

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|---------------------|
| Course-Section: | PHIL 100 01 |
| Title: | Intro To Philosophy |
| Instructor: | Yalowitz,Steven |

Term - Spring 2011

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Enrollment: | 40 |
| Questionnaires: | 30 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|----|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 6 | 13 | 3.87 | 1207/1449 | 4.43 | 4.43 | 4.33 | 4.14 | 3.87 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 14 | 4.00 | 1061/1446 | 4.53 | 4.41 | 4.29 | 4.20 | 4.00 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 16 | 4.31 | 738/1256 | 4.74 | 4.54 | 4.34 | 4.21 | 4.31 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 12 | 4.08 | 970/1402 | 4.47 | 4.41 | 4.27 | 4.10 | 4.08 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 17 | 4.34 | 540/1358 | 4.00 | 4.29 | 4.13 | 4.04 | 4.34 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 8 | 3.73 | 1027/1327 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.16 | 3.92 | 3.73 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 19 | 4.21 | 818/1435 | 4.33 | 4.39 | 4.20 | 4.11 | 4.21 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 8 | 12 | 4.03 | 1342/1446 | 4.25 | 4.33 | 4.67 | 4.57 | 4.03 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 9 | 8 | 3.70 | 1153/1437 | 4.43 | 4.25 | 4.12 | 4.04 | 3.70 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 18 | 4.38 | 954/1386 | 4.73 | 4.56 | 4.48 | 4.40 | 4.38 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 22 | 4.69 | 980/1390 | 4.93 | 4.80 | 4.74 | 4.67 | 4.69 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 14 | 3.97 | 1084/1379 | 4.54 | 4.42 | 4.34 | 4.28 | 3.97 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 1 | 16 | 3.97 | 1081/1379 | 4.71 | 4.53 | 4.36 | 4.26 | 3.97 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 17 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2.67 | 1197/1236 | 3.15 | 3.54 | 4.08 | 3.93 | 2.67 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 19 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3.36 | 983/1121 | 4.39 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 3.89 | 3.36 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 19 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 2.82 | 1099/1122 | 4.23 | 4.17 | 4.36 | 4.09 | 2.82 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 19 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 3.91 | 920/1121 | 4.64 | 4.39 | 4.40 | 4.08 | 3.91 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 19 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/790 | **** | 3.85 | 4.06 | 3.89 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|---------------------|
| Course-Section: | PHIL 100 01 |
| Title: | Intro To Philosophy |
| Instructor: | Yalowitz,Steven |

Term - Spring 2011

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Enrollment: | 40 |
| Questionnaires: | 30 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/205 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 4.37 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 29 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/34 | **** | **** | 4.33 | 2.63 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 29 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/35 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 5.00 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 29 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/31 | **** | 5.00 | 4.34 | 4.82 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/24 | **** | 5.00 | 4.34 | 4.64 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 7 | 0.00-0.99 | 2 | A | 14 | Required for Majors | 2 | Graduate | 1 | Major | 1 |
| 28-55 | 6 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 8 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 3 | C | 2 | General | 17 | Under-grad | 29 | Non-major | 29 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D | 1 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 1 | 3.50-4.00 | 9 | F | 1 | Electives | 7 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 3 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Enrollment: | 43 |
| Questionnaires: | 37 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 35 | 4.95 | 80/1449 | 4.43 | 4.43 | 4.33 | 4.14 | 4.95 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 35 | 4.92 | 84/1446 | 4.53 | 4.41 | 4.29 | 4.20 | 4.92 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 34 | 4.92 | 119/1256 | 4.74 | 4.54 | 4.34 | 4.21 | 4.92 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 28 | 4.81 | 171/1402 | 4.47 | 4.41 | 4.27 | 4.10 | 4.81 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 3 | 7 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 17 | 3.65 | 1102/1358 | 4.00 | 4.29 | 4.13 | 4.04 | 3.65 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 24 | 4.39 | 543/1327 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.16 | 3.92 | 4.39 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 30 | 4.69 | 279/1435 | 4.33 | 4.39 | 4.20 | 4.11 | 4.69 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 3 | 4.08 | 1324/1446 | 4.25 | 4.33 | 4.67 | 4.57 | 4.08 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 28 | 4.97 | 31/1437 | 4.43 | 4.25 | 4.12 | 4.04 | 4.97 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 32 | 4.89 | 237/1386 | 4.73 | 4.56 | 4.48 | 4.40 | 4.89 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 5.00 | 1/1390 | 4.93 | 4.80 | 4.74 | 4.67 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 32 | 4.91 | 114/1379 | 4.54 | 4.42 | 4.34 | 4.28 | 4.91 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 34 | 4.97 | 51/1379 | 4.71 | 4.53 | 4.36 | 4.26 | 4.97 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 26 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 3.63 | ****/1236 | 3.15 | 3.54 | 4.08 | 3.93 | **** |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 5.00 | 1/1121 | 4.39 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 3.89 | 5.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 5.00 | 1/1122 | 4.23 | 4.17 | 4.36 | 4.09 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 5.00 | 1/1121 | 4.64 | 4.39 | 4.40 | 4.08 | 5.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 23 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4.20 | ****/790 | **** | 3.85 | 4.06 | 3.89 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Course-Section: PHIL 100 03 | Term - Spring 2011 | Enrollment: 43 |
| Title: Intro To Philosophy | | Questionnaires: 37 |
| Instructor: Thomas,James G | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|----------------|----|-----------|----|-----------------|----|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 32 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 1 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C | 0 | General | 17 | Under-grad | 37 | Non-major | 37 |
| 84-150 | 13 | 3.00-3.49 | 7 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 19 | F | 0 | Electives | 14 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 3 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 3 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|---------------------|
| Course-Section: | PHIL 100 04 |
| Title: | Intro To Philosophy |
| Instructor: | Thomas,James G |

Term - Spring 2011

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Enrollment: | 45 |
| Questionnaires: | 38 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 34 | 4.92 | 119/1449 | 4.43 | 4.43 | 4.33 | 4.14 | 4.92 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 33 | 4.89 | 103/1446 | 4.53 | 4.41 | 4.29 | 4.20 | 4.89 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 36 | 4.95 | 80/1256 | 4.74 | 4.54 | 4.34 | 4.21 | 4.95 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 25 | 4.62 | 396/1402 | 4.47 | 4.41 | 4.27 | 4.10 | 4.62 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 7 | 21 | 4.18 | 698/1358 | 4.00 | 4.29 | 4.13 | 4.04 | 4.18 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 26 | 4.64 | 281/1327 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.16 | 3.92 | 4.64 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 29 | 4.71 | 257/1435 | 4.33 | 4.39 | 4.20 | 4.11 | 4.71 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 32 | 4 | 4.08 | 1324/1446 | 4.25 | 4.33 | 4.67 | 4.57 | 4.08 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 31 | 4.94 | 53/1437 | 4.43 | 4.25 | 4.12 | 4.04 | 4.94 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 34 | 4.94 | 122/1386 | 4.73 | 4.56 | 4.48 | 4.40 | 4.94 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 5.00 | 1/1390 | 4.93 | 4.80 | 4.74 | 4.67 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 33 | 4.89 | 151/1379 | 4.54 | 4.42 | 4.34 | 4.28 | 4.89 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 35 | 4.97 | 51/1379 | 4.71 | 4.53 | 4.36 | 4.26 | 4.97 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 4 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 4.78 | ****/1236 | 3.15 | 3.54 | 4.08 | 3.93 | **** |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 4.80 | 165/1121 | 4.39 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 3.89 | 4.80 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 4.70 | 370/1122 | 4.23 | 4.17 | 4.36 | 4.09 | 4.70 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 4.90 | 211/1121 | 4.64 | 4.39 | 4.40 | 4.08 | 4.90 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 29 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/790 | **** | 3.85 | 4.06 | 3.89 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | | | | |
|-----------------|---------------------|--------------------|--|-----------------|----|
| Course-Section: | PHIL 100 04 | Term - Spring 2011 | | Enrollment: | 45 |
| Title: | Intro To Philosophy | | | Questionnaires: | 38 |
| Instructor: | Thomas,James G | | | | |

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|----------------|----|-----------|----|-----------------|----|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | A | 24 | Required for Majors | 1 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 8 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 4 | C | 0 | General | 15 | Under-grad | 38 | Non-major | 38 |
| 84-150 | 11 | 3.00-3.49 | 5 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 12 | F | 0 | Electives | 14 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 3 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 5 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|---------------------|
| Course-Section: | PHIL 100 05 |
| Title: | Intro To Philosophy |
| Instructor: | Ealick,Greg |

