



Individual Instructor Course Evaluation (ICE) Spring 2015-16 Report for PHIL206 21938 2 (Christopher Low Johns)

Instructor Course Evaluation (ICE) Spring 2015-16

Project Audience 16

Responses Received 15

Response Ratio 94%

Subject Details

Name	PHIL206
COURSE_SUBJECT	Philosophy
COURSE_SECTION	2
CRN	21938
FACULTY	Arts & Sciences
First Name	Christopher Low
Last Name	Johns

Creation Date Fri, Jun 03, 2016




Demographics

Question	Required from major	Elective from major	Elective outside major	Required outside major	University required
1. The course is	0%	21%	43%	0%	36%


Question	>=90	85-89	80-84	70-79	<70
2. Expected grade in course	7%	14%	50%	29%	0%

Question	<=3	4-6	7-10	>10
3. No. of hours worked for the course per week	43%	43%	14%	0%

Break down by Class



This course is:




Section A - Score Report

	Resp	(SA)	(A)	(N)	(D)	(SD)	Mean
A.1. The instructor was prepared for the class	13	7	3	1	0	2	4.0
A.2. The instructor demonstrated knowledge of the subject	13	6	4	1	0	2	3.9
A.3. The instructor was accessible for feedback	13	7	1	3	0	2	3.8
A.4. The instructor communicated his/her subject well	13	6	3	1	1	2	3.8
A.5. The instructor stimulated and maintained my interest in the course	13	5	2	2	1	3	3.4
A.6. The instructor evaluated work using clear grading criteria	13	6	3	1	1	2	3.8
A.7. The instructor promoted and encouraged analytical / critical thinking	13	6	2	3	0	2	3.8
A.8. Overall rating of the instructor's teaching effectiveness	13	6	2	2	1	2	3.7

Competency	Course
Section A - Evaluate your Instructor	3.8

Section A - Scale Distribution



Section A - Evaluate your Instructor

Question	Course	Faculty (Arts & Sciences)	University	Category (OAHM)
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
A.1. The instructor was prepared for the class	4.0	4.4	4.4	4.4
A.2. The instructor demonstrated knowledge of the subject	3.9	4.4	4.4	4.5
A.3. The instructor was accessible for feedback	3.8	4.3	4.3	4.3
A.4. The instructor communicated his/her subject well	3.8	4.3	4.2	4.4
A.5. The instructor stimulated and maintained my interest in the course	3.4	4.1	4.1	4.2
A.6. The instructor evaluated work using clear grading criteria	3.8	4.1	4.1	4.1
A.7. The instructor promoted and encouraged analytical / critical thinking	3.8	4.2	4.2	4.3

Course Evaluation (ICE) Spring 2015-16


A.8. Overall rating of the instructor's teaching effectiveness	3.7	4.2	4.2	4.3
Overall	3.8	4.2	4.2	4.3

Section B - Score Report

	Resp	(SA)	(A)	(N)	(D)	(SD)	Mean
B.1. Course objectives were clear	13	5	4	2	0	2	3.8
B.2. Course content covered stated objectives	13	6	3	2	0	2	3.8
B.3. Course was appropriately organized and paced	13	5	5	1	0	2	3.8
B.4. Resources available were adequate (handouts, textbooks, readings, demonstrations,etc.)	13	6	5	0	0	2	4.0
B.5. Assessment was appropriate to course content & learning outcomes	13	5	4	1	1	2	3.7
B.6. Rate the overall quality of the course	13	5	4	1	1	2	3.7

Competency	Course
Section B - Evaluate your course	3.8

Section B - Scale Distribution



Section B - Evaluate your Course


Question	Course	Faculty (Arts & Sciences)	University	Category (OAHM)
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
B.1. Course objectives were clear	3.8	4.2	4.2	4.3
B.2. Course content covered stated objectives	3.8	4.2	4.2	4.3
B.3. Course was appropriately organized and paced	3.8	4.2	4.1	4.2
B.4. Resources available were adequate (handouts, textbooks, readings, demonstrations,etc.)	4.0	4.2	4.2	4.3
B.5. Assessment was appropriate to course content & learning outcomes	3.7	4.2	4.2	4.2
B.6. Rate the overall quality of the course	3.7	4.2	4.2	4.2
Overall	3.8	4.2	4.2	4.2

