

Course-Section: PHIL 100 0201
 Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: EALICK, GREG E.
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1142
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	5	16	4.50	549/1504	4.54	4.28	4.27	4.13	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	5	16	4.57	426/1503	4.61	4.32	4.20	4.16	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	20	4.71	300/1290	4.79	4.55	4.28	4.19	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	0	8	13	4.39	606/1453	4.45	4.33	4.21	4.11	4.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	20	4.71	189/1421	4.18	4.15	4.00	3.91	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	7	12	4.30	525/1365	4.25	4.11	4.08	3.96	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	8	13	4.42	577/1485	4.52	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1504	4.34	4.26	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	1	0	8	13	4.50	338/1483	4.43	4.18	4.06	3.97	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	348/1425	4.77	4.52	4.41	4.36	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	21	4.87	596/1426	4.88	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	6	16	4.54	526/1418	4.57	4.38	4.25	4.20	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	22	4.83	221/1416	4.81	4.41	4.26	4.21	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	18	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	919/1199	3.82	3.55	3.97	3.82	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	2	1	12	4.50	364/1312	4.44	4.01	4.00	3.69	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	299/1303	4.75	4.24	4.24	3.93	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	375/1299	4.87	4.46	4.25	3.94	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	9	11	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	****/ 758	4.54	3.98	4.01	3.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	6	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PHIL 100 0301
 Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: Huckfeldt, Vaug
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1143
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	13	8	4.08	1056/1504	4.54	4.28	4.27	4.13	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	6	14	4.24	869/1503	4.61	4.32	4.20	4.16	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	6	17	4.52	488/1290	4.79	4.55	4.28	4.19	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	12	9	4.16	878/1453	4.45	4.33	4.21	4.11	4.16
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	6	15	4.36	449/1421	4.18	4.15	4.00	3.91	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	6	7	7	3.70	1046/1365	4.25	4.11	4.08	3.96	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	10	11	4.28	727/1485	4.52	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	25	0	4.00	1411/1504	4.34	4.26	4.69	4.66	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	6	12	1	3.74	1135/1483	4.43	4.18	4.06	3.97	3.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	10	13	4.46	842/1425	4.77	4.52	4.41	4.36	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	6	18	4.75	825/1426	4.88	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	4	7	12	4.21	897/1418	4.57	4.38	4.25	4.20	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	8	15	4.50	623/1416	4.81	4.41	4.26	4.21	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	16	2	1	1	2	1	2.86	1104/1199	3.82	3.55	3.97	3.82	2.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	3	1	3	6	3.92	794/1312	4.44	4.01	4.00	3.69	3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	546/1303	4.75	4.24	4.24	3.93	4.54
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	263/1299	4.87	4.46	4.25	3.94	4.85
4. Were special techniques successful	12	11	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 758	4.54	3.98	4.01	3.80	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.50	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 73	****	4.00	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 18
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B 13	Graduate 0
					Major 0