Term - Spring 2011

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Enrollment: | 40 |
| Questionnaires: | 32 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|----|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 10 | 13 | 3.97 | 1138/1449 | 4.43 | 4.43 | 4.33 | 4.14 | 3.97 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 15 | 10 | 4.10 | 1011/1446 | 4.53 | 4.41 | 4.29 | 4.20 | 4.10 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 18 | 4.48 | 544/1256 | 4.74 | 4.54 | 4.34 | 4.21 | 4.48 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 2 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 10 | 4.00 | 1022/1402 | 4.47 | 4.41 | 4.27 | 4.10 | 4.00 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 11 | 9 | 2 | 2.90 | 1320/1358 | 4.00 | 4.29 | 4.13 | 4.04 | 2.90 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 9 | 7 | 3.61 | 1089/1327 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.16 | 3.92 | 3.61 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 10 | 9 | 3.73 | 1173/1435 | 4.33 | 4.39 | 4.20 | 4.11 | 3.73 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 15 | 4.48 | 1034/1446 | 4.25 | 4.33 | 4.67 | 4.57 | 4.48 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 16 | 6 | 4.04 | 848/1437 | 4.43 | 4.25 | 4.12 | 4.04 | 4.04 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 19 | 4.40 | 929/1386 | 4.73 | 4.56 | 4.48 | 4.40 | 4.40 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 26 | 4.87 | 633/1390 | 4.93 | 4.80 | 4.74 | 4.67 | 4.87 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 8 | 13 | 4.10 | 1018/1379 | 4.54 | 4.42 | 4.34 | 4.28 | 4.10 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 19 | 4.60 | 579/1379 | 4.71 | 4.53 | 4.36 | 4.26 | 4.60 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 20 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 2.80 | 1180/1236 | 3.15 | 3.54 | 4.08 | 3.93 | 2.80 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 3.75 | 854/1121 | 4.39 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 3.89 | 3.75 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 20 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 3.83 | 940/1122 | 4.23 | 4.17 | 4.36 | 4.09 | 3.83 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 4.50 | 591/1121 | 4.64 | 4.39 | 4.40 | 4.08 | 4.50 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 20 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/790 | **** | 3.85 | 4.06 | 3.89 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|---------------------|
| Course-Section: | PHIL 100 05 |
| Title: | Intro To Philosophy |
| Instructor: | Ealick,Greg |

Term - Spring 2011

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Enrollment: | 40 |
| Questionnaires: | 32 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 30 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/205 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 4.37 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 30 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/67 | **** | **** | 4.58 | 4.48 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 30 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/66 | **** | **** | 4.36 | 4.35 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 30 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/64 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 4.01 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 30 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/75 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 3.95 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 30 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/73 | **** | **** | 4.00 | 3.44 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/34 | **** | **** | 4.33 | 2.63 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 30 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/35 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 5.00 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 30 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.09 | 5.00 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 30 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.04 | 4.75 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 30 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/27 | **** | **** | 4.13 | **** | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/31 | **** | 5.00 | 4.34 | 4.82 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 31 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/18 | **** | 5.00 | 4.13 | 4.88 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 31 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/24 | **** | 5.00 | 4.34 | 4.64 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|--------|
| 00-27 | 9 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 12 |
| 28-55 | 6 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 16 |
| | | | | Required for Majors | 1 |
| | | | | Graduate | 0 |
| | | | | Major | 0 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: PHIL 100 05 | | Term - Spring 2011 | | | | | Enrollment: 40 | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|--------------------|----|-------------|---|-----------|--------------------|---|------------|---|--------|-----------|------|-------|------|----|
| Title: Intro To Philosophy | | | | | | | Questionnaires: 32 | | | | | | | | | |
| Instructor: Ealick,Greg | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Questions | | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect | |
| | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C | 1 | General | | | 21 | Under-grad | 32 | Non-major | | | | 32 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | 10 | D | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 6 | F | 0 | Electives | | | 6 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | | | 0 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Enrollment: | 41 |
| Questionnaires: | 32 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|----|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 8 | 15 | 4.13 | 1027/1449 | 4.43 | 4.43 | 4.33 | 4.14 | 4.13 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 19 | 4.41 | 704/1446 | 4.53 | 4.41 | 4.29 | 4.20 | 4.41 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 27 | 4.81 | 206/1256 | 4.74 | 4.54 | 4.34 | 4.21 | 4.81 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 19 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 4.46 | 584/1402 | 4.47 | 4.41 | 4.27 | 4.10 | 4.46 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 25 | 4.63 | 267/1358 | 4.00 | 4.29 | 4.13 | 4.04 | 4.63 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.50 | ****/1327 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.16 | 3.92 | **** |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 10 | 6 | 13 | 3.84 | 1109/1435 | 4.33 | 4.39 | 4.20 | 4.11 | 3.84 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 14 | 4.45 | 1057/1446 | 4.25 | 4.33 | 4.67 | 4.57 | 4.45 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 6 | 4.25 | 638/1437 | 4.43 | 4.25 | 4.12 | 4.04 | 4.25 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 27 | 4.75 | 462/1386 | 4.73 | 4.56 | 4.48 | 4.40 | 4.75 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 5.00 | 1/1390 | 4.93 | 4.80 | 4.74 | 4.67 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 19 | 4.41 | 770/1379 | 4.54 | 4.42 | 4.34 | 4.28 | 4.41 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 28 | 4.75 | 385/1379 | 4.71 | 4.53 | 4.36 | 4.26 | 4.75 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 22 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3.33 | 1078/1236 | 3.15 | 3.54 | 4.08 | 3.93 | 3.33 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 11 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 17 | 4.62 | 326/1121 | 4.39 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 3.89 | 4.62 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 11 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 12 | 4.19 | 781/1122 | 4.23 | 4.17 | 4.36 | 4.09 | 4.19 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 11 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 14 | 4.52 | 577/1121 | 4.64 | 4.39 | 4.40 | 4.08 | 4.52 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 11 | 17 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.00 | ****/790 | **** | 3.85 | 4.06 | 3.89 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Enrollment: | 41 |
| Questionnaires: | 32 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 29 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/200 | **** | **** | 4.28 | 4.19 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/205 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 4.37 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 29 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/201 | **** | **** | 4.51 | 4.57 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 29 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/202 | **** | **** | 4.42 | 4.55 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 28 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/196 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 4.42 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/67 | **** | **** | 4.58 | 4.48 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 29 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/66 | **** | **** | 4.36 | 4.35 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 29 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/64 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 4.01 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 29 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/75 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 3.95 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 29 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/73 | **** | **** | 4.00 | 3.44 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/34 | **** | **** | 4.33 | 2.63 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/35 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 5.00 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.09 | 5.00 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.04 | 4.75 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 31 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/27 | **** | **** | 4.13 | **** | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/31 | **** | 5.00 | 4.34 | 4.82 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 31 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/18 | **** | 5.00 | 4.13 | 4.88 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/24 | **** | 5.00 | 4.34 | 4.64 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Enrollment: | 41 |
| Questionnaires: | 32 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/15 | **** | 5.00 | 4.18 | 4.50 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/13 | **** | 5.00 | 4.07 | 4.63 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 6 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 12 | Required for Majors | 3 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 1 |
| 28-55 | 7 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 15 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 4 | C | 2 | General | 23 | Under-grad | 32 | Non-major | 31 |
| 84-150 | 5 | 3.00-3.49 | 6 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 6 | F | 0 | Electives | 4 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|---------------------|
| Course-Section: | PHIL 100 07 |
| Title: | Intro To Philosophy |
| Instructor: | Thomas,James G |

Term - Spring 2011

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Enrollment: | 44 |
| Questionnaires: | 29 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 24 | 4.76 | 269/1449 | 4.43 | 4.43 | 4.33 | 4.14 | 4.76 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 26 | 4.86 | 130/1446 | 4.53 | 4.41 | 4.29 | 4.20 | 4.86 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 28 | 4.97 | 53/1256 | 4.74 | 4.54 | 4.34 | 4.21 | 4.97 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 21 | 4.87 | 136/1402 | 4.47 | 4.41 | 4.27 | 4.10 | 4.87 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 15 | 4.30 | 578/1358 | 4.00 | 4.29 | 4.13 | 4.04 | 4.30 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 22 | 4.74 | 187/1327 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.16 | 3.92 | 4.74 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 22 | 4.81 | 155/1435 | 4.33 | 4.39 | 4.20 | 4.11 | 4.81 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 12 | 4.39 | 1103/1446 | 4.25 | 4.33 | 4.67 | 4.57 | 4.39 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 20 | 4.71 | 192/1437 | 4.43 | 4.25 | 4.12 | 4.04 | 4.71 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 5.00 | 1/1386 | 4.73 | 4.56 | 4.48 | 4.40 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 5.00 | 1/1390 | 4.93 | 4.80 | 4.74 | 4.67 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 27 | 4.96 | 51/1379 | 4.54 | 4.42 | 4.34 | 4.28 | 4.96 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 5.00 | 1/1379 | 4.71 | 4.53 | 4.36 | 4.26 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 16 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 3.80 | 882/1236 | 3.15 | 3.54 | 4.08 | 3.93 | 3.80 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 4.79 | 181/1121 | 4.39 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 3.89 | 4.79 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 4.86 | 222/1122 | 4.23 | 4.17 | 4.36 | 4.09 | 4.86 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 5.00 | 1/1121 | 4.64 | 4.39 | 4.40 | 4.08 | 5.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 16 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4.00 | ****/790 | **** | 3.85 | 4.06 | 3.89 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Course-Section: PHIL 100 07 | Term - Spring 2011 | Enrollment: 44 |
| Title: Intro To Philosophy | | Questionnaires: 29 |
| Instructor: Thomas,James G | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/34 | **** | **** | 4.33 | 2.63 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 20 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 3 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 3 | C | 0 | General | 15 | Under-grad | 29 | Non-major | 29 |
| 84-150 | 8 | 3.00-3.49 | 4 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 8 | F | 0 | Electives | 9 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 6 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|-------------------|
| Course-Section: | PHIL 146 01 |
| Title: | Critical Thinking |
| Instructor: | Templeton,Roye |

