
MICHAEL HATCHER
Teaching Portfolio

+91 70304 31054
michael.d.hatcher@gmail.com
www.michaeldhatcher.com

FLAME University, Gat No. 1270,
Lavale, Pune, Maharashtra 412115,
India

Contents

TEACHING STATEMENT	2
TEACHING EXPERIENCE	4
PEER OBSERVATIONS	5
SELECTED WRITTEN STUDENT EVALUATIONS	11
SUMMARY OF NUMERICAL STUDENT EVALUATIONS (WITH PAGE NUMBER FOR EACH SURVEY)	13
SYLLABI FOR COURSES TAUGHT	
INTRODUCTION TO WESTERN PHILOSOPHY	16
INTRODUCTION TO APPLIED ETHICS	22
CRITICAL REASONING	27
ANCIENT AND MEDIEVAL PHILOSOPHY	34
PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION	50
THE GOOD LIFE	66
ELEMENTARY LOGIC AND CRITICAL THINKING	79
THE HUMAN EXPERIENCE (CORE 115)	88
THE HUMAN EXPERIENCE (CORE 110)	112
COPIES OF ALL WRITTEN AND NUMERICAL STUDENT EVALUATIONS	126

TEACHING STATEMENT

A student raised their hand and offered the following principle: It is okay to violate a person's rights when doing so is the only way to prevent a greater number of rights violations. I had been contrasting utilitarian and deontological approaches in ethics. I wrote the student's principle on the board. I asked how the class felt about a case where we prevent the violation of two persons' rights in this way, as compared to a case where we prevent the violation of a large number of people's rights. Students felt the cases were different. The first student saw that their principle did not distinguish between these cases, and then clarified that the rights violations we prevent must be *much* greater in number. Another student insisted it is never okay to violate anyone's rights. And on the discussion went.

In one sense, I had not planned this exchange. I am not sure whether, till then, I had even considered the exact principle my student offered. But in another sense, it is a case of what, above all else, I aim for my teaching to produce, namely: participation in the philosophical conversation.

In service of this end, I intersperse miniature lectures with discussion. I will explain an author's argument, for example, and then wait for and discuss students' objections to its premises. Even while presenting, I pause often and encourage questions. And depending on the size of the class, I may break it into smaller groups to better facilitate discussion.

Good conversations consist not of lengthy speeches falling to the ground but digestible contributions responsive to each other. This thought informs not only my strategy in class, but also my approach to how students prepare for class. Short, clear, rich readings are preferred whenever possible. In addition, before class I have students upload to Moodle a question they see arising from the text along with a few paragraphs of explanation. I write brief feedback for them before class. Sometimes I have the opportunity to encourage a student to bring up in class an insightful point they had made, which can help a more reticent student participate verbally.

I cannot shake an impression which remains from when I was a student. It is that the best teachers are especially skilled at listening to their students. We teachers are passionate about the ideas we want to cover. So, I suspect we are often tempted to "get past" contributions from students to avoid getting derailed. This temptation, while understandable, is pernicious. Suppose, for example, that a student's contribution seems hopelessly confused. Even so, if time is taken to understand and situate it, it can turn out to be insightful. Besides, even when the end result is sorting out confusion, taking students seriously and treating them with gentleness and respect is an antidote to the fear of making mistakes which can otherwise inhibit them.

Or suppose a student's contribution is tied up with an idea one had planned to discuss later. It may sometimes be best to explain how the class will return to the point later. But if used too often, I believe this strategy demotivates students from influencing the ideas discussed and how they are framed. An area of growth I have set for myself is to make it my default to discuss such contributions on their own terms, deferring them for later only when necessary. This requires not only a healthy sense of which ideas must be covered and which are window dressing, but also flexibility about the *order* in which they are covered. Turns out there is rationale behind the metaphor of "knowing something backwards and forwards", in that the ability to explain ideas both backwards and forwards requires a deeper understanding of them. I am convinced that, if it can be done, covering ideas organically is more effective, whether or not the order of coverage is precisely the one I had planned.

The importance of listening manifests in office hours, too. Students I would otherwise be tempted to think are indifferent I quite often find to be suffering from significant relational,

psychological, or financial stressors. I have never been able to argue a student into putting aside their troubles and focusing on the material. But I have found that, sometimes, a listening ear and supportive words can help them experience the class as a safe place rather than just another stressor. And this correlates positively with their putting forth the effort they can with the time they have. As an aside, I have a practice of praying for each student by name once a month, which tends to take about one hour. I find this practice helps me see students as persons rather than projects, and I would encourage analogues of this practice for those who do not pray.

I assume everyone, at some level, cares about philosophy's big questions. I assume we all care whether we live in a Quinean ontological desert or a Dantean rainforest, whether the good life is found in providing for our antecedent preferences or in the self-denial and submission characteristic of religion, whether we are truly free, whether we can know such things in the first place, and so on. But some philosophers address these questions in a grand and hasty manner which casts up more dust than is worth the effort, while others address small questions with rigor, but offer no vision on how the progress they make makes any difference. All of this contributes, I suspect, to the feeling among some students that philosophy is a waste of time.

So, when I design a course, I hunt for tractable problems which may also have upshots for the big questions. For example, in one of my ethics courses, I end up arguing for an account of the good life on which what is intrinsically good for one is enjoying what is excellent. Now, for many excellent things – e.g., friendship, sacrificial love, etc. – virtues undergird our capacity to enjoy them. So, near the end of the course, I assign a reflective paper in which students explain a virtue as well as a practice which could develop it. Making vivid how a topic could impact life gives students a broader framework within which to situate philosophy's otherwise seemingly labyrinthine pattern of arguments, objections, and replies. It is not always easy, but I want my students to buy into the inquiries we spend our time on.

I have been discussing ways I promote participation in the philosophical conversation. Now, of course, the ultimate goal is not just participation but *effective* participation. As Aristotle might say, though, students learn to participate effectively by participating, as one learns to play guitar well by playing guitar. Before their first paper is due, students will have already tried out their own objections to arguments, in previous classes, many times over. They will have heard me reason aloud about how well the objection lands, which premise in particular it puts pressure on, how best to formulate it, how the author might reply, etc. These are opportunities to learn, through trial and error, what it takes to develop an objection. Once, when explaining an upcoming paper, a student summarized my instructions by saying that it looked like I wanted them to do in their paper what we had been doing in class. I was glad the connection was clear to her.

