

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	23

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	4	4	6	4	5	3.09	1495/1542	4.34	4.36	4.33	4.18	3.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	3	9	3	5	3.17	1483/1542	4.36	4.40	4.29	4.23	3.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	6	1	3	3.70	1144/1339	4.56	4.56	4.32	4.14	3.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	3	3	3	11	3.82	1210/1498	4.28	4.28	4.26	4.08	3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	2	2	6	8	3.55	1215/1428	4.24	4.20	4.12	3.98	3.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	2	6	9	3.73	1097/1407	4.11	4.21	4.15	3.92	3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	6	5	4	5	3.18	1404/1521	4.11	4.28	4.20	4.09	3.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	1	0	1	20	4.82	836/1541	4.77	4.53	4.70	4.66	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	2	4	6	3	2	2.94	1438/1518	4.13	4.11	4.11	4.00	2.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	5	4	6	4	3.35	1418/1472	4.45	4.52	4.46	4.38	3.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	1119/1475	4.89	4.76	4.72	4.63	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	2	4	6	6	3.74	1254/1471	4.42	4.39	4.32	4.23	3.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	2	4	4	7	3.50	1318/1470	4.47	4.38	4.33	4.21	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	14	4	0	0	0	1	1.80	****/1310	3.31	3.58	4.06	3.93	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	2	2	2	3.25	1095/1210	4.03	3.94	4.18	3.91	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	3	0	4	3.75	1041/1211	4.03	4.01	4.37	4.15	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	742/1207	4.55	4.30	4.41	4.12	4.38

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	16	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/859	****	3.95	4.08	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 14	Under-grad 23
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 4	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 1	
			? 2		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	40
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	0	0	1	2	5	9	9	3.88	1275/1542	4.34	4.36	4.33	4.18	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	9	10	3.92	1190/1542	4.36	4.40	4.29	4.23	3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	23	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1339	4.56	4.56	4.32	4.14	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	2	5	16	4.46	618/1498	4.28	4.28	4.26	4.08	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	8	14	4.35	544/1428	4.24	4.20	4.12	3.98	4.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	9	11	4.29	640/1407	4.11	4.21	4.15	3.92	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	5	5	11	3.84	1176/1521	4.11	4.28	4.20	4.09	3.84
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1541	4.77	4.53	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	4	11	7	0	3.14	1404/1518	4.13	4.11	4.11	4.00	3.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	10	8	6	3.76	1340/1472	4.45	4.52	4.46	4.38	3.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	700/1475	4.89	4.76	4.72	4.63	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	8	9	7	3.96	1141/1471	4.42	4.39	4.32	4.23	3.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	2	7	4	7	3.67	1268/1470	4.47	4.38	4.33	4.21	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	13	3	5	3	1	0	2.17	1299/1310	3.31	3.58	4.06	3.93	2.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	3	4	2	2	1	2.50	1191/1210	4.03	3.94	4.18	3.91	2.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	2	1	6	0	3	3.08	1173/1211	4.03	4.01	4.37	4.15	3.08

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	40
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														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	1	1	4	5	3.92	979/1207	4.55	4.30	4.41	4.12	3.92

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1 A 19	Required for Majors	0 Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0 B 6		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4 C 0	General	19 Under-grad 26 Non-major 26
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6 D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4 F 0	Electives	5
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 0		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2012

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	0	0	0	3	27	4.90	169/1542	4.34	4.36	4.33	4.18	4.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	101/1542	4.36	4.40	4.29	4.23	4.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1339	4.56	4.56	4.32	4.14	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	1	26	4.89	134/1498	4.28	4.28	4.26	4.08	4.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	3	4	3	17	4.03	833/1428	4.24	4.20	4.12	3.98	4.03
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	2	25	4.67	252/1407	4.11	4.21	4.15	3.92	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	26	4.83	159/1521	4.11	4.28	4.20	4.09	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	17	13	4.43	1182/1541	4.77	4.53	4.70	4.66	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	118/1518	4.13	4.11	4.11	4.00	4.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	29	4.97	84/1472	4.45	4.52	4.46	4.38	4.97
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1475	4.89	4.76	4.72	4.63	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	29	4.97	65/1471	4.42	4.39	4.32	4.23	4.97
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1470	4.47	4.38	4.33	4.21	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	17	1	0	1	1	10	4.46	364/1310	3.31	3.58	4.06	3.93	4.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/1210	4.03	3.94	4.18	3.91	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/1211	4.03	4.01	4.37	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/1207	4.55	4.30	4.41	4.12	****
4. Were special techniques successful	24	1	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	****/859	****	3.95	4.08	3.95	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2012

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														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/207	****	****	4.12	3.92	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	****	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	****	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/199	****	****	4.15	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	****	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	****	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	****	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	****	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	****	4.36	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.29	4.82	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.25	4.80	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2012