Term - Spring 2011

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Enrollment: | 40 |
| Questionnaires: | 21 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 7 | 3.57 | 1337/1449 | 3.44 | 4.43 | 4.33 | 4.14 | 3.57 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 2 | 7 | 3.48 | 1336/1446 | 3.34 | 4.41 | 4.29 | 4.20 | 3.48 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 7 | 3.85 | 1035/1256 | 3.75 | 4.54 | 4.34 | 4.21 | 3.85 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 13 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3.13 | 1350/1402 | 3.56 | 4.41 | 4.27 | 4.10 | 3.13 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 7 | 3.52 | 1164/1358 | 3.36 | 4.29 | 4.13 | 4.04 | 3.52 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 15 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2.67 | 1306/1327 | 2.67 | 4.27 | 4.16 | 3.92 | 2.67 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 13 | 4.29 | 739/1435 | 4.17 | 4.39 | 4.20 | 4.11 | 4.29 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 1 | 4.05 | 1339/1446 | 4.12 | 4.33 | 4.67 | 4.57 | 4.05 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2.72 | 1406/1437 | 2.47 | 4.25 | 4.12 | 4.04 | 2.72 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 3.52 | 1316/1386 | 3.36 | 4.56 | 4.48 | 4.40 | 3.52 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 9 | 3.86 | 1349/1390 | 3.83 | 4.80 | 4.74 | 4.67 | 3.86 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3.24 | 1318/1379 | 2.96 | 4.42 | 4.34 | 4.28 | 3.24 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 3.24 | 1317/1379 | 3.04 | 4.53 | 4.36 | 4.26 | 3.24 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 9 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2.25 | 1222/1236 | 2.50 | 3.54 | 4.08 | 3.93 | 2.25 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2.27 | 1111/1121 | 2.14 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 3.89 | 2.27 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 10 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 2.09 | 1120/1122 | 2.17 | 4.17 | 4.36 | 4.09 | 2.09 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 10 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2.09 | 1121/1121 | 2.12 | 4.39 | 4.40 | 4.08 | 2.09 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 10 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/790 | **** | 3.85 | 4.06 | 3.89 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|-------------------|
| Course-Section: | PHIL 146 01 |
| Title: | Critical Thinking |
| Instructor: | Templeton,Roye |

Term - Spring 2011

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Enrollment: | 40 |
| Questionnaires: | 21 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 20 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/200 | **** | **** | 4.28 | 4.19 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/205 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 4.37 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 20 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/202 | **** | **** | 4.42 | 4.55 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/67 | **** | **** | 4.58 | 4.48 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 20 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/34 | **** | **** | 4.33 | 2.63 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/35 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 5.00 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.09 | 5.00 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.04 | 4.75 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 20 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/27 | **** | **** | 4.13 | **** | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 20 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/31 | **** | 5.00 | 4.34 | 4.82 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 20 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/18 | **** | 5.00 | 4.13 | 4.88 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 20 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/24 | **** | 5.00 | 4.34 | 4.64 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|-------------------------------|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 A 8 | Required for Majors | 2 Graduate 0 Major 1 |
| 28-55 | 5 | 1.00-1.99 | 1 B 3 | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 C 4 | General | 13 Under-grad 21 Non-major 20 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 D 2 | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Course-Section: PHIL 146 01 | Term - Spring 2011 | Enrollment: 40 |
| Title: Critical Thinking | | Questionnaires: 21 |
| Instructor: Templeton,Roye | | |

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

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|---|-----------|---|---|---|-----------|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 6 | F | 1 | Electives | | 2 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | | 2 | | | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|-------------------|
| Course-Section: | PHIL 146 02 |
| Title: | Critical Thinking |
| Instructor: | Templeton,Roye |

Term - Spring 2011

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Enrollment: | 39 |
| Questionnaires: | 20 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 3.30 | 1395/1449 | 3.44 | 4.43 | 4.33 | 4.14 | 3.30 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 3.21 | 1395/1446 | 3.34 | 4.41 | 4.29 | 4.20 | 3.21 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 7 | 3.65 | 1127/1256 | 3.75 | 4.54 | 4.34 | 4.21 | 3.65 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 4.00 | 1022/1402 | 3.56 | 4.41 | 4.27 | 4.10 | 4.00 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 3.20 | 1272/1358 | 3.36 | 4.29 | 4.13 | 4.04 | 3.20 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4.00 | ****/1327 | 2.67 | 4.27 | 4.16 | 3.92 | **** |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 4.05 | 944/1435 | 4.17 | 4.39 | 4.20 | 4.11 | 4.05 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 5 | 4.20 | 1248/1446 | 4.12 | 4.33 | 4.67 | 4.57 | 4.20 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 2.21 | 1433/1437 | 2.47 | 4.25 | 4.12 | 4.04 | 2.21 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 3.20 | 1357/1386 | 3.36 | 4.56 | 4.48 | 4.40 | 3.20 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 9 | 3.80 | 1355/1390 | 3.83 | 4.80 | 4.74 | 4.67 | 3.80 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 2.68 | 1362/1379 | 2.96 | 4.42 | 4.34 | 4.28 | 2.68 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 2.84 | 1350/1379 | 3.04 | 4.53 | 4.36 | 4.26 | 2.84 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 11 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2.75 | 1187/1236 | 2.50 | 3.54 | 4.08 | 3.93 | 2.75 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2.00 | 1116/1121 | 2.14 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 3.89 | 2.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 8 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2.25 | 1116/1122 | 2.17 | 4.17 | 4.36 | 4.09 | 2.25 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 7 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2.15 | 1120/1121 | 2.12 | 4.39 | 4.40 | 4.08 | 2.15 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 7 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/790 | **** | 3.85 | 4.06 | 3.89 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|-------------------|
| Course-Section: | PHIL 146 02 |
| Title: | Critical Thinking |
| Instructor: | Templeton,Roye |

Term - Spring 2011

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Enrollment: | 39 |
| Questionnaires: | 20 |

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect | | |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|------------|---|--------|----------|------|-------|------|------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 19 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/205 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 4.37 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/67 | **** | **** | 4.58 | 4.48 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 19 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/66 | **** | **** | 4.36 | 4.35 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 19 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/34 | **** | **** | 4.33 | 2.63 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 19 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/35 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 5.00 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/31 | **** | 5.00 | 4.34 | 4.82 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/18 | **** | 5.00 | 4.13 | 4.88 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 3 | Required for Majors | 1 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 3 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 0 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | 5 | C | 13 | General | 10 | Under-grad | 20 | Non-major | 20 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 4 | D | 1 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 2 | F | 2 | Electives | 6 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 2 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PHIL 150 01 |
| Title: | Contemporary Moral Iss |
| Instructor: | Ealick,Greg |

Term - Spring 2011

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Enrollment: | 77 |
| Questionnaires: | 41 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 12 | 18 | 4.13 | 1027/1449 | 4.13 | 4.43 | 4.33 | 4.14 | 4.13 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 13 | 14 | 3.97 | 1088/1446 | 3.97 | 4.41 | 4.29 | 4.20 | 3.97 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 5 | 14 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 12 | 4.18 | 834/1256 | 4.18 | 4.54 | 4.34 | 4.21 | 4.18 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 3 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 13 | 16 | 4.11 | 957/1402 | 4.11 | 4.41 | 4.27 | 4.10 | 4.11 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 23 | 4.47 | 404/1358 | 4.47 | 4.29 | 4.13 | 4.04 | 4.47 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 12 | 17 | 4.22 | 687/1327 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.16 | 3.92 | 4.22 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 5 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 15 | 3.83 | 1126/1435 | 3.83 | 4.39 | 4.20 | 4.11 | 3.83 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 20 | 4.56 | 984/1446 | 4.56 | 4.33 | 4.67 | 4.57 | 4.56 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 11 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 14 | 9 | 3.97 | 927/1437 | 3.97 | 4.25 | 4.12 | 4.04 | 3.97 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 24 | 4.51 | 793/1386 | 4.51 | 4.56 | 4.48 | 4.40 | 4.51 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 30 | 4.80 | 787/1390 | 4.80 | 4.80 | 4.74 | 4.67 | 4.80 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 6 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 9 | 19 | 4.26 | 902/1379 | 4.26 | 4.42 | 4.34 | 4.28 | 4.26 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 27 | 4.54 | 644/1379 | 4.54 | 4.53 | 4.36 | 4.26 | 4.54 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 6 | 25 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 3.60 | ****/1236 | **** | 3.54 | 4.08 | 3.93 | **** |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 7 | 13 | 3.88 | 812/1121 | 3.88 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 3.89 | 3.88 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 8 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 18 | 4.18 | 787/1122 | 4.18 | 4.17 | 4.36 | 4.09 | 4.18 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 18 | 4.39 | 699/1121 | 4.39 | 4.39 | 4.40 | 4.08 | 4.39 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 8 | 23 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3.70 | ****/790 | **** | 3.85 | 4.06 | 3.89 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PHIL 150 01 |
| Title: | Contemporary Moral Iss |
| Instructor: | Ealick,Greg |

Term - Spring 2011

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Enrollment: | 77 |
| Questionnaires: | 41 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 34 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/200 | **** | **** | 4.28 | 4.19 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 36 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.00 | ****/205 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 4.37 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 35 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/201 | **** | **** | 4.51 | 4.57 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 36 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.00 | ****/202 | **** | **** | 4.42 | 4.55 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 35 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/196 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 4.42 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 34 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4.40 | ****/67 | **** | **** | 4.58 | 4.48 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 35 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4.00 | ****/66 | **** | **** | 4.36 | 4.35 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 35 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4.00 | ****/64 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 4.01 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 35 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4.25 | ****/75 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 3.95 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 35 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.00 | ****/73 | **** | **** | 4.00 | 3.44 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 35 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3.17 | ****/34 | **** | **** | 4.33 | 2.63 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 36 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3.40 | ****/35 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 5.00 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 36 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.20 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.09 | 5.00 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 36 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.04 | 4.75 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 35 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/27 | **** | **** | 4.13 | **** | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3.83 | ****/31 | **** | 5.00 | 4.34 | 4.82 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 35 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/18 | **** | 5.00 | 4.13 | 4.88 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 35 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/24 | **** | 5.00 | 4.34 | 4.64 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PHIL 150 01 |
| Title: | Contemporary Moral Iss |
| Instructor: | Ealick,Greg |

