1368/1378	2.46	4.22	4.29	4.09	2.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	7	3	4	1	0	1.93	1370/1378	2.34	4.46	4.31	4.08	1.93
4. Were special techniques successful	1	14	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 904	****	3.50	4.03	3.94	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHIL 150 0101
 Title CONTEMPORARY MORAL ISS
 Instructor: EALICK, GREG E. (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1247
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	1	3	7	7	4.11	1150/1670	4.37	4.39	4.31	4.23	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	9	4.28	943/1666	4.33	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	644/1406	4.65	4.55	4.32	4.31	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	7	6	4.06	1055/1615	4.36	4.41	4.24	4.17	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	3	3	7	3.56	1257/1566	3.77	4.23	4.07	4.03	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	9	4	3.72	1170/1528	4.06	4.24	4.12	4.00	3.72
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	8	8	4.22	938/1650	4.31	4.24	4.22	4.28	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	712/1667	4.92	4.39	4.67	4.61	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	11	4	4.19	808/1626	4.29	4.29	4.11	4.07	4.01
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	2	14	4.61	755/1559	4.76	4.63	4.46	4.47	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	2	15	4.67	1090/1560	4.89	4.84	4.72	4.68	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	762/1549	4.47	4.43	4.31	4.32	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	520/1546	4.73	4.59	4.32	4.32	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	14	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/1323	4.00	3.42	4.00	3.91	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	3	3	5	3	3.40	1141/1384	3.42	4.04	4.10	3.92	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	2	0	3	10	4.40	718/1378	4.10	4.22	4.29	4.09	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	692/1378	4.61	4.46	4.31	4.08	4.47
4. Were special techniques successful	3	12	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 904	3.33	3.50	4.03	3.94	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	1
			? 1		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PHIL 150 0101
 Title CONTEMPORARY MORAL ISS
 Instructor: EALICK, GREG E. (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1248
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	1	3	7	7	4.11	1150/1670	4.37	4.39	4.31	4.23	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	9	4.28	943/1666	4.33	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	644/1406	4.65	4.55	4.32	4.31	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	7	6	4.06	1055/1615	4.36	4.41	4.24	4.17	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	3	3	7	3.56	1257/1566	3.77	4.23	4.07	4.03	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	9	4	3.72	1170/1528	4.06	4.24	4.12	4.00	3.72
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	8	8	4.22	938/1650	4.31	4.24	4.22	4.28	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	712/1667	4.92	4.39	4.67	4.61	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	1191/1626	4.29	4.29	4.11	4.07	4.01
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/1559	4.76	4.63	4.46	4.47	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1560	4.89	4.84	4.72	4.68	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1549	4.47	4.43	4.31	4.32	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1546	4.73	4.59	4.32	4.32	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1323	4.00	3.42	4.00	3.91	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	3	3	5	3	3.40	1141/1384	3.42	4.04	4.10	3.92	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	2	0	3	10	4.40	718/1378	4.10	4.22	4.29	4.09	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	692/1378	4.61	4.46	4.31	4.08	4.47
4. Were special techniques successful	3	12	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 904	3.33	3.50	4.03	3.94	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	1
			? 1		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PHIL 150 0102
 Title CONTEMPORARY MORAL ISS
 Instructor: EALICK, GREG E.
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1249
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	876/1670	4.37	4.39	4.31	4.23	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	2	5	7	3.88	1331/1666	4.33	4.34	4.27	4.30	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	8	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	212/1406	4.65	4.55	4.32	4.31	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	724/1615	4.36	4.41	4.24	4.17	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	1	6	6	3.71	1181/1566	3.77	4.23	4.07	4.03	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	7	6	3.94	983/1528	4.06	4.24	4.12	4.00	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	3	5	7	4.00	1135/1650	4.31	4.24	4.22	4.28	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1667	4.92	4.39	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	865/1626	4.29	4.29	4.11	4.07	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	503/1559	4.76	4.63	4.46	4.47	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	647/1560	4.89	4.84	4.72	4.68	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	7	6	4.13	1087/1549	4.47	4.43	4.31	4.32	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	619/1546	4.73	4.59	4.32	4.32	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	15	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1323	4.00	3.42	4.00	3.91	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	3	7	3	3.35	1163/1384	3.42	4.04	4.10	3.92	3.35
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	5	0	1	1	10	3.65	1145/1378	4.10	4.22	4.29	4.09	3.65
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	550/1378	4.61	4.46	4.31	4.08	4.65
4. Were special techniques successful	1	14	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 904	3.33	3.50	4.03	3.94	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.67	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 15	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B 9					
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 2	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major 18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	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 150 0103
 Title CONTEMPORARY MORAL ISS
 Instructor: EALICK, GREG E.
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1250
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	809/1670	4.37	4.39	4.31	4.23	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	622/1666	4.33	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	226/1406	4.65	4.55	4.32	4.31	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	446/1615	4.36	4.41	4.24	4.17	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	2	2	2	3.33	1373/1566	3.77	4.23	4.07	4.03	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	733/1528	4.06	4.24	4.12	4.00	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	361/1650	4.31	4.24	4.22	4.28	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1667	4.92	4.39	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	126/1626	4.29	4.29	4.11	4.07	4.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1559	4.76	4.63	4.46	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1560	4.89	4.84	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	294/1549	4.47	4.43	4.31	4.32	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1546	4.73	4.59	4.32	4.32	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	3	1	1	2.67	1323/1384	3.42	4.04	4.10	3.92	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	0	3	4	3.89	1064/1378	4.10	4.22	4.29	4.09	3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	417/1378	4.61	4.46	4.31	4.08	4.78