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
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	4.77	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	27	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	13	Under-grad	30	Non-major	30
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	12	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	8	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	42
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	0	1	28	4.97	68/1542	4.34	4.36	4.33	4.18	4.97
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	58/1542	4.36	4.40	4.29	4.23	4.97
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1339	4.56	4.56	4.32	4.14	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	1	25	4.82	180/1498	4.28	4.28	4.26	4.08	4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	5	6	14	4.19	703/1428	4.24	4.20	4.12	3.98	4.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	3	23	4.59	325/1407	4.11	4.21	4.15	3.92	4.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	2	23	4.66	343/1521	4.11	4.28	4.20	4.09	4.66
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	23	6	4.21	1360/1541	4.77	4.53	4.70	4.66	4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	88/1518	4.13	4.11	4.11	4.00	4.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1472	4.45	4.52	4.46	4.38	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1475	4.89	4.76	4.72	4.63	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1471	4.42	4.39	4.32	4.23	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1470	4.47	4.38	4.33	4.21	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	21	1	0	2	0	5	4.00	761/1310	3.31	3.58	4.06	3.93	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	129/1210	4.03	3.94	4.18	3.91	4.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	479/1211	4.03	4.01	4.37	4.15	4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1207	4.55	4.30	4.41	4.12	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	42
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														
4. Were special techniques successful	18	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/859	****	3.95	4.08	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	25	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	16	Under-grad	29	Non-major	29
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	9	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	40
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	1	0	0	0	3	9	16	4.46	691/1542	4.34	4.36	4.33	4.18	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	8	17	4.43	726/1542	4.36	4.40	4.29	4.23	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	0	9	17	4.43	671/1339	4.56	4.56	4.32	4.14	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	15	2	1	0	6	4	3.69	1267/1498	4.28	4.28	4.26	4.08	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	6	18	4.46	431/1428	4.24	4.20	4.12	3.98	4.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	2	1	5	2	5	3.47	1228/1407	4.11	4.21	4.15	3.92	3.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	4	3	6	15	4.14	955/1521	4.11	4.28	4.20	4.09	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	276/1541	4.77	4.53	4.70	4.66	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	2	0	1	1	7	8	4.29	640/1518	4.13	4.11	4.11	4.00	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	4	22	4.71	520/1472	4.45	4.52	4.46	4.38	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1475	4.89	4.76	4.72	4.63	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	5	20	4.54	607/1471	4.42	4.39	4.32	4.23	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	4	23	4.75	374/1470	4.47	4.38	4.33	4.21	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	19	2	2	0	1	3	3.13	1206/1310	3.31	3.58	4.06	3.93	3.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	3	0	13	4.63	356/1210	4.03	3.94	4.18	3.91	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	2	1	1	1	10	4.07	898/1211	4.03	4.01	4.37	4.15	4.07
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	402/1207	4.55	4.30	4.41	4.12	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	13	10	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	****/859	****	3.95	4.08	3.95	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	29

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/210	****	****	4.17	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/69	****	****	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/69	****	****	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/73	****	****	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/35	****	****	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/23	****	****	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.29	4.82	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	29

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.25	4.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1 A 12	Required for Majors	3 Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0 B 11		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1 C 1	General	15 Under-grad 29 Non-major 29
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	8 D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7 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 100 06
Title:	Intro To Philosophy
Instructor:	Smith,Aaron Joh

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	29

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	9	15	4.31	895/1542	4.34	4.36	4.33	4.18	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	7	18	4.38	787/1542	4.36	4.40	4.29	4.23	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	4	20	4.41	682/1339	4.56	4.56	4.32	4.14	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	1	1	2	5	6	3.93	1129/1498	4.28	4.28	4.26	4.08	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	1	7	18	4.38	519/1428	4.24	4.20	4.12	3.98	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	17	1	1	0	6	4	3.92	963/1407	4.11	4.21	4.15	3.92	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	3	0	8	4	13	3.86	1170/1521	4.11	4.28	4.20	4.09	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1541	4.77	4.53	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	0	2	10	11	4.25	686/1518	4.13	4.11	4.11	4.00	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	0	7	20	4.55	753/1472	4.45	4.52	4.46	4.38	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	25	4.86	646/1475	4.89	4.76	4.72	4.63	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	2	9	15	4.24	953/1471	4.42	4.39	4.32	4.23	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	0	5	21	4.52	681/1470	4.47	4.38	4.33	4.21	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	20	3	1	2	1	2	2.78	1260/1310	3.31	3.58	4.06	3.93	2.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	1	2	13	4.39	538/1210	4.03	3.94	4.18	3.91	4.39
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	3	2	13	4.56	543/1211	4.03	4.01	4.37	4.15	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	0	3	14	4.61	546/1207	4.55	4.30	4.41	4.12	4.61