Term - Spring 2011

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Enrollment: | 77 |
| Questionnaires: | 41 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 35 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/15 | **** | 5.00 | 4.18 | 4.50 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 35 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/13 | **** | 5.00 | 4.07 | 4.63 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 8 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 8 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 7 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 18 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 4 | C | 6 | General | 22 | Under-grad | 41 | Non-major | 41 |
| 84-150 | 1 | 3.00-3.49 | 5 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 6 | F | 0 | Electives | 7 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 2 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 8 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|-----------------------|
| Course-Section: | PHIL 152 01 |
| Title: | Intro To Moral Theory |
| Instructor: | Ealick,Greg |

Term - Spring 2011

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Enrollment: | 41 |
| Questionnaires: | 34 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|----|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 11 | 16 | 4.18 | 977/1449 | 4.37 | 4.43 | 4.33 | 4.14 | 4.18 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 12 | 11 | 3.85 | 1180/1446 | 4.34 | 4.41 | 4.29 | 4.20 | 3.85 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 19 | 4.52 | 510/1256 | 4.58 | 4.54 | 4.34 | 4.21 | 4.52 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 10 | 3.89 | 1105/1402 | 4.38 | 4.41 | 4.27 | 4.10 | 3.89 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 13 | 6 | 7 | 3.24 | 1260/1358 | 4.45 | 4.29 | 4.13 | 4.04 | 3.24 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 10 | 5 | 9 | 3.67 | 1061/1327 | 3.78 | 4.27 | 4.16 | 3.92 | 3.67 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 10 | 9 | 3.62 | 1236/1435 | 4.12 | 4.39 | 4.20 | 4.11 | 3.62 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 15 | 4.44 | 1064/1446 | 4.33 | 4.33 | 4.67 | 4.57 | 4.44 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 14 | 7 | 3.96 | 927/1437 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.12 | 4.04 | 3.96 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 11 | 15 | 4.09 | 1148/1386 | 4.58 | 4.56 | 4.48 | 4.40 | 4.09 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 29 | 4.85 | 659/1390 | 4.91 | 4.80 | 4.74 | 4.67 | 4.85 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 14 | 13 | 4.03 | 1050/1379 | 4.47 | 4.42 | 4.34 | 4.28 | 4.03 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 25 | 4.56 | 633/1379 | 4.65 | 4.53 | 4.36 | 4.26 | 4.56 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 30 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/1236 | 3.46 | 3.54 | 4.08 | 3.93 | **** |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 12 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 11 | 4.18 | 649/1121 | 4.39 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 3.89 | 4.18 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 12 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 12 | 4.09 | 835/1122 | 4.38 | 4.17 | 4.36 | 4.09 | 4.09 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 18 | 4.68 | 456/1121 | 4.68 | 4.39 | 4.40 | 4.08 | 4.68 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 12 | 19 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/790 | 3.56 | 3.85 | 4.06 | 3.89 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|-----------------------|
| Course-Section: | PHIL 152 01 |
| Title: | Intro To Moral Theory |
| Instructor: | Ealick,Greg |

Term - Spring 2011

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Enrollment: | 41 |
| Questionnaires: | 34 |

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect | | |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|------------|---|--------|----------|------|-------|------|------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/205 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 4.37 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/67 | **** | **** | 4.58 | 4.48 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 32 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/66 | **** | **** | 4.36 | 4.35 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 32 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/64 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 4.01 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/34 | **** | **** | 4.33 | 2.63 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 33 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/35 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 5.00 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 33 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.04 | 4.75 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/31 | **** | 5.00 | 4.34 | 4.82 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 7 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 16 | Required for Majors | 6 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 3 | 1.00-1.99 | 1 | B | 12 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 5 | C | 3 | General | 16 | Under-grad | 34 | Non-major | 34 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | 7 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 5 | F | 0 | Electives | 6 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 3 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|-----------------------|
| Course-Section: | PHIL 152 02 |
| Title: | Intro To Moral Theory |
| Instructor: | Seng,Phillip S |

Term - Spring 2011

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Enrollment: | 41 |
| Questionnaires: | 29 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 17 | 4.34 | 809/1449 | 4.37 | 4.43 | 4.33 | 4.14 | 4.34 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 14 | 4.39 | 714/1446 | 4.34 | 4.41 | 4.29 | 4.20 | 4.39 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 21 | 4.71 | 313/1256 | 4.58 | 4.54 | 4.34 | 4.21 | 4.71 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 18 | 4.63 | 385/1402 | 4.38 | 4.41 | 4.27 | 4.10 | 4.63 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 25 | 4.79 | 142/1358 | 4.45 | 4.29 | 4.13 | 4.04 | 4.79 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 11 | 4.25 | 662/1327 | 3.78 | 4.27 | 4.16 | 3.92 | 4.25 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 20 | 4.68 | 302/1435 | 4.12 | 4.39 | 4.20 | 4.11 | 4.68 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 7 | 4.27 | 1204/1446 | 4.33 | 4.33 | 4.67 | 4.57 | 4.27 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 13 | 4.59 | 287/1437 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.12 | 4.04 | 4.59 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 25 | 4.93 | 163/1386 | 4.58 | 4.56 | 4.48 | 4.40 | 4.93 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 5.00 | 1/1390 | 4.91 | 4.80 | 4.74 | 4.67 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 23 | 4.78 | 288/1379 | 4.47 | 4.42 | 4.34 | 4.28 | 4.78 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 24 | 4.89 | 197/1379 | 4.65 | 4.53 | 4.36 | 4.26 | 4.89 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 4 | 12 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 7 | 3.92 | 800/1236 | 3.46 | 3.54 | 4.08 | 3.93 | 3.92 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 16 | 4.63 | 309/1121 | 4.39 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 3.89 | 4.63 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 15 | 4.74 | 341/1122 | 4.38 | 4.17 | 4.36 | 4.09 | 4.74 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 18 | 4.95 | 127/1121 | 4.68 | 4.39 | 4.40 | 4.08 | 4.95 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 10 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.50 | ****/790 | 3.56 | 3.85 | 4.06 | 3.89 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|-----------------------|
| Course-Section: | PHIL 152 02 |
| Title: | Intro To Moral Theory |
| Instructor: | Seng,Phillip S |

Term - Spring 2011

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Enrollment: | 41 |
| Questionnaires: | 29 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|----------------------------|------|---|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 9 Required for Majors | 3 | Graduate 0 Major 1 |
| 28-55 | 3 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 15 | | |
| 56-83 | 4 | 2.00-2.99 6 | C 3 General | 17 | Under-grad 29 Non-major 28 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 1 | D 0 | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 2 | F 0 Electives | 5 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 Other | 2 | |
| | | | ? 2 | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|-----------------------|
| Course-Section: | PHIL 152 03 |
| Title: | Intro To Moral Theory |
| Instructor: | Seng,Phillip S |

Term - Spring 2011

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Enrollment: | 40 |
| Questionnaires: | 32 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 19 | 4.44 | 691/1449 | 4.37 | 4.43 | 4.33 | 4.14 | 4.44 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 19 | 4.48 | 597/1446 | 4.34 | 4.41 | 4.29 | 4.20 | 4.48 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 23 | 4.63 | 411/1256 | 4.58 | 4.54 | 4.34 | 4.21 | 4.63 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 15 | 4.43 | 641/1402 | 4.38 | 4.41 | 4.27 | 4.10 | 4.43 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 26 | 4.75 | 163/1358 | 4.45 | 4.29 | 4.13 | 4.04 | 4.75 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 10 | 7 | 3.66 | 1066/1327 | 3.78 | 4.27 | 4.16 | 3.92 | 3.66 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 26 | 4.78 | 184/1435 | 4.12 | 4.39 | 4.20 | 4.11 | 4.78 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 12 | 4.38 | 1119/1446 | 4.33 | 4.33 | 4.67 | 4.57 | 4.38 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 14 | 9 | 4.11 | 791/1437 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.12 | 4.04 | 4.11 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 26 | 4.78 | 407/1386 | 4.58 | 4.56 | 4.48 | 4.40 | 4.78 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 30 | 4.94 | 372/1390 | 4.91 | 4.80 | 4.74 | 4.67 | 4.94 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 22 | 4.66 | 451/1379 | 4.47 | 4.42 | 4.34 | 4.28 | 4.66 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 24 | 4.72 | 445/1379 | 4.65 | 4.53 | 4.36 | 4.26 | 4.72 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 17 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 3.69 | 942/1236 | 3.46 | 3.54 | 4.08 | 3.93 | 3.69 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 15 | 4.50 | 396/1121 | 4.39 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 3.89 | 4.50 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 13 | 4.45 | 584/1122 | 4.38 | 4.17 | 4.36 | 4.09 | 4.45 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 15 | 4.68 | 456/1121 | 4.68 | 4.39 | 4.40 | 4.08 | 4.68 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 11 | 12 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3.56 | 625/790 | 3.56 | 3.85 | 4.06 | 3.89 | 3.56 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|-----------------------|
| Course-Section: | PHIL 152 03 |
| Title: | Intro To Moral Theory |
| Instructor: | Seng, Phillip S |

