



201408-PHIL347-0101-PHILOSOPHY OF LAW - Cindy Phillips - Instructor Report - (Instructor View) Fall 2014

University of Maryland Course Evaluation Fall 2014

Number of Students Enrolled: 27

Number of Evaluations Submitted: 18

Response Rate: 66.7%

Subject Details

DIVISION_SD ARHU

DEPARTMENT ARHU-Philosophy

Report Comments

This report presents feedback received from students for the course **201408-PHIL347-0101-PHILOSOPHY OF LAW** and for the Instructor **Cindy Phillips** in that course. Course means are provided as well as department, college, and college course-level means (e.g., all 200-level courses in a college). Means are calculated from all responses by all students in the unit (i.e., course section, department, college, course-level in a college) on that item and exclude NA/not applicable responses. A grade table is included on the next page.

Indication is provided below for the Large Lecture Group if there is one affiliated with this course section.

Semester: 201408

Course #: PHIL347

Section #: 101

Course Name: 201408-PHIL347-0101-PHILOSOPHY OF LAW

Large Lecture Group: No Large Lecture Designation

Instructor: Cindy Phillips

Creation Date Wed, Jan 21, 2015

Technology powered by blue 

[Download PDF](#)

Grade Distribution:

Student Count	Grade A	Grade B	Grade C	Grade D	Grade F	Grade PS	Grade W
27	9	13	4	0	1	0	0

Grade distribution is current as of January 8, 2015 and includes students receiving a W for the course. Some grades are not included (e.g., Cancel, Incomplete). Student Count reflects total enrollment as of September 23, 2014 and includes any students auditing the course.

Administrator University-Wide Course Items Applied to All Section Instructors

Results for use by faculty/instructors and for administrative purposes.
N/A responses have been excluded from the following calculations.

By Score

Scale is Strongly Disagree (0) to Strongly Agree (4) with a Neutral mid-point

Question	Course	Department	College	Course Level
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
The course was intellectually challenging.	3.72	3.21	3.08	3.07
I learned a lot from this course.	3.50	3.03	3.12	3.10
Overall	3.61	3.12	3.10	3.09

By Frequency

1. The course was intellectually challenging.

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	0	0	0.0%
Disagree	1	0	0.0%
Neutral	2	0	0.0%
Agree	3	5	27.8%
Strongly Agree	4	13	72.2%

Statistics	Value
Response Count	18
Mean	3.72
Standard Deviation	+/-0.46

2. I learned a lot from this course.

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	0	0	0.0%
Disagree	1	0	0.0%
Neutral	2	0	0.0%
Agree	3	9	50.0%
Strongly Agree	4	9	50.0%

Statistics	Value
Response Count	18
Mean	3.50
Standard Deviation	+/-0.51

How does this course fit into your academic plan or course of study?

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
General Education or CORE Requirement	0	5	27.8%
Major/Certificate/Minor/Program Requirement	1	9	50.0%
Elective	2	4	22.2%

Additional comments (e.g., about course content/materials, teaching style, etc.):

Comment
<p>A few bad-eggs brought the content and level of discourse in class discussions to pretty low levels. It was often not worth going to class because the professor would allow for some students (who spoke very poorly and often added non-sequitor commentary) to speak, preventing me from really learning during class.</p> <p>Cindy's teaching style was awesome. She never just lectured our ears off - she had a power point with a few key words from the readings and then explained in her own words to help with the sense reading materials - then always had an open discussion with the class. The materials were dense but she made it learnable and actually enjoyable. The course seemed like it was going to be super hard and boring - it was challenging but nothing too over the top and it was the opposite of boring because of her. I only missed 2 classes bc of critical doctors appointments.. And I was sad about</p>

missing them too.

While the courseload was appropriate for the course level, it seemed very overwhelming for those who have not taken many philosophy courses (I am of those people). However, Cindy made the information very easy to comprehend.

I really enjoyed the discussions and the way that Cindy helped the class understand the material, without sacrificing the students' own philosophical exploration to understand the philosophical law theories. The material covered was very illuminating and offered an in depth exploration of the foundation and application of law and government. I think this course allowed a complete understanding of the relevant philosophies, however, taught students how to question and philosophically debate even the most widely accepted political philosophies.

Fun Class.

Cindy is cool

Administrator University-Wide Instructor **Cindy Phillips** Items

Results for use by faculty/instructors and for administrative purposes.
N/A responses have been excluded from the following calculations.