At FLAME University, I have taught critical reasoning, applied ethics, and introduction to western philosophy, which is a historical survey of philosophy in the west. I am also currently the faculty mentor for the student-led philosophy club and debate club. While at Valparaiso University, I taught logic, bioethics, a course on the good life, philosophy of religion, ancient and medieval philosophy, and the human experience, which is a writing-intensive introduction to the humanities for freshman. I also have experience advising students in service learning. In fall of 2016, I was with the Joint Educational Project at USC, and here at FLAME, I have served as a faculty mentor for the Developmental Activities Program. Both programs help students integrate academic course content with community service.

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

COURSES TAUGHT AT FLAME UNIVERSITY

PHIL104: Introduction to Western Philosophy

CETH101: Introduction to Applied Ethics (x5)

CRTL101: Critical Reasoning (x4)

COURSES TAUGHT AT VALPARAISO UNIVERSITY

PHIL330/THEO335: Philosophy of Religion

PHIL 275: Ancient and Medieval Philosophy

PHIL341/THEO341: Bioethics

PHIL 125: The Good Life

CORE115: The Human Experience

CORE110: The Human Experience (x2)

PHIL 145: Elementary Logic and Critical Thinking (x6)

COURSES TAUGHT AS TEACHING ASSISTANT AT USC

PHIL285: Knowledge, Explanation, and the Cosmos

PHIL135: Legal Controversies and Ethical Principles

PHIL 256/220: Science, Religion and the Making of the Modern Mind (x2)

PHIL262: Mind and Self: Modern Conceptions

PHIL101: Philosophical Foundations of Modern Western Culture

REFERENCES

Shieva Kleinschmidt
Associate Professor of Philosophy
University of Southern California
kleinsch@usc.edu

Susan Harris
Executive Director
Joint Educational Project
University of Southern California
scharris@usc.edu

Phil Woodward
Assistant Professor of Philosophy
Niagara University
pwoodward@niagara.edu



Valparaiso
University

COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES

Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Instructor: Michael Hatcher

Date Submitted: 4/25/208

Reviewer: Aaron Preston

Course: PHIL 125

Date of pre-observation meeting: 4/23/18

Date of classroom observation: 4/24/18

Date of post-observation meeting: 4/25/18

Please provide an overall evaluation of your colleague's teaching in the shaded field below. Keep the Peer Teaching Evaluation Procedure document in mind as you write, and make specific comments about the quality of your colleague's teaching in light of the following areas of evaluation:

- Syllabus preparation and organization
- Course design
- Classroom management and pedagogy
- Student and instructor engagement
- The instructor's self-reflection on teaching

Specific examples, both positive and negative, will be helpful information to your colleague, your department chair, members of the Tenure & Promotion Committee, and your dean. (The shaded field will expand as you enter your response.)

Michael's syllabus is well constructed. It is clear, informative, easy to navigate, and contains the required syllabus elements.

The course design is quite good. The readings struck me as very well-chosen, and the assignments and other expectations are appropriate for a 100 level philosophy class.

In the classroom, Michael was very good. 75 minutes can be a long stretch for 100-level students in a gen ed course, but Michael did a great job of breaking the period up by moving back and forth between small-group discussion, class-discussion, and mini-lectures on distinct topics which emerged from the discussions, as follows:

Michael began class a minute or so early, calling for reading-response papers to be passed in. He then turned to the general theme that would be occupying the class for the few remaining classes of the semester: disciplines, as a means of character-formation, to be explored in connection with several religious and philosophical traditions. He clearly connected this new topic to what the class had recently been discussing: a "hybrid theory" of the good life according to which a good life is characterized by (a) having sources of "subjective" enjoyment which are (b) objectively excellent. What if one doesn't enjoy objectively excellent things - how does one come to enjoy them? Transformative disciplines are the answer.

After this introduction by way of mini-lecture, Michael had the students break into small groups to discuss a question about the reading for today: why is intention is not enough to secure transformation? All the students appeared to be actively engaged in their small group discussions, and a few minutes later when Michael pulled them into a large group discussion many were ready to contribute. Michael began calling on students by name, and writing their answers on the board, leading a discussion of each in turn.

The class period was taken up with several cycles of this pattern: (i) mini-lecture introducing a topic and key concepts, (ii) small-group discussion focusing on a question drawing the mini-lecture together with the day's reading, (iii) large-group discussion in which individuals reported back from their small groups to the class as a whole, with Michael effectively facilitating class-wide discussion and making connections among the students points and the reading, etc. This seemed to be a very effective strategy for maintaining student attention and engagement throughout the entire 75 minute period. (I noticed only one student on his phone, and only for a brief minute or two, during the entire class period.) Michael's mini-lectures were well-planned and very clear. He is very pleasant and approachable in his interactions with the students, and they clearly felt comfortable sharing their ideas with him. It was, in my judgment, a very successful class.


In my pre-and post-observation meetings with Michael, he showed himself to be very thoughtful and reflective about his teaching. He clearly cares about student-learning and works hard to plan courses and class periods that will facilitate this.

Signed:



Peer Reviewer

Date:



Signed:



Faculty Member Being Reviewed

Date:



The faculty member's signature above does not necessarily signify agreement with this evaluation, only acknowledgement that it has been completed and shared with the faculty member on the date noted.

Following completion of this report, please provide a copy to both the colleague under review and to his/her department chair in keeping with section 2.3.5.3.2 of the *Faculty Handbook*.



Valparaiso
University

COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES

Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Instructor: Michael Hatcher

Date Submitted: November 9, 2018

Reviewer: Philip Woodward

Course: PHIL 145

Date of pre-observation meeting: **Thursday, November 8**

Date of classroom observation: **Friday, November 9**

Date of post-observation meeting: **Friday, November 9**

Please provide an overall evaluation of your colleague's teaching in the shaded field below. Keep the Peer Teaching Evaluation Procedure document in mind as you write, and make specific comments about the quality of your colleague's teaching in light of the following areas of evaluation:

- Syllabus preparation and organization
- Course design
- Classroom management and pedagogy
- Student and instructor engagement
- The instructor's self-reflection on teaching

Specific examples, both positive and negative, will be helpful information to your colleague, your department chair, members of the Tenure & Promotion Committee, and your dean. (The shaded field will expand as you enter your response.)

