

Instructor Evaluation: PHIL 221, Philosophy of Mind, Spring 2015. Overall score 4.6 out of 5.

Question	Course	Category	Faculty	University
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
A.1. The instructor was prepared for the class	4.7	4.2	4.3	4.3
A.2. The instructor demonstrated knowledge of the subject	4.6	4.3	4.3	4.4
A.3. The instructor was accessible for feedback	4.6	4.1	4.2	4.2
A.4. The instructor communicated his/her subject well	4.5	4.1	4.2	4.2
A.5. The instructor stimulated and maintained my interest in the course	4.4	4.0	4.0	4.0
A.6. The instructor evaluated work using clear grading criteria	4.7	4.0	4.1	4.1
A.7. The instructor promoted and encouraged analytical / critical thinking	4.6	4.1	4.1	4.1
A.8. Overall rating of the instructor's teaching effectiveness	4.6	4.1	4.1	4.2
Overall	4.6	4.1	4.2	4.2

Comments for PHIL 221 Philosophy of Mind, Christopher Johns

Identify Instructor's strengths.

Comment

Dr. Johns is an extremely lively, energetic and down to earth professor, he was able to maintain my interest in the course through humor, informality and wit.

charisma

accessible to feedback

Good energy and vibes. Knows how to make technical notions more accessible when needed.

Clear, knowledgeable, funny and a very nice person

He communicates very well with his students. The example he gives are spot on.

A genuine concern for making students understand

EXCELLENT INSTRUCTOR!!

very energetic knows how to captivate the class's attention

Knows the material good enough to communicate it to a student despite its complexity. Perfect way to teach.

Keeps the class curious about the material.

Great work ethic, explains very well and maintains a pleasant atmosphere in the class, very organized, makes sure everyone understands what's going on

Identify Instructor's weaknesses.

Sometimes answers remain vaguely explained

none

Should allow a draft for the final paper so that we do not crash if we're on the wrong track.

Tough grader.

some difficulty at articulating philosophical points in plain language without compromising accuracy.

None

Identify course's strengths and weaknesses.

Comment

- great insight into contemporary theories of the mind - encourages critical thinking

interesting sometimes boring

It was an interesting course. No weaknesses.

Very interesting course, has something for everyone, promotes philosophical and critical thinking.

Strengths: Beyond informative and extremely interesting. No weaknesses

Please provide specific suggestions for improving the course.

Comment

none all is good

Given the difficulty of the course material, I think that the professor should be more lenient with the grading.

Perhaps if the instructor were to correct inaccurate views of students, by showing pointing out to them

subtle differences then discussion could be more constructive

You can't make something more perfect!

Instructor Evaluation PHIL 206, Business Ethics, Spring 15, Christopher Johns 4.4 out of 5

Evaluate your instructor

Question	Course	Category	Faculty	University
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
A.1. The instructor was prepared for the class	4.6	4.2	4.3	4.3
A.2. The instructor demonstrated knowledge of the subject	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.4
A.3. The instructor was accessible for feedback	4.4	4.1	4.2	4.2
A.4. The instructor communicated his/her subject well	4.3	4.1	4.2	4.2
A.5. The instructor stimulated and maintained my interest in the course	4.5	4.0	4.0	4.0
A.6. The instructor evaluated work using clear grading criteria	4.5	4.0	4.1	4.1
A.7. The instructor promoted and encouraged analytical / critical thinking	4.6	4.1	4.1	4.1
A.8. Overall rating of the instructor's teaching effectiveness	4.3	4.1	4.1	4.2
Overall	4.4	4.1	4.2	4.2

Comments: **Identify Instructor's strengths.**

Comment

Mr. Johns really knows how to motivate students to interact in the course with him and to motivate the students to read.

Great speaker. Fun class

Mr. Christopher is one of the most amazing teachers that i have ever had the change to learn from. he is one of a kind and my favorite by far. he is very open to opinions, and very kind and easy with the way he deals with his students. he always kept me interested in the class, never a dull moment. and even with all the fun, when things had to be serious, he never fails to make it serious. he had the perfect balance on enjoyment of the course and the seriousness of knowledge. i will be definitely trying to find other courses that i can take, but with him as my instructor. This university, without a doubt needs more teachers like him. not to mention that he was a great help to me this semester and an amazing influence.

Allows for discussion in the course which was effective.

Encouraging discussions in class

Identify Instructor's weaknesses.

Comment

no weaknesses

Stingy with grades. When correcting papers, his personal views on certain topics sometimes come in conflict with the student's. I felt that this conflict of personal views contributed to my loss of grades on that paper.