56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 100 0401
 Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: THOMAS, JAMES
 Enrollment: 44
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1144
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	31	4.88	146/1504	4.54	4.28	4.27	4.13	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	31	4.88	119/1503	4.61	4.32	4.20	4.16	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	31	4.91	131/1290	4.79	4.55	4.28	4.19	4.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	5	25	4.64	300/1453	4.45	4.33	4.21	4.11	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	4	3	7	5	12	3.58	1067/1421	4.18	4.15	4.00	3.91	3.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	7	22	4.47	333/1365	4.25	4.11	4.08	3.96	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	7	24	4.62	339/1485	4.52	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	32	2	4.06	1397/1504	4.34	4.26	4.69	4.66	4.06
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	29	4.91	84/1483	4.43	4.18	4.06	3.97	4.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	33	4.94	107/1425	4.77	4.52	4.41	4.36	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	33	4.97	151/1426	4.88	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	32	4.91	113/1418	4.57	4.38	4.25	4.20	4.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	31	4.88	164/1416	4.81	4.41	4.26	4.21	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	0	3	4	3	18	4.29	471/1199	3.82	3.55	3.97	3.82	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	1	21	4.87	132/1312	4.44	4.01	4.00	3.69	4.87
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	237/1303	4.75	4.24	4.24	3.93	4.87
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	102/1299	4.87	4.46	4.25	3.94	4.96
4. Were special techniques successful	11	15	0	0	4	0	4	4.00	****/ 758	4.54	3.98	4.01	3.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	24	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	10	Under-grad	34	Non-major	34
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PHIL 100 0501
 Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: THOMAS, JAMES
 Enrollment: 49
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1145
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	37	4.88	146/1504	4.54	4.28	4.27	4.13	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	37	4.88	119/1503	4.61	4.32	4.20	4.16	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	40	4.95	66/1290	4.79	4.55	4.28	4.19	4.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	4	5	31	4.68	260/1453	4.45	4.33	4.21	4.11	4.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	4	1	7	4	22	4.03	731/1421	4.18	4.15	4.00	3.91	4.03
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	4	7	29	4.54	274/1365	4.25	4.11	4.08	3.96	4.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	7	34	4.79	170/1485	4.52	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	31	10	4.21	1300/1504	4.34	4.26	4.69	4.66	4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	37	4.93	67/1483	4.43	4.18	4.06	3.97	4.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	39	4.95	90/1425	4.77	4.52	4.41	4.36	4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	37	4.93	401/1426	4.88	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	6	35	4.85	158/1418	4.57	4.38	4.25	4.20	4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	40	4.98	43/1416	4.81	4.41	4.26	4.21	4.98
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	0	1	2	5	26	4.65	189/1199	3.82	3.55	3.97	3.82	4.65
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	2	20	4.78	176/1312	4.44	4.01	4.00	3.69	4.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	1	0	22	4.91	177/1303	4.75	4.24	4.24	3.93	4.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	102/1299	4.87	4.46	4.25	3.94	4.96
4. Were special techniques successful	19	10	1	0	0	2	10	4.54	175/ 758	4.54	3.98	4.01	3.80	4.54
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.50	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.00	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: PHIL 100 0501
 Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: THOMAS, JAMES
 Enrollment: 49
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1145
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	33	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	9	C	0	General	18	Under-grad	41	Non-major	42
84-150	19	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	14	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 100 0701
 Title INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: BERKOVITZ, JOSE
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1146
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	3	12	13	4.36	763/1504	4.54	4.28	4.27	4.13	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	10	16	4.46	556/1503	4.61	4.32	4.20	4.16	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	2	25	4.86	166/1290	4.79	4.55	4.28	4.19	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	18	0	0	3	0	7	4.40	594/1453	4.45	4.33	4.21	4.11	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	5	6	15	4.21	579/1421	4.18	4.15	4.00	3.91	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	21	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	****/1365	4.25	4.11	4.08	3.96	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	9	17	4.50	455/1485	4.52	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	16	12	4.43	1155/1504	4.34	4.26	4.69	4.66	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	6	9	8	4.09	804/1483	4.43	4.18	4.06	3.97	4.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	6	21	4.71	492/1425	4.77	4.52	4.41	4.36	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	525/1426	4.88	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	0	12	14	4.36	754/1418	4.57	4.38	4.25	4.20	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	24	4.86	198/1416	4.81	4.41	4.26	4.21	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	22	0	0	4	0	1	3.40	****/1199	3.82	3.55	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	2	1	4	7	4.14	663/1312	4.44	4.01	4.00	3.69	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	469/1303	4.75	4.24	4.24	3.93	4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	253/1299	4.87	4.46	4.25	3.94	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	16	12	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 758	4.54	3.98	4.01	3.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	18	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	1	B	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	30	Non-major	30
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PHIL 100H 0101
 Title INTRO TO PHIL-HONORS
 Instructor: YALOWITZ, STEVE
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1147
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	0	3	4	4.00	1092/1504	4.00	4.28	4.27	4.13	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	3	4.11	981/1503	4.11	4.32	4.20	4.16	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	588/1290	4.44	4.55	4.28	4.19	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	194/1453	4.75	4.33	4.21	4.11	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	879/1421	3.89	4.15	4.00	3.91	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	451/1365	4.38	4.11	4.08	3.96	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	926/1485	4.11	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.26	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	5	2	4.00	850/1483	4.00	4.18	4.06	3.97	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	209/1425	4.89	4.52	4.41	4.36	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	790/1426	4.78	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	514/1418	4.56	4.38	4.25	4.20	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	296/1416	4.78	4.41	4.26	4.21	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	429/1199	4.33	3.55	3.97	3.82	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	572/1312	4.29	4.01	4.00	3.69	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	776/1303	4.29	4.24	4.24	3.93	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	656/1299	4.43	4.46	4.25	3.94	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 758	****	3.98	4.01	3.80	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHIL 146 0101
 Title CRITICAL THINKING
 Instructor: TEMPLETON, ROYE
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1148
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	1	6	9	4.05	1070/1504	4.03	4.28	4.27	4.13	4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	7	8	4.11	990/1503	4.28	4.32	4.20	4.16	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	4	11	4.26	775/1290	4.50	4.55	4.28	4.19	4.26
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	0	4	11	4.11	679/1421	3.98	4.15	4.00	3.91	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	18	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1365	3.71	4.11	4.08	3.96	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	129/1485	4.90	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.84
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	17	0	3.89	1454/1504	4.02	4.26	4.69	4.66	3.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	2	1	6	3	2	3.14	1358/1483	3.45	4.18	4.06	3.97	3.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	5	12	4.42	876/1425	4.48	4.52	4.41	4.36	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	4	0	14	4.37	1217/1426	4.53	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.37
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	11	6	4.11	981/1418	4.12	4.38	4.25	4.20	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	4	3	6	3	3.11	1318/1416	3.42	4.41	4.26	4.21	3.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	2	5	3	2	1	2.62	1131/1199	2.84	3.55	3.97	3.82	2.62
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	3	4	4	3	3.06	1140/1312	2.97	4.01	4.00	3.69	3.06
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	3	4	3	6	3.59	1101/1303	3.61	4.24	4.24	3.93	3.59
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	3	2	3	4	5	3.35	1149/1299	3.36	4.46	4.25	3.94	3.35
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.07	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.50	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.00	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	5	Under-grad	19	Non-major	17

