Howard Shaeffer
PHIL 420 - Cont Epistemology & Metaphysics (41732)
No. enrolled = 21 / No. of surveys returned = 14
200940

Survey Results

Legend

Question text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Left pole</th>
<th>Right pole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=No. of responses
av.=Mean
dev.=Std. Dev.
ab.=Abstention

1. Background Information

1.1) My class standing is:

- Freshman/Sophomore: 14.3%
- Junior: 28.6%
- Senior: 42.9%
- Graduate student: 7.1%
- Other: 7.1%

1.2) This course:

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

- applies to my major: 76.9%
- is a GE requirement: 0%
- is an elective on a topic related to my major: 7.7%
- is a free elective not related to my major: 7.7%

2. Instructor Rating

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

- Poor: 21.4%
- Excellent: 78.6%

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

- Poor: 21.4%
- Excellent: 78.6%

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

- Poor: 21.4%
- Excellent: 78.6%

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

- Poor: 21.4%
- Excellent: 78.6%
The instructor's ability to challenge me was ...

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

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 ...

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

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

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

3. Philosophy Department Questions

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

The instructor's returning of work in a timely manner was ...
Histogram for scaled questions

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

- Poor: 21%
- Excellent: 79%
- av. = 4.8
- dev. = 0.4
- n = 14

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

- Poor: 14%
- Excellent: 86%
- av. = 4.9
- dev. = 0.8
- n = 14

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

- Poor: 21%
- Excellent: 79%
- av. = 4.4
- dev. = 0.8
- n = 14

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

- Poor: 7%
- Excellent: 93%
- av. = 4.9
- dev. = 0.4
- n = 14

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

- Poor: 14%
- Excellent: 86%
- av. = 4.9
- dev. = 0.3
- n = 14

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

- Poor: 7%
- Excellent: 93%
- av. = 4.9
- dev. = 0.3
- n = 14

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

- Poor: 14%
- Excellent: 86%
- av. = 5
- dev. = 0
- n = 14

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

- Poor: 29%
- Excellent: 71%
- av. = 4.7
- dev. = 0.6
- n = 14

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

- Poor: 7%
- Excellent: 93%
- av. = 4.9
- dev. = 0.3
- n = 14

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

- Poor: 29%
- Excellent: 71%
- av. = 4.7
- dev. = 0.5
- n = 14

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

- Poor: 29%
- Excellent: 43%
- av. = 4.1
- dev. = 0.9
- n = 14
# Profile

**Subunit:** Philosophy  
**Name of the instructor:** Howard Shaeffer  
**Name of the course:** PHIL 420 - Cont Epistemology & Metaphysics (41732)

## 2. Instructor Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>n=14</th>
<th>av=4.8</th>
<th>n=14</th>
<th>av=4.4</th>
<th>n=14</th>
<th>av=4.4</th>
<th>n=14</th>
<th>av=4.6</th>
<th>n=14</th>
<th>av=4.9</th>
<th>n=14</th>
<th>av=4.9</th>
<th>n=14</th>
<th>av=4.9</th>
<th>n=14</th>
<th>av=5</th>
<th>n=14</th>
<th>av=4.7</th>
<th>n=14</th>
<th>av=4.9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1) The instructor's contribution to my understanding of concepts/ideas was...</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2) The instructor's accessibility/availability for consultation outside of class (office hours, by appointment, email, phone) was...</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3) The instructor's explanation of the grading system was...</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4) The instructor's ability to present information clearly was...</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5) The instructor's ability to challenge me was...</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6) The instructor's ability to create an atmosphere where students were comfortable asking questions and/or engaging in discussion was...</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7) 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...</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8) The instructor's ability to demonstrate knowledge of the subject matter was...</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9) The quality of the instructor's overall preparation for class was...</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10) The instructor's overall teaching effectiveness in this course was...</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 3. Philosophy Department Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>n=14</th>
<th>av=4.7</th>
<th>n=14</th>
<th>av=4.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1) The instructor's ability to relate course objectives with course content/assignments/tests was...</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2) The instructor's returning of work in a timely manner was...</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Profile

Subunit: Philosophy
Name of the instructor: Howard Shaeffer
Name of the course: PHIL 420 - Cont Epistemology & Metaphysic (41732)

2. Instructor Rating

av. = 4.8
4. Student Comments (Only writing within the textboxes will be recorded.)

4.1) Please comment on the instructor's overall teaching effectiveness:

Excellent teacher
- I really enjoy classes with Prof. Shaeffer
- One of the best professors at HSV

Very good, made the material easy to understand.

Prof. Shaeffer is an excellent teacher in all regards.

Great teacher, very knowledgeable, effective at teaching very

complex subjects.
Professor Sheaffer is very clear and effective in teaching the advanced subject. I was very pleased.

Lectures were very helpful. The handouts helped a lot, could use more.

Benjamin is a great instructor who challenges his students to achieve greater results. His helpful critiques allow us to improve in the areas in which we need to work on, but that might be neglected by us.

I felt you were very effective with your teaching. This is a difficult class, I know you make it more understandable and easier to grasp.

Be more positive supervision.

Great at explaining complex concepts in a clear manner & easily relatable to real-life examples. Good at keeping conversations on track & organized.

42) Please comment on the content of the course (for example, topics, tests, texts, organization, etc.)
Very interesting class.

Content was good, but very challenging. Though it was a bit alienating that most reading material was from white/male sources, it would be interesting to have reading from a more diverse group of philosophers. Organization & assignments were excellent.

Hard to comment effectively considering the dysfunctionality of furloughs, but overall, course was fine.

Great topic, challenging.

This is difficult material, but I feel the topics are well chosen and supply the basics required.

I enjoyed the tests and the provided prompts helped a lot in guiding my essays. Very challenging material.
Good course, good texts.

The content of the course was very interesting, it was the reason I chose the class. The tests were very challenging because Dr. Shafer's instruction made it much clearer.

Papers related directly to class discussions were very clear. Tests were interesting and informative.

Course was challenging but worth the effort.

Other comments:

I know that it is not good content to grade on, but more room in the essay prompts for personal ideas/experiences would be awesome.
Awesome professor!

The course sucks. I deserve more class time because I am paying more for it.
Challenging but very interesting class.