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHIL 150 0104
 Title CONTEMPORARY MORAL ISS
 Instructor: EALICK, GREG E.
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1251
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	253/1670	4.37	4.39	4.31	4.23	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	355/1666	4.33	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	495/1406	4.65	4.55	4.32	4.31	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	326/1615	4.36	4.41	4.24	4.17	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	258/1566	3.77	4.23	4.07	4.03	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	260/1528	4.06	4.24	4.12	4.00	4.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	690/1650	4.31	4.24	4.22	4.28	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	768/1667	4.92	4.39	4.67	4.61	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	531/1626	4.29	4.29	4.11	4.07	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	673/1559	4.76	4.63	4.46	4.47	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1560	4.89	4.84	4.72	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	683/1549	4.47	4.43	4.31	4.32	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	520/1546	4.73	4.59	4.32	4.32	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	692/1323	4.00	3.42	4.00	3.91	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	651/1384	3.42	4.04	4.10	3.92	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	915/1378	4.10	4.22	4.29	4.09	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	481/1378	4.61	4.46	4.31	4.08	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	779/ 904	3.33	3.50	4.03	3.94	3.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.46	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHIL 152 0101
 Title INTRO TO MORAL THEORY
 Instructor: THOMAS, JAMES
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1252
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	2	2	29	4.82	290/1670	4.48	4.39	4.31	4.23	4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	30	4.91	173/1666	4.49	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	31	4.94	134/1406	4.65	4.55	4.32	4.31	4.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	27	4.79	263/1615	4.52	4.41	4.24	4.17	4.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	5	10	14	4.06	814/1566	4.00	4.23	4.07	4.03	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	9	20	4.53	398/1528	4.35	4.24	4.12	4.00	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	8	22	4.63	406/1650	4.28	4.24	4.22	4.28	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	30	3	4.09	1477/1667	3.91	4.39	4.67	4.61	4.09
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	30	4.94	81/1626	4.50	4.29	4.11	4.07	4.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	29	4.88	323/1559	4.64	4.63	4.46	4.47	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	32	5.00	1/1560	4.94	4.84	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	32	4.97	81/1549	4.68	4.43	4.31	4.32	4.97
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	31	4.94	162/1546	4.70	4.59	4.32	4.32	4.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	22	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	423/1323	3.46	3.42	4.00	3.91	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1384	4.55	4.04	4.10	3.92	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	146/1378	4.67	4.22	4.29	4.09	4.95
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1378	4.79	4.46	4.31	4.08	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	14	14	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 904	3.71	3.50	4.03	3.94	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	29	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	6	C	0	General	10	Under-grad	33	Non-major	33
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	12	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 152 0301
 Title INTRO TO MORAL THEORY
 Instructor: FERRY, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1253
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	7	12	13	4.09	1167/1670	4.48	4.39	4.31	4.23	4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	13	15	4.30	908/1666	4.49	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	9	22	4.61	495/1406	4.65	4.55	4.32	4.31	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	4	10	12	4.31	813/1615	4.52	4.41	4.24	4.17	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	7	5	18	4.15	743/1566	4.00	4.23	4.07	4.03	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	14	5	13	3.97	955/1528	4.35	4.24	4.12	4.00	3.97
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	10	5	18	4.24	914/1650	4.28	4.24	4.22	4.28	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	7	23	2	3.84	1618/1667	3.91	4.39	4.67	4.61	3.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	3	21	3	3.93	1089/1626	4.50	4.29	4.11	4.07	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	8	22	4.68	656/1559	4.64	4.63	4.46	4.47	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	4	26	4.81	855/1560	4.94	4.84	4.72	4.68	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	7	21	4.63	525/1549	4.68	4.43	4.31	4.32	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	4	25	4.74	420/1546	4.70	4.59	4.32	4.32	4.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	25	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1323	3.46	3.42	4.00	3.91	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	4	10	11	4.28	651/1384	4.55	4.04	4.10	3.92	4.28
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	2	8	14	4.36	763/1378	4.67	4.22	4.29	4.09	4.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	386/1378	4.79	4.46	4.31	4.08	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	9	8	2	1	2	7	5	3.71	653/ 904	3.71	3.50	4.03	3.94	3.71