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	40
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														
4. Were special techniques successful	11	12	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	****/859	****	3.95	4.08	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 6	C 4	General 21	Under-grad 29
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives 6	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	260/1542	4.34	4.36	4.33	4.18	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	338/1542	4.36	4.40	4.29	4.23	4.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	22	4.80	254/1339	4.56	4.56	4.32	4.14	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	745/1498	4.28	4.28	4.26	4.08	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	173/1428	4.24	4.20	4.12	3.98	4.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	19	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	****/1407	4.11	4.21	4.15	3.92	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	5	14	4.28	806/1521	4.11	4.28	4.20	4.09	4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1541	4.77	4.53	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	10	11	4.45	433/1518	4.13	4.11	4.11	4.00	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	367/1472	4.45	4.52	4.46	4.38	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	430/1475	4.89	4.76	4.72	4.63	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	6	15	4.50	637/1471	4.42	4.39	4.32	4.23	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	257/1470	4.47	4.38	4.33	4.21	4.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	18	0	2	1	0	2	3.40	****/1310	3.31	3.58	4.06	3.93	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	4	11	4.50	430/1210	4.03	3.94	4.18	3.91	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	2	1	3	10	4.12	880/1211	4.03	4.01	4.37	4.15	4.12

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	1	0	15	4.65	518/1207	4.55	4.30	4.41	4.12	4.65

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 1	B 11		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 2	General	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives	5
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	1
			? 3		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	39
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	2	3	4	4	3.25	1475/1542	3.53	4.36	4.33	4.18	3.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	2	6	5	3.69	1332/1542	3.84	4.40	4.29	4.23	3.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	0	6	0	6	3.57	1193/1339	3.79	4.56	4.32	4.14	3.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	2	1	2	0	0	2.00	1496/1498	3.00	4.28	4.26	4.08	2.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	4	5	2	3.06	1354/1428	3.42	4.20	4.12	3.98	3.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1080/1407	3.75	4.21	4.15	3.92	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	1	13	4.56	452/1521	4.36	4.28	4.20	4.09	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	0	15	4.75	906/1541	4.88	4.53	4.70	4.66	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	4	2	4	4	1	2.73	1473/1518	2.83	4.11	4.11	4.00	2.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	0	1	4	8	4.07	1202/1472	4.35	4.52	4.46	4.38	4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	0	1	4	8	4.07	1390/1475	3.93	4.76	4.72	4.63	4.07
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	2	2	2	6	3.40	1359/1471	3.63	4.39	4.32	4.23	3.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	7	1	5	1	1	2.20	1456/1470	2.53	4.38	4.33	4.21	2.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	3	2	1	3	2	2.91	1246/1310	2.52	3.58	4.06	3.93	2.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	5	3	4	2	0	2.21	1203/1210	2.33	3.94	4.18	3.91	2.21
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	4	2	3	2	3	2.86	1192/1211	2.87	4.01	4.37	4.15	2.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	4	3	3	1	3	2.71	1198/1207	2.86	4.30	4.41	4.12	2.71
4. Were special techniques successful	2	13	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/859	****	3.95	4.08	3.95	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	39
Questionnaires:	16

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	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/207	****	****	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/210	****	****	4.17	4.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/35	****	****	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/19	****	****	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.29	4.82	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	15

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	1	2	7	4	3.80	1315/1542	3.53	4.36	4.33	4.18	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	6	6	4.00	1122/1542	3.84	4.40	4.29	4.23	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	0	0	6	6	4.00	982/1339	3.79	4.56	4.32	4.14	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1058/1498	3.00	4.28	4.26	4.08	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	3	3	5	3.77	1090/1428	3.42	4.20	4.12	3.98	3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	12	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1407	3.75	4.21	4.15	3.92	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	0	5	6	4.15	944/1521	4.36	4.28	4.20	4.09	4.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1541	4.88	4.53	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	2	4	2	5	1	2.93	1442/1518	2.83	4.11	4.11	4.00	2.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	629/1472	4.35	4.52	4.46	4.38	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	3	1	2	7	3.79	1430/1475	3.93	4.76	4.72	4.63	3.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	2	6	4	3.86	1201/1471	3.63	4.39	4.32	4.23	3.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	2	3	2	3	2.86	1425/1470	2.53	4.38	4.33	4.21	2.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	3	2	2	1	0	2.13	1300/1310	2.52	3.58	4.06	3.93	2.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	3	1	3	2	0	2.44	1194/1210	2.33	3.94	4.18	3.91	2.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	3	2	2	1	2.89	1190/1211	2.87	4.01	4.37	4.15	2.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	3	0	2	2	2	3.00	1172/1207	2.86	4.30	4.41	4.12	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	7	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/859	****	3.95	4.08	3.95	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	15