Term - Spring 2011

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Enrollment: | 40 |
| Questionnaires: | 32 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/200 | **** | **** | 4.28 | 4.19 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/205 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 4.37 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/201 | **** | **** | 4.51 | 4.57 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/202 | **** | **** | 4.42 | 4.55 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/196 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 4.42 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/67 | **** | **** | 4.58 | 4.48 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/66 | **** | **** | 4.36 | 4.35 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/64 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 4.01 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/75 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 3.95 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/73 | **** | **** | 4.00 | 3.44 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/34 | **** | **** | 4.33 | 2.63 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/35 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 5.00 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.09 | 5.00 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.04 | 4.75 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/27 | **** | **** | 4.13 | **** | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/31 | **** | 5.00 | 4.34 | 4.82 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/18 | **** | 5.00 | 4.13 | 4.88 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/24 | **** | 5.00 | 4.34 | 4.64 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------------|--------------------|-----------------|----|
| Course-Section: | PHIL 152 03 | Term - Spring 2011 | Enrollment: | 40 |
| Title: | Intro To Moral Theory | | Questionnaires: | 32 |
| Instructor: | Seng, Phillip S | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/15 | **** | 5.00 | 4.18 | 4.50 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/13 | **** | 5.00 | 4.07 | 4.63 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 3 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | A | 15 | Required for Majors | 3 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 1 |
| 28-55 | 3 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 10 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C | 4 | General | 15 | Under-grad | 32 | Non-major | 31 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 7 | F | 0 | Electives | 7 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 3 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 3 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|-----------------------|
| Course-Section: | PHIL 152 04 |
| Title: | Intro To Moral Theory |
| Instructor: | Smith,Aaron Joh |

Term - Spring 2011

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Enrollment: | 38 |
| Questionnaires: | 21 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 12 | 4.38 | 758/1449 | 4.37 | 4.43 | 4.33 | 4.14 | 4.38 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 11 | 4.29 | 830/1446 | 4.34 | 4.41 | 4.29 | 4.20 | 4.29 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 13 | 4.55 | 476/1256 | 4.58 | 4.54 | 4.34 | 4.21 | 4.55 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4.50 | 528/1402 | 4.38 | 4.41 | 4.27 | 4.10 | 4.50 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 17 | 4.80 | 128/1358 | 4.45 | 4.29 | 4.13 | 4.04 | 4.80 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | ****/1327 | 3.78 | 4.27 | 4.16 | 3.92 | **** |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 4 | 7 | 3.67 | 1209/1435 | 4.12 | 4.39 | 4.20 | 4.11 | 3.67 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 8 | 4.30 | 1176/1446 | 4.33 | 4.33 | 4.67 | 4.57 | 4.30 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 13 | 2 | 3.78 | 1103/1437 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.12 | 4.04 | 3.78 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 14 | 4.43 | 903/1386 | 4.58 | 4.56 | 4.48 | 4.40 | 4.43 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 18 | 4.81 | 787/1390 | 4.91 | 4.80 | 4.74 | 4.67 | 4.81 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 11 | 4.24 | 919/1379 | 4.47 | 4.42 | 4.34 | 4.28 | 4.24 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 13 | 4.33 | 836/1379 | 4.65 | 4.53 | 4.36 | 4.26 | 4.33 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 12 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2.75 | 1187/1236 | 3.46 | 3.54 | 4.08 | 3.93 | 2.75 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 4.36 | 529/1121 | 4.39 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 3.89 | 4.36 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 4.07 | 840/1122 | 4.38 | 4.17 | 4.36 | 4.09 | 4.07 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 4.43 | 673/1121 | 4.68 | 4.39 | 4.40 | 4.08 | 4.43 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 7 | 10 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/790 | 3.56 | 3.85 | 4.06 | 3.89 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|-----------------------|
| Course-Section: | PHIL 152 04 |
| Title: | Intro To Moral Theory |
| Instructor: | Smith,Aaron Joh |

Term - Spring 2011

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Enrollment: | 38 |
| Questionnaires: | 21 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/205 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 4.37 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 20 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/34 | **** | **** | 4.33 | 2.63 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 20 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/35 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 5.00 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 20 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/31 | **** | 5.00 | 4.34 | 4.82 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|-----------------------|
| Course-Section: | PHIL 152 05 |
| Title: | Intro To Moral Theory |
| Instructor: | Smith,Aaron Joh |

Term - Spring 2011

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Enrollment: | 43 |
| Questionnaires: | 21 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 14 | 4.52 | 567/1449 | 4.37 | 4.43 | 4.33 | 4.14 | 4.52 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 15 | 4.67 | 354/1446 | 4.34 | 4.41 | 4.29 | 4.20 | 4.67 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 14 | 4.50 | 519/1256 | 4.58 | 4.54 | 4.34 | 4.21 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 4.44 | 613/1402 | 4.38 | 4.41 | 4.27 | 4.10 | 4.44 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 14 | 4.65 | 241/1358 | 4.45 | 4.29 | 4.13 | 4.04 | 4.65 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 3.56 | 1108/1327 | 3.78 | 4.27 | 4.16 | 3.92 | 3.56 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 10 | 3.86 | 1101/1435 | 4.12 | 4.39 | 4.20 | 4.11 | 3.86 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 7 | 4.29 | 1190/1446 | 4.33 | 4.33 | 4.67 | 4.57 | 4.29 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 7 | 4.35 | 527/1437 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.12 | 4.04 | 4.35 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 13 | 4.65 | 630/1386 | 4.58 | 4.56 | 4.48 | 4.40 | 4.65 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 20 | 4.95 | 266/1390 | 4.91 | 4.80 | 4.74 | 4.67 | 4.95 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 16 | 4.67 | 437/1379 | 4.47 | 4.42 | 4.34 | 4.28 | 4.67 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 16 | 4.75 | 385/1379 | 4.65 | 4.53 | 4.36 | 4.26 | 4.75 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 15 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3.60 | ****/1236 | 3.46 | 3.54 | 4.08 | 3.93 | **** |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 9 | 4.27 | 599/1121 | 4.39 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 3.89 | 4.27 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 10 | 4.53 | 512/1122 | 4.38 | 4.17 | 4.36 | 4.09 | 4.53 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 4.67 | 473/1121 | 4.68 | 4.39 | 4.40 | 4.08 | 4.67 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 6 | 11 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/790 | 3.56 | 3.85 | 4.06 | 3.89 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|-----------------------|
| Course-Section: | PHIL 152 05 |
| Title: | Intro To Moral Theory |
| Instructor: | Smith,Aaron Joh |

Term - Spring 2011

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Enrollment: | 43 |
| Questionnaires: | 21 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/205 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 4.37 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/34 | **** | **** | 4.33 | 2.63 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/35 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 5.00 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.09 | 5.00 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.04 | 4.75 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/31 | **** | 5.00 | 4.34 | 4.82 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/18 | **** | 5.00 | 4.13 | 4.88 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|--------|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 4 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 A 3 | Required for Majors | 2 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 B 14 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 4 C 3 | General | 11 | Under-grad | 21 | Non-major | 21 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 D 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 2 F 0 | Electives | 4 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | P 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | ? 1 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|-------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PHIL 251 01 |
| Title: | Ethical Issues in Sci & |
| Instructor: | Wilson,Richard |

Term - Spring 2011

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Enrollment: | 71 |
| Questionnaires: | 46 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|----|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 12 | 8 | 17 | 3.67 | 1300/1449 | 3.67 | 4.43 | 4.33 | 4.32 | 3.67 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 13 | 9 | 19 | 3.91 | 1142/1446 | 3.91 | 4.41 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 3.91 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 14 | 11 | 16 | 3.91 | 1016/1256 | 3.91 | 4.54 | 4.34 | 4.36 | 3.91 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 13 | 17 | 4.10 | 963/1402 | 4.10 | 4.41 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.10 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 4 | 13 | 3.23 | 1263/1358 | 3.23 | 4.29 | 4.13 | 4.13 | 3.23 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 14 | 19 | 4.09 | 803/1327 | 4.09 | 4.27 | 4.16 | 4.12 | 4.09 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 9 | 12 | 18 | 3.89 | 1068/1435 | 3.89 | 4.39 | 4.20 | 4.17 | 3.89 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 23 | 15 | 4.23 | 1226/1446 | 4.23 | 4.33 | 4.67 | 4.63 | 4.23 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 12 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 11 | 8 | 3.74 | 1124/1437 | 3.74 | 4.25 | 4.12 | 4.10 | 3.74 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 14 | 7 | 19 | 4.02 | 1170/1386 | 4.02 | 4.56 | 4.48 | 4.46 | 4.02 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 36 | 4.77 | 855/1390 | 4.77 | 4.80 | 4.74 | 4.76 | 4.77 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 13 | 9 | 18 | 3.95 | 1091/1379 | 3.95 | 4.42 | 4.34 | 4.31 | 3.95 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 5 | 8 | 18 | 3.71 | 1197/1379 | 3.71 | 4.53 | 4.36 | 4.37 | 3.71 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 12 | 3 | 6 | 9 | 6 | 7 | 3.26 | 1104/1236 | 3.26 | 3.54 | 4.08 | 4.16 | 3.26 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 11 | 7 | 13 | 3.44 | 959/1121 | 3.44 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.11 | 3.44 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 5 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 8 | 12 | 12 | 3.59 | 997/1122 | 3.59 | 4.17 | 4.36 | 4.34 | 3.59 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 5 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 15 | 16 | 4.02 | 850/1121 | 4.02 | 4.39 | 4.40 | 4.39 | 4.02 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 5 | 16 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 8 | 9 | 3.84 | 526/790 | 3.84 | 3.85 | 4.06 | 4.01 | 3.84 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|-------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PHIL 251 01 |
| Title: | Ethical Issues in Sci & |
| Instructor: | Wilson,Richard |