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 19	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99 0	B 16		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 1	General 5	Under-grad 34 Non-major 34
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 8	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 4	
			? 3		

Course-Section: PHIL 152 0501
 Title INTRO TO MORAL THEORY
 Instructor: THOMAS, JAMES
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1254
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	1	0	2	26	4.83	281/1670	4.48	4.39	4.31	4.23	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1666	4.49	4.34	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1406	4.65	4.55	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	182/1615	4.52	4.41	4.24	4.17	4.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	3	4	4	12	3.73	1159/1566	4.00	4.23	4.07	4.03	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	5	20	4.55	383/1528	4.35	4.24	4.12	4.00	4.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	0	28	4.90	166/1650	4.28	4.24	4.22	4.28	4.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	20	9	4.31	1326/1667	3.91	4.39	4.67	4.61	4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1626	4.50	4.29	4.11	4.07	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1559	4.64	4.63	4.46	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1560	4.94	4.84	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1549	4.68	4.43	4.31	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1546	4.70	4.59	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	17	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	507/1323	3.46	3.42	4.00	3.91	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1384	4.55	4.04	4.10	3.92	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1378	4.67	4.22	4.29	4.09	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1378	4.79	4.46	4.31	4.08	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	19	5	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	****/ 904	3.71	3.50	4.03	3.94	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 22	Required for Majors 18	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 7					
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C 0	General	5	Under-grad	29	Non-major 29
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	5	D 0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				P 0					
				I 0	Other	4			
				? 0					

Course-Section: PHIL 152 0601
 Title INTRO TO MORAL THEORY
 Instructor: TITCHENER, JOHN
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1255
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	2	10	5	4.18	1082/1670	4.48	4.39	4.31	4.23	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	8	3	3.76	1403/1666	4.49	4.34	4.27	4.30	3.76	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	7	7	4.06	1027/1406	4.65	4.55	4.32	4.31	4.06	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	1018/1615	4.52	4.41	4.24	4.17	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	4	7	4.06	820/1566	4.00	4.23	4.07	4.03	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/1528	4.35	4.24	4.12	4.00	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	1	4	5	4	3.35	1516/1650	4.28	4.24	4.22	4.28	3.35	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	8	8	0	3.41	1655/1667	3.91	4.39	4.67	4.61	3.41	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	2	8	4	4.14	854/1626	4.50	4.29	4.11	4.07	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	7	5	4.00	1280/1559	4.64	4.63	4.46	4.47	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	358/1560	4.94	4.84	4.72	4.68	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	1087/1549	4.68	4.43	4.31	4.32	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	7	6	4.13	1087/1546	4.70	4.59	4.32	4.32	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	3	2	1	0	0	1.67	1311/1323	3.46	3.42	4.00	3.91	1.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	3	5	5	3.93	909/1384	4.55	4.04	4.10	3.92	3.93	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	0	5	8	4.36	774/1378	4.67	4.22	4.29	4.09	4.36	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	795/1378	4.79	4.46	4.31	4.08	4.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	12	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	3.71	3.50	4.03	3.94	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHIL 210 0101
 Title PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION
 Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1256
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	1	5	5	12	4.22	1038/1670	4.22	4.39	4.31	4.32	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	6	12	4.22	1015/1666	4.22	4.34	4.27	4.27	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	483/1406	4.61	4.55	4.32	4.39	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	2	0	5	11	4.39	712/1615	4.39	4.41	4.24	4.29	4.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	7	13	4.43	460/1566	4.43	4.23	4.07	4.00	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	1	4	14	4.55	383/1528	4.55	4.24	4.12	4.11	4.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	4	2	9	6	3.57	1442/1650	3.57	4.24	4.22	4.20	3.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	19	3	4.09	1482/1667	4.09	4.39	4.67	4.64	4.09
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	2	8	9	4.14	854/1626	4.14	4.29	4.11	4.06	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	7	11	4.38	1042/1559	4.38	4.63	4.46	4.40	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	298/1560	4.95	4.84	4.72	4.73	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	6	3	11	4.25	977/1549	4.25	4.43	4.31	4.25	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	457/1546	4.71	4.59	4.32	4.30	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	17	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1323	****	3.42	4.00	4.08	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	962/1384	3.83	4.04	4.10	4.07	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	603/1378	4.50	4.22	4.29	4.25	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	354/1378	4.83	4.46	4.31	4.26	4.83

