

TEACHING EVALUATIONS

Sydney Penner

Contents

1	Fall 2014: PHIL 3210	2
2	Fall 2014: PHIL 6210	10
3	Spring 2014: PHILOS 3220	18
4	Fall 2013: PHL 231	19
5	Spring 2010: PHIL 1112	30
6	Fall 2009: PHIL 1112	35

Introductory notes

In cases where I have provided compilations of the student evaluations, copies of the original evaluations are available on request. No evaluations are omitted from the compilations.

Classes on my CV but not included here were small classes for which no student evaluations were provided.

Further teaching materials, including syllabi for the courses evaluated below, are available on request, as well as online at <http://sydneypenner.ca/teaching.shtml>.

Cornell University
 Course Evaluation Response Summary
 Semester: Fall 2014 Course Owner: PHIL
 Course: PHIL 3210 LEC 001 CID: 16839
 Title: Medieval Philosophy
 Instructor: Penner
 4 Responses, 7 Enrolled, 57.14% Response

You are asked to respond to the following questions, in as objective spirit as possible, in order to help the instructor to evaluate his/her performance and improve it in the future.

Please use the following rating scale for questions 5 - 19.

RATING SCALE

- 1= Strongly Disagree
- 2= Disagree
- 3= Neutral/Not Applicable
- 4= Agree
- 5= Strongly Agree

Question	Mean	StDevP	Count	1	2	3	4	5
N01. Class Year 1) Freshman 2) Sophomore 3) Junior 4) Senior 5) Graduate	4.25	0.43	4	0	0	0	3	1
N02. Status of this class in your program 1) Major 2) Elective 3) Other degree/major requirement 4) Uncertain	1.75	0.82	4	2	1	1	0	
N03. Based on 100% completion of assignments and attendance, rate the amount of effort you put into this course 1) Almost none 2) Slightly below required amount 3) Required Amount 4) More than required	3.25	0.43	4	0	0	3	1	0
N04. What grade do you expect in this course 1) A or passing 2) B 3) C 4) D 5) F or failing	1.50	0.5	4	2	2	0	0	0
N05. Instructor was well prepared 1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral/Not Applicable 4) Agree 5) Strongly Agree	5.00	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
N06. Instructor presented course material in a clear and effective manner 1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral/Not Applicable 4) Agree 5) Strongly Agree	5.00	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
N07. Instructor's presentations were stimulating and held my interest 1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral/Not Applicable 4) Agree 5) Strongly Agree	5.00	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
N08. The instructor covered a sufficient amount of course material 1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral/Not Applicable 4) Agree 5) Strongly Agree	5.00	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
N09. The instructor presented the course material in an organized manner 1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral/Not Applicable 4) Agree 5) Strongly Agree	5.00	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
N10. The instructor's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted 1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral/Not Applicable 4) Agree 5) Strongly Agree	4.50	0.86	4	0	0	1	0	3

Cornell University
 Course Evaluation Response Summary
 Semester: Fall 2014 Course Owner: PHIL
 Course: PHIL 3210 LEC 001 CID: 16839
 Title: Medieval Philosophy
 Instructor: Penner
 4 Responses, 7 Enrolled, 57.14% Response

N11. The instructor's comments on written work were thorough and instructive 1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral/Not Applicable 4) Agree 5) Strongly Agree	4.75	0.43	4	0	0	0	1	3
N12. The instructor was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of class 1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral/Not Applicable 4) Agree 5) Strongly Agree	5.00	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
N13. The course topic was interesting and thought provoking 1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral/Not Applicable 4) Agree 5) Strongly Agree	4.75	0.43	4	0	0	0	1	3
N14. Based on the course level and prerequisites, the difficulty level of this course was suitable 1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral/Not Applicable 4) Agree 5) Strongly Agree	4.00	0.70	4	0	0	1	2	1
N15. The amount of required reading for this course was appropriate 1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral/Not Applicable 4) Agree 5) Strongly Agree	4.50	0.5	4	0	0	0	2	2
N16. The amount of written work (papers, exams, etc.) for this course was appropriate 1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral/Not Applicable 4) Agree 5) Strongly Agree	4.50	0.5	4	0	0	0	2	2
N17. The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate 1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral/Not Applicable 4) Agree 5) Strongly Agree	5.00	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
N18. The student discussion that occurred in the course was valuable 1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral/Not Applicable 4) Agree 5) Strongly Agree	4.50	0.5	4	0	0	0	2	2
N19. Overall, this course met my expectations 1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral/Not Applicable 4) Agree 5) Strongly Agree	5.00	0	4	0	0	0	0	4

Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Fall 2014 Course Owner: PHIL
Course: PHIL 3210 LEC 001 CID: 16839
Title: Medieval Philosophy
Instructor: Penner
4 Responses, 7 Enrolled, 57.14% Response

C01. What were the major strengths of this course?

407424. Material was very interesting and the class discussions were very good.

415494. The course struck a very good balance between breadth of figures and topics covered, and the depth of analysis of those figures and topics.

407425. Professor Penner is an amazing philosopher who has a great amount of knowledge and enthusiasm for Medieval Philosophy, which became infectious for the rest of the class! Since our class was less than 10 people most days, we were able to hold a seminar-style class, where serious and prolonged discussions were held with the professor and between us students, which is crucial to philosophical study. The readings were also extremely interesting, and Professor Penner's clear teaching made it easy to understand challenging concepts.

415490. This course was organized very well and the professor had a strong command of the material. Discussions during class were often thought-provoking and everyone had the chance to contribute.

Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Fall 2014 Course Owner: PHIL
Course: PHIL 3210 LEC 001 CID: 16839
Title: Medieval Philosophy
Instructor: Penner
4 Responses, 7 Enrolled, 57.14% Response

C02. What were the major weaknesses of this course?

-
407424. Didn't get through all the material expected in the allotted class time. Could plan a bit better for that.
-
415494. I wish we had read more Augustine.
-
407425. There were no major weaknesses for this course. I felt that there could have been more writing assignments, which would have helped develop my philosophy and treatise writing capabilities.
-
415490. There was so much to talk about that we often didn't have enough time to cover everything in class.

Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Fall 2014 Course Owner: PHIL
Course: PHIL 3210 LEC 001 CID: 16839
Title: Medieval Philosophy
Instructor: Penner
4 Responses, 7 Enrolled, 57.14% Response

C03. What aspects of the instructor's performance in the course did you like?

407424. Knew material very well but admitted when it was unfamiliar so as to avoid misleading us.

415494. The instructor was very knowledgeable and good at distilling the arguments of the texts read.

407425. Professor Penner was amazing! He was always willing to talk about a subject with you outside of class for hours! His enthusiasm and his passion for philosophy made the class and readings extremely entertaining and thought-provoking. He was also never afraid to bring in other philosophical ideas to give a more holistic approach to how philosophers from other time periods (including today) thought about the issues we were discussing. He was also humble and never made us feel like our non-philosophy backgrounds meant that our opinions were less valuable or illogical. He took us all seriously and valued our thoughts.

415490. He is very patient, approachable, and understanding. He usually interprets everyone's questions and answers very well, which is an effective demonstration of his principle of giving a charitable account of people's arguments. He also practices his other principle with us, being critical, during class by challenging our statements so that we improve our reasoning.

Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Fall 2014 Course Owner: PHIL
Course: PHIL 3210 LEC 001 CID: 16839
Title: Medieval Philosophy
Instructor: Penner
4 Responses, 7 Enrolled, 57.14% Response

C04. What would you recommend to improve the instructor's performance in this course?

407424. Sometimes rein in the class a bit more because we got very carried away discussing certain topics when we should have moved on once we started going off on tangents.

415494. I would have like to talk about the problem of universals more, although I understand that isn't the ideal topic for a survey course.

407425. I have no recommendations! Professor Penner was an absolute pleasure to have as an instructor and I wish him all the best! Any class he teaches will no doubt be great to take as a student!

415490. I recommend figuring out a way to cover all, or at least more, of the course material that was intended to discuss.

Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Fall 2014 Course Owner: PHIL
Course: PHIL 3210 LEC 001 CID: 16839
Title: Medieval Philosophy
Instructor: Penner
4 Responses, 7 Enrolled, 57.14% Response

C05. Please comment on how helpful and interesting you found the required reading and how well it served its purpose in the course.

407424. My only objection is to the excessively confusing language in some of the reading due it being a translation. There isn't really a way to avoid this that I can think of.

415494. The reading always very interesting and covered a good balance between metaphysics, epistemology, philosophy of language, and ethics.

407425. The reading was really interesting! I would have personally preferred an intro reading on Aristotle (maybe his categories or a selection from his Physics?), but Porphyry was probably satisfactory for those purposes.

415490. Reading the material was essential for contributing in the class. They were prime examples of excellent reasoning and clarity and for that I found them pretty interesting. There was a central theme in the course that brought all the readings together, making it easier to understand each reading and the course as a whole.

Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Fall 2014 Course Owner: PHIL
Course: PHIL 3210 LEC 001 CID: 16839
Title: Medieval Philosophy
Instructor: Penner
4 Responses, 7 Enrolled, 57.14% Response

C06. other comments/suggestions?

407424. Great class. Glad I took it.

415494. N/A

415490. I enjoyed the class! Thank you Sydney.

Cornell University
 Course Evaluation Response Summary
 Semester: Fall 2014 Course Owner: PHIL
 Course: PHIL 6210 SEM 101 CID: 16844
 Title: Medieval Philosophy
 Instructor: Penner
 4 Responses, 6 Enrolled, 66.67% Response

You are asked to respond to the following questions, in as objective spirit as possible, in order to help the instructor to evaluate his/her performance and improve it in the future.

Please use the following rating scale for questions 5 - 19.

RATING SCALE

- 1= Strongly Disagree
- 2= Disagree
- 3= Neutral/Not Applicable
- 4= Agree
- 5= Strongly Agree

Question	Mean	StDevP	Count	1	2	3	4	5
N01. Class Year 1) Freshman 2) Sophomore 3) Junior 4) Senior 5) Graduate	5.00	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
N02. Status of this class in your program 1) Major 2) Elective 3) Other degree/major requirement 4) Uncertain	2.67	0.47	3	0	1	2	0	
N03. Based on 100% completion of assignments and attendance, rate the amount of effort you put into this course 1) Almost none 2) Slightly below required amount 3) Required Amount 4) More than required	3.50	0.5	2	0	0	1	1	0
N04. What grade do you expect in this course 1) A or passing 2) B 3) C 4) D 5) F or failing	1.00	0	2	2	0	0	0	0
N05. Instructor was well prepared 1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral/Not Applicable 4) Agree 5) Strongly Agree	3.75	1.63	4	1	0	0	1	2
N06. Instructor presented course material in a clear and effective manner 1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral/Not Applicable 4) Agree 5) Strongly Agree	4.00	1.73	4	1	0	0	0	3
N07. Instructor's presentations were stimulating and held my interest 1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral/Not Applicable 4) Agree 5) Strongly Agree	3.75	1.63	4	1	0	0	1	2
N08. The instructor covered a sufficient amount of course material 1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral/Not Applicable 4) Agree 5) Strongly Agree	3.33	1.69	3	1	0	0	1	1
N09. The instructor presented the course material in an organized manner 1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral/Not Applicable 4) Agree 5) Strongly Agree	3.50	1.5	4	1	0	0	2	1
N10. The instructor's grades were appropriate for the quality of work submitted 1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral/Not Applicable 4) Agree 5) Strongly Agree	5.00	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

Cornell University
 Course Evaluation Response Summary
 Semester: Fall 2014 Course Owner: PHIL
 Course: PHIL 6210 SEM 101 CID: 16844
 Title: Medieval Philosophy
 Instructor: Penner
 4 Responses, 6 Enrolled, 66.67% Response

N11. The instructor's comments on written work were thorough and instructive 1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral/Not Applicable 4) Agree 5) Strongly Agree	5.00	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
N12. The instructor was responsive in discussing course related materials outside of class 1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral/Not Applicable 4) Agree 5) Strongly Agree	3.67	1.88	3	1	0	0	0	2
N13. The course topic was interesting and thought provoking 1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral/Not Applicable 4) Agree 5) Strongly Agree	3.50	1.5	4	1	0	0	2	1
N14. Based on the course level and prerequisites, the difficulty level of this course was suitable 1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral/Not Applicable 4) Agree 5) Strongly Agree	3.33	1.69	3	1	0	0	1	1
N15. The amount of required reading for this course was appropriate 1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral/Not Applicable 4) Agree 5) Strongly Agree	3.33	1.69	3	1	0	0	1	1
N16. The amount of written work (papers, exams, etc.) for this course was appropriate 1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral/Not Applicable 4) Agree 5) Strongly Agree	4.50	0.5	2	0	0	0	1	1
N17. The amount of discussion that occurred in class was adequate 1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral/Not Applicable 4) Agree 5) Strongly Agree	4.00	1.73	4	1	0	0	0	3
N18. The student discussion that occurred in the course was valuable 1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral/Not Applicable 4) Agree 5) Strongly Agree	3.75	1.63	4	1	0	0	1	2
N19. Overall, this course met my expectations 1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral/Not Applicable 4) Agree 5) Strongly Agree	3.75	1.63	4	1	0	0	1	2

Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Fall 2014 Course Owner: PHIL
Course: PHIL 6210 SEM 101 CID: 16844
Title: Medieval Philosophy
Instructor: Penner
4 Responses, 6 Enrolled, 66.67% Response

C01. What were the major strengths of this course?

407434. Professor Penner did an excellent job ensuring that the discussion took place at a high level, while also making sure that everyone in the seminar could follow what was being discussed.

415644. Enjoyed learning about the basics of medieval metaphysics and Suárez's views in particular.

415641. Dr. Penner was very clear in his presentation, and very good at moderating discussion. He often clarified objections that were raised, helping us all understand them. Dr. Penner also has impressive command of the material we covered.

Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Fall 2014 Course Owner: PHIL
Course: PHIL 6210 SEM 101 CID: 16844
Title: Medieval Philosophy
Instructor: Penner
4 Responses, 6 Enrolled, 66.67% Response

C02. What were the major weaknesses of this course?