I observed Michael Hatcher's PHIL 145 class on Friday, November 9. Michael began the class by collecting homework and then briefly explaining how the topic from the previous class (causal reasoning) is related to the content from this class (inference to the best explanation). Michael delved into the topic by describing a phenomenon (there's snow in the front yard) and listing four hypotheses that explain the phenomenon. He broke students into pre-determined groups and asked them to rank the hypotheses for better/worse. On the basis of student answers to these questions, he introduced four 'theoretical values': fruitfulness, adequacy, conservatism, and simplicity. He then passed out a handout that contained examples of new information that either increases or decreases the degree that some hypothesis manifests one of these virtues. The rest of the class period was spent going over student answers to these exercises.

The pacing and sequence of Michael's teaching is excellent: over the course of the hour, students went from zero familiarity with the relevant terms to a working familiarity that will allow them to complete the day's homework exercises. I was especially impressed with the way that Michael started with a concrete case that naturally motivated the four theoretical values; Michael only needed to name, and give rigorous definitions for, the four concepts, as students' intuitions had already been nudged in their direction. Michael's manner with the students is both confident and gentle. He seems to have developed a rapport with them.

I suggest two areas for improvement: first, Michael occasionally makes a comment that expresses a complicated philosophical insight he's having but that may leave the class confused. I recommend that he either stop to fully explain such thoughts, or move on without giving voice to them. (I should note: I've seen a substantial improvement on this front since last I observed Michael). Second, Michael seems more comfortable affirming correct answers from students than working through incorrect answers. I suggest that he be more intentional about how he can capitalize on incorrect answers as ways to calibrate student understanding.

Both of these suggestions are relatively minor. In general, Michael is clearly very effective in the classroom, and his pedagogical skills continue to mature.

Signed: _____ Date: _____
Peer Reviewer

Signed: _____ Date: _____
Faculty Member Being Reviewed

The faculty member's signature above does not necessarily signify agreement with this evaluation, only acknowledgement that it has been completed and shared with the faculty member on the date noted.

Following completion of this report, please provide a copy to both the colleague under review and to his/her department chair in keeping with section 2.3.5.3.2 of the *Faculty Handbook*.



COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES

Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Instructor: Michael Hatcher

Date Submitted: 12/6

Reviewer: Philip Woodward

Course: Core 110

Date of pre-observation meeting: 11/30

Date of classroom observation: 12/1

Date of post-observation meeting: 12/4

Please provide an overall evaluation of your colleague's teaching in the shaded field below. Keep the Peer Teaching Evaluation Procedure document in mind as you write, and make specific comments about the quality of your colleague's teaching in light of the following areas of evaluation:

- Syllabus preparation and organization
- Course design
- Classroom management and pedagogy
- Student and instructor engagement
- The instructor's self-reflection on teaching

Specific examples, both positive and negative, will be helpful information to your colleague, your department chair, members of the Tenure & Promotion Committee, and your dean. (The shaded field will expand as you enter your response.)

I observed Michael's Core 110 class on Friday, December 1, from 10:30 to 11:20. Texts for the class were *Frankenstein*, the creation story in the book of Genesis, Percy Shelley's poem "Prometheus Unbound," and excerpts from Milton's *Paradise Lost*. Michael's focus was on comparing Victor Frankenstein (protagonist of *Frankenstein*) and God as depicted in Genesis, in their respective capacities as creators. Michael structured the class by asking a series of four discussion questions over the course of the hour; in each instance, after stating the question, he broke the class into discussion groups (easily enough, as students are seated around tables), gave students a few minutes to discuss, and then called on each group to share their responses. He recorded their responses on the board, commenting on them and drawing connections among them where appropriate.

The content of the class period was clear and the pacing apt. Throughout the hour, students were aware of the current task they were engaged in and how it followed naturally on the previous task. Michael has an affable demeanor as an instructor, to which students respond well. Discussion was vigorous. Though a few student responses were predictably ill-formed, many were quite sophisticated. Michael worked carefully with both types of responses, to put them to work answering whatever guiding question was operative. In sum, my assessment is that Michael is effectively facilitating discussions in Core. His students are lucky to have him as their instructor.

In our debriefing afterward, I recommended to Michael that he implement a few minor changes that I suspect will make his teaching still more effective. First, I noticed that when Michael called the class back together after being in discussion groups, many students still had their backs turned to him, which encouraged distracted behaviors (such as texting and whispering). So I recommend that Michael invite students to turn toward the front of the class, or toward whomever is speaking. Second, I noticed that some of the commentary Michael made in response to student answers went by too quickly to be valuable to the class, or was directed narrowly to the student whose answer he was commenting on. Relatedly, when the class arrived at a ‘payoff’ moment—for example, when it became apparent that a big difference between God’s responsible creating and Victor’s irresponsible creating is that Victor creates out of a sense of loss whereas God creates out of abundance—the relevant observation was made too quickly for students to fully appreciate and appropriate it. So, I recommend that Michael treat such teaching-opportunities more deliberately, by slowing them down and making sure to draw the whole class into the discussion.

Signed: _____ Date: _____
Peer Reviewer

Signed: _____ Date: _____
Faculty Member Being Reviewed

The faculty member’s signature above does not necessarily signify agreement with this evaluation, only acknowledgement that it has been completed and shared with the faculty member on the date noted.

Following completion of this report, please provide a copy to both the colleague under review and to his/her department chair in keeping with section 2.3.5.3.2 of the *Faculty Handbook*.

SELECTED WRITTEN STUDENT EVALUATIONS

'Very good at explaining concepts in a relatable way. Also very good at understanding where a student's confusion stems from.'

'Clearly presented all topics in a way that actually made sense. Took time to make sure we understood each concept.'

'Micheal Hatcher has immense knowledge about philosophy, and as his concepts are clear about the topics he is teaching, it is easier for us as students to understand.'

'Michael sir is the best teacher I've seen so far attending university online. The feedback sir gives is always transparent straightforward and encouraging...'

'While the continuous assessments were challenging at times, they were worth every bit of effort thanks to the continuous, in-depth feedback we got. The course matter was presented in an interesting, discussion evoking manner, the assignments were creative and interesting and the professor was patient and precise. This would definitely be the course I've learnt the most from and found the most interesting this term and I wouldn't change a single thing about it.'

