



Evaluation of Instruction and Course

University of Missouri

Assessment Resource Center
University of Missouri

Complete this COVER SHEET and place on top of each group of evaluations.

Department: Philosophy
 Contact Person: Jen Bennett Phone: 882-2871
 Instructor Name: Kenneth Shields
 Catalog Number and Section: (Example: 1000.04) 1100H-01

DIRECTIONS:

1. Use a #2 black lead pencil.
2. Write the correct number in the box and fill in the corresponding bubble below.
3. Darken the bubbles completely.
4. Erase ANY stray marks.
5. Erase completely or use correction tape (NOT a liquid) to make any corrections.

REQUIRED INFORMATION:

This information must be correct. Reports cannot be generated from the accompanying evaluation sheets unless all columns are filled in and the information is correct and accurate.

- 8 digits

This is the employee ID number of the instructor of this class. If ID number has leading 0s, these zeros **must** be entered so that all columns have a number. For student instructors, use their student ID number. *Reminder:* To avoid errors, confirm that the instructor is listed correctly in PeopleSoft before submitting evaluation forms.

- 5 digits

This number is in the Current Class Offerings (Schedule of Classes), column heading "Class." Each class session (e.g., lecture, lab, discussion) will have a unique number. This number will be different each semester.

The semester the class was taught. The year will automatically be added.

14114811	57840
● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●	● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●
● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●	● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●
● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●	● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●
● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●	● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●

12/15/2015

16-01-00





Evaluation of Instruction and Course

University of Missouri





Evaluation of Instruction and Course

University of Missouri

Group Report for : Shields,Kenneth Wesley; Course: INTRODUCTION TO ETHICS

Course: PHIL 1100H Section: 01 Semester: SP2017 Class Number: 57840

No. Respondents: 19

Standard Form Report							
Choices: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, Strongly Disagree	Percent of Responses						
Course Content and Structure	SA (5)	A (4)	N (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	# Rsp	Mean
The syllabus clearly explained the course objectives, requirements, and grading system.	74%	21%	5%	0%	0%	19	4.68
Course content was relevant and useful (e.g., readings, online media, classwork, assignments).	74%	16%	11%	0%	0%	19	4.63
Resources (e.g., articles, literature, textbooks, class notes, online resources) were easy to access.	79%	21%	0%	0%	0%	19	4.79
This course challenged me.	53%	37%	11%	0%	0%	19	4.42
Teaching Delivery	SA (5)	A (4)	N (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	# Rsp	Mean
This instructor was consistently well-prepared.	63%	32%	5%	0%	0%	19	4.58
This instructor was audible and clear.	74%	21%	5%	0%	0%	19	4.68
This instructor was knowledgeable and enthusiastic about the topic.	95%	5%	0%	0%	0%	19	4.95
This instructor effectively used examples/illustrations to promote learning.	89%	5%	0%	5%	0%	19	4.79
This instructor fostered questions and/or class participation.	95%	5%	0%	0%	0%	19	4.95
This instructor clearly explained important information/ideas/concepts.	68%	26%	0%	5%	0%	19	4.58
This instructor effectively used teaching methods appropriate to this class (e.g., critiques, discussion, demonstrations, group work).	79%	16%	5%	0%	0%	19	4.74
Learning Environment	SA (5)	A (4)	N (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	# Rsp	Mean
This instructor responded appropriately to questions and comments.	68%	26%	5%	0%	0%	19	4.63
This instructor stimulated student thinking and learning.	79%	21%	0%	0%	0%	19	4.79
This instructor promoted an atmosphere of mutual respect regarding diversity in student demographics and viewpoints, such as race, gender, or politics.	89%	5%	5%	0%	0%	19	4.84
This instructor was approachable and available for extra help.	89%	11%	0%	0%	0%	19	4.89
This instructor used class time effectively.	53%	37%	11%	0%	0%	19	4.42
This instructor helped students to be independent learners, responsible for their own learning.	68%	21%	11%	0%	0%	19	4.58
Assessment	SA (5)	A (4)	N (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	# Rsp	Mean
I was well-informed about my performance during this course.	74%	26%	0%	0%	0%	19	4.74
Assignments/projects/exams were graded fairly based on clearly communicated criteria.	74%	21%	5%	0%	0%	19	4.68
This instructor provided feedback that helped me improve my skills in this subject area.	79%	21%	0%	0%	0%	19	4.79
Teaching Effectiveness	SA (5)	A (4)	N (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	# Rsp	Mean
This instructor taught effectively considering both the possibilities and limitations of the subject matter and the course (including class size and facilities).	84%	11%	5%	0%	0%	19	4.79