84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	2
				P	0		
				I	0	Other	2
				?	0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PHIL 146 0201
 Title CRITICAL THINKING
 Instructor: TEMPLETON, ROYE
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1149
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	8	8	4.00	1092/1504	4.03	4.28	4.27	4.13	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	13	4.45	572/1503	4.28	4.32	4.20	4.16	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	18	4.73	280/1290	4.50	4.55	4.28	4.19	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	270/1453	4.67	4.33	4.21	4.11	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	4	3	7	8	3.86	895/1421	3.98	4.15	4.00	3.91	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	1032/1365	3.71	4.11	4.08	3.96	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	49/1485	4.90	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	13	6	4.14	1360/1504	4.02	4.26	4.69	4.66	4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	1	0	5	7	4	3.76	1117/1483	3.45	4.18	4.06	3.97	3.76
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	0	4	16	4.55	736/1425	4.48	4.52	4.41	4.36	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	1	18	4.68	940/1426	4.53	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	4	5	11	4.14	955/1418	4.12	4.38	4.25	4.20	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	4	6	8	3.73	1180/1416	3.42	4.41	4.26	4.21	3.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	3	3	3	2	4	3.07	1045/1199	2.84	3.55	3.97	3.82	3.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	4	6	2	2	2.88	1190/1312	2.97	4.01	4.00	3.69	2.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	2	4	4	5	3.63	1089/1303	3.61	4.24	4.24	3.93	3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	3	5	3	4	3.38	1145/1299	3.36	4.46	4.25	3.94	3.38
4. Were special techniques successful	6	12	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 758	****	3.98	4.01	3.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	5	General	3	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	2						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 150 0101
 Title CONTEMPORARY MORAL ISS
 Instructor: DWYER, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1150
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	376/1504	4.54	4.28	4.27	4.13	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	403/1503	4.79	4.32	4.20	4.16	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	300/1290	4.69	4.55	4.28	4.19	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	656/1453	4.33	4.33	4.21	4.11	4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	3	10	4.35	459/1421	4.43	4.15	4.00	3.91	4.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	4	6	6	4.00	782/1365	4.11	4.11	4.08	3.96	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	433/1485	4.61	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	14	3	4.18	1330/1504	4.36	4.26	4.69	4.66	4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	258/1483	4.62	4.18	4.06	3.97	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	209/1425	4.86	4.52	4.41	4.36	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.56	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	402/1418	4.79	4.38	4.25	4.20	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	394/1416	4.78	4.41	4.26	4.21	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	0	4	5	6	3.94	714/1199	4.15	3.55	3.97	3.82	3.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	2	6	5	4.07	697/1312	4.01	4.01	4.00	3.69	4.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	719/1303	4.24	4.24	4.24	3.93	4.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	323/1299	4.75	4.46	4.25	3.94	4.79
4. Were special techniques successful	5	11	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 758	3.60	3.98	4.01	3.80	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHIL 150 0201
 Title CONTEMPORARY MORAL ISS
 Instructor: DWYER, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1151
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	482/1504	4.54	4.28	4.27	4.13	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	64/1503	4.79	4.32	4.20	4.16	4.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	311/1290	4.69	4.55	4.28	4.19	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	7	9	4.26	764/1453	4.33	4.33	4.21	4.11	4.26
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	7	10	4.35	459/1421	4.43	4.15	4.00	3.91	4.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	9	7	4.15	681/1365	4.11	4.11	4.08	3.96	4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	319/1485	4.61	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	11	8	4.35	1207/1504	4.36	4.26	4.69	4.66	4.35
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	180/1483	4.62	4.18	4.06	3.97	4.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	107/1425	4.86	4.52	4.41	4.36	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.56	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	139/1418	4.79	4.38	4.25	4.20	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	164/1416	4.78	4.41	4.26	4.21	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	412/1199	4.15	3.55	3.97	3.82	4.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	7	9	4.15	657/1312	4.01	4.01	4.00	3.69	4.15
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	0	5	14	4.55	535/1303	4.24	4.24	4.24	3.93	4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	354/1299	4.75	4.46	4.25	3.94	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	0	9	2	0	3	3	3	3.45	597/ 758	3.60	3.98	4.01	3.80	3.45
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	4.50	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	4.00	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: PHIL 150 0201
 Title CONTEMPORARY MORAL ISS
 Instructor: DWYER, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1151
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	4						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	2	General	5	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	2						

Course-Section: PHIL 150 0301
 Title CONTEMPORARY MORAL ISS
 Instructor: DWYER, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1152
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	684/1504	4.54	4.28	4.27	4.13	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	151/1503	4.79	4.32	4.20	4.16	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	344/1290	4.69	4.55	4.28	4.19	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	643/1453	4.33	4.33	4.21	4.11	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	261/1421	4.43	4.15	4.00	3.91	4.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	6	5	4.17	672/1365	4.11	4.11	4.08	3.96	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	290/1485	4.61	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	1064/1504	4.36	4.26	4.69	4.66	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	298/1483	4.62	4.18	4.06	3.97	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	420/1425	4.86	4.52	4.41	4.36	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.56	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	171/1418	4.79	4.38	4.25	4.20	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	324/1416	4.78	4.41	4.26	4.21	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	561/1199	4.15	3.55	3.97	3.82	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	1	1	6	3.82	870/1312	4.01	4.01	4.00	3.69	3.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	1	1	0	7	3.82	1028/1303	4.24	4.24	4.24	3.93	3.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	385/1299	4.75	4.46	4.25	3.94	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	2	7	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	508/ 758	3.60	3.98	4.01	3.80	3.75