'The course was unexpectedly heavy. However, the work as well as manner of discussion was very interactive and interesting, and prompted a lot of new ideas.'

'Ethics with Prof. Hatcher has been one of the best courses I've taken at FLAME so far.'

'This class made it worth waking up at 8. It's extremely difficult to teach someone how to think, and the professor did this very well.'

'He is very joyous and makes the sessions quite engaging.'

'He is really kind and always in a happy mood. He was always available to meet and willing to help explain material and help out however he could. He also made good handouts for discussion.'

'I found this course extremely difficult and on one occasion he sat w/ me for 1hr 45 min going through material.'

'This instructor's main strengths were providing a friendly, inviting, and jovial working classroom environment, teaching the course material in an interesting and engaging manner that is easy to comprehend by breaking down the material in a way that is appropriate for the students, being a dynamic and inviting presence in the classroom, and providing timely and excellent test prep.'

'Easy to approach, gave me the opportunity to articulate my thoughts and have an intellectual conversation without fear of saying the wrong thing. Learned a lot from bouncing ideas off of him as well as hearing his opposing views, always questioned my thoughts in a way that helped me form them better. Overall great teacher!'

'I enjoyed the course...It made me realize that my thinking capacity is far greater than I ever expected. I was able to open up and it felt good.'

'Just want to tell you that you are an amazing person Michael. It feels good to have a professor that is vulnerable when it needs to be and has a warm heart.'

'Professor Hatcher really cared to make sure that his students fully understood the information. He was enthusiastic about teaching which helped his students to stay engaged and be excited about learning. He was happy to answer any questions and more than willing to meet his students for office hours in order to give extra help.'

'He always comes to class with relevant discussion questions and our class is always engaged and on task. He is impartial and tries to engage everyone in our class and not just a few students. I always feel well prepared for our assignments and of all my classes I have learned the most in this class.'

'I love the class discussions, when we are all trying to think of objections for an argument. It gets super philosophical and my mind just gets blown every time.'

SUMMARY OF NUMERICAL STUDENT EVALUATIONS

FOR COURSES TAUGHT AT FLAME UNIVERSITY

AVERAGE STUDENT EVALUATION RATING: 4.65

The student evaluation rating is the students' response to the prompt 'Overall, I rate this instructor as an excellent teacher', where strongly agree = 5, agree = 4, neutral = 3, disagree = 2, and strongly disagree = 1. I give the page numbers for each survey, which are easy to find when this document is viewed as a pdf.

STUDENT EVALUATION RATINGS			<i>page number for complete written and numerical survey</i>
<i>Term 4 2021/22</i>	PHIL104: Introduction to Western Philosophy	4.00	126
<i>Term 3 2021/22</i>	CRTL101 E: Critical Reasoning	5.00	127
	CRTL101 H: Critical Reasoning	4.50	128
<i>Term 2 2021/22</i>	CETH101 K: Introduction to Applied Ethics	4.80	129
<i>Term 1 2021/22</i>	CETH101 R: Introduction to Applied Ethics	4.56	130
	CETH101 U: Introduction to Applied Ethics	4.50	131
<i>Term 3 2020/21</i>	CETH101 I: Introduction to Applied Ethics	4.65	132
	CETH101 K: Introduction to Applied Ethics	4.55	133
<i>Term 2 2020/21</i>	CRTL101 C: Critical Reasoning	4.93	134
	CETH101 F: Introduction to Applied Ethics	4.56	135
<i>Term 1 2020/21</i>	CRTL101 L: Critical Reasoning	5.00	136
	CETH101 N: Introduction to Applied Ethics	4.80	137

FOR COURSES TAUGHT AT VALPARAISO UNIVERSITY

AVERAGE STUDENT ASSESSMENT OF INSTRUCTION RATING: 4.39

At Valparaiso University, the Student Assessment of Instruction Rating is the result of a survey of students regarding the following: Organization and Clarity, Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation, Rapport and Respect, Feedback and Accessibility, and Student Perceptions of Learning. It is the average of scores in response to questions asking whether desirable features along these dimensions were present. Please see the copies of written and numerical student evaluations for each specific feature. A scale of 1 to 5 is used for the scores, where strongly agree = 5, agree = 4, neutral = 3, disagree = 2, and strongly disagree = 1.

STUDENT ASSESSMENT OF INSTRUCTION RATINGS			page number for complete written and numerical survey
<i>Spring 2020</i>	PHIL 341 AX / THEO 341 AX: Bioethics		
	PHIL 341 AX Survey:	4.75	138
	THEO 341 AX Survey:	4.62	144
	PHIL 145 A: Elementary Logic and Critical Thinking	4.24	154
	PHIL 145 B: Elementary Logic and Critical Thinking	4.43	160
	PHIL 145 C: Elementary Logic and Critical Thinking	4.62	168
<i>Fall 2019</i>	PHIL 275 A: Ancient and Medieval Philosophy	4.61	174
	PHIL 145 A: Elementary Logic and Critical Thinking	4.28	180
<i>Spring 2019</i>	CORE 115 F01: The Human Experience	4.28	186
	PHIL 145 B: Elementary Logic and Critical Thinking	3.73	192
	PHIL 145 C: Elementary Logic and Critical Thinking	4.23	199
<i>Fall 2018</i>	PHIL 330 AX / THEO 335 AX: Philosophy of Religion		
	PHIL 330 AX Survey:	4.57	206
	THEO 335 AX Survey:	4.13	211
	CORE 110 D01: The Human Experience	4.47	217
	PHIL 145 A: Elementary Logic and Critical Thinking	4.32	222
<i>Spring 2018</i>	PHIL 125 A: The Good Life	4.59	228
	PHIL 125 B: The Good Life	4.64	235
	PHIL 145 C: Elementary Logic and Critical Thinking	4.18	241
<i>Fall 2017</i>	CORE 110 C03: The Human Experience	4.68	247
	CORE 110 E06: The Human Experience	4.26	255
	PHIL 145 A: Elementary Logic and Critical Thinking	4.20	262

**FOR COURSES TAUGHT AS TEACHING ASSISTANT AT UNIVERSITY OF
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA**

AVERAGE STUDENT EVALUATION RATING: 4.52

At the University of Southern California, the student evaluation rating is the average rating in response to the question, ‘Overall, how would you rate this teaching assistant?’ A scale of 1 to 5 is used for the scores, where poor = 1, below average = 2, average = 3, above average = 4, and excellent = 5.