The views on homosexuality is one example.

no weaknesses what so ever

Slightly harsh grading in writing assignments.

Identify course's strengths and weaknesses.

the course teaches the students how to behave in the workplace and how to be ethical about everything

i hate bussines but after taking this course with Mr.Christopher i actually enjoyed it alot

Important material to discuss. I enjoyed it.

The course is interesting however the readings are way too long (up to 30+ pages per week).

Please provide specific suggestions for improving the course.

Comment

Maybe with less readings and more in class discussions to be able to explain the readings the course would be more interesting

get more teachers like Mr. Christopher

Nothing, the course was well paced, organized, and grade distribution was fair. Dr, Johns incorporates writing assignments, attendance, quizzes, a presentation, and an exam into the grading of the course which is fair.

(Maybe make a 10% midterm 10% final because I don't know what to expect on a 20% final because we haven't had an exam before hand, but that's it.)

- shorter readings

Official report for PHIL 225 (History of Moral Philosophy) Spring 2014. Overall score 4.2 out of 5

ICE Report

https://oira.aub.edu.lb//apex/f?p=113:2:357551793525301::NO:...

CJ08 Logout

Courses List > ICE Report

OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND ASSESSMENT

INSTRUCTOR COURSE EVALUATION

201420-PHIL-225-1-L-Christopher Low Johns

Arts & Sciences	INSTRUCTOR: Christopher Low Johns	ACADEMIC TERM Spring 2013-14	OVERALL SCORE 4.2								
COURSE PHIL 225	SECTION 1	ENROLLMENT 12	Response Rate 67%	-----Percentiles-----							
#RESPONSES SA A U D SD AVG CATEGORY FACULTY UNIVERSITY											
INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION											
1	The instructor was prepared for the class	8	4	2	1	0	4.1	38	44	47	
2	The instructor demonstrated knowledge of the subject	8	3	1	3	1	0	3.8	13	20	21
3	The instructor was accessible for feedback	8	5	2	1	0	0	4.5	74	79	80
4	The instructor communicated his/her subject well	8	3	3	1	0	1	3.9	28	34	37
5	The instructor stimulated and maintained my interest in the course	8	4	3	1	0	0	4.4	76	81	80
6	The instructor evaluated work using clear grading criteria	8	5	2	1	0	0	4.5	87	88	87
7	The instructor promoted and encouraged analytical / critical thinking	8	5	2	1	0	0	4.5	82	86	85
8	Overall rating of the instructor's teaching effectiveness	7	4	2	1	0	0	4.4	68	74	75
....SECTION STATISTICS: MINIMUM 3.8.....MAXIMUM 4.5....											
4.3											
60 67 68											
COURSE EVALUATION											
9	Course objectives were clear	8	4	3	1	0	0	4.4	79	81	82
10	Course content covered stated objectives.	7	3	1	2	1	0	3.9	34	38	39
11	Course was appropriately organized and paced.	8	3	3	1	1	0	4	48	52	56
12	Resources available were adequate (handouts, textbooks, readings, demonstrations,etc.)	8	6	2	0	0	0	4.8	93	96	96
13	Assessment was appropriate to course content & learning outcomes	8	5	0	2	0	1	4	47	54	56
14	Rate the overall quality of the course	8	5	1	2	0	0	4.4	79	82	83
....SECTION STATISTICS: MINIMUM 3.9.....MAXIMUM 4.8....											
4.3											
73 76 77											
LEARNING OUTCOMES											
15	This course increased my interest in the subject.	8	3	4	1	0	0	4.3	75	80	77
16	In this course I have learned something that I consider valuable	8	5	2	1	0	0	4.5	82	87	83
17	I would recommend this course to other students	8	4	2	1	1	0	4.1	58	67	63
....SECTION STATISTICS: MINIMUM 4.1.....MAXIMUM 4.5....											
4.3											
72 79 75											
ADDITIONAL ITEMS											
18	The instructor kept the balance between discussion and lecture well suited to this type of course.	8	4	1	1	2	0	3.9	33		
19	Class discussion contributed positively to learning in this course.	8	4	1	2	1	0	4	43		
20	The grading system was clearly explained to students.	8	5	2	1	0	0	4.5	88		
21	The examination content is representative of course content and objectives.	8	3	2	2	1	0	3.9	36		
22	Instructor was concerned about students' progress in the course.	8	4	3	0	1	0	4.3	65		
23	Instructor related various topics of the course to each other.	8	6	0	1	1	0	4.4	68		
24	The course helped to improve my critical thinking skills.	8	3	2	2	1	0	3.9	39		
....SECTION STATISTICS: MINIMUM 3.9.....MAXIMUM 4.5....											
4.1											
54											
.....POOL SIZE.....											
335 1123 2049											

OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND ASSESSMENT

Comments for PHIL 225 SP 14, Christopher Johns

Identify Instructor's strengths.