407434. None beyond the difficulty of the material.

415641. The topic was a bit narrow, especially since almost none of us had any background in Suarez, let alone medieval philosophy.

Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Fall 2014 Course Owner: PHIL
Course: PHIL 6210 SEM 101 CID: 16844
Title: Medieval Philosophy
Instructor: Penner
4 Responses, 6 Enrolled, 66.67% Response

C03. What aspects of the instructor's performance in the course did you like?

407434. Professor Penner's comments on our questions in and outside of class were thorough and very helpful.

415644. Handouts were very helpful. It was also useful to begin with Aquinas to understand the metaphysical backdrop.

415641. Clear detailed handouts at the beginning of class, made complex texts understandable. The instructor was a superb guide to the text itself, having wide-ranging expertise in Suarez's Latin vocabulary and phraseology.

Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Fall 2014 Course Owner: PHIL
Course: PHIL 6210 SEM 101 CID: 16844
Title: Medieval Philosophy
Instructor: Penner
4 Responses, 6 Enrolled, 66.67% Response

C04. What would you recommend to improve the instructor's performance in this course?

407434. I don't think there were any obvious areas that needed improvement.

415644. It would have been nice to see some sort of concise comparison of other medieval views that Suárez would have been aware of and responding to.

415641. Perhaps more of an overview of Suarez up front, and less time on reading through all the minutiae of his views on causation.

Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Fall 2014 Course Owner: PHIL
Course: PHIL 6210 SEM 101 CID: 16844
Title: Medieval Philosophy
Instructor: Penner
4 Responses, 6 Enrolled, 66.67% Response

C05. Please comment on how helpful and interesting you found the required reading and how well it served its purpose in the course.

407434. I thought it was very interesting and served the course well.

415644. The reading seemed well chosen to and progress logically.

415641. See above comment: the reading was too narrowly focused on one specific topic. I would have appreciated doing that topic for half the course, say, and the other half either surveying Suarez's metaphysics or picking one other related topic to explore.

Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Fall 2014 Course Owner: PHIL
Course: PHIL 6210 SEM 101 CID: 16844
Title: Medieval Philosophy
Instructor: Penner
4 Responses, 6 Enrolled, 66.67% Response

C06. other comments/suggestions?

415644. Thanks for an interesting class!

3 Spring 2014: PHILOS 3220 End-of-Semester Evaluations

<p>Sydney Penner</p> <p>Cumulative Student Evaluation of Instruction Summary</p> <p>Report generated on 5/6/2014</p> <p>NOTE TO INSTRUCTOR: Mark the "Multi Inst" box for course sections that were team taught or had more than one instructor.</p> <p>"Web" is "Y" if student ratings were collected electronically.</p> <p>Comparison groups are based on class size (Small, Medium, Large) and electivity (Required, Free, Choose). See individual reports for more details.</p>	<p>SEI Item Descriptions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Well organized 2. Intellectually stimulating 3. Instructor interested in teaching 4. Encouraged independent thinking 5. Instructor well prepared 6. Instructor interested in helping students 7. Learned greatly from instructor 8. Created learning atmosphere 9. Communicated subject matter clearly 10. Overall rating
--	---

PHILOS 3220

College: ASC

Campus: COL

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Item 10
Comparison

Multi Inst

2014 Spr	Class Num:	29865
# Enrolled: 30	# Resp: 8	Web: Y

Instructor Mean

4.6	4.0	4.5	4.8	5.0	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.6	4.6
0.5	1.1	0.5	0.5	0.0	0.5	0.7	0.5	0.7	0.5

Instructor SD

4.3

4 Fall 2013: PHL 231 End-of-Semester Evaluations

Asbury University
2013 Fall Course Evaluations

Course: PHL231BFA13 : ETHICS

Instructor: Sydney Penner *

1 - Class or Program				
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Responses
Freshman	(1)	1	6.25%	
Sophomore	(2)	12	75.00%	
Junior	(3)	1	6.25%	
Senior	(4)	2	12.50%	
Asbury Academy	(5)	0	0.00%	
Adult Professional Studies	(6)	0	0.00%	
Graduate	(7)	0	0.00%	
Other	(8)	0	0.00%	
	(0)	0	0.00%	
Return Rate				16/23 (69.57%)





2 - Reason for taking course				
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Responses
General Ed	(1)	15	93.75%	
Elective	(2)	1	6.25%	
Major	(3)	0	0.00%	
Minor	(4)	0	0.00%	
	(0)	0	0.00%	
Return Rate				16/23 (69.57%)

3 - Effort Invested				
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Responses
Great	(1)	4	25.00%	
Much	(2)	10	62.50%	
Moderate	(3)	2	12.50%	
Little	(4)	0	0.00%	
	(0)	0	0.00%	
Return Rate				16/23 (69.57%)






Asbury University
2013 Fall Course Evaluations

Course: PHL231BFA13 : ETHICS






Instructor: Sydney Penner *

4 - Expected Grade				
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Responses
A	(1)	3	18.75%	
B	(2)	10	62.50%	
C	(3)	2	12.50%	
D	(4)	1	6.25%	
F	(5)	0	0.00%	
	(0)	0	0.00%	

Return Rate			
16/23 (69.57%)			

5 - The course syllabus was clear and helpful. Sydney Penner												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Responses					Means			
Strongly Agree	(4)	9	56.25%						3.56	3.57	3.54	
Agree	(3)	7	43.75%									
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%									
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0.00%									
	(0)	0	0.00%									

Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Dept. Benchmark	Mean	STD	Median	College/School Benchmark	Mean	STD	Median
16/23 (69.57%)	3.56	0.51	4.00	833	3.57	0.61	4.00	4,604	3.54	0.61	4.00

6 - The learning outcomes of the course were clearly stated. Sydney Penner												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Responses					Means			
Strongly Agree	(4)	7	43.75%						3.44	3.56	3.55	
Agree	(3)	9	56.25%									
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%									
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0.00%									
	(0)	0	0.00%									

Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Dept. Benchmark	Mean	STD	Median	College/School Benchmark	Mean	STD	Median
16/23 (69.57%)	3.44	0.51	3.00	831	3.56	0.57	4.00	4,601	3.55	0.58	4.00

Asbury University
2013 Fall Course Evaluations

Course: PHL231BFA13 : ETHICS

Instructor: Sydney Penner *

7 - The learning outcomes of the course were effectively met.
Sydney Penner

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Responses					Means			
Strongly Agree	(4)	6	37.50%							3.38	3.46	3.48
Agree	(3)	10	62.50%									
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%									
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0.00%									
	(0)	0	0.00%									
				0	25	50	75	100	Question	Dept. Benchmark	College/School Benchmark	
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Dept. Benchmark	Mean	STD	Median	College/School Benchmark	Mean	STD	Median	
16/23 (69.57%)	3.38	0.50	3.00	832	3.46	0.67	4.00	4,595	3.48	0.65	4.00	

8 - The course grading system was clearly established in the syllabus.
Sydney Penner

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Responses					Means			
Strongly Agree	(4)	8	50.00%							3.44	3.55	3.55
Agree	(3)	7	43.75%									
Disagree	(2)	1	6.25%									
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0.00%									
	(0)	0	0.00%									
				0	25	50	75	100	Question	Dept. Benchmark	College/School Benchmark	
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Dept. Benchmark	Mean	STD	Median	College/School Benchmark	Mean	STD	Median	
16/23 (69.57%)	3.44	0.63	3.50	829	3.55	0.61	4.00	4,591	3.55	0.61	4.00	