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	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/210	****	****	4.17	4.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/35	****	****	4.36	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.57	4.84	****

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	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	7	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	80
Questionnaires:	42

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	4	4	16	17	4.12	1086/1542	4.12	4.36	4.33	4.18	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	10	13	15	3.95	1165/1542	3.95	4.40	4.29	4.23	3.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	18	0	1	2	5	15	4.48	615/1339	4.48	4.56	4.32	4.14	4.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	2	3	4	10	17	4.03	1047/1498	4.03	4.28	4.26	4.08	4.03
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	6	11	19	4.10	792/1428	4.10	4.20	4.12	3.98	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	3	7	11	17	4.03	864/1407	4.03	4.21	4.15	3.92	4.03
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	5	4	9	8	12	3.47	1340/1521	3.47	4.28	4.20	4.09	3.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	16	23	4.59	1062/1541	4.59	4.53	4.70	4.66	4.59
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	1	3	19	8	4.10	849/1518	4.10	4.11	4.11	4.00	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	2	9	28	4.54	778/1472	4.54	4.52	4.46	4.38	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	4	35	4.78	843/1475	4.78	4.76	4.72	4.63	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	5	4	7	24	4.25	946/1471	4.25	4.39	4.32	4.23	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	0	7	30	4.49	716/1470	4.49	4.38	4.33	4.21	4.49
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	33	1	2	2	2	0	2.71	****/1310	****	3.58	4.06	3.93	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	3	4	9	7	13	3.64	977/1210	3.64	3.94	4.18	3.91	3.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	3	0	8	5	21	4.11	886/1211	4.11	4.01	4.37	4.15	4.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	2	7	5	21	4.11	892/1207	4.11	4.30	4.41	4.12	4.11
4. Were special techniques successful	5	10	1	4	4	7	11	3.85	568/859	3.85	3.95	4.08	3.95	3.85

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	80
Questionnaires:	42

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/69	****	****	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	****	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	39	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	39	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/73	****	****	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	39	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/35	****	****	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	40	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	40	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/23	****	****	4.41	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	40	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/19	****	****	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	40	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.29	4.82	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	40	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/18	****	****	4.25	4.80	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	80
Questionnaires:	42

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	40	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	4.77	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 0	A 17	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99 0	B 15		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General 23	Under-grad 42
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives 3	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 2	
			? 10		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	6	16	4.57	560/1542	4.64	4.36	4.33	4.18	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	14	4.57	541/1542	4.61	4.40	4.29	4.23	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	16	4.65	424/1339	4.80	4.56	4.32	4.14	4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	1	3	3	10	4.11	996/1498	4.41	4.28	4.26	4.08	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	8	9	4.00	851/1428	3.90	4.20	4.12	3.98	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	1	3	4	8	4.00	874/1407	4.18	4.21	4.15	3.92	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	8	11	4.30	785/1521	4.35	4.28	4.20	4.09	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	1020/1541	4.43	4.53	4.70	4.66	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	9	7	4.35	561/1518	4.52	4.11	4.11	4.00	4.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	11	10	4.41	954/1472	4.58	4.52	4.46	4.38	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	538/1475	4.92	4.76	4.72	4.63	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	9	11	4.41	785/1471	4.54	4.39	4.32	4.23	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	230/1470	4.80	4.38	4.33	4.21	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	14	2	0	3	1	2	3.13	1206/1310	3.98	3.58	4.06	3.93	3.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	323/1210	4.43	3.94	4.18	3.91	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	488/1211	4.48	4.01	4.37	4.15	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	267/1207	4.62	4.30	4.41	4.12	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	8	12	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/859	****	3.95	4.08	3.95	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	23

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	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/207	****	****	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/210	****	****	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	****	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	****	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/199	****	****	4.15	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	****	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/69	****	****	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	****	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/73	****	****	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/35	****	****	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.29	4.82	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	23

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	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.25	4.80	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	4.77	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 5	C 1	General 11	Under-grad 23 Non-major 23
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 6	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 2	
			? 0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 152 02
Title:	Intro To Moral Theory
Instructor:	Wilson,Richard

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	39
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	8	12	4.41	780/1542	4.64	4.36	4.33	4.18	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	10	12	4.55	565/1542	4.61	4.40	4.29	4.23	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	349/1339	4.80	4.56	4.32	4.14	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	722/1498	4.41	4.28	4.26	4.08	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	3	2	15	4.43	473/1428	3.90	4.20	4.12	3.98	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	5	12	4.38	549/1407	4.18	4.21	4.15	3.92	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	6	6	9	4.05	1026/1521	4.35	4.28	4.20	4.09	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	17	5	4.23	1347/1541	4.43	4.53	4.70	4.66	4.23
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	9	7	4.28	663/1518	4.52	4.11	4.11	4.00	4.28
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	6	11	4.33	1022/1472	4.58	4.52	4.46	4.38	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	538/1475	4.92	4.76	4.72	4.63	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	681/1471	4.54	4.39	4.32	4.23	4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	3	13	4.38	834/1470	4.80	4.38	4.33	4.21	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	1	1	1	3	7	4.08	722/1310	3.98	3.58	4.06	3.93	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	5	2	6	3.86	875/1210	4.43	3.94	4.18	3.91	3.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	0	2	4	6	3.86	1008/1211	4.48	4.01	4.37	4.15	3.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	2	2	3	7	4.07	899/1207	4.62	4.30	4.41	4.12	4.07