By Score

Scale is Strongly Disagree (0) to Strongly Agree (4) with a Neutral mid-point

Question	Course	Department	College	Course Level	
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
The instructor treated students with respect.	3.83	3.45	3.55	3.53	
The instructor was well-prepared for class.	3.89	3.46	3.48	3.42	
Overall, this instructor was an effective teacher.	3.72	3.14	3.29	3.25	
	Overall	3.81	3.35	3.44	3.40

By Frequency

1. The instructor treated students with respect.

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	0	0	0.0%
Disagree	1	0	0.0%
Neutral	2	0	0.0%
Agree	3	3	16.7%
Strongly Agree	4	15	83.3%

Statistics	Value
Response Count	18
Mean	3.83
Standard Deviation	+/-0.38

2. The instructor was well-prepared for class.

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	0	0	0.0%
Disagree	1	0	0.0%
Neutral	2	0	0.0%
Agree	3	2	11.1%
Strongly Agree	4	16	88.9%

Statistics	Value
Response Count	18
Mean	3.89
Standard Deviation	+/-0.32

3. Overall, this instructor was an effective teacher.

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	0	0	0.0%
Disagree	1	0	0.0%
Neutral	2	1	5.6%
Agree	3	3	16.7%
Strongly Agree	4	14	77.8%

Statistics	Value
Response Count	18
Mean	3.72
Standard Deviation	+/-0.57

Overall Score

Averaging the following five scaled Administrator items (from above, repeated below) results in the Overall Score.

Scale is Strongly Disagree (0) to Strongly Agree (4) with a Neutral mid-point

Competency	Course
The course was intellectually challenging.	3.72
I learned a lot from this course.	3.50
The instructor treated students with respect.	3.83
The instructor was well-prepared for class.	3.89
Overall, this instructor was an effective teacher.	3.72
Total Score	3.73

The standards the instructor **Cindy Phillips** set for students were...

By Score

Scale is Too Low (0) to Too High (2) with an Appropriate mid-point

Question	Course	Department	College	Course Level
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
The standards the instructor set for students were...	1.00	1.08	1.11	1.11

By Frequency

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Too Low	0	1	5.6%
Appropriate	1	16	88.9%
Too High	2	1	5.6%

Student University-Wide Course Items Applied to All Section Instructors

Results for use by faculty/instructors and students.

N/A responses have been excluded from the following calculations.

By Score

Scale is Strongly Disagree (0) to Strongly Agree (4) with a Neutral mid-point

Question	Course	Department	College	Course Level
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Course guidelines were clearly described in the syllabus.	3.44	3.20	3.24	3.18

By Frequency

Options	Score	Count	Percentage	Statistics	Value
Strongly Disagree	0	0	0.0%	Response Count	18
Disagree	1	0	0.0%	Mean	3.44
Neutral	2	2	11.1%	Standard Deviation	+/-0.70
Agree	3	6	33.3%		
Strongly Agree	4	10	55.6%		

Based on the quality of my work in this course, the grades I earned were

By Score

Scale is Too Low (0) to Too High (2) with an Appropriate mid-point

Question	Course	Department	College	Course Level
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Based on the quality of my work in this course, the grades I earned were	0.94	0.88	0.86	0.86

By Frequency

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Too Low	0	1	5.9%
Appropriate	1	16	94.1%
Too High	2	0	0.0%

Given the course level and number of credits, the workload was

By Score

Scale is Too Low (0) to Too High (2) with an Appropriate mid-point

Question	Course	Department	College	Course Level
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Given the course level and number of credits, the workload was	1.06	1.07	1.14	1.14

By Frequency

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Too Low	0	0	0.0%
Appropriate	1	16	94.1%
Too High	2	1	5.9%

How much effort did you put into the course?

By Score

Scale is Little (0) to Considerable (2) with a Moderate mid-point

Question	Course	Department	College	Course Level
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
How much effort did you put into the course?	1.61	1.29	1.47	1.51

By Frequency

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Little	0	0	0.0%
Moderate	1	7	38.9%
Considerable	2	11	61.1%

Student University-Wide Instructor **Cindy Phillips** Items

Results for use by faculty/instructors and students.

N/A responses have been excluded from the following calculations.

By Score

Scale is Strongly Disagree (0) to Strongly Agree (4) with a Neutral mid-point

Question	Course	Department	College	Course Level
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
The instructor was effective in communicating the content of the course.	3.61	3.22	3.30	3.25
The instructor was responsive to student concerns.	3.83	3.31	3.40	3.38
The instructor helped create an atmosphere that kept me engaged in course content.	3.67	2.96	3.20	3.17

By Frequency

1. The instructor was effective in communicating the content of the course.

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	0	0	0.0%
Disagree	1	1	5.6%
Neutral	2	0	0.0%
Agree	3	4	22.2%
Strongly Agree	4	13	72.2%

Statistics	Value
Response Count	18
Mean	3.61
Standard Deviation	+/-0.78

2. The instructor was responsive to student concerns.

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	0	0	0.0%
Disagree	1	0	0.0%
Neutral	2	0	0.0%
Agree	3	3	16.7%
Strongly Agree	4	15	83.3%

Statistics	Value
Response Count	18
Mean	3.83
Standard Deviation	+/-0.38

3. The instructor helped create an atmosphere that kept me engaged in course content.

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	0	0	0.0%
Disagree	1	0	0.0%
Neutral	2	1	5.6%
Agree	3	4	22.2%
Strongly Agree	4	13	72.2%

Statistics	Value
Response Count	18
Mean	3.67
Standard Deviation	+/-0.59

201408-PHIL347-0101-PHILOSOPHY OF LAW - Instructor: Cindy

DPhillips

28

1 00000

-20-