9 - The grading system was consistently applied and equitable.
Sydney Penner

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Responses					Means			
Strongly Agree	(4)	8	50.00%							3.50	3.50	3.53
Agree	(3)	8	50.00%									
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%									
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0.00%									
	(0)	0	0.00%									
				0	25	50	75	100	Question	Dept. Benchmark	College/School Benchmark	
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Dept. Benchmark	Mean	STD	Median	College/School Benchmark	Mean	STD	Median	
16/23 (69.57%)	3.50	0.52	3.50	830	3.50	0.69	4.00	4,578	3.53	0.64	4.00	

Asbury University
2013 Fall Course Evaluations

Course: PHL231BFA13 : ETHICS

Instructor: Sydney Penner *

10 - The course challenged me to think critically.
Sydney Penner

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Responses					Means		
Strongly Agree	(4)	11	68.75%						3.69	3.57	3.49
Agree	(3)	5	31.25%								
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%								
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0.00%								
	(0)	0	0.00%								

Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Dept. Benchmark	Mean	STD	Median	College/School Benchmark	Mean	STD	Median
16/23 (69.57%)	3.69	0.48	4.00	832	3.57	0.63	4.00	4,594	3.49	0.69	4.00

11 - Assignments and projects supported the objectives of the course.
Sydney Penner

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Responses					Means		
Strongly Agree	(4)	10	62.50%						3.63	3.55	3.55
Agree	(3)	6	37.50%								
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%								
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0.00%								
	(0)	0	0.00%								

Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Dept. Benchmark	Mean	STD	Median	College/School Benchmark	Mean	STD	Median
16/23 (69.57%)	3.63	0.50	4.00	824	3.55	0.59	4.00	4,581	3.55	0.59	4.00

12 - Examinations covered course material fairly and adequately.
Sydney Penner

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Responses					Means		
Strongly Agree	(4)	8	50.00%						3.50	3.46	3.48
Agree	(3)	8	50.00%								
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%								
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0.00%								
	(0)	0	0.00%								

Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Dept. Benchmark	Mean	STD	Median	College/School Benchmark	Mean	STD	Median
16/23 (69.57%)	3.50	0.52	3.50	827	3.46	0.69	4.00	4,563	3.48	0.66	4.00

Asbury University
2013 Fall Course Evaluations

Course: PHL231BFA13 : ETHICS

Instructor: Sydney Penner *

13 - The textbook materials required were appropriate for the course.
Sydney Penner

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Responses					Means		
Strongly Agree	(4)	10	62.50%						3.63	3.50	3.49
Agree	(3)	6	37.50%								
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%								
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0.00%								
	(0)	0	0.00%								
				0	25	50	75	100	Question	Dept. Benchmark	College/School Benchmark
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Dept. Benchmark	Mean	STD	Median	College/School Benchmark	Mean	STD	Median
16/23 (69.57%)	3.63	0.50	4.00	831	3.50	0.67	4.00	4,576	3.49	0.66	4.00

14 - The overall quality of the course was very good.
Sydney Penner

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Responses					Means		
Strongly Agree	(4)	10	62.50%						3.63	3.46	3.48
Agree	(3)	6	37.50%								
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%								
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0.00%								
	(0)	0	0.00%								
				0	25	50	75	100	Question	Dept. Benchmark	College/School Benchmark
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Dept. Benchmark	Mean	STD	Median	College/School Benchmark	Mean	STD	Median
16/23 (69.57%)	3.63	0.50	4.00	831	3.46	0.72	4.00	4,585	3.48	0.70	4.00

15 - Conveyed the subject matter of this course in a clear way.
Sydney Penner

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Responses					Means		
Strongly Agree	(4)	6	37.50%						3.38	3.50	3.50
Agree	(3)	10	62.50%								
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%								
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0.00%								
	(0)	0	0.00%								
				0	25	50	75	100	Question	Dept. Benchmark	College/School Benchmark
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Dept. Benchmark	Mean	STD	Median	College/School Benchmark	Mean	STD	Median
16/23 (69.57%)	3.38	0.50	3.00	832	3.50	0.70	4.00	4,596	3.50	0.69	4.00

Asbury University
2013 Fall Course Evaluations

Course: PHL231BFA13 : ETHICS

Instructor: Sydney Penner *

16 - Provided useful comments and timely feedback on assigned work.
Sydney Penner

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Responses					Means		
Strongly Agree	(4)	10	62.50%								
Agree	(3)	6	37.50%								
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%								
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0.00%								
	(0)	0	0.00%								
				0	25	50	75	100	Question	Dept. Benchmark	College/School Benchmark
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Dept. Benchmark	Mean	STD	Median	College/School Benchmark	Mean	STD	Median
16/23 (69.57%)	3.63	0.50	4.00	832	3.47	0.69	4.00	4,594	3.47	0.71	4.00

17 - Modeled a commitment to the integration of academic excellence and spiritual vitality.
Sydney Penner

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Responses					Means		
Strongly Agree	(4)	10	62.50%								
Agree	(3)	6	37.50%								
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%								
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0.00%								
	(0)	0	0.00%								
				0	25	50	75	100	Question	Dept. Benchmark	College/School Benchmark
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Dept. Benchmark	Mean	STD	Median	College/School Benchmark	Mean	STD	Median
16/23 (69.57%)	3.63	0.50	4.00	819	3.65	0.55	4.00	4,590	3.60	0.58	4.00

18 - Showed approachability and responsiveness and respect for others.
Sydney Penner

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Responses					Means		
Strongly Agree	(4)	11	68.75%								
Agree	(3)	5	31.25%								
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%								
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0.00%								
	(0)	0	0.00%								
				0	25	50	75	100	Question	Dept. Benchmark	College/School Benchmark
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Dept. Benchmark	Mean	STD	Median	College/School Benchmark	Mean	STD	Median
16/23 (69.57%)	3.69	0.48	4.00	824	3.61	0.62	4.00	4,585	3.62	0.60	4.00

Asbury University
2013 Fall Course Evaluations

Course: PHL231BFA13 : ETHICS

Instructor: Sydney Penner *

19 - Promoted my intellectual engagement with the subject matter.
Sydney Penner

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Responses					Means						
Strongly Agree	(4)	10	62.50%						<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Question</td> <td>3.63</td> <td>Dept. Benchmark</td> <td>3.52</td> <td>College/School Benchmark</td> <td>3.52</td> </tr> </table>	Question	3.63	Dept. Benchmark	3.52	College/School Benchmark	3.52
Question	3.63	Dept. Benchmark	3.52	College/School Benchmark	3.52										
Agree	(3)	6	37.50%												
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%												
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0.00%												
	(0)	0	0.00%												
				0	25	50	75	100							
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Dept. Benchmark		Mean	STD	Median	College/School Benchmark	Mean	STD	Median			
16/23 (69.57%)	3.63	0.50	4.00	828		3.52	0.64	4.00	4,592	3.52	0.66	4.00			