STUDENT EVALUATION RATINGS				page number for complete written and numerical survey
<i>Fall 2015</i>	PHIL 256: Science, Religion and the Making of the Modern Mind			
	Zlatan Damnjanovic	Section 49352:	4.43	270
		Section 49353:	4.79	276
<i>Fall 2013</i>	PHIL 135: Legal Controversies and Ethical Principles			
	Andrei Marmor	Section 49590:	4.43	282
		Section 49593:	4.17	287
		Section 49596:	4.46	293
<i>Spring 2013</i>	PHIL 101: Philosophical Foundations of Modern Western Culture			
	Jacob Ross	Section 49301:	4.47	299
		Section 49302:	4.38	317
<i>Fall 2012</i>	PHIL 285: Knowledge, Explanation, and the Cosmos			
	Shieva Kleinschmidt	Section 49572:	4.77	330
		Section 49573:	4.80	346
		Section 49577:	4.17	357
<i>Spring 2012</i>	PHIL 262: Mind and Self: Modern Conceptions			
	Janet Levin	Section 49373:	3.90	358
		Section 49377:	4.75	370
<i>Fall 2011</i>	PHIL 220: Science, Religion and the Making of the Modern Mind			
	John Dreher	Section 49581:	4.79	383
		Section 49582:	5.00	395

Note: Written responses were never provided from section 49577 of PHIL 285.

PHIL104 Syllabus: Intro to Western Philosophy

Professor: Michael Hatcher

Classrooms: Mon, 2:15pm-4:10pm in RNJ002 (Ramanujan Building)

Fri, 2:15pm-4:10pm in TGR102 (Tagore Building)

Office Hours: **Mon/Fri 4:10pm-4:40pm** after class in the classroom and **Wed 2pm-3pm** either in person in my office or on the Zoom office hour link on Moodle. To avail the office hour on Zoom, “knock” on my “digital door” by texting me over WhatsApp me at 7030431054. Do not text to schedule, just “knock” when you are on the link already and I will join the link too.

Office: Kasturba 205

Course Description

This course is an introduction to the philosophical conversation in the West. We will read and discuss philosophers such as Plato, Aristotle, Epicurus, Plotinus, Aquinas, Descartes, Hume, Kant, and Mill. We will learn to identify and understand the ideas and arguments these philosophers are putting forth about the nature of reality, knowledge, value, the human person, and what it might mean to live a good life. You will learn to read, understand, and engage with a philosopher’s ideas for yourself, by reading their works firsthand and discussing them in class. Assignments will require you to demonstrate your understanding of and engagement with these works in your writing.

Class Format

Attendance

At 2:15pm sharp, I take attendance for session one by reading through your names. Similarly for session two, after the 10-minute half-time break. When reading your names, after moving to the next name, I do not go back; so, if you have missed it, you have missed your chance for attendance for that session. So, you will need to be in class on time, sharp. (Also note that if you are present for your name but later leave and do not return, I can erase the checkmark for attendance I have made.)

Mindfulness minute

I may often begin class with a one-minute mindfulness exercise, e.g., *count breaths, describe an object, notice new sounds or sensations, remember a joy*. This can be a way to clean your “mental room” for class (similar to how we clean our physical rooms before having guests over).

Textual questions

As you will see below, a central component of this course is reading the assigned text, wrestling with it, and completing a Reading Response Assignment prior to class. These assignments involve your asking a textual question. I begin each session with 9-10 of these questions of yours on the board, so that your individual question will be on the board every fourth session (that is, once a week). Class begins with discussion of some, though not necessarily all, of these questions.

Your posture in class

The class centers on discussion of the text. So, you will need the text in view. They will all be pdfs on Moodle. So, have a laptop with the text. Also have a document in which you can take notes (consider ‘split screen’), and/or a physical notebook. But please position your laptop in such a way that you can clearly see me; and, when a fellow student speaks, look, pay attention to them, and listen well. If I ever have evidence that you are using your laptop for anything besides (i) the text and (ii) notes on the text and class, I will ask you to stop doing that.

Discussion groups

I may often ask you to form groups of 3-5 students near you to discuss a question.

Assessments

Class Engagement – 10% Weightage

How well are you listening to those in the classroom, whether the teacher or your fellow students? Are you verbally contributing during class, asking questions which demonstrate that you have been listening and thinking about the material? Are you asking questions when you are confused or have doubts? Are you pushing the discussion forward? Are you showing respect for everyone?

Reading Response Assignments – 20% Weightage

Reading Response Assignments (RRAs) require careful reading of the assigned text before class and are a way for you to demonstrate how you have wrestled with it.

Each is graded on a 10-point scale. There are 12 of them, the first due on the second class held, with the 2 lowest scoring dropped at the end of the course. **Each is to be uploaded on Moodle before 10am on the class day the assigned text will be discussed. Late RRAs receive 0.**

At the top of your RRA, type either

- (a) I did not read all of the text assigned for class,
- (b) I read all of the text assigned for class, or
- (c) I read all of the assigned text for class as well as at least significant portions of the text twice or more.

And then type your name. 2 marks depend on this. (a) secures 0, (b) 1, (c) 2. Please be honest with yourself about this.

After this, in one sentence that you have thought carefully about, write out your own *textual question* – that is, a question about the text.

Then, underneath your textual question, in one or two paragraphs (word count minimum / maximum: 100-250 words), explain how your question arose from your reading of the text. Aim for your explanation to help me see that your question is a *good* question about the text. One way to think about this: Make as clear as you can that your question is one the author of the text, were they to read it, would take it to show a genuine wrestle with the ideas in the text, to show evidence of a degree of understanding of the whole assigned text (the more, the better), and to be pointing toward an issue the text itself is pointing towards.

To expand on how to ask good questions about the text, they can look lots of different ways:

Perhaps the author says something which, in the context of the whole assigned text, can be reasonably interpreted to mean A, as well as something which, in the context of the whole assigned text, can be reasonably interpreted to mean B. And perhaps you can see reasons to worry that A and B cannot both be true, i.e., that they conflict with each other. That kind of thing would be good to ask about.