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 152 02
Title:	Intro To Moral Theory
Instructor:	Wilson,Richard

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	39
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	8	9	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	****/859	****	3.95	4.08	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1 A 13	Required for Majors	2 Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 B 3		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1 C 2	General	6 Under-grad 22 Non-major 22
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2 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	3
			? 4		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 152 03
Title:	Intro To Moral Theory
Instructor:	Ealick,Greg

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	632/1542	4.64	4.36	4.33	4.18	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	12	7	4.14	1052/1542	4.61	4.40	4.29	4.23	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	18	4.73	349/1339	4.80	4.56	4.32	4.14	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	3	8	8	4.10	1007/1498	4.41	4.28	4.26	4.08	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	3	4	5	6	3.27	1311/1428	3.90	4.20	4.12	3.98	3.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	1	5	4	4	3.44	1242/1407	4.18	4.21	4.15	3.92	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	6	6	7	3.77	1212/1521	4.35	4.28	4.20	4.09	3.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	13	4.59	1054/1541	4.43	4.53	4.70	4.66	4.59
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	13	3	4.06	881/1518	4.52	4.11	4.11	4.00	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	4	4	13	4.27	1072/1472	4.58	4.52	4.46	4.38	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	781/1475	4.92	4.76	4.72	4.63	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	6	5	8	3.90	1178/1471	4.54	4.39	4.32	4.23	3.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	297/1470	4.80	4.38	4.33	4.21	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	16	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	495/1310	3.98	3.58	4.06	3.93	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	1	1	6	5	3.73	934/1210	4.43	3.94	4.18	3.91	3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	4	4	6	4.00	918/1211	4.48	4.01	4.37	4.15	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	2	2	3	8	4.13	876/1207	4.62	4.30	4.41	4.12	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	7	14	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/859	****	3.95	4.08	3.95	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 152 03
Title:	Intro To Moral Theory
Instructor:	Ealick,Greg

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/210	****	****	4.17	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	****	4.56	4.27	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	****	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	14	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 152 04
Title:	Intro To Moral Theory
Instructor:	Thomas,James G

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	40
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	0	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	135/1542	4.64	4.36	4.33	4.18	4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	115/1542	4.61	4.40	4.29	4.23	4.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	63/1339	4.80	4.56	4.32	4.14	4.96
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	187/1498	4.41	4.28	4.26	4.08	4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	4	4	13	4.04	827/1428	3.90	4.20	4.12	3.98	4.04
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	7	18	4.58	335/1407	4.18	4.21	4.15	3.92	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	150/1521	4.35	4.28	4.20	4.09	4.84
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	17	9	4.35	1260/1541	4.43	4.53	4.70	4.66	4.35
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	88/1518	4.52	4.11	4.11	4.00	4.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	84/1472	4.58	4.52	4.46	4.38	4.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	215/1475	4.92	4.76	4.72	4.63	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	65/1471	4.54	4.39	4.32	4.23	4.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	71/1470	4.80	4.38	4.33	4.21	4.96
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	19	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	****/1310	3.98	3.58	4.06	3.93	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1210	4.43	3.94	4.18	3.91	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1211	4.48	4.01	4.37	4.15	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1207	4.62	4.30	4.41	4.12	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 152 04
Title:	Intro To Moral Theory
Instructor:	Thomas,James G

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	40
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														
4. Were special techniques successful	18	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/859	****	3.95	4.08	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	25	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	26	Non-major	26
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	10	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 152 05
Title:	Intro To Moral Theory
Instructor:	Thomas,James G