20 - Organized course material and class time.
Sydney Penner

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Responses					Means						
Strongly Agree	(4)	8	50.00%						<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Question</td> <td>3.50</td> <td>Dept. Benchmark</td> <td>3.50</td> <td>College/School Benchmark</td> <td>3.51</td> </tr> </table>	Question	3.50	Dept. Benchmark	3.50	College/School Benchmark	3.51
Question	3.50	Dept. Benchmark	3.50	College/School Benchmark	3.51										
Agree	(3)	8	50.00%												
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%												
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0.00%												
	(0)	0	0.00%												
				0	25	50	75	100							
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Dept. Benchmark		Mean	STD	Median	College/School Benchmark	Mean	STD	Median			
16/23 (69.57%)	3.50	0.52	3.50	829		3.50	0.66	4.00	4,589	3.51	0.65	4.00			

21 - Maintained an environment conducive to learning.
Sydney Penner

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Responses					Means						
Strongly Agree	(4)	10	62.50%						<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Question</td> <td>3.63</td> <td>Dept. Benchmark</td> <td>3.53</td> <td>College/School Benchmark</td> <td>3.55</td> </tr> </table>	Question	3.63	Dept. Benchmark	3.53	College/School Benchmark	3.55
Question	3.63	Dept. Benchmark	3.53	College/School Benchmark	3.55										
Agree	(3)	6	37.50%												
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%												
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0.00%												
	(0)	0	0.00%												
				0	25	50	75	100							
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Dept. Benchmark		Mean	STD	Median	College/School Benchmark	Mean	STD	Median			
16/23 (69.57%)	3.63	0.50	4.00	826		3.53	0.62	4.00	4,591	3.55	0.60	4.00			

Asbury University
2013 Fall Course Evaluations

Course: PHL231BFA13 : ETHICS

Instructor: Sydney Penner *

22 - Explored how this subject relates to other disciplines.
Sydney Penner

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Responses					Means			
Strongly Agree	(4)	5	31.25%							3.25	3.32	3.42
Agree	(3)	10	62.50%									
Disagree	(2)	1	6.25%									
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0.00%									
	(0)	0	0.00%									
				0	25	50	75	100	Question	Dept. Benchmark	College/School Benchmark	
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Dept. Benchmark	Mean	STD	Median	College/School Benchmark	Mean	STD	Median	
16/23 (69.57%)	3.25	0.58	3.00	831	3.32	0.72	3.00	4,592	3.42	0.70	4.00	

23 - Encouraged participation in class.
Sydney Penner

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Responses					Means			
Strongly Agree	(4)	12	75.00%							3.75	3.51	3.58
Agree	(3)	4	25.00%									
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%									
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0.00%									
	(0)	0	0.00%									
				0	25	50	75	100	Question	Dept. Benchmark	College/School Benchmark	
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Dept. Benchmark	Mean	STD	Median	College/School Benchmark	Mean	STD	Median	
16/23 (69.57%)	3.75	0.45	4.00	828	3.51	0.64	4.00	4,585	3.58	0.61	4.00	

24 - Addressed faith, learning, and living as important features of Asbury University educational experience.
Sydney Penner

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Responses					Means			
Strongly Agree	(4)	8	50.00%							3.50	3.63	3.51
Agree	(3)	8	50.00%									
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%									
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0.00%									
	(0)	0	0.00%									
				0	25	50	75	100	Question	Dept. Benchmark	College/School Benchmark	
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Dept. Benchmark	Mean	STD	Median	College/School Benchmark	Mean	STD	Median	
16/23 (69.57%)	3.50	0.52	3.50	832	3.63	0.55	4.00	4,592	3.51	0.63	4.00	

Asbury University
2013 Fall Course Evaluations

Course: PHL231BFA13 : ETHICS

Instructor: Sydney Penner *

25 - Sparked a lifelong desire for learning.
Sydney Penner

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Responses					Means		
Strongly Agree	(4)	8	50.00%						3.44	3.40	3.38
Agree	(3)	7	43.75%								
Disagree	(2)	1	6.25%								
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0.00%								
	(0)	0	0.00%								
				0	25	50	75	100	Question	Dept. Benchmark	College/School Benchmark
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Dept. Benchmark	Mean	STD	Median	College/School Benchmark	Mean	STD	Median
16/23 (69.57%)	3.44	0.63	3.50	832	3.40	0.73	4.00	4,589	3.38	0.74	4.00

26 - Equipped me to understand and engage human culture at a deeper level, in the interest of advancing the cause of Christ around the world.
Sydney Penner

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Responses					Means		
Strongly Agree	(4)	9	56.25%						3.56	3.52	3.42
Agree	(3)	7	43.75%								
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%								
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0.00%								
	(0)	0	0.00%								
				0	25	50	75	100	Question	Dept. Benchmark	College/School Benchmark
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Dept. Benchmark	Mean	STD	Median	College/School Benchmark	Mean	STD	Median
16/23 (69.57%)	3.56	0.51	4.00	830	3.52	0.63	4.00	4,585	3.42	0.70	4.00

27 - Stimulated my thinking about liberal arts study as education for the whole person—spiritual, moral, intellectual, aesthetic, and social.
Sydney Penner

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Responses					Means		
Strongly Agree	(4)	8	50.00%						3.44	3.43	3.40
Agree	(3)	7	43.75%								
Disagree	(2)	1	6.25%								
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0.00%								
	(0)	0	0.00%								
				0	25	50	75	100	Question	Dept. Benchmark	College/School Benchmark
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Dept. Benchmark	Mean	STD	Median	College/School Benchmark	Mean	STD	Median
16/23 (69.57%)	3.44	0.63	3.50	832	3.43	0.67	4.00	4,591	3.40	0.70	4.00

Asbury University
2013 Fall Course Evaluations

Course: PHL231BFA13 : ETHICS

Instructor: Sydney Penner *

28 - Please state what you liked about this course/instructor.
Sydney Penner

Return Rate	12/23 (52.17%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The instructor was very helpful and taught the difficult content in a way that was clear and understandable. - He enjoys what he's teaching and encourages us to engage with what he's lecturing on. - Enjoyed all very much! class was a little difficult, but otherwise enjoyed it. - This was a much harder course than I expected, but I found that to be good in the end. The workload was slightly imbalanced due to the fact that he was a new professor, but it got better with time and as he continues here, I believe he will make it work better. I really enjoyed Dr. Penner. His teaching style was on a higher level than I am used to, and I liked being challenged critically. - I honestly, like the instructor more than I like the course. However, it was a great experience for me. His style of teaching Ethics was different from the other ways they were taught to me before, but it was a good time reading and analyzing moral ideologies. - Great class. The teacher really knows what he's talking about and explains confusing things in a way we can understand. - As a new professor it was hard to know what the class would be like. It was challenging and difficult but somewhat enjoyable. The study guides for the readings made it much easier to understand the readings. - I really liked Prof. Penner. He was very personable and smart. - I greatly enjoyed having Dr. Penner this last semester, he is able to engage a wide variety of topics, and is clearly very well versed in his field. Frankly, Dr. Penner is the best philosophy teacher I have had at Asbury university, the school would be very lucky to keep him (and his wife!). Dr. Penner is very intelligent, yet humble. He is equitable in his grading and has reasonable expectations for students. - I really enjoyed being in Dr. Penner's class he is an asset to the Asbury. He brought a different viewpoint into the classroom which was good because it encouraged us to think and perceive worldviews differently. He was always respectful in the classroom to all students. He is very approachable and easy going. I learned a lot from the course and it has really challenged me to think about issues deeper. I thank him for encouraging me to see the world around me through different lenses and I am glad that I waited til senior in order to get him. I know that I will use what I learned in his class later on down the road. - flexible due dates, not too many assignments and the ones given were well suited to the course - Dr. Penner was very good at starting discussion in the classroom, and those times ended up being the most interesting to me, I think. He was very approachable and very timely in returning graded work, which I really appreciate. He did a lot to help his students succeed, by doing things like adding due dates to assignments, adding extra credit options, and giving out study guides for the exams. 	

