1. Background Information

1.1) My class standing is:

- Freshman/Sophomore: 13.3%
- Junior: 66.7%
- Senior: 13.3%
- Graduate student: 0%
- Other: 6.7%

1.2) This course:
(Select "applies to my major" if the course fulfills both GE and major requirements)

- applies to my major: 73.3%
- is a GE requirement: 0%
- is an elective on a topic related to my major: 13.3%
- is a free elective not related to my major: 0%
- other: 13.3%

2. Instructor Rating

2.1) The instructor's contribution to my understanding of concepts/ideas was...

- Poor: 0%
- 1: 6.7%
- 2: 40%
- 3: 46.7%
- 4: 53.3%

2.2) The instructor's accessibility/availability for consultation outside of class (office hours, by appointment, email, phone) was ...

- Poor: 0%
- 1: 26.7%
- 2: 20%
- 3: 53.3%

2.3) The instructor's explanation of the grading system was ...

- Poor: 0%
- 1: 13.3%
- 2: 20%
- 3: 46.7%
- 4: 20%

2.4) The instructor's ability to present information clearly was ...

- Poor: 0%
- 1: 6.7%
- 2: 46.7%
- 3: 46.7%
- 4: 46.7%
The instructor's ability to challenge me was ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>53.3%</th>
<th>46.7%</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>n=15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>av.</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>dev=0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The instructor's ability to create an atmosphere where students were comfortable asking questions and/or engaging in discussion was ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>6.7%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>73.3%</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>n=15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>av.</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>dev=0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The instructor's ability to create a classroom environment that was respectful of diversity (ethnicity, socio-economic background, sexual-orientation, nationality, age, ability, religion, gender) was ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>n=15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>av.</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>dev=0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The instructor's ability to demonstrate knowledge of the subject matter was ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>26.7%</th>
<th>73.3%</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>n=15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>av.</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>dev=0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The quality of the instructor's overall preparation for class was ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>60%</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>n=15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>av.</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>dev=0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The instructor's overall teaching effectiveness in this course was ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>6.7%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>53.3%</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>n=15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>av.</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>dev=0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Philosophy Department Questions

The instructor's ability to relate course objectives with course content/assignments/tests was ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>6.7%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>53.3%</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>n=15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>av.</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>dev=0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The instructor's returning of work in a timely manner was ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>26.7%</th>
<th>26.7%</th>
<th>46.7%</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>n=15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>av.</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>dev=0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The instructor's contribution to my understanding of concepts/ideas was...

- Excellent: 53%
- Poor: 40%

av. = 4.5
dev. = 0.6
n = 15

The instructor's accessibility/availability for consultation outside of class (office hours, by appointment, email, etc.) was...

- Excellent: 53%
- Poor: 27%

av. = 4.3
dev. = 0.9
n = 15

The instructor's explanation of the grading system was...

- Excellent: 47%
- Poor: 40%

av. = 3.7
dev. = 1
n = 15

The instructor's ability to present information clearly was...

- Excellent: 47%
- Poor: 47%

av. = 4.4
dev. = 0.6
n = 15

The instructor's ability to challenge me was...

- Excellent: 53%
- Poor: 27%

av. = 4.5
dev. = 0.5
n = 15

The instructor's ability to create an atmosphere where students were comfortable asking questions and/or participating in class discussions was...

- Excellent: 73%
- Poor: 20%

av. = 4.7
dev. = 0.6
n = 15

The instructor's ability to create a classroom environment that was respectful of diversity (ethnicity, gender, age, religion) was...

- Excellent: 65%
- Poor: 20%

av. = 4.8
dev. = 0.4
n = 15

The instructor's ability to demonstrate knowledge of the subject matter was...

- Excellent: 73%
- Poor: 27%

av. = 4.7
dev. = 0.5
n = 15

The quality of the instructor's overall preparation for class was...

- Excellent: 60%
- Poor: 40%

av. = 4.6
dev. = 0.5
n = 15

The instructor's overall teaching effectiveness in this course was...

- Excellent: 53%
- Poor: 40%

av. = 4.5
dev. = 0.6
n = 15

The instructor's ability to relate course objectives with course content/assignments/tests was...