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	31

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	25	4.81	260/1542	4.64	4.36	4.33	4.18	4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	27	4.87	169/1542	4.61	4.40	4.29	4.23	4.87
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	29	4.94	110/1339	4.80	4.56	4.32	4.14	4.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	3	4	22	4.66	369/1498	4.41	4.28	4.26	4.08	4.66
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	3	3	3	7	11	3.74	1104/1428	3.90	4.20	4.12	3.98	3.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	3	8	18	4.52	395/1407	4.18	4.21	4.15	3.92	4.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	2	26	4.80	185/1521	4.35	4.28	4.20	4.09	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	19	11	4.37	1242/1541	4.43	4.53	4.70	4.66	4.37
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1518	4.52	4.11	4.11	4.00	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	27	4.90	209/1472	4.58	4.52	4.46	4.38	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1475	4.92	4.76	4.72	4.63	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	130/1471	4.54	4.39	4.32	4.23	4.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1470	4.80	4.38	4.33	4.21	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	20	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	425/1310	3.98	3.58	4.06	3.93	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	129/1210	4.43	3.94	4.18	3.91	4.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	194/1211	4.48	4.01	4.37	4.15	4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1207	4.62	4.30	4.41	4.12	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 152 05
Title:	Intro To Moral Theory
Instructor:	Thomas,James G

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	31

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	21	7	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/859	****	3.95	4.08	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	28	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	1	C	0	General	10	Under-grad	31	Non-major	31
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	15	F	0	Electives	14	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	68
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	6	0	1	5	6	14	6	3.59	1413/1542	3.59	4.36	4.33	4.35	3.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	2	5	8	8	9	3.53	1397/1542	3.53	4.40	4.29	4.29	3.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	2	10	7	13	3.97	1010/1339	3.97	4.56	4.32	4.40	3.97
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	1	8	9	13	4.10	1012/1498	4.10	4.28	4.26	4.31	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	6	3	2	8	5	8	3.50	1231/1428	3.50	4.20	4.12	4.17	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	7	10	14	4.16	784/1407	4.16	4.21	4.15	4.14	4.16
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	2	8	10	12	4.00	1046/1521	4.00	4.28	4.20	4.22	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	2	25	5	4.09	1431/1541	4.09	4.53	4.70	4.68	4.09
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	1	3	9	15	1	3.41	1331/1518	3.41	4.11	4.11	4.12	3.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	5	7	10	9	3.74	1346/1472	3.74	4.52	4.46	4.53	3.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	2	5	24	4.71	987/1475	4.71	4.76	4.72	4.79	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	3	8	10	9	3.74	1249/1471	3.74	4.39	4.32	4.37	3.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	4	4	9	5	9	3.35	1356/1470	3.35	4.38	4.33	4.40	3.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	4	4	3	8	6	5	3.19	1186/1310	3.19	3.58	4.06	4.19	3.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	3	6	7	7	3.56	996/1210	3.56	3.94	4.18	4.18	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	4	8	5	7	3.52	1096/1211	3.52	4.01	4.37	4.34	3.52
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	3	8	5	8	3.64	1067/1207	3.64	4.30	4.41	4.40	3.64
4. Were special techniques successful	13	7	1	3	6	3	5	3.44	732/859	3.44	3.95	4.08	4.07	3.44

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	68
Questionnaires:	38

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	36	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/210	****	****	4.17	4.32	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	36	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/69	****	****	4.56	4.68	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/69	****	****	4.60	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/68	****	****	4.50	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/73	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	36	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.72	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.55	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/35	****	****	4.36	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	36	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/25	****	****	4.59	4.70	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	36	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/23	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	36	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/30	****	****	4.27	3.95	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/19	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	36	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/29	****	****	4.29	4.50	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	36	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/18	****	****	4.25	4.50	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	68
Questionnaires:	38

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	36	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	4.50	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	25	Required for Majors	27	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	6						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	38	Non-major	38
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	6						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	30
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	3	5	1	12	4.05	1145/1542	4.05	4.36	4.33	4.37	4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	4	12	4.24	954/1542	4.24	4.40	4.29	4.31	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	1	6	11	4.19	872/1339	4.19	4.56	4.32	4.36	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	3	5	1	8	3.53	1338/1498	3.53	4.28	4.26	4.32	3.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	7	12	4.38	510/1428	4.38	4.20	4.12	4.15	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	4	5	3	5	3.05	1344/1407	3.05	4.21	4.15	4.20	3.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	0	17	4.57	441/1521	4.57	4.28	4.20	4.23	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	345/1541	4.95	4.53	4.70	4.71	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	3	2	3	10	3	3.38	1342/1518	3.38	4.11	4.11	4.13	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	3	15	4.57	728/1472	4.57	4.52	4.46	4.46	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	2	2	5	11	4.10	1387/1475	4.10	4.76	4.72	4.74	4.10
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	4	0	14	4.19	992/1471	4.19	4.39	4.32	4.33	4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	5	2	10	3.76	1233/1470	3.76	4.38	4.33	4.35	3.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	5	2	7	5	3.38	1121/1310	3.38	3.58	4.06	4.11	3.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	10	1	1	2	2	2.06	1206/1210	2.06	3.94	4.18	4.27	2.06
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	8	1	2	3	2	2.38	1207/1211	2.38	4.01	4.37	4.45	2.38

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	6	1	3	2	4	2.81	1189/1207	2.81	4.30	4.41	4.51	2.81