Or perhaps the author explains idea I₁ in terms of idea I₂, and then explains I₂ in terms of a couple different examples, but that, even in the context of the whole assigned text, it is unclear what the examples have in common, and so unclear what I₂, and so I₁, is actually supposed to mean. That kind of thing would be good to ask about.

Or perhaps the author argues for conclusion C on the basis of premise P, but that, even in the context of the whole assigned text, there are lots of ways to imagine that P is true but C false, so that it is unclear why the author takes P to be a good reason to believe C. That kind of thing would be good to ask about.

Or perhaps...

Or perhaps... [I hope you get the idea! Notice how good questions correlate with wrestling with, and achieving at least some degree of understanding of, the entirety of the assigned text.]

The remaining 8 marks depend on the quality of your textual question as discernible from that question itself as well as your explanation of how it arose from your reading of the text. I grade your RRAs at 10am on the day of class. I will try to give a sentence or two of feedback on Moodle as appropriate, too. Please read this feedback to improve your preparation for class and your textual questions.

The following page of this syllabus is a template for RRAs.

Student Name
Intro to Western Philosophy, T4 2022

Reading Response Assignment for [place here the appropriate assigned reading; e.g., *Selections from Plato's Gorgias*]

(b) I read all of the text assigned for class. [Notice how this is one of three possible options; again, please be honest in each assignment.]

Student name typed

Textual Question: Am I here asking a good question about the text? [Ensure the question is *one* sentence, grammatical, and ends with a question mark.]

Explanation of Textual Question:

Here is the first sentence adequately and clearly explaining how my question arose from the text, so as to help my reader see that it is a good question to ask of the text, in view of a wrestle with the entirety of the assigned text. Here is the next sentence adequately and clearly explaining how my question arose from the text, so as to help my reader see that it is a good question to ask of the text, in view of a wrestle with the entirety of the assigned text. Here is the next sentence adequately and clearly explaining how my question arose from the text, so as to help my reader see that it is a good question to ask of the text, in view of a wrestle with the entirety of the assigned text.

Here is the next sentence adequately and clearly explaining how my question arose from the text, so as to help my reader see that it is a good question to ask of the text, in view of a wrestle with the entirety of the assigned text. Here is the next sentence adequately and clearly explaining how my question arose from the text, so as to help my reader see that it is a good question to ask of the text, in view of a wrestle with the entirety of the assigned text.

Word count: 230 [notice how this fits within the 100-250 minimum/maximum]

Writing Assignment 1 – 20% Weightage

In this assignment, entirely in your own words, you will compose your own dialogue between yourself and Plato. A more detailed prompt for this writing assignment will be given in due course.

Writing Assignment 2 – 20% Weightage

In your own words and in your own way, you will demonstrate your understanding of the ideas and arguments found in the texts of at least two of the philosophers covered in the class. You will put these philosophers in dialogue *and*, in contrast with Writing Assignment 1, you will also join the dialogue in the final section of your assignment. A more detailed prompt for this writing assignment will be given in due course.

Final Exam – 30% Weightage

In a series of questions requiring written answers of about a half-page to a page, your understanding of the texts and ideas and arguments covered in the course will be examined. This exam will be cumulative. (Hint: this is a good reason to take good notes each class day!) A more detailed prompt will be given in due course.

Reading Schedule and Deadlines

This reading schedule and the deadlines are both tentative and may be updated; if and when this occurs, I will message the class over Moodle.

Session	Topic	Readings	Deadlines
1-2 on 7 Mar	Class cancelled		RRAs due each class day before 10am beginning 14 Mar
3-4 on 11 Mar	What is Philosophy?	Selections from Aristotle's <i>Metaphysics</i> and Plato's <i>Symposium</i>	
5-6 on 14 Mar	Plato	Selections from Plato's <i>Gorgias</i>	
7-8 on 21 Mar	Plato	Selections from Plato's <i>Republic Book II and Book IV</i>	
9-10 on 25 Mar	Plato	Selections from Plato's <i>Republic Books VI-VII and Book IX</i>	
11-12 on 28 Mar	Aristotle	Selections from Aristotle's <i>Physics</i>	
13-14 on 1 Apr	Aristotle	Selections from Aristotle's <i>Nicomachean Ethics</i>	

15-16 on 4 Apr	Epicurus and the Stoics	Epicurus' <i>Letter to Menoeceus</i> and Selections from Stoics <i>On Fate and Ethics</i>	Writing Assignment 1 due 5 Apr before 11:59pm
17-18 on 8 Apr	Aquinas	Selections from Aquinas' <i>Summa Theologica</i>	
19-20 on 11 Apr	Descartes	Selections from Descartes' <i>Meditations</i>	
21-22 on 18 Apr	Hume	Selections from Hume's <i>An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding</i> and <i>Abstract of a Treatise of Human Nature</i>	
23-24 on 22 Apr	Reid	Reflections on the Common Theory of Ideas	Writing Assignment 2 due 27 Apr before 11:59pm Final Exam on TBA
25-26 on 25 Apr	Kant	Selections from Kant's <i>Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals</i>	
27-28 on 29 Apr	Mill	Selections from Mill's <i>Utilitarianism</i>	

INTRODUCTION TO APPLIED ETHICS

COURSE CODE: CETH101

CREDITS: 2

PROGRAM: UNDERGRADUATE

DESCRIPTION:

This course is aimed at understanding and analysing ethical issues in real life situations. The students will be able to understand ethical theories, relevant concepts and social components that contribute to ethical reasoning at the end of the course. Ethical issues such as privacy, personal and professional relationships, business ethics, and animal and food ethics are explored. The course uses lecture-cum-discussion method with the aid of case studies in ethics.

OBJECTIVES OF THE COURSE:

1. Introduce philosophical analysis of moral issues
2. Introduce and demonstrate recognition and application of normative theories to different situations and actions.
3. Facilitate development of critical thinking skills, particularly about moral reasoning.
4. Provide opportunities to make well-reasoned moral judgements and respectful defences.
5. Examine personal ethical biases and demonstrate how to respect contrary views.