Asbury University
2013 Fall Course Evaluations

Course: PHL231BFA13 : ETHICS

Instructor: Sydney Penner *

29 - What suggestions do you have to improve the course? Sydney Penner	
Return Rate	12/23 (52.17%)
<p>- Give more notice for quizzes.</p> <p>- Unfixed deadlines for papers... I know it was meant well, but I'm just too busy... But I guess that's really more on me than on him. :)</p> <p>- Maybe spend a little more time going over each new concept, rather than talking about it for one class or so and then moving on, or going over 3 or 4 new concepts in one class. That was what confused me the most during the course of the class.</p> <p>- nothing!</p> <p>- Balancing the workload so that it is more friendly to people taking this class as a Gen Ed.</p> <p>- A reduction in the quantity of reading content will be good, in the some cases where we had to read 2 or more works for one class.</p> <p>- I would have liked more tests. I don't think two is enough; that makes the tests worth a lot which is stressful and puts too much material to study on one test.</p> <p>- We had too many readings, often we would not even get a chance to cover them in class so it seemed like a waste of time especially when I usually did not understand the readings.</p> <p>- For this review I have added a significant amount of critique, not because Dr. Penner is lacking in any way, but simply because he is new to Asbury and the american system, and I believe appreciates feedback.</p> <p>1. This is a general education requirement and often times taken by freshmen. For that reason, I feel there should be more time spent on how to read/understand philosophy, a brief introduction to philosophy, and more information regarding the history and development of ethical thought. Historical facts and data help students grab hold of ideas and remember who said them, and why they were said. I have a background in theology, and have taken other philosophy courses; if not for this, I feel I would have been at a great disadvantage in the course.</p> <p>2. Reading philosophy is hard, freshmen do not like to do what is hard, therefore, freshmen will not read philosophy. My recommendation is that there be regular quizzes or mandatory reading guides/homework. I personally made great use of the reading responses; however, unless mandatory only your "A" students are going to make use of them. I believe much of the lack of conversation within the class was a result of students not having a clear understanding of philosophical thought, difficulty understanding the author, and/or not having read the material.</p> <p>3. As stated above, this is a largely introductory course. As a result, names, dates, and concepts need to be clearly laid out for students. Give them the information, and then challenge them to think critically. If you do not agree with this particular teaching style, then voice it at the beginning of the year; otherwise, students will import their previous schema's regarding courses and will be behind.</p> <p>4. be difficult. The course felt to me as if I could invest little of much effort and still receive a good grade. The quizzes were equitable I felt, the papers could be longer, and critiques could be stiffer. I would also recommend a more difficult large paper, at least 5 pages maybe more.</p> <p>again, all in all this was an excellent course and Dr. Penner is a great professor.</p> <p>- I would be helpful to have due dates for papers to help better organize time. It was quite harder to get everything done. He could explain the Short paper a bit better because it took me a longer time to write from being unsure of what or how to do. Finding a reading and biblical passage was a lot harder than I expected. It got done with many late nights this week.</p> <p>- quizzes at end of class instead of beginning because sometimes, even if much effort is put into trying to understand the reading, students may still not understand the reading. also helps encourage paying attention in class. more specific grading scale</p> <p>- It was hard for me to see how normative and applied ethics were connected. It was also unclear to me whether or not one kind of normative ethical belief was always held (other than by the philosopher), and what kind of normative belief a Christian has.</p>	

5 Spring 2010: PHIL 1112 End-of-Semester Evaluations

Means calculated from all sixteen completed evaluations.

OVERALL MEAN FOR QUESTIONS 2–33: 1.49 (in the first quartile; median score for Spring 2010 instructors of First-Year Writing Seminars is 1.77)

OVERALL MEAN FOR QUESTIONS 20–33: 1.33

Nota bene: The mean for questions 20–33 is more relevant for assessing teaching quality, but I have not been given the median score for instructors for those questions.

INDIVIDUAL QUESTIONS:

Question 1) The most important reason I chose this seminar: most students selected: (1) I liked the course description.

For questions 2–5: 1 = An appropriate amount, 2 = Too much, 3 = Too little, 4 = Far too much, 5 = Far too little.

	Mean	Question
2)	1.25	How much reading did you do?
3)	1.06	How much out-of-class writing did you do?
4)	1.19	How much time was spent learning about writing?
5)	1.50	How much time was devoted to learning how to revise your essays?

For questions 6–19: How much do you agree with the following statements? 1 = Very strongly, 2 = Strongly, 3 = Somewhat, 4 = A little, 5 = Not at all.

In class, in conferences, or in paper comments, the teacher emphasized

	Mean	Question
6)	2.19	choosing the words that best express ideas.
7)	2.25	writing grammatically correct sentences.
8)	2.00	structuring sentences carefully.
9)	1.88	providing appropriate documentation for sources.
10)	1.25	developing a strong argument.
11)	1.38	writing well-focused, coherent paragraphs.
12)	1.88	making transitions from one paragraph to the next.
13)	1.63	focusing an essay on a significant problem, hypothesis, thesis, argument, or idea.
14)	1.44	supporting claims with pertinent substantive evidence.
15)	1.75	incorporating and analyzing source material and quotations.
16)	1.69	editing essays to eliminate flaws of grammar, word choice, spelling, and format.
17)	1.63	revising essays to enhance interest, clarity, and persuasiveness.
18)	1.44	writing in a style appropriate for a particular purpose.
19)	1.69	writing in a style appropriate for a particular audience.

For questions 20–33: How much do you agree with the following statements? 1 = Very strongly, 2 = Strongly, 3 = Somewhat, 4 = A little, 5 = Not at all.

In this seminar,

	Mean	Question
20)	1.31	reading and writing assignments formed an understandable progression.
21)	1.63	the level of difficulty of the readings seemed appropriate.
22)	1.69	I learned to read with care in the discipline of the seminar.
23)	1.44	informal/prep. writing assignments helped me understand the readings and write a
24)	1.38	I had opportunities to confer privately with the teacher.
25)	1.13	the teacher was well-prepared.
26)	1.19	the teacher directed discussions well.
27)	1.19	the teacher treated my writing with respect.
28)	1.13	the teacher graded my papers fairly.
29)	1.19	the teacher returned our papers within a reasonable length of time.
30)	1.13	comments on each returned paper helped me improve the next assignment.
31)	1.31	I felt intellectually stimulated.
32)	1.44	I became a more confident writer.
33)	1.44	I became a more skillful writer.