Evaluation of Instruction and Course

University of Missouri

Feedback for Other Students (IDK = I Don't Know)	% Yes	% No	% IDK	# Rsp
Would you recommend this class to other students regarding...?				
CLASS CONTENT	95%	0%	5%	19
CLASS STRUCTURE (E.G., ORGANIZATION, PACING)	89%	0%	11%	19
POSITIVE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT	95%	0%	5%	19
INSTRUCTOR'S TEACHING SKILL/STYLE	95%	5%	0%	19
FAIRNESS OF GRADING	95%	0%	5%	19

Student Information (NA = Not Applicable, NR = No Response)													
Course	Expected Grade	Class Year	Classes attend	Extent use online	Outside hours per week	Complete work							
Requiremen	11%	A	84%	Freshman	47%	0-25	0%	None	68%	0-3	0%	0-25	11%
Elective	79%	B	16%	Sophomore	42%	26-50	0%	Little	26%	4-7	5%	26-50	0%
Other	11%	C	0%	Junior	0%	51-75	0%	Some	5%	8-11	5%	51-75	5%
NR	0%	D	0%	Senior	11%	76-90	0%	Moderate	0%	12-15	47%	76-90	32%
		F	0%	Graduate	0%	91-100	100%	Large	0%	> 15	16%	91-100	53%
		S	0%	Other	0%	NA	0%	NA	0%	NA	26%	NA	0%
		U	0%	NR	0%	NR	0%	NR	0%	NR	0%	NR	0%
		None	0%										
		NR	0%										

Grade A & B = The mean score of students who reported an expected grade of A or B.

Construct Means (21 Questions)									
Content/Struct		Teaching		Environment		Assessment		Effectiveness	
Mean	4.63	Mean	4.75	Mean	4.69	Mean	4.74	Mean	4.79
Grade A & B	4.63	Grade A & B	4.75	Grade A & B	4.69	Grade A & B	4.74	Grade A & B	4.79

COMPOSITE SCORE of the 21 Construct Questions	
Mean	4.71
Grade A & B	4.71

Construct Means and Composite Score are calculated based on the number of respondents for each question in order to apply less weight to questions not applicable to a class.



Evaluation of Instruction and Course

University of Missouri

Group Report for: Shields, Kenneth Wesley; Course: INTRODUCTION TO ETHICS

Course: PHIL 1100H Section: 01 Semester: SP2017 Class Number: 57840

Section VI: Your Comments Are Valued

What aspects of the teaching or content of this course were especially good?

In class examples and going through arguments together was helpful.

Kenny ~~was~~ is extremely passionate about the course material and shows within his teaching. He has been ~~very~~ adamant about equipping us with the philosophical skills that everyday life requires and strives to make us well-rounded thinkers with whatever field we end up in. I have really enjoyed the critical thinking that occurs in his class.

The assigned readings were extremely helpful with gaining a full understanding of the content in lecture and discussions each week.

Kenny promoted group discussion and created an environment that fosters diversity of thought, something that is hard to find on campus.



Evaluation of Instruction and Course

University of Missouri

Kenneth did an amazing job of explaining difficult topics, facilitating discussion, and remaining impartial on controversial issues. This class helped improve my critical thinking and argumentation dramatically. I really enjoyed this class and how it made me question ideas I took for granted and develop my own opinions on difficult subjects.

For the first two weeks of this course, I hated philosophy. I did not understand it & felt doomed. Then I started completing the readings & asking more questions & this class is now one that I look forward to. I talk about these philosophical issues w/ friends & family & am proud of the work I've accomplished in this course with the guidance of professor Shields.

I have really enjoyed the applied ethics section, and I think the discussion board really helped me gain a greater perspective of my classmates opinions.