EXPECTED LEARNING OUTCOMES:

At the end of the course the learner will be expected to be able to:

1. Discuss ethical theories and concepts
2. Recognize and explain relevant ethical and social concerns regarding the issue at hand.
3. Classify the moral complexity of situations.
4. Explain important ethical components and recognize concerns common to various situations.
5. Demonstrate reasoning for ethical judgements.

DETAILS OF THE COURSE SYLLABUS

1. Normative ethics, moral dilemmas
2. Interpersonal ethics
3. Professional ethics
4. Biomedical ethics
5. Business ethics
6. Food ethics
7. Animal ethics

INDICATIVE READING LIST

1. *The Moral Life* by Luper and Brown
2. *Ethics: Theory and Contemporary Issues* by MacKinnon
3. *Introduction to Applied Ethics* by Robert L. Holmes
4. *Encyclopedia of Applied Ethics*

EVALUATION PLAN (in % adding up to 100%)

Assessment	Weightage
Class Engagement	15
Final Assessment: Ethics Bowl	40
Reflection Piece	25
Appeal Writing	20

Introduction to Applied Ethics

Syllabus with Schedule and Deadlines

Professor: Michael Hatcher

Office Hours: Look for announcement and instructions on Moodle

Email: michael.hatcher@flame.edu.in

Note on Email: I process email thoroughly once each weekday. I often, but not always, process emails once each Saturday. I do not check email on Sunday. With all this in mind, in terms of response time to expect, please do email me with questions; I love to answer them!

Schedule and Deadlines

This schedule is tentative and may be updated; if and when this occurs, I will message the class over Moodle.

Session	Topic	Readings	Deadlines for Evaluation Components
1-2 on 29 Oct	Introductions, moral dilemmas and theories	* Falzon, “Crimes and Misdemeanors – Moral Philosophy”, Ch. 3 of <i>Philosophy Goes to the Movies</i> (p. 99-140)	
3-4 on 2 Nov	Moral dilemmas and theories continued, and arguments	* Same reading as for 29 Oct	
5-6 on 9 Nov	Friendship	* Luper, Ch. 5 “Friendship” (p. 177-204) <i>Appeal Writing explained</i>	* Appeal Writing due 11 Nov before midnight
7-8 on 12 Nov	Marriage	* Luper, Ch. 7 “Marriage and Family” (p. 266-290)	
9-10 on 16 Nov	Family	* Luper, Ch. 7 “Marriage and Family” (p. 290-307)	

11-12 on 19 Nov	Sexuality	* Luper, Ch. 6 “Sexual Relationships” (p. 211-252)	<p>* Reflection Piece due 2 Dec before midnight</p> <p>* Ethics Bowl on 21 Dec</p>
13-14 on 23 Nov	Eating Meat	* Norcross, “Puppies, Pigs and People: Eating Meat and Marginal Cases” (p. 286-300) <i>Reflection Piece explained</i>	
15-16 on 26 Nov	Animal Rights	* Frey, “Moral Standing, the Value of Lives, and Speciesism” (p. 301-317) * Cigman, “Death, Misfortune and Species Inequality” (p. 625-630)	
17-18 on 30 Nov	Business Ethics	* Daly, “Globalization and Its Discontents” (p. 477-481) * Shiva, “Principles of Earth Democracy” (p. 481-484)” * Singer, “Famine, Affluence, and Morality” (p. 469-476)	
19-20 on 3 Dec	Discrimination	* Luper, Ch. 11 “Discrimination” (p. 405-430)	
21-22 on 7 Dec	Abortion	* Anne-Warren, “On the Moral and Legal Status of Abortion” (p. 397-406) * Marquis, “Why Abortion Is Immoral” (p. 361-370) <i>Ethics Bowl explained</i>	
23-24 on 10 Dec	Euthanasia	* Chris Hill “The Note” 1994 (p. 353-357) * Luper, Ch. 9 “Euthanasia” (p. 347-362) <i>Determine EB teams</i>	
25-26 on 14 Dec	Professional Ethics	* Rini, “Fake News and Partisan Epistemology” * Worsnip, “The Obligation to Diversify One’s Sources: Against Epistemic Partisanship in the Consumption of News Media”	
27-28 on 17 Dec	Student Questions	Each student is to come to class with their own ethical or moral question to discuss	
29-30 on 21 Dec	Ethics Bowl	Ethics Bowl	

Course Outline: Critical Reasoning 2022-23

Course description:

This course introduces the fundamentals of reasoning through the systematic study of arguments. Sound reasoning is pivotal not only for effective communication but also in deciding what beliefs to hold and what actions to take. This course will equip students with the ability to identify an argument and analyse its quality, and also to formulate their own effectively. The lectures and class activities include discussion of theory, practice, and contemporary readings. Critical Reasoning is a skill-based course with wide-ranging practical applications in the academic, professional, and personal lives of students.

Objectives of the Course:

1	Introduce basic principles of formal and informal logic
2	Learn how to critically analyse ideas, arguments and points of view
3	Learn about common fallacies and how to identify them
4	Introduce logic in science, law and ethics
5	Express one's ideas clearly, vigorously, and succinctly
6	Learn to critically read texts
7	Inculcate the rules of good reasoning to one's life

Learning outcomes:

1	Identify premises and conclusions in an argument
2	Distinguish between arguments and explanations
3	Recognize an argument by its type
4	Apply different logical tools in argument formation
5	Recognize fallacies in an argument
6	Summarize complex arguments, explaining their different components

Topics:

1	Introducing the components of arguments
2	Explanations
3	Assumptions

4	Evaluating reasons
5	Deductive reasoning (categorical & propositional)
6	Inductive reasoning (analogical & causal)
7	Fallacies
8	Constructing arguments
9	Language and argumentation

Reading list:

Textbook:

1. Critical Reasoning, A Practical Introduction by Anne Thomson
2. Art of Reasoning: an introduction to logic and critical thinking by David Kelley

Reference books:

1. Critical thinking: your guide to effective argument, successful analysis and independent study by Tom Chatfield
2. Illustrated book of bad arguments by Ali Almossawi
3. Introduction to Logic by Irvin Copi and Carl Cohen
4. Introduction to Logic by Patrick J Hurley

Assessments:

Assessment	Weightage	When
End Term	40	Examination week
Participation	15	Throughout the term
Presentation	25	Week 5-6
Assignment	20	Week 2-3

Critical Reasoning

Syllabus with Schedule and Deadlines

Professor: Michael Hatcher

Contacting Me: I process email thoroughly every weekday before noon. Thus, emails in the evening or over the weekend may need to wait until the next weekday before they will be processed. But do make use of email, I love to answer any questions you have. My office is Kasturba 205, and my office hours are 2-3pm Tuesdays and Thursdays. My email is: michael.hatcher@flame.edu.in.