Term - Spring 2011

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Enrollment: | 71 |
| Questionnaires: | 46 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/200 | **** | **** | 4.28 | 4.35 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/205 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 4.10 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/201 | **** | **** | 4.51 | 4.42 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/202 | **** | **** | 4.42 | 4.32 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/196 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 4.10 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/67 | **** | **** | 4.58 | 4.48 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/66 | **** | **** | 4.36 | 4.17 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/64 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 3.96 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/75 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.48 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/73 | **** | **** | 4.00 | 4.04 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/34 | **** | **** | 4.33 | 3.66 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/35 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 3.19 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.09 | 3.74 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 44 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.04 | 3.67 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/27 | **** | **** | 4.13 | 3.33 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/31 | **** | 5.00 | 4.34 | 2.63 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/18 | **** | 5.00 | 4.13 | 3.50 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/24 | **** | 5.00 | 4.34 | 3.75 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|-------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PHIL 251 01 |
| Title: | Ethical Issues in Sci & |
| Instructor: | Wilson,Richard |

Term - Spring 2011

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Enrollment: | 71 |
| Questionnaires: | 46 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/15 | **** | 5.00 | 4.18 | 3.75 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | ****/13 | **** | 5.00 | 4.07 | 3.25 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 24 | Required for Majors | 34 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 3 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 15 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 5 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C | 0 | General | 1 | Under-grad | 46 | Non-major | 46 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | 11 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 8 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 6 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|---------------------|
| Course-Section: | PHIL 322 01 |
| Title: | Hist Of Phil:Modern |
| Instructor: | Braude,Stephen |

Term - Spring 2011

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Enrollment: | 59 |
| Questionnaires: | 18 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 11 | 4.33 | 821/1449 | 4.33 | 4.43 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 4.33 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 14 | 4.56 | 505/1446 | 4.56 | 4.41 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.56 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 14 | 4.72 | 302/1256 | 4.72 | 4.54 | 4.34 | 4.39 | 4.72 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 4.56 | 468/1402 | 4.56 | 4.41 | 4.27 | 4.37 | 4.56 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 4.00 | 827/1358 | 4.00 | 4.29 | 4.13 | 4.14 | 4.00 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4.11 | 783/1327 | 4.11 | 4.27 | 4.16 | 4.23 | 4.11 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 4.61 | 370/1435 | 4.61 | 4.39 | 4.20 | 4.25 | 4.61 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 4 | 4.22 | 1233/1446 | 4.22 | 4.33 | 4.67 | 4.68 | 4.22 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 4.25 | 638/1437 | 4.25 | 4.25 | 4.12 | 4.14 | 4.25 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 11 | 4.50 | 803/1386 | 4.50 | 4.56 | 4.48 | 4.53 | 4.50 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 14 | 4.72 | 923/1390 | 4.72 | 4.80 | 4.74 | 4.76 | 4.72 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 12 | 4.39 | 787/1379 | 4.39 | 4.42 | 4.34 | 4.38 | 4.39 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 14 | 4.61 | 567/1379 | 4.61 | 4.53 | 4.36 | 4.40 | 4.61 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | ****/1236 | **** | 3.54 | 4.08 | 4.18 | **** |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 13 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.20 | 637/1121 | 4.20 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.31 | 4.20 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.40 | 631/1122 | 4.40 | 4.17 | 4.36 | 4.46 | 4.40 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.40 | 694/1121 | 4.40 | 4.39 | 4.40 | 4.53 | 4.40 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 13 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/790 | **** | 3.85 | 4.06 | 4.11 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|---------------------|
| Course-Section: | PHIL 322 01 |
| Title: | Hist Of Phil:Modern |
| Instructor: | Braude,Stephen |

Term - Spring 2011

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Enrollment: | 59 |
| Questionnaires: | 18 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 7 | Required for Majors | 12 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 4 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 5 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 3 | C | 4 | General | 2 | Under-grad | 18 | Non-major | 14 |
| 84-150 | 8 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 7 | F | 0 | Electives | 1 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 2 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|------------------|
| Course-Section: | PHIL 334 01 |
| Title: | Asian Philosophy |
| Instructor: | Templeton,Roye |

Term - Spring 2011

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Enrollment: | 30 |
| Questionnaires: | 26 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 16 | 4.28 | 877/1449 | 4.28 | 4.43 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 4.28 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 17 | 4.36 | 745/1446 | 4.36 | 4.41 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.36 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 16 | 4.38 | 675/1256 | 4.38 | 4.54 | 4.34 | 4.39 | 4.38 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 9 | 3.96 | 1058/1402 | 3.96 | 4.41 | 4.27 | 4.37 | 3.96 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 17 | 4.71 | 198/1358 | 4.71 | 4.29 | 4.13 | 4.14 | 4.71 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 3.72 | 1032/1327 | 3.72 | 4.27 | 4.16 | 4.23 | 3.72 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 17 | 4.44 | 558/1435 | 4.44 | 4.39 | 4.20 | 4.25 | 4.44 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 18 | 5 | 4.17 | 1275/1446 | 4.17 | 4.33 | 4.67 | 4.68 | 4.17 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 5 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 10 | 3.86 | 1049/1437 | 3.86 | 4.25 | 4.12 | 4.14 | 3.86 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 22 | 4.84 | 304/1386 | 4.84 | 4.56 | 4.48 | 4.53 | 4.84 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 18 | 4.56 | 1106/1390 | 4.56 | 4.80 | 4.74 | 4.76 | 4.56 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 4.44 | 716/1379 | 4.44 | 4.42 | 4.34 | 4.38 | 4.44 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 15 | 4.24 | 909/1379 | 4.24 | 4.53 | 4.36 | 4.40 | 4.24 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 14 | 4.26 | 546/1236 | 4.26 | 3.54 | 4.08 | 4.18 | 4.26 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 11 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 3.40 | 971/1121 | 3.40 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.31 | 3.40 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 10 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 3.50 | 1005/1122 | 3.50 | 4.17 | 4.36 | 4.46 | 3.50 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 11 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 3.53 | 1006/1121 | 3.53 | 4.39 | 4.40 | 4.53 | 3.53 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 10 | 13 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2.33 | ****/790 | **** | 3.85 | 4.06 | 4.11 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|------------------|
| Course-Section: | PHIL 334 01 |
| Title: | Asian Philosophy |
| Instructor: | Templeton,Roye |

Term - Spring 2011

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Enrollment: | 30 |
| Questionnaires: | 26 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|--------|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | A 3 | Required for Majors | 6 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 3 |
| 28-55 | 5 | 1.00-1.99 | B 16 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | C 5 | General | 12 | Under-grad | 26 | Non-major | 23 |
| 84-150 | 9 | 3.00-3.49 | D 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | F 0 | Electives | 6 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | P 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | ? 2 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|-------------------|
| Course-Section: | PHIL 346 01 |
| Title: | Deductive Systems |
| Instructor: | Wilson,Richard |

Term - Spring 2011

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Enrollment: | 52 |
| Questionnaires: | 22 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 15 | 4.71 | 309/1449 | 4.71 | 4.43 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 4.71 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 17 | 4.76 | 230/1446 | 4.76 | 4.41 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.76 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 17 | 4.76 | 258/1256 | 4.76 | 4.54 | 4.34 | 4.39 | 4.76 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 4.67 | 339/1402 | 4.67 | 4.41 | 4.27 | 4.37 | 4.67 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 14 | 4.78 | 149/1358 | 4.78 | 4.29 | 4.13 | 4.14 | 4.78 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 4.67 | 253/1327 | 4.67 | 4.27 | 4.16 | 4.23 | 4.67 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 15 | 4.57 | 411/1435 | 4.57 | 4.39 | 4.20 | 4.25 | 4.57 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 5 | 4.25 | 1212/1446 | 4.25 | 4.33 | 4.67 | 4.68 | 4.25 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 9 | 4.26 | 627/1437 | 4.26 | 4.25 | 4.12 | 4.14 | 4.26 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 13 | 4.55 | 755/1386 | 4.55 | 4.56 | 4.48 | 4.53 | 4.55 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 16 | 4.80 | 787/1390 | 4.80 | 4.80 | 4.74 | 4.76 | 4.80 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 12 | 4.45 | 702/1379 | 4.45 | 4.42 | 4.34 | 4.38 | 4.45 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 15 | 4.60 | 579/1379 | 4.60 | 4.53 | 4.36 | 4.40 | 4.60 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 13 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.00 | 709/1236 | 4.00 | 3.54 | 4.08 | 4.18 | 4.00 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 4.63 | 317/1121 | 4.63 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.31 | 4.63 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 4.38 | 656/1122 | 4.38 | 4.17 | 4.36 | 4.46 | 4.38 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4.50 | 591/1121 | 4.50 | 4.39 | 4.40 | 4.53 | 4.50 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 14 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | ****/790 | **** | 3.85 | 4.06 | 4.11 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|-------------------|
| Course-Section: | PHIL 346 01 |
| Title: | Deductive Systems |
| Instructor: | Wilson, Richard |

Term - Spring 2011

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Enrollment: | 52 |
| Questionnaires: | 22 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 13 | Required for Majors | 14 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 4 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 3 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C | 2 | General | 2 | Under-grad | 22 | Non-major | 18 |
| 84-150 | 5 | 3.00-3.49 | 4 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 3 | F | 0 | Electives | 3 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 2 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|----------------------|
| Course-Section: | PHIL 355 01 |
| Title: | Political Philosophy |
| Instructor: | Seng, Phillip S |