Is excellent at engaging class discussion and increasing interest in course content. Allows adequate room for debate and discussion which are central to learning difficult concepts such as in this course.

Very pleasant. Funny. Professional. Explains very clearly. Engaging.

Identify Instructor's weaknesses.

We sometimes get into discussion and lose the topic we are talking about

Identify course's strengths and weaknesses.

Very stimulating course.

WE had 4 heavy books to read throughout the semester. however these books were very helpful to inquire into the subject of the course

Official report for PHIL 211 (Introduction to Logic) Spring 2014. Overall score 4.1 out of 5

ICE Report

<https://oira.aub.edu.lb/apex/f?p=113:2:357551793525301::NO:...>

CJ08 [Logout](#)

[Courses List](#) > ICE Report

OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND ASSESSMENT

INSTRUCTOR COURSE EVALUATION

201420-PHIL-211-3-L-Christopher Low Johns

Arts & Sciences INSTRUCTOR: Christopher Low Johns ACADEMIC TERM Spring 2013-14 **OVERALL SCORE 4.1**
 COURSE PHIL 211 SECTION 3 CATEGORY Humanities ENROLLMENT 25 Response Rate 56%

-----Percentiles-----

	#RESPONSES	SA	A	U	D	SD	AVG	CATEGORY	FACULTY	UNIVERSITY
INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION										
1 The instructor was prepared for the class	10	1	5	2	2	0	3.5	12	14	15
2 The instructor demonstrated knowledge of the subject	10	1	5	2	1	1	3.4	4	8	9
3 The instructor was accessible for feedback	10	7	3	0	0	0	4.7	87	90	90
4 The instructor communicated his/her subject well	10	0	7	1	2	0	3.5	13	18	20
5 The instructor stimulated and maintained my interest in the course	10	2	8	0	0	0	4.2	57	66	66
6 The instructor evaluated work using clear grading criteria	10	5	5	0	0	0	4.5	87	88	87
7 The instructor promoted and encouraged analytical / critical thinking	10	3	5	2	0	0	4.1	50	58	58
8 Overall rating of the instructor's teaching effectiveness	10	2	4	4	0	0	3.8	26	33	34
....SECTION STATISTICS: MINIMUM 3.4.....MAXIMUM 4.7....							4	36	43	45
COURSE EVALUATION										
9 Course objectives were clear	9	2	7	0	0	0	4.2	64	66	67
10 Course content covered stated objectives.	9	2	6	1	0	0	4.1	52	56	57
11 Course was appropriately organized and paced.	10	4	3	3	0	0	4.1	58	60	62
12 Resources available were adequate (handouts, textbooks, readings, demonstrations, etc.)	10	6	3	1	0	0	4.5	82	87	87
13 Assessment was appropriate to course content & learning outcomes	10	5	4	1	0	0	4.4	79	84	84
14 Rate the overall quality of the course	10	3	6	1	0	0	4.2	62	68	69
....SECTION STATISTICS: MINIMUM 4.1.....MAXIMUM 4.5....							4.3	73	76	77
LEARNING OUTCOMES										
15 This course increased my interest in the subject.	10	5	2	2	0	1	4	55	63	59
16 In this course I have learned something that I consider valuable	10	2	5	3	0	0	3.9	39	46	42
17 I would recommend this course to other students	9	3	3	2	1	0	3.9	43	52	48
....SECTION STATISTICS: MINIMUM 3.9.....MAXIMUM 4....							3.9	44	51	48
ADDITIONAL ITEMS										
18 The instructor kept the balance between discussion and lecture well suited to this type of course.	8	1	7	0	0	0	4.1	50		
19 Class discussion contributed positively to learning in this course.	8	2	5	1	0	0	4.1	52		
20 The grading system was clearly explained to students.	9	4	4	1	0	0	4.3	77		
21 The examination content is representative of course content and objectives.	9	3	6	0	0	0	4.3	69		
22 Instructor was concerned about students' progress in the course.	9	4	3	2	0	0	4.2	60		
23 Instructor related various topics of the course to each other.	9	3	4	2	0	0	4.1	45		
24 The course helped to improve my critical thinking skills.	9	3	4	2	0	0	4.1	57		
....SECTION STATISTICS: MINIMUM 4.1.....MAXIMUM 4.3....							4.2	62		
.....POOL SIZE.....								335	1123	2049