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors		9	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	11							
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General		8	Under-grad	23	Non-major	20
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	6	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives		2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		4				
				?	0							

Course-Section: PHIL 248 0101
 Title INTRO SCIENTIF REASONI
 Instructor: SENG, PHILLIP
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 45

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1257
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	5	12	26	4.36	876/1670	4.36	4.39	4.31	4.32	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	12	30	4.60	490/1666	4.60	4.34	4.27	4.27	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	38	4.80	261/1406	4.80	4.55	4.32	4.39	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	13	29	4.61	434/1615	4.61	4.41	4.24	4.29	4.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	6	7	26	4.16	743/1566	4.16	4.23	4.07	4.00	4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	24	1	1	2	3	12	4.26	697/1528	4.26	4.24	4.12	4.11	4.26
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	5	37	4.80	237/1650	4.80	4.24	4.22	4.20	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	13	24	7	3.86	1615/1667	3.86	4.39	4.67	4.64	3.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	0	3	9	27	4.44	515/1626	4.44	4.29	4.11	4.06	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	38	4.84	371/1559	4.84	4.63	4.46	4.40	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	6	37	4.82	829/1560	4.82	4.84	4.72	4.73	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	6	36	4.75	366/1549	4.75	4.43	4.31	4.25	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	6	35	4.73	445/1546	4.73	4.59	4.32	4.30	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	0	0	5	8	23	4.50	326/1323	4.50	3.42	4.00	4.08	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	179/1384	4.89	4.04	4.10	4.07	4.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	316/1378	4.83	4.22	4.29	4.25	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	354/1378	4.83	4.46	4.31	4.26	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	27	10	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	****/ 904	****	3.50	4.03	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.33	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 31	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General 5	Under-grad 45 Non-major 45
84-150	14	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 12	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 21	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHIL 251 0101
 Title ETH ISS SCI ENG&INF TE
 Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1258
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	4	4	9	12	3.90	1344/1670	4.14	4.39	4.31	4.32	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	12	12	4.24	979/1666	4.22	4.34	4.27	4.27	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	7	9	13	4.10	997/1406	4.10	4.55	4.32	4.39	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	5	10	12	4.14	990/1615	4.33	4.41	4.24	4.29	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	9	4	6	3.84	1068/1566	3.65	4.23	4.07	4.00	3.84
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	6	9	14	4.28	688/1528	4.30	4.24	4.12	4.11	4.28
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	4	10	7	7	3.43	1490/1650	3.48	4.24	4.22	4.20	3.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	24	4	4.14	1444/1667	4.27	4.39	4.67	4.64	4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	0	7	10	7	4.00	953/1626	4.11	4.29	4.11	4.06	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	4	5	10	7	3.57	1451/1559	3.81	4.63	4.46	4.40	3.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	26	4.89	621/1560	4.83	4.84	4.72	4.73	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	3	5	13	5	3.67	1345/1549	3.91	4.43	4.31	4.25	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	4	5	9	8	3.70	1313/1546	3.95	4.59	4.32	4.30	3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	4	3	7	3	3	2.90	1227/1323	3.10	3.42	4.00	4.08	2.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	4	2	4	4	8	3.45	1122/1384	3.65	4.04	4.10	4.07	3.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	2	7	5	7	3.68	1134/1378	3.87	4.22	4.29	4.25	3.68
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	1	7	4	9	3.86	1067/1378	3.88	4.46	4.31	4.26	3.86
4. Were special techniques successful	8	10	0	1	5	4	2	3.58	702/ 904	3.40	3.50	4.03	4.01	3.58
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.25	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 18	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B 9		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C 1	General 2	Under-grad 30 Non-major 30
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				P 0		
				I 0	Other 21	
				? 0		

Course-Section: PHIL 251 0102
 Title ETH ISS SCI ENG&INF TE
 Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1259
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	8	11	4.38	835/1670	4.14	4.39	4.31	4.32	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	8	10	4.19	1037/1666	4.22	4.34	4.27	4.27	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	13	6	4.10	1003/1406	4.10	4.55	4.32	4.39	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	3	3	13	4.53	530/1615	4.33	4.41	4.24	4.29	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	3	0	3	5	4	3.47	1310/1566	3.65	4.23	4.07	4.00	3.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	6	11	4.33	631/1528	4.30	4.24	4.12	4.11	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	6	4	5	6	3.52	1454/1650	3.48	4.24	4.22	4.20	3.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	12	8	4.40	1256/1667	4.27	4.39	4.67	4.64	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	2	7	8	4.22	762/1626	4.11	4.29	4.11	4.06	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	2	9	8	4.05	1270/1559	3.81	4.63	4.46	4.40	4.05
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	929/1560	4.83	4.84	4.72	4.73	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	3	7	9	4.15	1061/1549	3.91	4.43	4.31	4.25	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	6	11	4.19	1032/1546	3.95	4.59	4.32	4.30	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	1	2	4	4	2	3.31	1107/1323	3.10	3.42	4.00	4.08	3.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	3	7	6	3.84	957/1384	3.65	4.04	4.10	4.07	3.84
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	5	5	8	4.05	951/1378	3.87	4.22	4.29	4.25	4.05
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	2	3	9	5	3.89	1058/1378	3.88	4.46	4.31	4.26	3.89
4. Were special techniques successful	3	9	1	2	2	2	2	3.22	799/ 904	3.40	3.50	4.03	4.01	3.22