Section C - Score Report

	Resp	(SA)	(A)	(N)	(D)	(SD)	Mean
C.1. This course increased my interest in the subject	13	4	4	2	1	2	3.5
C.2. In this course I have learned something that I consider valuable	13	5	4	1	0	3	3.6
C.3. I would recommend this course to other students	13	4	4	2	0	3	3.5

Competency	Course
Section C - Course learning outcomes	3.5

Section C - Scale Distribution



Section C - Course Learning Outcomes


Question	Course	Faculty (Arts & Sciences)	University	Category (OAHM)
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
C.1. This course increased my interest in the subject	3.5	4.0	4.0	4.0
C.2. In this course I have learned something that I consider valuable	3.6	4.1	4.1	4.2
C.3. I would recommend this course to other students	3.5	4.0	4.0	4.1
Overall	3.5	4.0	4.0	4.1

Section D (Humanities) - Score Report

	Resp	(SA)	(A)	(N)	(D)	(SD)	Mean
D.1. The instructor kept the balance between discussion and lecture well suited to this type of course	13	6	5	0	0	2	4.0
D.2. Class discussion contributed positively to learning in this course	12	5	2	3	0	2	3.7
D.3. The grading system was clearly explained to students	13	5	4	2	0	2	3.8
D.4. The examination content is representative of course content and objectives	13	5	5	1	0	2	3.8
D.5. Instructor was concerned about students' progress in the course	13	4	2	4	1	2	3.4
D.6. Instructor related various topics of the course to each other	13	5	4	2	0	2	3.8
D.7. The course helped to improve my critical thinking skills	13	6	1	3	0	3	3.5

Competency	Course
Section D (Humanities) - Additional items	3.7


Section D (Humanities) - Scale Distribution



Section D (Humanities)

Question	Course	Category (OAHM)
	Mean	Mean
D.1. The instructor kept the balance between discussion and lecture well suited to this type of course	4.0	4.3
D.2. Class discussion contributed positively to learning in this course	3.7	4.3
D.3. The grading system was clearly explained to students	3.8	4.1
D.4. The examination content is representative of course content and objectives	3.8	4.2
D.5. Instructor was concerned about students' progress in the course	3.4	4.2
D.6. Instructor related various topics of the course to each other	3.8	4.3
D.7. The course helped to improve my critical thinking skills	3.5	4.2
Overall	3.7	4.2

Summary results



ICE Average

Competency	Course
Section A - Evaluate your Instructor	3.8
Section B - Evaluate your Course	3.8
Section C - Course Learning Outcomes	3.5
Section D - Additional Items	3.7
Total Score	3.7

Ranking

Strengths		
1	A.1. The instructor was prepared for the class	4.0
2	B.4. Resources available were adequate (handouts, textbooks, readings, demonstrations,etc.)	4.0
3	D.1. The instructor kept the balance between discussion and lecture well suited to this type of course	4.0
4	A.2. The instructor demonstrated knowledge of the subject	3.9
5	A.3. The instructor was accessible for feedback	3.8


Areas for development		
1	A.5. The instructor stimulated and maintained my interest in the course	3.4
2	D.5. Instructor was concerned about students' progress in the course	3.4
3	C.3. I would recommend this course to other students	3.5
4	C.1. This course increased my interest in the subject	3.5
5	D.7. The course helped to improve my critical thinking skills	3.5

Comments:

Identify Instructor's strengths.



Identify Instructor's weaknesses.



Identify course's strengths and weaknesses.



Identify Instructor's strengths.

Comment
-
none
Good teacher
Fluent, intelligent
smart, motivates, funny
Enthusiastic about the material.

Identify Instructor's weaknesses.

Comment
-
doesn't follow the grading criteria that he provides .
He has no heart
Somewhat strict and impatient
Had a strange approach to grading criteria in relation to a philosophy course.

Identify course's strengths and weaknesses.

Comment
-
Nothing
Interesting but long

Please provide specific suggestions for improving the course.

Comment
-
changing the professor
fewer material/assignments