Comments for PHIL 211 (Introduction to Logic) Spring 2014. Christopher Johns

OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND ASSESSMENT
INSTRUCTOR COURSE EVALUATION

Arts & Sciences
ACADEMIC TERM: Spring 2013-14

201420-PHIL-211-3-L-Christopher Low Johns

25 Identify Instructor's strengths.

- Charismatic
engaging
Hardworking
Well prepared
- Friendly, and SOOO dedicated.
- He is very involved and hard-working.
- He was active, lively, and showed interest in teaching the course
- The teacher is lively when it comes to teaching the calss. He conveys a good culture in class rather than a traditional information feeding one. The use of power point slides came to a great advantage
- Writing about the subject particularly and explaining in writing. I found it more effective than oral explanation because it was very slow paced when it was in class

26 Identify Instructor's weaknesses.

-
- A bit lost when it comes to the course
- He sometimes got confused, but that's normal, because the material is so tricky...he always fixed it eventually
- I had difficulty understanding some aspects in the course, and asking him to repeat the explanation didn't really help
- In certain instances, too much time was spent explaining what we'll do before we actually start.
- None.

27 Identify course's strengths and weaknesses.

- Interactive
- The combination of the formal "Logic book" with "Logicomix" is very complementary.
- The course is a good elective however its not really logic when it comes to derviations, but it is logic when we were reading logicomics
- The course itself is interesting. It teaches to think critically, and logically.
- very very stimulating, and interesting... until it gets systematic. but other than that, it's very enriching ... you learn about a whole new world

28 Please provide specific suggestions for improving the course.

-
- having a solving session would really be beneficial... a lecture class and 1 solving session a week

TEACHING EVALUATIONS SUMMARY (original documents available on request) **Chris Johns, Ph.D.**
American University Beirut **Ethics 210 Spring 2010** **Modern 214 Fall 2009**

Student responses on a scale from 5 (strongly agree) to 1 (strongly disagree)	Average out of 17 students	% strongly agree or agree	Percentile among 653 faculty	Average out of 12 students	% strongly agree or agree	Percentile among 767 faculty
1. Was prepared for the class	4.9	100	97	4.5	92	72
2. Demonstrated knowledge of the subject	4.8	100	91	4.4	83	52
3. Was accessible for feedback	4.5	100	81	4.7	92	93
4. Communicated subject well	4.5	94	78	4.3	75	62
5. Stimulated and maintained my interest in the course	4.6	100	93	4.2	83	70
6. Evaluated work using clear grading criteria	4.4	100	89	4.4	75	90
7. Promoted and encouraged analytical / critical thinking	4.8	100	97	4.4	83	84
8. Overall rating of the instructors teaching effectiveness	4.5	100	80	4.3	75	68
Instructor evaluation average	4.6	99	92	4.4	82	81
9. Course objectives were clear	4.5	93	93	4.3	92	88
10. Course content covered stated objectives.	4.7	100	96	4.3	92	83
11. Course was appropriately organized and paced.	4.6	94	95	4.1	75	73
12. Resources available were adequate	4.5	94	93	4.6	92	95
13. Assessment was appropriate to content & learning outcomes	4.4	94	87	4.5	100	94
14. Rate overall course quality	4.5	100	89	4.2	83	77
Course evaluation average	4.5	96	93	4.3	89	87
15. This course increased my interest in the subject.	4.5	94	90	4.0	75	72
16. In this course I have learned something valuable	4.4	100	83	4.3	92	78
17. I would recommend this course to other students	4.6	100	91	4.0	75	66
Learning outcomes average	4.5	98	89	4.1	81	73
18. Instructor kept appropriate balance between discussion and lecture	4.7	100		4.3	83	
19. Class discussion contributed positively to learning	4.6	100		4.0	75	
20. The grading system was clearly explained to students.	4.5	94		4.2	83	
21. The examination content is representative of course content and objectives	4.6	100		4.5	100	
22. Instructor was concerned about students progress	4.5	94		4	75	
23. Instructor related various topics of the course to each other.	4.4	88		4.6	100	
24. The course helped to improve my critical thinking skills.	4.5	94		4.4	92	
Additional items average	4.5	96	No stats	4.3	87	No stats