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 16	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate
56-83	4	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	21
			P 1		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	17

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PHIL 322 0101
 Title HIST OF PHIL:MODERN
 Instructor: BRAUDE, STEPHEN
 Enrollment: 62
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1260
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	3	14	8	17	3.80	1419/1670	3.80	4.39	4.31	4.24	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	5	10	13	14	3.73	1424/1666	3.73	4.34	4.27	4.18	3.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	1	8	12	20	4.02	1045/1406	4.02	4.55	4.32	4.22	4.02
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	24	0	2	8	6	3	3.53	1442/1615	3.53	4.41	4.24	4.18	3.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	3	11	6	18	3.61	1225/1566	3.61	4.23	4.07	4.04	3.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	23	2	3	5	6	4	3.35	1357/1528	3.35	4.24	4.12	4.07	3.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	6	11	7	8	11	3.16	1559/1650	3.16	4.24	4.22	4.12	3.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	4	25	13	4.16	1430/1667	4.16	4.39	4.67	4.67	4.16
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	1	5	22	8	3.95	1055/1626	3.95	4.29	4.11	4.06	3.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	0	3	7	30	4.50	896/1559	4.50	4.63	4.46	4.40	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	3	37	4.83	777/1560	4.83	4.84	4.72	4.67	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	1	4	17	17	4.05	1129/1549	4.05	4.43	4.31	4.25	4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	4	9	25	4.24	1002/1546	4.24	4.59	4.32	4.24	4.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	21	6	2	6	4	3	2.81	1241/1323	2.81	3.42	4.00	3.99	2.81
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	5	2	5	3	10	3.44	1125/1384	3.44	4.04	4.10	4.12	3.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	1	3	3	2	14	4.09	939/1378	4.09	4.22	4.29	4.30	4.09
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	1	5	2	16	4.38	777/1378	4.38	4.46	4.31	4.33	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	21	21	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 904	****	3.50	4.03	4.03	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 1	A 13	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0 Major 6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 15		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 6	C 9	General 8	Under-grad 44 Non-major 38
84-150	17	3.00-3.49 8	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 23	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHIL 322H 0101
 Title HIST OF PHIL:MODERN
 Instructor: BRAUDE, STEPHEN
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1261
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	2	4.25	996/1670	4.25	4.39	4.31	4.24	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1199/1666	4.00	4.34	4.27	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	597/1406	4.50	4.55	4.32	4.22	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1380/1615	3.67	4.41	4.24	4.18	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	226/1566	4.75	4.23	4.07	4.04	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	899/1528	4.00	4.24	4.12	4.07	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1610/1650	2.75	4.24	4.22	4.12	2.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1368/1667	4.25	4.39	4.67	4.67	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.29	4.11	4.06	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	521/1559	4.75	4.63	4.46	4.40	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1411/1560	4.25	4.84	4.72	4.67	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	977/1549	4.25	4.43	4.31	4.25	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	715/1546	4.50	4.59	4.32	4.24	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1179/1323	3.00	3.42	4.00	3.99	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	820/1384	4.00	4.04	4.10	4.12	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	970/1378	4.00	4.22	4.29	4.30	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.46	4.31	4.33	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