- Discussions in class
 - Respectful atmosphere
 - Awesome powerpoint slides
 - We got to choose applied ethics topics
 - very enthusiastic teacher
-

The instructor is incredibly passionate about the subject he is teaching. His attitude inspires others to engage and participate.



Evaluation of Instruction and Course

University of Missouri

I didn't particularly enjoy the content until Applied Ethics, but Kenny did a good job at making the class engaging even when I wasn't very interested.

Kenny was an amazing teacher. His high energy and passion for the subject matter made it easy to engage and learn. The coursework was very challenging, but in a way that helped me improve my thinking and philosophical reasoning.

Kenny always seemed to be prepared and excited for class. He was also funny and kind to every student. He is a great instructor and any school would be lucky to have him.

You are extremely enthusiastic about the topics, which keeps it engaging. It was nice that we got to pick our applied ethics topics. You outlined the arguments from the readings in ways that made them easy to discuss and understand.

The teacher cared about us being able to fully understand each topic. He allowed students to have their own ideas, gave constructive feedback. Material was interesting.

Kenny is very enthusiastic about philosophy and is always willing to explain anything that might be confusing or is a heated topic.



Evaluation of Instruction and Course

University of Missouri

I loved how the class was mainly discussion based. The assigned readings were never too long, & were interesting & relevant.

I really enjoyed the level of energy and passion Mr. Shields brought when talking about philosophy. It not only kept me very focused, I like how Mr. Shields was able to make things applicable to non-philosophy majors like me.

critiques & classwork & the built-in-charity grading system

He is very enthusiastic about teaching the course.



Evaluation of Instruction and Course

University of Missouri

What changes could be made to improve the teaching or the content of this course?

Sometimes students were excited about discussion but instructor would take over explanations, this is very discouraging when we think we have a good response but aren't given the chance to continue discussion.

When it comes to grading, explaining exactly why points were taken off would be nice.

Not sure 2-minute break is necessary. it often cuts into discussion.

06/01/2016

17-02.00

For myself, I would have benefitted for more thorough explanations of the readings before class discussions

06/01/2016

17-02.00

While evaluating and discussing in class the arguments presented in the assigned readings, it would be extremely helpful in actually breaking down the argument. It's nice to hear others' objections to each argument, but maybe recapping at the end of discussion major reasons why and why not a particular can hold.

06/01/2016

17-02.00

Grading could be more clear, knowing how many points are being lost on a specific mistake would be nice.

06/01/2016

17-02.00

06/01/2016

17-02.00





Evaluation of Instruction and Course

University of Missouri

I felt very behind & unprepared during the first few classes (some of this was my own fault) but I think it would have helped to spend a class or two really learning about the terminology & basics of philosophy before diving into articles & topics

06/01/2016

17-02.00

N/A

06/01/2016

17-02.00

06/01/2016

17-02.00

Switching who was in your small group occasionally as opposed to the same 4 students all semester being in one group.

06/01/2016

17-02.00

06/01/2016

17-02.00





Evaluation of Instruction and Course

University of Missouri

The only thing that could have been better was getting through all of the content in a particular day. However, this wasn't Terry's fault. Our classes also got into long discussions (about the topic) that took time away from lecture.

06/01/2016

17-02.00

Keeping the discussion time a bit less set to the timer maybe. It seems like sometimes we have more to say or less to talk about and the discussion could continue or stop there. The breaks are a nice idea but I'm not sure we really need them.

06/01/2016

17-02.00

I would have liked more meta-ethics topics and a little less normative-ethics topics.

06/01/2016

17-02.00

06/01/2016

17-02.00

Sometimes Kenny tends to talk a little fast + it's a bit hard to understand - he just really loves the material + gets excited!

06/01/2016

17-02.00



Evaluation of Instruction and Course

University of Missouri

06/01/2016

17-02.00

I personally would have enjoyed more small group discussions, not sure if it would have worked w/ amount of content that was covered.

06/01/2016

17-02.00

more explanation of topics before class discussion, because the readings can be difficult to grasp so sometimes I'm confused in the discussions.

06/01/2016

17-02.00

I wish it was more lecture base rather than too much student discussion. Sometimes I was more confused after lecture due to lack of explanation and students' own ideas of topic.

06/01/2016

17-02.00