Term - Spring 2011

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Enrollment: | 33 |
| Questionnaires: | 18 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 13 | 4.56 | 527/1449 | 4.56 | 4.43 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 4.56 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 4.61 | 425/1446 | 4.61 | 4.41 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.61 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 4.73 | 291/1256 | 4.73 | 4.54 | 4.34 | 4.39 | 4.73 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 10 | 4.41 | 655/1402 | 4.41 | 4.41 | 4.27 | 4.37 | 4.41 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 14 | 4.61 | 276/1358 | 4.61 | 4.29 | 4.13 | 4.14 | 4.61 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 12 | 4.56 | 356/1327 | 4.56 | 4.27 | 4.16 | 4.23 | 4.56 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 9 | 4.44 | 572/1435 | 4.44 | 4.39 | 4.20 | 4.25 | 4.44 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 5 | 4.06 | 1335/1446 | 4.06 | 4.33 | 4.67 | 4.68 | 4.06 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 4.83 | 105/1437 | 4.83 | 4.25 | 4.12 | 4.14 | 4.83 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 13 | 4.67 | 614/1386 | 4.67 | 4.56 | 4.48 | 4.53 | 4.67 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 4.94 | 319/1390 | 4.94 | 4.80 | 4.74 | 4.76 | 4.94 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 12 | 4.67 | 437/1379 | 4.67 | 4.42 | 4.34 | 4.38 | 4.67 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 4.72 | 430/1379 | 4.72 | 4.53 | 4.36 | 4.40 | 4.72 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.33 | 492/1236 | 4.33 | 3.54 | 4.08 | 4.18 | 4.33 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 4.69 | 257/1121 | 4.69 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.31 | 4.69 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 8 | 4.42 | 621/1122 | 4.42 | 4.17 | 4.36 | 4.46 | 4.42 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 4.58 | 537/1121 | 4.58 | 4.39 | 4.40 | 4.53 | 4.58 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 6 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | ****/790 | **** | 3.85 | 4.06 | 4.11 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|----------------------|
| Course-Section: | PHIL 355 01 |
| Title: | Political Philosophy |
| Instructor: | Seng,Phillip S |

Term - Spring 2011

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Enrollment: | 33 |
| Questionnaires: | 18 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|---|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 8 | Required for Majors | 6 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 2 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 6 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | 3 | C | 0 | General | 4 | Under-grad | 18 | Non-major | 16 |
| 84-150 | 4 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 3 | F | 0 | Electives | 3 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 2 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 4 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|----------------------|
| Course-Section: | PHIL 399 01 |
| Title: | Topics In Philosophy |
| Instructor: | Wilson,Richard |

Term - Spring 2011

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Enrollment: | 30 |
| Questionnaires: | 17 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 12 | 4.53 | 567/1449 | 4.53 | 4.43 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 4.53 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 4.06 | 1033/1446 | 4.06 | 4.41 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.06 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 4.60 | 433/1256 | 4.60 | 4.54 | 4.34 | 4.39 | 4.60 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 4.69 | 304/1402 | 4.69 | 4.41 | 4.27 | 4.37 | 4.69 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 14 | 4.76 | 156/1358 | 4.76 | 4.29 | 4.13 | 4.14 | 4.76 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 12 | 4.69 | 235/1327 | 4.69 | 4.27 | 4.16 | 4.23 | 4.69 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 4.25 | 769/1435 | 4.25 | 4.39 | 4.20 | 4.25 | 4.25 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 8 | 4.47 | 1041/1446 | 4.47 | 4.33 | 4.67 | 4.68 | 4.47 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 4.20 | 691/1437 | 4.20 | 4.25 | 4.12 | 4.14 | 4.20 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 11 | 4.29 | 1022/1386 | 4.29 | 4.56 | 4.48 | 4.53 | 4.29 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 14 | 4.71 | 958/1390 | 4.71 | 4.80 | 4.74 | 4.76 | 4.71 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 4.24 | 919/1379 | 4.24 | 4.42 | 4.34 | 4.38 | 4.24 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 12 | 4.29 | 866/1379 | 4.29 | 4.53 | 4.36 | 4.40 | 4.29 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4.50 | ****/1236 | **** | 3.54 | 4.08 | 4.18 | **** |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 4.27 | 593/1121 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.31 | 4.27 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 6 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 4.09 | 835/1122 | 4.09 | 4.17 | 4.36 | 4.46 | 4.09 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 4.36 | 715/1121 | 4.36 | 4.39 | 4.40 | 4.53 | 4.36 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 7 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3.50 | ****/790 | **** | 3.85 | 4.06 | 4.11 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Course-Section: PHIL 399 01 | Term - Spring 2011 | Enrollment: 30 |
| Title: Topics In Philosophy | | Questionnaires: 17 |
| Instructor: Wilson, Richard | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|-----------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 12 | Required for Majors 3 | Graduate 0 Major 3 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 4 | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 1 | C 0 | General 1 | Under-grad 17 Non-major 14 |
| 84-150 | 5 | 3.00-3.49 4 | D 0 | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 3 | F 0 | Electives 10 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other 2 | |
| | | | ? 1 | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|----------------------|
| Course-Section: | PHIL 399B 01 |
| Title: | Topics In Philosophy |
| Instructor: | Thomas,James G |

Term - Spring 2011

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Enrollment: | 38 |
| Questionnaires: | 30 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 24 | 4.79 | 228/1449 | 4.79 | 4.43 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 4.79 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 21 | 4.69 | 325/1446 | 4.69 | 4.41 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.69 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 19 | 4.95 | 67/1256 | 4.95 | 4.54 | 4.34 | 4.39 | 4.95 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 24 | 4.86 | 143/1402 | 4.86 | 4.41 | 4.27 | 4.37 | 4.86 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 20 | 4.41 | 471/1358 | 4.41 | 4.29 | 4.13 | 4.14 | 4.41 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 24 | 4.76 | 180/1327 | 4.76 | 4.27 | 4.16 | 4.23 | 4.76 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 21 | 4.57 | 411/1435 | 4.57 | 4.39 | 4.20 | 4.25 | 4.57 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 9 | 4.31 | 1167/1446 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 4.67 | 4.68 | 4.31 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 22 | 4.85 | 101/1437 | 4.85 | 4.25 | 4.12 | 4.14 | 4.85 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 26 | 4.90 | 220/1386 | 4.90 | 4.56 | 4.48 | 4.53 | 4.90 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 5.00 | 1/1390 | 5.00 | 4.80 | 4.74 | 4.76 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 26 | 4.83 | 223/1379 | 4.83 | 4.42 | 4.34 | 4.38 | 4.83 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 27 | 4.90 | 183/1379 | 4.90 | 4.53 | 4.36 | 4.40 | 4.90 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 26 | 4.93 | 61/1236 | 4.93 | 3.54 | 4.08 | 4.18 | 4.93 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1121 | 5.00 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.31 | 5.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1122 | 5.00 | 4.17 | 4.36 | 4.46 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1121 | 5.00 | 4.39 | 4.40 | 4.53 | 5.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 22 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/790 | **** | 3.85 | 4.06 | 4.11 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|----------------------|
| Course-Section: | PHIL 399B 01 |
| Title: | Topics In Philosophy |
| Instructor: | Thomas,James G |

Term - Spring 2011

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Enrollment: | 38 |
| Questionnaires: | 30 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|-----------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 26 | Required for Majors 3 | Graduate 0 Major 1 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 1 | B 0 | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 1 | C 0 | General 1 | Under-grad 30 Non-major 29 |
| 84-150 | 12 | 3.00-3.49 6 | D 0 | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 11 | F 0 | Electives 20 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other 4 | |
| | | | ? 3 | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|---------------------|
| Course-Section: | PHIL 400 01 |
| Title: | Indep Study In Phil |
| Instructor: | Wilson,Richard |

Term - Spring 2011

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| Enrollment: | 5 |
| Questionnaires: | 4 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1449 | 5.00 | 4.43 | 4.33 | 4.46 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1446 | 5.00 | 4.41 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1256 | 5.00 | 4.54 | 4.34 | 4.43 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1402 | 5.00 | 4.41 | 4.27 | 4.35 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1358 | 4.67 | 4.29 | 4.13 | 4.21 | 5.00 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1327 | 5.00 | 4.27 | 4.16 | 4.28 | 5.00 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1435 | 5.00 | 4.39 | 4.20 | 4.27 | 5.00 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 888/1446 | 4.56 | 4.33 | 4.67 | 4.71 | 4.67 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1437 | 5.00 | 4.25 | 4.12 | 4.20 | 5.00 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1386 | 5.00 | 4.56 | 4.48 | 4.55 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1390 | 5.00 | 4.80 | 4.74 | 4.78 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1379 | 5.00 | 4.42 | 4.34 | 4.40 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1379 | 5.00 | 4.53 | 4.36 | 4.44 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 331/1236 | 4.50 | 3.54 | 4.08 | 4.13 | 4.50 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1121 | 5.00 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.39 | 5.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1122 | 5.00 | 4.17 | 4.36 | 4.54 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1121 | 5.00 | 4.39 | 4.40 | 4.60 | 5.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/790 | 5.00 | 3.85 | 4.06 | 4.27 | 5.00 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|---------------------|
| Course-Section: | PHIL 400 01 |
| Title: | Indep Study In Phil |
| Instructor: | Wilson,Richard |

Term - Spring 2011

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| Enrollment: | 5 |
| Questionnaires: | 4 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/31 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.34 | 4.17 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/18 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.13 | 4.00 | 5.00 |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/24 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.34 | 3.98 | 5.00 |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/15 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.18 | 3.94 | 5.00 |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/13 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.07 | 3.80 | 5.00 |

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|---------------------|
| Course-Section: | PHIL 400 02 |
| Title: | Indep Study In Phil |
| Instructor: | Ealick,Greg |

Term - Spring 2011

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| Enrollment: | 2 |
| Questionnaires: | 1 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1449 | 5.00 | 4.43 | 4.33 | 4.46 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1446 | 5.00 | 4.41 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 827/1358 | 4.67 | 4.29 | 4.13 | 4.21 | 4.00 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1435 | 5.00 | 4.39 | 4.20 | 4.27 | 5.00 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 1354/1446 | 4.56 | 4.33 | 4.67 | 4.71 | 4.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1437 | 5.00 | 4.25 | 4.12 | 4.20 | 5.00 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1386 | 5.00 | 4.56 | 4.48 | 4.55 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1390 | 5.00 | 4.80 | 4.74 | 4.78 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1379 | 5.00 | 4.42 | 4.34 | 4.40 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1379 | 5.00 | 4.53 | 4.36 | 4.44 | 5.00 |