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

Course-Section: PHIL 346 0101
 Title DEDUCTIVE SYSTEMS
 Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 54
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1262
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	3	0	7	6	18	4.06	1189/1670	4.06	4.39	4.31	4.24	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	2	10	18	4.24	979/1666	4.24	4.34	4.27	4.18	4.24	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	7	23	4.50	597/1406	4.50	4.55	4.32	4.22	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	27	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	****/1615	****	4.41	4.24	4.18	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	3	2	6	4	13	3.79	1122/1566	3.79	4.23	4.07	4.04	3.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	27	2	1	0	2	2	3.14	****/1528	****	4.24	4.12	4.07	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	6	6	18	4.12	1055/1650	4.12	4.24	4.22	4.12	4.12	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	26	8	4.24	1381/1667	4.24	4.39	4.67	4.67	4.24	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	5	6	11	8	3.65	1323/1626	3.65	4.29	4.11	4.06	3.65	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	5	13	14	4.18	1205/1559	4.18	4.63	4.46	4.40	4.18	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	0	4	6	21	4.33	1376/1560	4.33	4.84	4.72	4.67	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	4	5	9	12	3.78	1294/1549	3.78	4.43	4.31	4.25	3.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	0	4	10	16	4.09	1106/1546	4.09	4.59	4.32	4.24	4.09	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	29	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1323	****	3.42	4.00	3.99	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	4	0	3	3	4	3.21	1212/1384	3.21	4.04	4.10	4.12	3.21	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	2	1	5	3	3	3.29	1259/1378	3.29	4.22	4.29	4.30	3.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	3	0	4	3	4	3.36	1248/1378	3.36	4.46	4.31	4.33	3.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	20	13	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 904	****	3.50	4.03	4.03	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 17	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0	Major 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 7			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C 5	General 5	Under-grad 34	Non-major 31
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	7	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 18		
				? 0			

Course-Section: PHIL 350 0101
 Title ETHICAL THEORY
 Instructor: FERRY, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1263
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	7	11	4.17	1082/1670	4.17	4.39	4.31	4.24	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	5	13	4.30	908/1666	4.30	4.34	4.27	4.18	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	4	14	4.26	868/1406	4.26	4.55	4.32	4.22	4.26
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	423/1615	4.63	4.41	4.24	4.18	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	8	13	4.48	419/1566	4.48	4.23	4.07	4.04	4.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	16	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	899/1528	4.00	4.24	4.12	4.07	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	3	15	4.35	794/1650	4.35	4.24	4.22	4.12	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	4	16	2	3.83	1621/1667	3.83	4.39	4.67	4.67	3.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	3	4	11	3	3.67	1312/1626	3.67	4.29	4.11	4.06	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	1	6	12	4.29	1136/1559	4.29	4.63	4.46	4.40	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	1150/1560	4.62	4.84	4.72	4.67	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	2	8	9	4.10	1108/1549	4.10	4.43	4.31	4.25	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	4	14	4.43	822/1546	4.43	4.59	4.32	4.24	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	16	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	****/1323	****	3.42	4.00	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	3	4	8	4.00	820/1384	4.00	4.04	4.10	4.12	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	836/1378	4.29	4.22	4.29	4.30	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	2	3	11	4.41	741/1378	4.41	4.46	4.31	4.33	4.41
4. Were special techniques successful	6	15	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 904	****	3.50	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors		7	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C	9	General		2	Under-grad	23	Non-major	16
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	1							
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		11				
				?	1							

Course-Section: PHIL 350H 0101
 Title ETHICAL THEORY
 Instructor: FERRY, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1264
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	479/1670	4.67	4.39	4.31	4.24	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	870/1666	4.33	4.34	4.27	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.55	4.32	4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	379/1615	4.67	4.41	4.24	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	559/1566	4.33	4.23	4.07	4.04	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1447/1528	3.00	4.24	4.12	4.07	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	361/1650	4.67	4.24	4.22	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.00	4.39	4.67	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.29	4.11	4.06	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	673/1559	4.67	4.63	4.46	4.40	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.84	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	900/1549	4.33	4.43	4.31	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	520/1546	4.67	4.59	4.32	4.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1179/1323	3.00	3.42	4.00	3.99	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	324/1384	4.67	4.04	4.10	4.12	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	970/1378	4.00	4.22	4.29	4.30	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.46	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	820/ 904	3.00	3.50	4.03	4.03	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0

General 1 Under-grad 3 Non-major 3

Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Other 0

Course-Section: PHIL 368 0101
 Title AESTHETICS
 Instructor: TITCHENER, JOHN
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1265
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	1	4	4	2	3.64	1498/1670	3.64	4.39	4.31	4.24	3.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	1142/1666	4.09	4.34	4.27	4.18	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	860/1406	4.27	4.55	4.32	4.22	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	1234/1615	3.90	4.41	4.24	4.18	3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	317/1566	4.64	4.23	4.07	4.04	4.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	760/1528	4.20	4.24	4.12	4.07	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	6	2	2	3.45	1481/1650	3.45	4.24	4.22	4.12	3.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	9	0	1	3.09	1660/1667	3.09	4.39	4.67	4.67	3.09
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	499/1626	4.44	4.29	4.11	4.06	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	1199/1559	4.20	4.63	4.46	4.40	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.84	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	1027/1549	4.20	4.43	4.31	4.25	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	595/1546	4.60	4.59	4.32	4.24	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	1155/1323	3.17	3.42	4.00	3.99	3.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	498/1384	4.44	4.04	4.10	4.12	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	481/1378	4.67	4.22	4.29	4.30	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	417/1378	4.78	4.46	4.31	4.33	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	671/ 904	3.67	3.50	4.03	4.03	3.67