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	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	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 152 0301
 Title INTRO TO MORAL THEORY
 Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1153
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	522/1504	4.47	4.28	4.27	4.13	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	414/1503	4.46	4.32	4.20	4.16	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	15	4.58	440/1290	4.59	4.55	4.28	4.19	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	1	2	4	7	4.00	1001/1453	4.32	4.33	4.21	4.11	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	3	12	4.37	449/1421	4.19	4.15	4.00	3.91	4.37
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	2	6	3	5	3.69	1052/1365	4.08	4.11	4.08	3.96	3.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	6	9	4.26	750/1485	4.28	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	15	3	4.17	1337/1504	4.32	4.26	4.69	4.66	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	6	10	4.37	506/1483	4.36	4.18	4.06	3.97	4.37
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	818/1425	4.45	4.52	4.41	4.36	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	301/1426	4.91	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	552/1418	4.51	4.38	4.25	4.20	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	2	14	4.47	662/1416	4.64	4.41	4.26	4.21	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	5	0	3	0	3	2.64	1129/1199	2.57	3.55	3.97	3.82	2.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	689/1312	4.13	4.01	4.00	3.69	4.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	563/1303	4.43	4.24	4.24	3.93	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	504/1299	4.60	4.46	4.25	3.94	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	9	8	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 758	****	3.98	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.07	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHIL 152 0401
 Title INTRO TO MORAL THEORY
 Instructor: Huckfeldt, Vaug
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1154
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	12	14	4.43	669/1504	4.47	4.28	4.27	4.13	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	10	15	4.43	618/1503	4.46	4.32	4.20	4.16	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	19	4.57	440/1290	4.59	4.55	4.28	4.19	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	9	14	4.29	741/1453	4.32	4.33	4.21	4.11	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	2	9	14	4.21	579/1421	4.19	4.15	4.00	3.91	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	6	11	10	4.15	690/1365	4.08	4.11	4.08	3.96	4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	10	13	4.25	761/1485	4.28	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	27	1	4.04	1402/1504	4.32	4.26	4.69	4.66	4.04
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	3	14	8	4.20	700/1483	4.36	4.18	4.06	3.97	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	13	13	4.44	853/1425	4.45	4.52	4.41	4.36	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	6	21	4.78	790/1426	4.91	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	12	14	4.48	604/1418	4.51	4.38	4.25	4.20	4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	9	16	4.58	554/1416	4.64	4.41	4.26	4.21	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	18	3	1	2	1	1	2.50	1138/1199	2.57	3.55	3.97	3.82	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	4	6	5	3.76	897/1312	4.13	4.01	4.00	3.69	3.76
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	4	3	9	4.18	845/1303	4.43	4.24	4.24	3.93	4.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	3	1	12	4.41	667/1299	4.60	4.46	4.25	3.94	4.41
4. Were special techniques successful	11	13	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	****/ 758	****	3.98	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.07	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.50	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.00	4.17	3.83	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A 16	Required for Majors 15	Graduate	0	Major	1	
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C 1	General	6	Under-grad	28	Non-major	27
84-150	3	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	5				
				? 0						

Course-Section: PHIL 152 0501
 Title INTRO TO MORAL THEORY
 Instructor: EALICK, GREG E.
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1155
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	10	11	4.45	624/1504	4.47	4.28	4.27	4.13	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	0	8	12	4.36	707/1503	4.46	4.32	4.20	4.16	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	400/1290	4.59	4.55	4.28	4.19	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	0	4	16	4.67	270/1453	4.32	4.33	4.21	4.11	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	4	6	9	4.00	745/1421	4.19	4.15	4.00	3.91	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	1	7	11	4.40	420/1365	4.08	4.11	4.08	3.96	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	5	4	12	4.33	670/1485	4.28	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	891/1504	4.32	4.26	4.69	4.66	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	338/1483	4.36	4.18	4.06	3.97	4.50

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	0	8	12	4.43	876/1425	4.45	4.52	4.41	4.36	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1426	4.91	4.72	4.69	4.56	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	8	12	4.52	552/1418	4.51	4.38	4.25	4.20	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	198/1416	4.64	4.41	4.26	4.21	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	16	1	3	0	1	0	2.20	****/1199	2.57	3.55	3.97	3.82	****

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	343/1312	4.13	4.01	4.00	3.69	4.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	507/1303	4.43	4.24	4.24	3.93	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	303/1299	4.60	4.46	4.25	3.94	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	8	10	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	****/ 758	****	3.98	4.01	3.80	****

Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.50	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.00	4.17	3.83	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	3	General	8	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	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	3				
				?	0						