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1 A 7	Required for Majors	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0 B 11		Graduate
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2 C 2	General	11
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4 D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5 F 0	Electives	4
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	1
			? 0		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	43
Questionnaires:	28

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	9	18	4.61	512/1542	4.61	4.36	4.33	4.37	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	22	4.64	441/1542	4.64	4.40	4.29	4.31	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	24	4.81	244/1339	4.81	4.56	4.32	4.36	4.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1498	5.00	4.28	4.26	4.32	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	228/1428	4.70	4.20	4.12	4.15	4.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	20	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	559/1407	4.38	4.21	4.15	4.20	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	6	18	4.56	463/1521	4.56	4.28	4.20	4.23	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	1	21	4	4.04	1447/1541	4.04	4.53	4.70	4.71	4.04
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	3	10	8	4.24	709/1518	4.24	4.11	4.11	4.13	4.24
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	5	19	4.50	817/1472	4.50	4.52	4.46	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	430/1475	4.93	4.76	4.72	4.74	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	3	6	17	4.32	882/1471	4.32	4.39	4.32	4.33	4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	3	22	4.61	588/1470	4.61	4.38	4.33	4.35	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	17	2	0	0	0	9	4.27	556/1310	4.27	3.58	4.06	4.11	4.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	2	2	1	1	5	3.45	1026/1210	3.45	3.94	4.18	4.27	3.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	2	1	2	1	5	3.55	1092/1211	3.55	4.01	4.37	4.45	3.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	2	1	1	2	5	3.64	1069/1207	3.64	4.30	4.41	4.51	3.64

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	43
Questionnaires:	28

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	17	7	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/859	****	3.95	4.08	4.13	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 16	Required for Majors 24	Graduate 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	7	2.00-2.99 4	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 28
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 2		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 394 01
Title:	Philosophy Of Biology
Instructor:	Pfeifer, Jessica

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	31
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	0	8	14	4.48	676/1542	4.48	4.36	4.33	4.37	4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	4	16	4.52	590/1542	4.52	4.40	4.29	4.31	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	15	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	582/1339	4.50	4.56	4.32	4.36	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	321/1498	4.70	4.28	4.26	4.32	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	4	16	4.48	421/1428	4.48	4.20	4.12	4.15	4.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	6	13	4.45	467/1407	4.45	4.21	4.15	4.20	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	8	12	4.45	588/1521	4.45	4.28	4.20	4.23	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	5	16	2	3.87	1507/1541	3.87	4.53	4.70	4.71	3.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	10	7	4.33	588/1518	4.33	4.11	4.11	4.13	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	351/1472	4.82	4.52	4.46	4.46	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	538/1475	4.91	4.76	4.72	4.74	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	268/1471	4.82	4.39	4.32	4.33	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	297/1470	4.82	4.38	4.33	4.35	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	7	2	1	3	4	4	3.50	1064/1310	3.50	3.58	4.06	4.11	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	2	1	7	4.18	681/1210	4.18	3.94	4.18	4.27	4.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	892/1211	4.08	4.01	4.37	4.45	4.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	499/1207	4.67	4.30	4.41	4.51	4.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 394 01
Title:	Philosophy Of Biology
Instructor:	Pfeifer, Jessica

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	31
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	12	10	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/859	****	3.95	4.08	4.13	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1 A 5	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0 B 13						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4 C 1	General	2	Under-grad	24	Non-major	11
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3 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	2				
			? 4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 399 01
Title:	Nature of Value
Instructor:	Smith,Aaron Joh

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	8	9	4.44	720/1542	4.44	4.36	4.33	4.37	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	9	8	4.47	656/1542	4.47	4.40	4.29	4.31	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	5	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	414/1339	4.67	4.56	4.32	4.36	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	452/1498	4.59	4.28	4.26	4.32	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	15	4.72	204/1428	4.72	4.20	4.12	4.15	4.72
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	201/1407	4.72	4.21	4.15	4.20	4.72
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	644/1521	4.41	4.28	4.20	4.23	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	721/1541	4.88	4.53	4.70	4.71	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	421/1518	4.47	4.11	4.11	4.13	4.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	753/1472	4.56	4.52	4.46	4.46	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	323/1475	4.94	4.76	4.72	4.74	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	3	13	4.56	587/1471	4.56	4.39	4.32	4.33	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	349/1470	4.78	4.38	4.33	4.35	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	14	3	0	0	0	1	2.00	****/1310	****	3.58	4.06	4.11	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	0	4	11	4.35	562/1210	4.35	3.94	4.18	4.27	4.35
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	3	4	3	8	3.89	998/1211	3.89	4.01	4.37	4.45	3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	379/1207	4.78	4.30	4.41	4.51	4.78

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 399 01
Title:	Nature of Value
Instructor:	Smith,Aaron Joh