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHIL 372 0101
 Title PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE
 Instructor: EALICK, GREG E.
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1266
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	611/1670	4.56	4.39	4.31	4.24	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	870/1666	4.33	4.34	4.27	4.18	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	189/1615	4.89	4.41	4.24	4.18	4.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	210/1566	4.78	4.23	4.07	4.04	4.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	131/1528	4.89	4.24	4.12	4.07	4.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	499/1650	4.56	4.24	4.22	4.12	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.39	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	207/1626	4.75	4.29	4.11	4.06	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	307/1559	4.89	4.63	4.46	4.40	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.84	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	622/1549	4.56	4.43	4.31	4.25	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.59	4.32	4.24	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1323	****	3.42	4.00	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	257/1384	4.75	4.04	4.10	4.12	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	400/1378	4.75	4.22	4.29	4.30	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.46	4.31	4.33	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHIL 373 0101
 Title METAPHYSICS
 Instructor: THOMAS, JAMES
 Enrollment: 49
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1267
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	8	26	4.76	350/1670	4.76	4.39	4.31	4.24	4.76	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	29	4.82	241/1666	4.82	4.34	4.27	4.18	4.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	23	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	261/1406	4.80	4.55	4.32	4.22	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	5	25	4.72	326/1615	4.72	4.41	4.24	4.18	4.72	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	11	18	4.32	569/1566	4.32	4.23	4.07	4.04	4.32	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	28	4.76	211/1528	4.76	4.24	4.12	4.07	4.76	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	6	25	4.65	383/1650	4.65	4.24	4.22	4.12	4.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	31	3	4.09	1482/1667	4.09	4.39	4.67	4.67	4.09	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.29	4.11	4.06	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	31	4.97	111/1559	4.97	4.63	4.46	4.40	4.97	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	32	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.84	4.72	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	28	4.88	229/1549	4.88	4.43	4.31	4.25	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	31	4.97	93/1546	4.97	4.59	4.32	4.24	4.97	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	11	1	0	2	3	15	4.48	355/1323	4.48	3.42	4.00	3.99	4.48	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	210/1384	4.82	4.04	4.10	4.12	4.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.22	4.29	4.30	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.46	4.31	4.33	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	14	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 904	****	3.50	4.03	4.03	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.04	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.30	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 24	Required for Majors	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 5	C 2	General	14
84-150	19	3.00-3.49 11	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives	3
			P 2		
			I 0	Other	12
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PHIL 390 0101
 Title PHILOSOPHY OF SPORT
 Instructor: TEMPLETON, ROYE
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1268
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	929/1670	4.31	4.39	4.31	4.24	4.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	5	9	4.31	895/1666	4.31	4.34	4.27	4.18	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	7	4.25	876/1406	4.25	4.55	4.32	4.22	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	837/1615	4.29	4.41	4.24	4.18	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	460/1566	4.44	4.23	4.07	4.04	4.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	2	9	4.27	697/1528	4.27	4.24	4.12	4.07	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	338/1650	4.69	4.24	4.22	4.12	4.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	8	6	4.25	1368/1667	4.25	4.39	4.67	4.67	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	637/1626	4.33	4.29	4.11	4.06	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.63	4.46	4.40	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	948/1560	4.75	4.84	4.72	4.67	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	683/1549	4.50	4.43	4.31	4.25	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	643/1546	4.56	4.59	4.32	4.24	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	1	2	5	7	4.00	692/1323	4.00	3.42	4.00	3.99	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	4	0	1	1	5	3.27	1194/1384	3.27	4.04	4.10	4.12	3.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	2	1	4	2	3.18	1278/1378	3.18	4.22	4.29	4.30	3.18	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	2	1	3	4	3.64	1156/1378	3.64	4.46	4.31	4.33	3.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	9	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 904	****	3.50	4.03	4.03	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.53	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.50	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	3.33	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHIL 400 0111
 Title INDEP STUDY IN PHIL
 Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1269
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.39	4.31	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1666	4.75	4.34	4.27	4.35	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.41	4.24	4.37	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1566	4.75	4.23	4.07	4.17	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.24	4.12	4.26	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.24	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.39	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1626	4.75	4.29	4.11	4.28	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.63	4.46	4.58	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.84	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.43	4.31	4.43	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.59	4.32	4.43	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.04	4.10	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.22	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.46	4.31	4.60	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1270
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.39	4.31	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	622/1666	4.75	4.34	4.27	4.35	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.41	4.24	4.37	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	389/1566	4.75	4.23	4.07	4.17	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.39	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	403/1626	4.75	4.29	4.11	4.28	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.63	4.46	4.58	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.84	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.43	4.31	4.43	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.59	4.32	4.43	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	5.00	4.64	5.00	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 27	5.00	5.00	4.54	5.00	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1271
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.39	4.31	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.34	4.27	4.35	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.41	4.24	4.37	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.23	4.07	4.17	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.24	4.12	4.26	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.39	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.29	4.11	4.28	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	5.00	4.64	5.00	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 27	5.00	5.00	4.54	5.00	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHIL 445 0101
 Title PHILOSOPHY OF LANGUAGE
 Instructor: EALICK, GREG E.
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1272
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	518/1670	4.64	4.39	4.31	4.45	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	943/1666	4.27	4.34	4.27	4.35	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	423/1406	4.67	4.55	4.32	4.48	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	499/1615	4.56	4.41	4.24	4.37	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	9	4.55	369/1566	4.55	4.23	4.07	4.17	4.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	323/1528	4.64	4.24	4.12	4.26	4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	298/1650	4.73	4.24	4.22	4.28	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.39	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.29	4.11	4.28	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	276/1559	4.91	4.63	4.46	4.58	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.84	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	284/1549	4.82	4.43	4.31	4.43	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.59	4.32	4.43	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1323	****	3.42	4.00	4.10	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	2	5	4.00	820/1384	4.00	4.04	4.10	4.32	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	459/1378	4.70	4.22	4.29	4.55	4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	281/1378	4.90	4.46	4.31	4.60	4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	1	8	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 904	****	3.50	4.03	4.22	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.80	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	5.00	4.54	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	11	Non-major	3
84-150	5	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	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 452 0101
 Title ADV TOPICS IN ETHICS
 Instructor: FERRY, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1273
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	1128/1670	4.13	4.39	4.31	4.45	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	4	6	4.07	1161/1666	4.07	4.34	4.27	4.35	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	261/1406	4.80	4.55	4.32	4.48	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	775/1615	4.33	4.41	4.24	4.37	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	11	4.53	374/1566	4.53	4.23	4.07	4.17	4.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	631/1528	4.33	4.24	4.12	4.26	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	806/1650	4.33	4.24	4.22	4.28	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	5	9	1	3.73	1636/1667	3.73	4.39	4.67	4.73	3.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	704/1626	4.27	4.29	4.11	4.28	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	858/1559	4.53	4.63	4.46	4.58	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	417/1560	4.93	4.84	4.72	4.80	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	257/1549	4.85	4.43	4.31	4.43	4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	679/1546	4.53	4.59	4.32	4.43	4.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	348/1384	4.64	4.04	4.10	4.32	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	431/1378	4.73	4.22	4.29	4.55	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	375/1378	4.82	4.46	4.31	4.60	4.82
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 1	General 3	Under-grad 15	Non-major 5
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 7		
				? 0			