Title

Baltimore County

JUN 14, 2005

Instructor: THOMAS, JAMES

Spring 2005

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 23

Questionnaires: 19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	79/1504	4.95	4.28	4.27	4.13	4.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	290/1503	4.68	4.32	4.20	4.16	4.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	92/1290	4.93	4.55	4.28	4.19	4.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	61/1453	4.95	4.33	4.21	4.11	4.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	0	1	12	4.00	745/1421	4.00	4.15	4.00	3.91	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	52/1365	4.94	4.11	4.08	3.96	4.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	190/1485	4.76	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	16	2	4.11	1376/1504	4.11	4.26	4.69	4.66	4.11
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	143/1483	4.76	4.18	4.06	3.97	4.76
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	107/1425	4.95	4.52	4.41	4.36	4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.56	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	165/1418	4.84	4.38	4.25	4.20	4.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.41	4.26	4.21	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	2	1	0	4	7	3.93	725/1199	3.93	3.55	3.97	3.82	3.93
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	189/1312	4.77	4.01	4.00	3.69	4.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	157/1303	4.92	4.24	4.24	3.93	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	182/1299	4.92	4.46	4.25	3.94	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	6	9	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 758	****	3.98	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.50	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.00	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: PHIL 152H 0101
 Title
 Instructor: THOMAS, JAMES
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1156
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 210 0101
 Title PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION
 Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1157
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	2	1	9	12	4.16	991/1504	4.16	4.28	4.27	4.26	4.16
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	0	1	9	12	4.08	1002/1503	4.08	4.32	4.20	4.18	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	7	14	4.28	758/1290	4.28	4.55	4.28	4.27	4.28
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	4	8	12	4.20	844/1453	4.20	4.33	4.21	4.20	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	7	15	4.48	338/1421	4.48	4.15	4.00	3.90	4.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	10	13	4.40	420/1365	4.40	4.11	4.08	4.00	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	2	7	9	4	3.36	1322/1485	3.36	4.32	4.16	4.15	3.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	18	6	4.20	1314/1504	4.20	4.26	4.69	4.68	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	0	3	11	5	3.95	919/1483	3.95	4.18	4.06	4.02	3.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	3	4	6	10	4.00	1165/1425	4.00	4.52	4.41	4.40	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	451/1426	4.91	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	3	0	10	9	4.00	1013/1418	4.00	4.38	4.25	4.22	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	3	7	10	3.96	1064/1416	3.96	4.41	4.26	4.24	3.96
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	15	3	0	1	1	3	3.13	1037/1199	3.13	3.55	3.97	3.95	3.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	3	0	2	2	9	3.88	832/1312	3.88	4.01	4.00	3.98	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	3	0	0	6	7	3.88	1004/1303	3.88	4.24	4.24	4.23	3.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	3	3	9	4.25	798/1299	4.25	4.46	4.25	4.21	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	10	12	3	0	0	0	1	2.00	****/ 758	****	3.98	4.01	3.89	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	10	Under-grad	26	Non-major	23
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 248 0101
 Title INTRO SCIENTIF REASONI
 Instructor: PFEIFER, JESSIC
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1158
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	8	7	4.24	914/1504	4.24	4.28	4.27	4.26	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	268/1503	4.71	4.32	4.20	4.18	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	194/1290	4.81	4.55	4.28	4.27	4.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	418/1453	4.53	4.33	4.21	4.20	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	3	3	9	4.00	745/1421	4.00	4.15	4.00	3.90	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	407/1365	4.41	4.11	4.08	4.00	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	68/1485	4.94	4.32	4.16	4.15	4.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	8	4.47	1112/1504	4.47	4.26	4.69	4.68	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	580/1483	4.30	4.18	4.06	4.02	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	224/1425	4.88	4.52	4.41	4.40	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	351/1426	4.94	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	88/1418	4.94	4.38	4.25	4.22	4.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	175/1416	4.88	4.41	4.26	4.24	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	0	2	1	1	5	4.00	636/1199	4.00	3.55	3.97	3.95	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	444/1312	4.43	4.01	4.00	3.98	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.24	4.24	4.23	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	253/1299	4.86	4.46	4.25	4.21	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	185/ 758	4.50	3.98	4.01	3.89	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 248H 0101
 Title
 Instructor: PFEIFER, JESSIC
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1159
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	1204/1504	3.89	4.28	4.27	4.26	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	981/1503	4.11	4.32	4.20	4.18	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	389/1290	4.63	4.55	4.28	4.27	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	440/1453	4.50	4.33	4.21	4.20	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	745/1421	4.00	4.15	4.00	3.90	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	988/1365	3.78	4.11	4.08	4.00	3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	536/1485	4.44	4.32	4.16	4.15	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	6	2	4.00	1411/1504	4.00	4.26	4.69	4.68	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	493/1483	4.38	4.18	4.06	4.02	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	724/1425	4.56	4.52	4.41	4.40	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	790/1426	4.78	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	656/1418	4.44	4.38	4.25	4.22	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	574/1416	4.56	4.41	4.26	4.24	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1050/1199	3.00	3.55	3.97	3.95	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	826/1312	3.89	4.01	4.00	3.98	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	450/1303	4.67	4.24	4.24	4.23	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	445/1299	4.67	4.46	4.25	4.21	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	343/ 758	4.17	3.98	4.01	3.89	4.17

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHIL 251 0101
 Title ETH ISS SCI ENG&INF TE
 Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1160
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5							
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	1	4	8	7	3.90	1194/1504	3.90	4.28	4.27	4.26	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	4	4	4	9	3.73	1221/1503	3.73	4.32	4.20	4.18	3.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	8	4	7	3.64	1120/1290	3.64	4.55	4.28	4.27	3.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	1	3	7	9	4.05	979/1453	4.05	4.33	4.21	4.20	4.05
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	14	0	2	2	2	2	3.50	1113/1421	3.50	4.15	4.00	3.90	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	6	6	7	3.86	935/1365	3.86	4.11	4.08	4.00	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	4	2	7	2	7	3.27	1344/1485	3.27	4.32	4.16	4.15	3.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	15	6	4.29	1255/1504	4.29	4.26	4.69	4.68	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	2	5	4	6	3.82	1072/1483	3.82	4.18	4.06	4.02	3.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	4	2	4	7	3	3.15	1360/1425	3.15	4.52	4.41	4.40	3.15
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	3	4	12	4.35	1222/1426	4.35	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.35
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	2	0	4	8	5	3.74	1172/1418	3.74	4.38	4.25	4.22	3.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	2	4	5	7	3.65	1202/1416	3.65	4.41	4.26	4.24	3.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	5	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	636/1199	4.00	3.55	3.97	3.95	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	572/1312	4.29	4.01	4.00	3.98	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	450/1303	4.67	4.24	4.24	4.23	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	445/1299	4.67	4.46	4.25	4.21	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	17	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	273/ 758	4.33	3.98	4.01	3.89	4.33
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	8	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 322 0101
 Title HIST OF PHIL:MODERN
 Instructor: Ribeiro, Anna
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1161
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	3	7	8	6	3.50	1353/1504	3.50	4.28	4.27	4.27	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	10	6	6	3.50	1304/1503	3.50	4.32	4.20	4.22	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	11	5	8	3.73	1085/1290	3.73	4.55	4.28	4.31	3.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	3	5	2	2	3.25	1366/1453	3.25	4.33	4.21	4.23	3.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	5	7	10	3.85	911/1421	3.85	4.15	4.00	4.01	3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	20	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	****/1365	****	4.11	4.08	4.08	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	5	9	10	4.00	990/1485	4.00	4.32	4.16	4.17	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	5	21	0	3.81	1461/1504	3.81	4.26	4.69	4.65	3.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	2	3	13	7	0	3.00	1379/1483	3.00	4.18	4.06	4.08	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	5	12	6	3.88	1227/1425	3.88	4.52	4.41	4.43	3.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	2	6	6	10	4.00	1319/1426	4.00	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	3	9	7	4	3.32	1297/1418	3.32	4.38	4.25	4.26	3.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	7	3	6	6	3.20	1304/1416	3.20	4.41	4.26	4.27	3.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	19	2	1	0	0	1	2.25	****/1199	****	3.55	3.97	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	4	3	2	3.27	1087/1312	3.27	4.01	4.00	4.09	3.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	992/1303	3.91	4.24	4.24	4.27	3.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	899/1299	4.09	4.46	4.25	4.30	4.09
4. Were special techniques successful	15	10	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 758	****	3.98	4.01	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	6	C	11	General	0	Under-grad	26	Non-major	13
84-150	16	3.00-3.49	4	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	20				
				?	2						