WRITTEN RESPONSES:

All comments are reproduced. Minor errors are corrected without note.

What were the best aspects of this course? this instructor?

- Good guy, very smart, interesting. Knows his stuff; teaches/leads class well.
- I liked course discussions in the class. He stimulated intellectual thought and conversations among us. I liked him. :)
- Mr. Penner was great!
- Great guy, great class, deserves promotion.
- I REALLY liked the discussions. They were insightful and funny.
- The essays were on interesting topics. The instructor really loves teaching the material.
- Sydney was interesting as an instructor and interested in his subject matter. The reading was good, but hard to understand.
- I really enjoyed the open discussion [illegible].
- The best aspects were learning the different existing philosophies regarding happiness and the good life. Sydney Penner was helpful in class with the questions he asked and good at helping us understand and think about all aspects of the different schools of thought.
- The readings were pretty interesting. The instructor was great in every way.
- Course: the essay topics—they were all interesting and were enjoyable. Instructor: great!

- The readings were intellectually challenging and fun to read. In fact, I very much enjoyed writing the essays because the essay topics were the very things I had wanted to write about before. GREAT PROF, SYDNEY.
- The reading was very thought-provoking and I wholeheartedly enjoyed the instruction/discussion.
- The entire course was excellent, and the instructor tried hard to keep the material engaging and interesting.
- Class was interesting. Clearly communicated philosophical ideas. Knew what he's talking about.
- The material was very interesting and thought-provoking, and the instructor clearly had studied it extensively and helped us to understand.

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

- Liked the philosophical writing style: nice and concise, very strong, deliberate. Great comments on papers.
- Yes, it has improved. I thought harder and more into the problems and prompts.
- Greatly improved.
- Writing has improved. He helped ALOT!
- Yes, I have learned to structure my papers and arguments more clearly.
- Yes. His comments on my essays helped me write the next one. Perhaps grammar.
- Yes. I learned how to write in a different discipline and write concisely.
- Yes, I never knew how to write a philosophy paper before.
- I believe my writing has improved in the philosophy field.
- Yes—practice and new types of writing.
- Yes. By making me write hard papers. Nope.
- My writing has improved stylistically by helping me structure my arguments extremely strongly.
- Yes. Sydney helped make my writing more concise and clear.
- I believe my writing has improved thanks to all the writing and the feedback I received.

- Yeah. Writing a lot. Grammar and word choice, maybe.
- Yes, my writing improved. The course helped me learn to be more straightforward in my writing.

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

- Yes, very. Explained analysing perils [last two words basically illegible]. Showed where I needed to explain more.
- Yes ⇒ helped me think harder and look into problems better.
- Absolutely. Helped perfect my writing.
- Yes—they pointed out ways I could improve.
- Yes, they were always useful.
- Yes. They were focused on what I should improve and can do differently.
- Yes, brought up points to improve argument.
- Very—detailed and comprehensive.
- Yes.
- Yes. They were not about grammar and more about the logic of the paper.
- Yes. Because I saw where my argument had holes.
- Yes, helped me fix up my papers very well.
- Yes. Comments are always helpful for me because they guide me in the right direction.
- Yes ⇒ knew where your mistakes are to correct them.
- Though minimal, they were helpful.

How useful were class discussion of the texts we read? of writing?

- Good for both. Very useful. Texts well explained and reviewed.
- Very ⇒ we thought about new topics.
- Very helpful.
- Very helpful. The readings were confusing, but the discussions helped.
- Very useful, perhaps a few too many though.
- Somewhat. Sometimes they were too difficult.
- Helped better [illegible].

- Very useful.
- Very.
- Very helpful.
- They were extremely thought provoking. Writing—just normal.
- Very and very. Discussions always cleared up the questions I had.
- They were useful and the instructor did an excellent job of clearing up hard pieces.
- Summary/clarification of the philosophy, good because we don't really have much of a background in philosophy yet.
- Very useful. The discussions shed a lot of light on (especially the most complicated) materials we read.

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

- Strength: clarity. Weakness: editing.
- Disorganization.
- Strength: structure. Weakness: syntax.
- I can structure my papers well, but I ramble . . . a lot.
- Clarity is my strength, grammar is my weakness.
- I write well, in depth, and nice sounding, but not always concisely.
- I am not that strong in grammar, but I definitely developed as a persuasive writer.
- I became better at writing more to-the-point and concise.
- Not sure.
- Strength: logic. Weakness: grammar.
- My reasoning abilities are probably not my greatest strength and my weakness is probably my conclusion.
- My clarity and organization are strong; my argument formulation could use work.
- I still consider style to be my greatest weakness, while grammar would be a strength.
- Strengths: grammar, structure. Weakness: forming clear, strong arguments.

6 Fall 2009: PHIL 1112 End-of-Semester Evaluations

Means calculated from all fourteen completed evaluations.

OVERALL MEAN FOR QUESTIONS 2-33: 2.11 (in the fourth quartile; median score for Fall 2009 instructors of First-Year Writing Seminars is 1.83)

OVERALL MEAN FOR QUESTIONS 20-33: 2.07

Nota bene: The mean for questions 20-33 is more relevant for assessing teaching quality, but I have not been given the median score for instructors for those questions.

INDIVIDUAL QUESTIONS:

Question 1) The most important reason I chose this seminar: most students selected: (1) I liked the course description.

For questions 2-5: 1 = An appropriate amount, 2 = Too much, 3 = Too little, 4 = Far too much, 5 = Far too little.

	Mean	Question
2)	1.38	How much reading did you do?
3)	2.00	How much out-of-class writing did you do?
4)	1.31	How much time was spent learning about writing?
5)	1.69	How much time was devoted to learning how to revise your essays?

For questions 6-19: How much do you agree with the following statements? 1 = Very strongly, 2 = Strongly, 3 = Somewhat, 4 = A little, 5 = Not at all.

In class, in conferences, or in paper comments, the teacher emphasized

	Mean	Question
6)	2.15	choosing the words that best express ideas.
7)	2.62	writing grammatically correct sentences.
8)	2.00	structuring sentences carefully.
9)	2.69	providing appropriate documentation for sources.
10)	1.46	developing a strong argument.
11)	2.31	writing well-focused, coherent paragraphs.
12)	3.62	making transitions from one paragraph to the next.
13)	1.85	focusing an essay on a significant problem, hypothesis, thesis, argument, or idea.
14)	2.00	supporting claims with pertinent substantive evidence.
15)	2.54	incorporating and analyzing source material and quotations.
16)	2.69	editing essays to eliminate flaws of grammar, word choice, spelling, and format.
17)	2.15	revising essays to enhance interest, clarity, and persuasiveness.
18)	1.62	writing in a style appropriate for a particular purpose.
19)	2.54	writing in a style appropriate for a particular audience.

For questions 20-33: How much do you agree with the following statements? 1 = Very strongly, 2 = Strongly, 3 = Somewhat, 4 = A little, 5 = Not at all.