Course-Section: PHIL 471 0101
 Title FREEDOM, DETERMINISM, RE
 Instructor: YALOWITZ, STEVE
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1274
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	338/1670	4.78	4.39	4.31	4.45	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	415/1666	4.67	4.34	4.27	4.35	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	205/1406	4.89	4.55	4.32	4.48	4.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	290/1615	4.75	4.41	4.24	4.37	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	210/1566	4.78	4.23	4.07	4.17	4.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	504/1528	4.44	4.24	4.12	4.26	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	255/1650	4.78	4.24	4.22	4.28	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.39	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	308/1626	4.63	4.29	4.11	4.28	4.63

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	307/1559	4.89	4.63	4.46	4.58	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	647/1560	4.89	4.84	4.72	4.80	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	537/1549	4.63	4.43	4.31	4.43	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	253/1546	4.89	4.59	4.32	4.43	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1323	****	3.42	4.00	4.10	****

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	390/1384	4.57	4.04	4.10	4.32	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	295/1378	4.86	4.22	4.29	4.55	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.46	4.31	4.60	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

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

Course-Section: PHIL 481 0101
 Title ANCIENT PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: HITZ, ZENA
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1275
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	479/1670	4.67	4.39	4.31	4.45	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1452/1666	3.67	4.34	4.27	4.35	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1057/1406	4.00	4.55	4.32	4.48	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1380/1615	3.67	4.41	4.24	4.37	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.23	4.07	4.17	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	631/1528	4.33	4.24	4.12	4.26	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1521/1650	3.33	4.24	4.22	4.28	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1022/1667	4.67	4.39	4.67	4.73	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.29	4.11	4.28	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	673/1559	4.67	4.63	4.46	4.58	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1090/1560	4.67	4.84	4.72	4.80	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	488/1549	4.67	4.43	4.31	4.43	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	520/1546	4.67	4.59	4.32	4.43	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.04	4.10	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.22	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.46	4.31	4.60	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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