Course-Section: PHIL 322H 0101
 Title HIST OF PHIL:MODERN
 Instructor: Ribeiro, Anna
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1162
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1453/1504	3.00	4.28	4.27	4.27	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1419/1503	3.00	4.32	4.20	4.22	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1193/1290	3.33	4.55	4.28	4.31	3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1282/1453	3.50	4.33	4.21	4.23	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	745/1421	4.00	4.15	4.00	4.01	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1296/1365	3.00	4.11	4.08	4.08	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1330/1485	3.33	4.32	4.16	4.17	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1493/1504	3.00	4.26	4.69	4.65	3.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1379/1483	3.00	4.18	4.06	4.08	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1278/1425	3.67	4.52	4.41	4.43	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	1417/1426	2.67	4.72	4.69	4.71	2.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1330/1418	3.00	4.38	4.25	4.26	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	1324/1416	3.00	4.41	4.26	4.27	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1288/1312	2.00	4.01	4.00	4.09	2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1297/1303	1.00	4.24	4.24	4.27	1.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1194/1299	3.00	4.46	4.25	4.30	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHIL 346 0101
 Title DEDUCTIVE SYSTEMS
 Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 56
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1163
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	5	5	23	4.44	639/1504	4.44	4.28	4.27	4.27	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	25	4.62	368/1503	4.62	4.32	4.20	4.22	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	2	4	25	4.74	260/1290	4.74	4.55	4.28	4.31	4.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	18	0	0	5	3	8	4.19	855/1453	4.19	4.33	4.21	4.23	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	7	6	14	4.14	642/1421	4.14	4.15	4.00	4.01	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	19	1	0	6	2	5	3.71	1032/1365	3.71	4.11	4.08	4.08	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	6	8	16	4.03	979/1485	4.03	4.32	4.16	4.17	4.03
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	21	13	4.38	1186/1504	4.38	4.26	4.69	4.65	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	2	9	16	4.43	433/1483	4.43	4.18	4.06	4.08	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	2	13	17	4.32	981/1425	4.32	4.52	4.41	4.43	4.32
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	5	28	4.79	755/1426	4.79	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	11	20	4.50	578/1418	4.50	4.38	4.25	4.26	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	4	26	4.65	472/1416	4.65	4.41	4.26	4.27	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	18	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	359/1199	4.42	3.55	3.97	4.02	4.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	0	1	0	6	4.25	****/1312	****	4.01	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	****/1303	****	4.24	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	0	1	1	0	6	4.38	****/1299	****	4.46	4.25	4.30	****
4. Were special techniques successful	27	3	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 758	****	3.98	4.01	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	22	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	4	Under-grad	34	Non-major	27
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PHIL 356 0101
 Title PHILOSOPHY OF LAW
 Instructor: MCCABE, MATTHEW
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1164
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	10	13	4.26	889/1504	4.26	4.28	4.27	4.27	4.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	10	14	4.33	751/1503	4.33	4.32	4.20	4.22	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	20	4.74	260/1290	4.74	4.55	4.28	4.31	4.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	10	11	4.45	517/1453	4.45	4.33	4.21	4.23	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	7	17	4.52	312/1421	4.52	4.15	4.00	4.01	4.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	1	2	2	2	9	4.00	782/1365	4.00	4.11	4.08	4.08	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	9	18	4.67	290/1485	4.67	4.32	4.16	4.17	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	263/1504	4.96	4.26	4.69	4.65	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	0	11	12	4.38	493/1483	4.38	4.18	4.06	4.08	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	0	1	23	4.80	331/1425	4.80	4.52	4.41	4.43	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	2	22	4.80	738/1426	4.80	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	5	19	4.79	205/1418	4.79	4.38	4.25	4.26	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	5	19	4.64	472/1416	4.64	4.41	4.26	4.27	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	15	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	455/1199	4.30	3.55	3.97	4.02	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	0	5	15	4.45	414/1312	4.45	4.01	4.00	4.09	4.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	2	4	15	4.50	563/1303	4.50	4.24	4.24	4.27	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	425/1299	4.68	4.46	4.25	4.30	4.68
4. Were special techniques successful	5	14	1	0	0	4	3	4.00	387/ 758	4.00	3.98	4.01	4.00	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.24	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.50	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.00	4.17	4.25	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	1	Major	5
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	9	Under-grad	26	Non-major	22
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PHIL 358 0101
 Title BIOETHICS
 Instructor: MCCABE, MATTHEW
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1165
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.28	4.27	4.27	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	268/1503	4.71	4.32	4.20	4.22	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	166/1290	4.86	4.55	4.28	4.31	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	118/1453	4.88	4.33	4.21	4.23	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	0	14	4.53	305/1421	4.53	4.15	4.00	4.01	4.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	97/1365	4.87	4.11	4.08	4.08	4.87
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	108/1485	4.88	4.32	4.16	4.17	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	6	9	2	3.76	1465/1504	3.76	4.26	4.69	4.65	3.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	314/1483	4.54	4.18	4.06	4.08	4.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	107/1425	4.94	4.52	4.41	4.43	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	301/1426	4.94	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	191/1418	4.80	4.38	4.25	4.26	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	232/1416	4.82	4.41	4.26	4.27	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	14	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1199	****	3.55	3.97	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	215/1312	4.73	4.01	4.00	4.09	4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.24	4.24	4.27	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	293/1299	4.82	4.46	4.25	4.30	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	7	7	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 758	****	3.98	4.01	4.00	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	4.00	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	17	Non-major	13
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PHIL 368 0101
 Title AESTHETICS
 Instructor: Ribeiro, Anna
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1166
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	763/1504	4.36	4.28	4.27	4.27	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	7	0	3.40	1349/1503	3.40	4.32	4.20	4.22	3.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	775/1290	4.27	4.55	4.28	4.31	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	4	5	3	3.77	1186/1453	3.77	4.33	4.21	4.23	3.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	4	9	4.33	479/1421	4.33	4.15	4.00	4.01	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	3	6	3	3.57	1118/1365	3.57	4.11	4.08	4.08	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	8	2	3.80	1146/1485	3.80	4.32	4.16	4.17	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	12	2	4.00	1411/1504	4.00	4.26	4.69	4.65	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	7	5	1	3.54	1222/1483	3.54	4.18	4.06	4.08	3.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	2	3	7	4.07	1139/1425	4.07	4.52	4.41	4.43	4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	967/1426	4.67	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	6	6	3	3.80	1141/1418	3.80	4.38	4.25	4.26	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	5	6	3.93	1078/1416	3.93	4.41	4.26	4.27	3.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	2	1	1	0	0	1.75	1187/1199	1.75	3.55	3.97	4.02	1.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	512/1312	4.36	4.01	4.00	4.09	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	719/1303	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.27	4.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	395/1299	4.71	4.46	4.25	4.30	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	1	10	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	648/ 758	3.25	3.98	4.01	4.00	3.25
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.20	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.52	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	7
					Under-grad 15
					Major 4
					Non-major 11