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	2	14	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/859	****	3.95	4.08	4.13	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	9
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	1	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	1				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 400 01
Title:	Indep Study In Phil
Instructor:	Ealick,Greg

Term - Spring 2012

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	1/1542	5.00	4.36	4.33	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1542	5.00	4.40	4.29	4.33	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1339	5.00	4.56	4.32	4.44	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1498	5.00	4.28	4.26	4.35	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1428	5.00	4.20	4.12	4.22	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.21	4.15	4.30	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1521	5.00	4.28	4.20	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.53	4.70	4.72	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1472	5.00	4.52	4.46	4.50	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1475	5.00	4.76	4.72	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1471	5.00	4.39	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1470	5.00	4.38	4.33	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1310	5.00	3.58	4.06	4.09	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1210	5.00	3.94	4.18	4.34	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1211	5.00	4.01	4.37	4.47	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1207	5.00	4.30	4.41	4.53	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 400 01
Title:	Indep Study In Phil
Instructor:	Ealick,Greg

Term - Spring 2012

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
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/859	5.00	3.95	4.08	4.19	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
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
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives 1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	14

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	11	4.79	285/1542	4.79	4.36	4.33	4.42	4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	615/1542	4.50	4.40	4.29	4.33	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	205/1339	4.86	4.56	4.32	4.44	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	512/1498	4.54	4.28	4.26	4.35	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	292/1428	4.62	4.20	4.12	4.22	4.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	629/1407	4.31	4.21	4.15	4.30	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	7	3	4	3.79	1208/1521	3.79	4.28	4.20	4.24	3.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	4.00	1455/1541	4.00	4.53	4.70	4.72	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	341/1518	4.55	4.11	4.11	4.18	4.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	778/1472	4.54	4.52	4.46	4.50	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	700/1475	4.85	4.76	4.72	4.74	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	696/1471	4.46	4.39	4.32	4.36	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	257/1470	4.85	4.38	4.33	4.38	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	12	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1310	****	3.58	4.06	4.09	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	251/1210	4.75	3.94	4.18	4.34	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	580/1211	4.50	4.01	4.37	4.47	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	630/1207	4.50	4.30	4.41	4.53	4.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	6	7	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/859	****	3.95	4.08	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	1	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 471 01
Title:	Freedom,Determimism,Resp
Instructor:	Yalowitz,Steven

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	18
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	1	0	0	11	4.75	322/1542	4.75	4.36	4.33	4.42	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	203/1542	4.83	4.40	4.29	4.33	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	224/1339	4.83	4.56	4.32	4.44	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	128/1498	4.90	4.28	4.26	4.35	4.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	252/1428	4.67	4.20	4.12	4.22	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	252/1407	4.67	4.21	4.15	4.30	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	518/1521	4.50	4.28	4.20	4.24	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	2	4.17	1387/1541	4.17	4.53	4.70	4.72	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	181/1518	4.75	4.11	4.11	4.18	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1472	5.00	4.52	4.46	4.50	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	484/1475	4.92	4.76	4.72	4.74	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	244/1471	4.83	4.39	4.32	4.36	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	159/1470	4.92	4.38	4.33	4.38	4.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	170/1210	4.86	3.94	4.18	4.34	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	661/1211	4.43	4.01	4.37	4.47	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	289/1207	4.86	4.30	4.41	4.53	4.86

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	18
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														
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/859	****	3.95	4.08	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 499 01
Title:	Advanced Topics Possible
Instructor:	Pfeifer, Jessica

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	12
Questionnaires:	8

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	1	5	4.25	962/1542	4.25	4.36	4.33	4.42	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	352/1542	4.71	4.40	4.29	4.33	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1339	****	4.56	4.32	4.44	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	660/1498	4.43	4.28	4.26	4.35	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	390/1428	4.50	4.20	4.12	4.22	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	405/1407	4.50	4.21	4.15	4.30	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	382/1521	4.63	4.28	4.20	4.24	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	1506/1541	3.88	4.53	4.70	4.72	3.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	822/1518	4.13	4.11	4.11	4.18	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	983/1472	4.38	4.52	4.46	4.50	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	1285/1475	4.38	4.76	4.72	4.74	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	821/1471	4.38	4.39	4.32	4.36	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	0	5	4.13	1058/1470	4.13	4.38	4.33	4.38	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	761/1310	4.00	3.58	4.06	4.09	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	866/1210	3.88	3.94	4.18	4.34	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	580/1211	4.50	4.01	4.37	4.47	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	402/1207	4.75	4.30	4.41	4.53	4.75

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	PHIL 499 01
Title:	Advanced Topics Possible
Instructor:	Pfeifer, Jessica

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	12
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	0	6	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	713/859	3.50	3.95	4.08	4.19	3.50

Frequency Distribution

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