In this seminar,

	Mean	Question
20)	2.31	reading and writing assignments formed an understandable progression.
21)	2.77	the level of difficulty of the readings seemed appropriate.
22)	2.15	I learned to read with care in the discipline of the seminar.
23)	2.31	informal/prep. writing assignments helped me understand the readings and write a
24)	1.77	I had opportunities to confer privately with the teacher.
25)	1.54	the teacher was well-prepared.
26)	1.54	the teacher directed discussions well.
27)	1.69	the teacher treated my writing with respect.
28)	2.00	the teacher graded my papers fairly.
29)	2.00	the teacher returned our papers within a reasonable length of time.
30)	2.46	comments on each returned paper helped me improve the next assignment.
31)	1.85	I felt intellectually stimulated.
32)	2.31	I became a more confident writer.
33)	2.31	I became a more skillful writer.

WRITTEN RESPONSES:

All comments are reproduced. Minor errors are corrected without note.

What were the best aspects of this course? this instructor?

- I learned how to construct a solid argument and write in a more direct style. The instructor explained EVERYTHING with flawless precision. It was remarkable.
- Subject matter and discussion were stimulating. The class was engaging and rarely boring. Instructor made strong effort to frequently include students in classroom discussion and encouraged all students to contribute.
- The in class discussions were my favorite part. Sydney did a great job leading them. Sydney was also really accommodating when I got sick. The only aspect that could be improved is that Sydney could ask the quiet kids more questions so it isn't the same 5 people talking.
- The instructor allowed open discussion. He is also very reasonable and it's easy to talk in class.
- The instructor was consistently well prepared and usually held interesting discussions.
- The best part of the course was discussing the various arguments of different philosophers in class. The instructor always came up with really good circumstances in which our argument would be wrong which enabled us to alter our arguments.
- The discussions were very informative and were led well by the instructor. The workload was high; however, it prepares students for the future.
- Discussions were fun. And interpretations of texts.

- Good in class discussion that really helped to understand the reading materials.
- Well directed discussions; challenging material; helpful and constructive criticism; and availability and willingness to discuss issues.
- Subject material is interesting. Instructor is very logical and good at holding discussions. Also clear at presenting ideas.
- The best aspect of this course was the information we discussed in class. Learning about happiness in our lives and how people aim to achieve it was interesting. Our instructor gave us great tips on what to look for in our reading and the comments on our papers helped to improve my writing.
- Course: good variety of reading; a lot of writing, so many opportunities to practice/learn new styles—felt like we were always writing. Instructor: intelligent; very dedicated to class and involved.

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

- Yes. See beginning of above answer [I learned how to construct a solid argument and write in a more direct style]. The writing exercises and essay feedback promoted this improvement. No.
- I do believe my writing has improved. I believe the two greatest factors that led to the improvement were: (1) the high quantity of essays and analytic reading responses and (2) the comments and critiques the instructor gave on the back of essays.
- My writing has gotten way better, I think. The sheer amount of writing was really helpful as well as Sydney's focus on clarity.
- Yes, I learned a lot about writing philosophy essays and how they differ from typical English essays. Sydney did a good job clarifying the stylistic differences. It was very helpful (i.e., I can use the word "you" and shouldn't have flowery introductions).
- It may have improved marginally. I would have benefitted more from a seminar focused more on writing and less on analyzing philosophical works.
- My writing in the field of philosophy has definitely improved. However, I do not think my traditional writing skills have improved greatly. The course promoted this by the instructor giving criticism to my essays and allowing me to fix them.
- Yes, I do believe that my writing has improved. I learned to write in a more specific way, enabling me to better use sources for essays.
- Yes, now it's less redundant and clunkier, but clearer for the reader. I explicitly state the direction of the essays that I write.

- I don't think so. The writing style we wrote was philosophical style and I don't know when I will need those styles unless I'm in another philosophy class.
- The course forced me to write with greater clarity.
- My writing improved, because this course stressed structure of arguments, which I haven't had much of before.
- Yes, the analytic reading responses got me to think about the readings which helped me with the larger papers we wrote.
- I think my writing did improve. I learned a new style of "philosophical writing" which is simpler and more blunt than the more formal/verbose writing I was taught in high school—which made me a more varied (in terms of skills) writer. Also, I had to interpret difficult texts like those of Aristotle, Aquinas, Mill, Hobbes, which was the biggest challenge/very intellectually stimulating.

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

- Yes. Illuminated holes in arguments so we could master making the strongest, most complete arguments possible.
- Yes. Gave both stylistic and technical critiques. Made suggestions to improve writing.
- Yes.
- Yes, he helped better my ideas and how concisely I got my point across.
- Yes, for the most part the comments were clear and beneficial to my writing. In some cases they were possibly more related to the philosophy and the instructor's own beliefs than on my writing.
- Yes, because they showed me flaws in my arguments and how to fix them.
- The comments on the papers were helpful. They provided direct feedback, which helped for future drafts.
- Yes, especially the latter essays, where the instructor points out argument flaws so that we can improve.
- Yes, the comments were very specific, pointing out the problems and holes in the arguments.
- Comments were thought-provoking and constructively critical.
- Yes, good responses to the ideas and the rigour of the arguments. Little response to grammar and sentence structure.
- Yes, they helped me pinpoint what was wrong with my writing, which allowed me to improve on each paper by learning from my mistakes.

- On big papers, yes. On our small weekly papers, no—we only got a grade for those. I would have liked comments on those since they took time to write.

How useful were class discussion of the texts we read? of writing?

- Both very useful.
- Often useful in clarifying the author's message and applying the messages to practical situations.
- Discussions were the best part.
- Very useful. I learned a lot about philosophy that I never knew existed.
- They allowed me to better understand the text which enabled me to write more clearly.
- They were useful in enhancing my understanding of the material, and they also showed possible flaws in the arguments we read.
- The discussions always proved to be useful. They helped me better understand the complex texts which were read throughout the course.
- Very.
- The discussions were helpful since most of the readings were confusing and the discussion clarified many things. Also, the discussion had a lot of student's opinion, which made it seem more interesting.
- Class discussions were very helpful in clarifying difficult material from the readings.
- Class discussions were good. I like how little b.s. got past the instructor. He was not good at drawing in everyone, so only a few people talked.
- Discussions were useful because it allowed us to get a better handle on the texts which were often hard to interpret.
- Class discussion was useful when we focused on writing methods/skills ... not engaging when we discussed texts.

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

- Strength: creativity in crafting an argument. Weakness: expressing ideas too verbosely.
- Strengths: interpretation and analysis. Weaknesses: verbosity, making sure to stay focused on the subject being addressed.
- Strengths: forming logical arguments. Weaknesses: grammatical mistakes/not rereading my work.

- My greatest strengths are coming up with a thesis and arguing for the thesis. My weaknesses are creative writing skills, sentence structuring, and alternating my word choice.
- I have significantly improved my analytical skills throughout the course.
- Strength: creativity in stringing thoughts. Weakness: testing the final arguments.
- My greatest strength is to present a more strong argument and write analytical responses more clearly. My weakness is the grammar.
- My greatest strength is now the clarity with which I write.
- Strengths: coherent arguments, decent prose. Weaknesses: adding flowery stylistic flairs, *way too slow* at writing!
- My strengths would be my opening arguments. My weakness would be bringing my entire paper together as a whole.
- Strength: able to write effectively and analytically about a given text (can take reading \Rightarrow ideas \Rightarrow my own work). Weakness: takes a lot of time to dissect challenging readings by philosophers.