84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2
				P	1		
				I	0	Other	4
				?	0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PHIL 372 0101
 Title PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE
 Instructor: PFEIFER, JESSIC
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1167
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	509/1504	4.54	4.28	4.27	4.27	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	95/1503	4.92	4.32	4.20	4.22	4.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.55	4.28	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	320/1453	4.62	4.33	4.21	4.23	4.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	5	3	3.85	911/1421	3.85	4.15	4.00	4.01	3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	346/1365	4.46	4.11	4.08	4.08	4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	339/1485	4.62	4.32	4.16	4.17	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	3	4.23	1287/1504	4.23	4.26	4.69	4.65	4.23
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	397/1483	4.45	4.18	4.06	4.08	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	143/1425	4.92	4.52	4.41	4.43	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	401/1426	4.92	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	438/1418	4.62	4.38	4.25	4.26	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.41	4.26	4.27	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1199	****	3.55	3.97	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	651/1312	4.17	4.01	4.00	4.09	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	910/1303	4.00	4.24	4.24	4.27	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.46	4.25	4.30	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 758	****	3.98	4.01	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	13	Non-major	9
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PHIL 391 0101
 Title PHILOSOPHY OF SEX
 Instructor: TEMPLETON, ROYE
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1168
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	4	4	4	10	3.91	1194/1504	3.91	4.28	4.27	4.27	3.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	6	4	4	7	3.45	1326/1503	3.45	4.32	4.20	4.22	3.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	5	5	5	6	3.45	1165/1290	3.45	4.55	4.28	4.31	3.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	3	6	3	4	3.35	1344/1453	3.35	4.33	4.21	4.23	3.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	7	7	8	4.05	718/1421	4.05	4.15	4.00	4.01	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	3	7	1	6	3.32	1232/1365	3.32	4.11	4.08	4.08	3.32
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	3	13	4.27	738/1485	4.27	4.32	4.16	4.17	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	9	13	0	3.59	1474/1504	3.59	4.26	4.69	4.65	3.59
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	3	3	5	6	3.53	1225/1483	3.53	4.18	4.06	4.08	3.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	541/1425	4.68	4.52	4.41	4.43	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	2	3	14	4.33	1232/1426	4.33	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	1	5	3	11	3.91	1098/1418	3.91	4.38	4.25	4.26	3.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	6	0	2	7	6	3.33	1281/1416	3.33	4.41	4.26	4.27	3.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	4	2	4	4	7	3.38	970/1199	3.38	3.55	3.97	4.02	3.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	12	2	4	0	0	1.56	1304/1312	1.56	4.01	4.00	4.09	1.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	8	5	5	0	0	1.83	1287/1303	1.83	4.24	4.24	4.27	1.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	9	1	5	3	0	2.11	1271/1299	2.11	4.46	4.25	4.30	2.11

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	8	General	14	Under-grad	22	Non-major	19
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	2						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 452 0101
 Title ADV TOPICS IN ETHICS
 Instructor: DWYER, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1169
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	1	4	11	4.28	864/1504	4.28	4.28	4.27	4.33	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	541/1503	4.47	4.32	4.20	4.18	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	12	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.55	4.28	4.32	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	2	12	4.47	486/1453	4.47	4.33	4.21	4.22	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	3	11	4.29	516/1421	4.29	4.15	4.00	4.02	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	2	11	4.35	472/1365	4.35	4.11	4.08	4.09	4.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	3	2	10	4.18	854/1485	4.18	4.32	4.16	4.14	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	9	8	4.47	1112/1504	4.47	4.26	4.69	4.73	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	2	1	12	4.44	421/1483	4.44	4.18	4.06	4.11	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	7	10	4.44	853/1425	4.44	4.52	4.41	4.38	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	0	17	4.83	667/1426	4.83	4.72	4.69	4.72	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	5	12	4.56	514/1418	4.56	4.38	4.25	4.25	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	3	14	4.61	511/1416	4.61	4.41	4.26	4.26	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	17	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1199	****	3.55	3.97	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	2	12	4.60	297/1312	4.60	4.01	4.00	4.07	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	0	0	14	4.80	299/1303	4.80	4.24	4.24	4.34	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	0	2	12	4.60	504/1299	4.60	4.46	4.25	4.38	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	4	12	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 758	****	3.98	4.01	4.17	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.50	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.00	4.17	4.29	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	8	Under-grad	19	Non-major	9
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	2						