- Excellent: 47%
- Poor: 40%

av. = 4.5
dev. = 0.6
n = 15

The instructor's returning of work in a timely manner was...

- Excellent: 47%
- Poor: 27%

av. = 4.2
dev. = 0.9
n = 15
### Profile

**Subunit:** Philosophy  
**Name of the instructor:** Howard Shaeffer  
**Name of the course:** PHIL 380 - Hist of Phil:Presoc-Aristotle (41731)

---

#### 2. Instructor Rating

1. The instructor's contribution to my understanding of concepts/ideas was...
   - Poor
   - Excellent
   - **n=15**  
   - **av.=4.5**

2. The instructor's accessibility/availability for consultation outside of class (office hours, by appointment, email, phone) was...
   - Poor
   - Excellent
   - **n=15**  
   - **av.=4.3**

3. The instructor's explanation of the grading system was...
   - Poor
   - Excellent
   - **n=15**  
   - **av.=3.7**

4. The instructor's ability to present information clearly was...
   - Poor
   - Excellent
   - **n=15**  
   - **av.=4.4**

5. The instructor's ability to challenge me was...
   - Poor
   - Excellent
   - **n=15**  
   - **av.=4.5**

6. The instructor's ability to create an atmosphere where students were comfortable asking questions and/or engaging in discussion was...
   - Poor
   - Excellent
   - **n=15**  
   - **av.=4.7**

7. The instructor's ability to create a classroom environment that was respectful of diversity (ethnicity, socio-economic background, sexual-orientation, nationality, age, ability, religion, gender) was...
   - Poor
   - Excellent
   - **n=15**  
   - **av.=4.8**

8. The instructor's ability to demonstrate knowledge of the subject matter was...
   - Poor
   - Excellent
   - **n=15**  
   - **av.=4.7**

9. The quality of the instructor's overall preparation for class was...
   - Poor
   - Excellent
   - **n=15**  
   - **av.=4.6**

10. The instructor's overall teaching effectiveness in this course was...
    - Poor
    - Excellent
    - **n=15**  
    - **av.=4.5**

---

#### 3. Philosophy Department Questions

1. The instructor's ability to relate course objectives with course content/assignments/tests was...
   - Poor
   - Excellent
   - **n=15**  
   - **av.=4.5**

2. The instructor's returning of work in a timely manner was...
   - Poor
   - Excellent
   - **n=15**  
   - **av.=4.2**
Profile

Subunit: Philosophy
Name of the instructor: Howard Shaeffer
Name of the course: PHIL 380 - Hist of Phil: Presoc-Aristotle (41731)

2. Instructor Rating

[Scale with mark at 4.5]

av. = 4.5
4.1) Please comment on the instructor's overall teaching effectiveness:

I felt his effectiveness was good.

Super clear, very knowledgeable, passionate.

Shaefler is a great teacher and a really cool guy. He truly has a passion for what he teaches.

Challenging and well informed.
Deep insight in the subject matter.
One of the best professors at HSU.
The ability to turn in drafts for your comments made this class much easier and helped me understand the material better.

Very clear, concise, explanatory and friendly. Every concept was effectively illustrated and analyzed, providing an approach easily understood for every student.

Well presented information, however, sometimes difficult to grasp concepts as ambiguity or uncertainty were present.

Shaeffer created a comfortable atmosphere where it was easy to engage in the subject.

42) Please comment on the content of the course (for example, topics, tests, texts, organization, etc.)
He is very concerned with getting papers and comments back in a timely manner.

The course subject matter is reflected well in the paper topics.

The material itself can be very difficult and convoluted. The essays are very hard to write sometimes when the information isn't already fully understood.

Pre-Socratics and their course material were informative.
More homework please. This was taught as best as possible. Furloughs didn’t help.

Content was very interesting. I do wish that more of the emphasis should be on Plato/Aristotle over the presocratics though...

Sometimes the content was left open.

However, I feel the course should...

The Socratics were difficult, as much of the info. was fragmented, but Plato and Aristotle were enjoyable.

4.3) Other comments:
I love all the stories involving Randall.

1) Felt there was little room for creativity in the essays.
2) Analytic approach to philosophy was a bon ton that
   sometimes limited the depth essays could be
   examined.

Helped me improve my writing to a significant degree.
Shudder makes information accessible and discussion possible.