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|---------------------|
| Course-Section: | PHIL 400 03 |
| Title: | Indep Study In Phil |
| Instructor: | Braude,Stephen |

Term - Spring 2011

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| Enrollment: | 1 |
| Questionnaires: | 1 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|--------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1449 | 5.00 | 4.43 | 4.33 | 4.46 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1446 | 5.00 | 4.41 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1402 | 5.00 | 4.41 | 4.27 | 4.35 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1358 | 4.67 | 4.29 | 4.13 | 4.21 | 5.00 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1327 | 5.00 | 4.27 | 4.16 | 4.28 | 5.00 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1435 | 5.00 | 4.39 | 4.20 | 4.27 | 5.00 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1446 | 4.56 | 4.33 | 4.67 | 4.71 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1437 | 5.00 | 4.25 | 4.12 | 4.20 | 5.00 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1386 | 5.00 | 4.56 | 4.48 | 4.55 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1390 | 5.00 | 4.80 | 4.74 | 4.78 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1379 | 5.00 | 4.42 | 4.34 | 4.40 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1379 | 5.00 | 4.53 | 4.36 | 4.44 | 5.00 |

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|---------------------|
| Course-Section: | PHIL 400 03 |
| Title: | Indep Study In Phil |
| Instructor: | Braude,Stephen |

Term - Spring 2011

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| Enrollment: | 1 |
| Questionnaires: | 1 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|-----------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | I | 0 | Other | | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| | ? | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|--------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PHIL 406 01 |
| Title: | Honors Ind Study in Phil |
| Instructor: | Yalowitz,Steven |

Term - Spring 2011

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| Enrollment: | 1 |
| Questionnaires: | 1 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|--------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1449 | 5.00 | 4.43 | 4.33 | 4.46 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1358 | 5.00 | 4.29 | 4.13 | 4.21 | 5.00 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1327 | 5.00 | 4.27 | 4.16 | 4.28 | 5.00 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1435 | 5.00 | 4.39 | 4.20 | 4.27 | 5.00 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1446 | 5.00 | 4.33 | 4.67 | 4.71 | 5.00 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1390 | 5.00 | 4.80 | 4.74 | 4.78 | 5.00 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1121 | 5.00 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.39 | 5.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1122 | 5.00 | 4.17 | 4.36 | 4.54 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1121 | 5.00 | 4.39 | 4.40 | 4.60 | 5.00 |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/31 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.34 | 4.17 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/18 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.13 | 4.00 | 5.00 |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/24 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.34 | 3.98 | 5.00 |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/15 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.18 | 3.94 | 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 | 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 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Course-Section: PHIL 406 01 | Term - Spring 2011 | Enrollment: 1 |
| Title: Honors Ind Study in Phil | | Questionnaires: 1 |
| Instructor: Yalowitz,Steven | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|---|-----------|---|---|---|-----------|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| 84-150 | 0 | 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 | | | | | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PHIL 445 01 |
| Title: | Philosophy of Language |
| Instructor: | Ealick,Greg |

Term - Spring 2011

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Enrollment: | 20 |
| Questionnaires: | 12 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 4.67 | 376/1449 | 4.67 | 4.43 | 4.33 | 4.46 | 4.67 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 4.75 | 241/1446 | 4.75 | 4.41 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.75 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 4.67 | 367/1256 | 4.67 | 4.54 | 4.34 | 4.43 | 4.67 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 4.75 | 236/1402 | 4.75 | 4.41 | 4.27 | 4.35 | 4.75 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 4.83 | 113/1358 | 4.83 | 4.29 | 4.13 | 4.21 | 4.83 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 4.92 | 82/1327 | 4.92 | 4.27 | 4.16 | 4.28 | 4.92 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 4.58 | 401/1435 | 4.58 | 4.39 | 4.20 | 4.27 | 4.58 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 4.83 | 667/1446 | 4.83 | 4.33 | 4.67 | 4.71 | 4.83 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 4.73 | 177/1437 | 4.73 | 4.25 | 4.12 | 4.20 | 4.73 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 4.83 | 320/1386 | 4.83 | 4.56 | 4.48 | 4.55 | 4.83 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 5.00 | 1/1390 | 5.00 | 4.80 | 4.74 | 4.78 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 4.83 | 211/1379 | 4.83 | 4.42 | 4.34 | 4.40 | 4.83 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 4.92 | 152/1379 | 4.92 | 4.53 | 4.36 | 4.44 | 4.92 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 4.00 | 709/1236 | 4.00 | 3.54 | 4.08 | 4.13 | 4.00 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.40 | 484/1121 | 4.40 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.39 | 4.40 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 455/1122 | 4.60 | 4.17 | 4.36 | 4.54 | 4.60 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 328/1121 | 4.80 | 4.39 | 4.40 | 4.60 | 4.80 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/790 | **** | 3.85 | 4.06 | 4.27 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PHIL 445 01 |
| Title: | Philosophy of Language |
| Instructor: | Ealick,Greg |

Term - Spring 2011

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Enrollment: | 20 |
| Questionnaires: | 12 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|--------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PHIL 471 01 |
| Title: | Freedom,Determimism,Resp |
| Instructor: | Yalowitz,Steven |

Term - Spring 2011

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Enrollment: | 19 |
| Questionnaires: | 13 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|----|---|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 4.77 | 258/1449 | 4.77 | 4.43 | 4.33 | 4.46 | 4.77 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 4.62 | 425/1446 | 4.62 | 4.41 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.62 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 4.85 | 182/1256 | 4.85 | 4.54 | 4.34 | 4.43 | 4.85 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 4.50 | 528/1402 | 4.50 | 4.41 | 4.27 | 4.35 | 4.50 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 4.46 | 415/1358 | 4.46 | 4.29 | 4.13 | 4.21 | 4.46 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 4.45 | 464/1327 | 4.45 | 4.27 | 4.16 | 4.28 | 4.45 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 4.69 | 279/1435 | 4.69 | 4.39 | 4.20 | 4.27 | 4.69 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 2 | 1 | 3.31 | 1438/1446 | 3.31 | 4.33 | 4.67 | 4.71 | 3.31 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 4.36 | 516/1437 | 4.36 | 4.25 | 4.12 | 4.20 | 4.36 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 4.85 | 304/1386 | 4.85 | 4.56 | 4.48 | 4.55 | 4.85 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 4.54 | 1134/1390 | 4.54 | 4.80 | 4.74 | 4.78 | 4.54 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 4.58 | 541/1379 | 4.58 | 4.42 | 4.34 | 4.40 | 4.58 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 4.92 | 135/1379 | 4.92 | 4.53 | 4.36 | 4.44 | 4.92 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1236 | **** | 3.54 | 4.08 | 4.13 | **** |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 240/1121 | 4.71 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.39 | 4.71 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 4.43 | 612/1122 | 4.43 | 4.17 | 4.36 | 4.54 | 4.43 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4.57 | 544/1121 | 4.57 | 4.39 | 4.40 | 4.60 | 4.57 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/790 | **** | 3.85 | 4.06 | 4.27 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Course-Section: PHIL 471 01 | Term - Spring 2011 | Enrollment: 19 |
| Title: Freedom, Determinism, Resp | | Questionnaires: 13 |
| Instructor: Yalowitz, Steven | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|--------------------|
| Course-Section: | PHIL 481 01 |
| Title: | Ancient Philosophy |
| Instructor: | Smith,Aaron Joh |

Term - Spring 2011

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Enrollment: | 15 |
| Questionnaires: | 6 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4.17 | 987/1449 | 4.17 | 4.43 | 4.33 | 4.46 | 4.17 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4.33 | 776/1446 | 4.33 | 4.41 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.33 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | 936/1256 | 4.00 | 4.54 | 4.34 | 4.43 | 4.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.17 | 898/1402 | 4.17 | 4.41 | 4.27 | 4.35 | 4.17 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4.00 | 827/1358 | 4.00 | 4.29 | 4.13 | 4.21 | 4.00 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 4.33 | 591/1327 | 4.33 | 4.27 | 4.16 | 4.28 | 4.33 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4.17 | 858/1435 | 4.17 | 4.39 | 4.20 | 4.27 | 4.17 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 667/1446 | 4.83 | 4.33 | 4.67 | 4.71 | 4.83 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4.40 | 470/1437 | 4.40 | 4.25 | 4.12 | 4.20 | 4.40 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4.17 | 1112/1386 | 4.17 | 4.56 | 4.48 | 4.55 | 4.17 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 4.67 | 1002/1390 | 4.67 | 4.80 | 4.74 | 4.78 | 4.67 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4.17 | 974/1379 | 4.17 | 4.42 | 4.34 | 4.40 | 4.17 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.17 | 970/1379 | 4.17 | 4.53 | 4.36 | 4.44 | 4.17 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | 1144/1236 | 3.00 | 3.54 | 4.08 | 4.13 | 3.00 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | 606/1121 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.39 | 4.25 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | 746/1122 | 4.25 | 4.17 | 4.36 | 4.54 | 4.25 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4.50 | 591/1121 | 4.50 | 4.39 | 4.40 | 4.60 | 4.50 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | 731/790 | 3.00 | 3.85 | 4.06 | 4.27 | 3.00 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Course-Section: PHIL 481 01 | Term - Spring 2011 | Enrollment: 15 |
| Title: Ancient Philosophy | | Questionnaires: 6 |
| Instructor: Smith,Aaron Joh | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Frequency Distribution

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