Course-Section: PHIL 454 0101
 Title ANIMALS & THE ENVRNMNT
 Instructor: VOELLER, CAROL
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1170
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	5	2	3.58	1328/1504	3.58	4.28	4.27	4.33	3.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	4	2	3.58	1278/1503	3.58	4.32	4.20	4.18	3.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	507/1290	4.50	4.55	4.28	4.32	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	1	7	4.17	878/1453	4.17	4.33	4.21	4.22	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	685/1421	4.09	4.15	4.00	4.02	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	462/1365	4.36	4.11	4.08	4.09	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	8	0	2	3.27	1344/1485	3.27	4.32	4.16	4.14	3.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	1200/1504	4.36	4.26	4.69	4.73	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	3	6	2	3.75	1123/1483	3.75	4.18	4.06	4.11	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	3	5	2	3.58	1294/1425	3.58	4.52	4.41	4.38	3.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	667/1426	4.83	4.72	4.69	4.72	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	6	2	3.75	1163/1418	3.75	4.38	4.25	4.25	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	6	5	4.25	871/1416	4.25	4.41	4.26	4.26	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1199	****	3.55	3.97	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	638/1312	4.18	4.01	4.00	4.07	4.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	288/1303	4.82	4.24	4.24	4.34	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	203/1299	4.91	4.46	4.25	4.38	4.91
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	1	3	4	3	3.82	493/ 758	3.82	3.98	4.01	4.17	3.82

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHIL 471 0101
 Title FREEDOM, DETERMINISM, RE
 Instructor: YALOWITZ, STEVE
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1171
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	669/1504	4.43	4.28	4.27	4.33	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	618/1503	4.43	4.32	4.20	4.18	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	166/1290	4.86	4.55	4.28	4.32	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	363/1453	4.57	4.33	4.21	4.22	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	524/1421	4.29	4.15	4.00	4.02	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	645/1365	4.20	4.11	4.08	4.09	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	240/1485	4.71	4.32	4.16	4.14	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.26	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	173/1483	4.71	4.18	4.06	4.11	4.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.52	4.41	4.38	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	895/1426	4.71	4.72	4.69	4.72	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	158/1418	4.86	4.38	4.25	4.25	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	380/1416	4.71	4.41	4.26	4.26	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1199	****	3.55	3.97	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	221/1312	4.71	4.01	4.00	4.07	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	401/1303	4.71	4.24	4.24	4.34	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	395/1299	4.71	4.46	4.25	4.38	4.71

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	7	Non-major	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	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	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHIL 472 0101
 Title ADV TOP:PHIL OF SCIENC
 Instructor: BERKOVITZ, JOSE
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1172
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	396/1504	4.63	4.28	4.27	4.33	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	125/1503	4.88	4.32	4.20	4.18	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.55	4.28	4.32	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.33	4.21	4.22	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	548/1421	4.25	4.15	4.00	4.02	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1365	****	4.11	4.08	4.09	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	761/1485	4.25	4.32	4.16	4.14	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	891/1504	4.75	4.26	4.69	4.73	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	338/1483	4.50	4.18	4.06	4.11	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	634/1425	4.63	4.52	4.41	4.38	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	736/1418	4.38	4.38	4.25	4.25	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	324/1416	4.75	4.41	4.26	4.26	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	987/1199	3.33	3.55	3.97	4.05	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	716/1312	4.00	4.01	4.00	4.07	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	2	0	1	3	3.83	1020/1303	3.83	4.24	4.24	4.34	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	741/1299	4.33	4.46	4.25	4.38	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 758	****	3.98	4.01	4.17	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	5.00	4.61	4.63	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	46/ 76	4.50	4.50	4.44	4.51	4.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	44/ 73	4.00	4.00	4.17	4.29	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	8	Non-major	3
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	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	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: phil 399
 Title philosophy of humor
 Instructor: thomas, james
 Enrollment: 0
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 2
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	5	25	4.66	367/1504	****	4.90	4.27	4.13	4.66
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	26	4.78	190/1503	****	4.91	4.20	4.16	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	4	25	4.86	159/1290	****	4.92	4.28	4.19	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	6	24	4.71	230/1453	****	4.87	4.21	4.11	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	7	20	4.41	410/1421	****	4.79	4.00	3.91	4.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	6	24	4.74	144/1365	****	4.75	4.08	3.96	4.74
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	4	25	4.71	251/1485	****	4.74	4.16	4.13	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	18	12	4.35	1207/1504	****	4.73	4.69	4.66	4.35
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	0	2	1	25	4.69	195/1483	****	4.33	4.06	3.97	4.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	26	4.84	285/1425	****	4.93	4.41	4.36	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	28	4.90	502/1426	****	4.99	4.69	4.56	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	26	4.81	191/1418	****	4.91	4.25	4.20	4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	28	4.87	175/1416	****	4.95	4.26	4.21	4.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	1	29	4.87	85/1199	****	4.88	3.97	3.82	4.87
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	1	1	15	4.67	255/1312	****	4.78	4.00	3.69	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	118/1303	****	4.90	4.24	3.93	4.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	273/1299	****	4.91	4.25	3.94	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	14	8	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	62/ 758	****	4.98	4.01	3.80	4.90

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	25	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	20	Under-grad	32	Non-major	32
84-150	21	3.00-3.49	12	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	1						