Classroom Details:

Monday 8:00 am to 9:55 am at ARB202 (Aryabhatta Building)
Thursday 8:00 am to 9:55 am at RNJ102 (Ramanujan Building)

Graded components with weight:

Participation	15%
Assignment	20%
Presentation	25%
End Term	40%

Advice: As the concepts and skills of this course build on each other, your success will depend on the *consistency* of the efforts you put in. Otherwise, the Assignment, Presentation, and End Term may catch you by surprise.

How to be consistent? Do the assigned readings before class, they will give you a good, initial exposure to the *concepts* to be learned that class. Participate in the group activities during class: they are indispensable practice of the *skills* to be learned that class. Take seriously any non-credit-involving pop quizzes I administer in class: though these will not directly affect your grade, once you complete them, I walk the class through the correct answers. This will tell you pretty clearly how prepared you are, individually, for the questions which will be on the End Term.

Finally, *ask* questions whenever there are doubts: I am here to help, and any question you have other students will also have, too.

Schedule and Deadlines

This schedule is tentative and may be updated; if and when this occurs, I will message the class over Moodle.

Note: For the Thomson textbook, the page number displayed on your pdf reader will not correspond with the actual page numbers which appear on the top of the textbook pages – use the actual page numbers which appear on the top of the textbook pages.

Sessions	Topic	Readings	Deadlines
1-2 on 22 Aug	Introduction to Critical Reasoning; What is an argument?; Difference between argument and non-argument	* Thomson: p. 1-4 of Introduction * Kelley: p. 67-77 of Chapter 4 * Benson, Cognitive bias cheat sheet (about two pages)	
3-4 on 25 Aug	Propositions; Types of propositions	* Kelley: p. 47-66 of Chapter 3 * Kelley: p. 261 of Chapter 9	
5-6 on 29 Aug	Identification of reasons and conclusions in arguments	* Kelley: p. 73-79 of Chapter 4	
7-8 on 1 Sep	Difference between explanations and arguments, Identification of explanans and explanandum	* Kelley: p. 79-80 of Ch. 4 * Kelley: p. 483-495 of Ch. 15	
9-10 on 5 Sep	Practice Reconstructing Another's Argument	* TBA	
11-12 on 8 Sep	Assumptions	* Thomson: p. 22-34 of Chapter 1 * Kelley: p. 88-91 of Chapter 4	* Assignment due on Moodle by 11:59pm 9 Sep
13-14 on 12 Sep	Introduction to deductive and inductive reasoning Categorical arguments	* Kelley: p. 82-87 of Chapter 4 * Kelley: p. 145-151 and 155-163 of Chapter 6 * Kelley: p. 179-180 and 184-185 and 198-203 of Chapter 7	

		Note: p. 159 of Kelley has an error: the visual diagram at the bottom of the page should have region 1 shaded grey.	
15-16 on 15 Sep	Categorical arguments	* Except for Kelly: p. 82-87 of Chapter 4, read the readings assigned for 17 Nov again	
17-18 on 19 Sep	Propositional arguments	* Kelley: p. 260-271 and 275-287 of Chapter 9 * Kelley: p. 300-306 of Chapter 10	
19-20 on 22 Sep	Propositional arguments	* Read the readings assigned for 24 Nov again	
21-22 on 26 Sep	Inductive reasoning – Analogical arguments	* Kelley: p. 442-455 of Chapter 13	
23-24 on 29 Sep	Practice Constructing Arguments	* Thomson: p. 151-160 of Chapter 7	
25-26 on 3 Oct	Presentations		* Presentations in class on 3 Oct
27-28 on 6 Oct	Fallacies	* Kelley: p. 228-233 of Chapter 8 * Kelley: p. 103-141 of Chapter 5	
29-30 10 Oct	Language and Argumentation	* Kelley: p. 9-46 of Chapters 1 and 2	
31-32 on 13 Oct	Review for End Term Exam		* End Term Exam TBA by program office

PHIL 275-A: ANCIENT AND MEDIEVAL PHILOSOPHY

Professor: Michael Hatcher

Email: michael.hatcher@valpo.edu

Cell: (714) 875-4343

Class and Class Times: in ASB 114, MWF 10:30am-11:20am

Office and Office Hours: in ASB 352, MWF 1-3pm, and by appointment

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course is a reading-intensive introduction to the main philosophers of the ancient and medieval periods, namely Plato, Aristotle, Augustine, Aquinas, and others. We will pay particular attention to how their metaphysical and epistemological arguments and views inform the question of what it means to be human and what it takes to live a good life. We will also highlight the effect these ideas had in Christian theology, as reflected in Augustine and Aquinas, on topics such as the existence and nature of God, free will, the problem of evil, etc. Throughout, our main strategy will be to read, first hand, the main works of these philosophers and discuss them.

TEXTS

There is one required text you will need to get for yourself, namely:

The Republic of Plato, by Plato, translated and edited by Allan Bloom (1991; second edition). Paperback, unabridged.

Thankfully, this book is rather plentiful and cheap on Amazon.

Here is the Amazon page: <https://www.amazon.com/Republic-Plato-Second/dp/0465069347/ref=sr_1_1?keywords=0465069347&qid=1564242523&s=gateway&sr=8-1>

And here is the ISBN number: 0465069347

All other required texts will be both uploaded to Blackboard and provided in class as hardcopies. Hardcopies will be necessary in class for discussion. Always bring the relevant texts to class.

COURSE GOALS AND STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES (SLOs)

Those who put consistent effort into this course will increase their...

1. ...skill in reading and understanding texts in ancient and medieval philosophy (which contributes to University-Wide SLO 2),
2. ...ability to productively think about what it means to be human in terms of the metaphysical and epistemological theories and arguments of Plato, Aristotle, Augustine, Aquinas, and others (which contributes to University-Wide SLO 6),
3. ...skill in writing papers which help the reader better understand aspects of difficult and important texts (which contributes to University-Wide SLO 4).

CLASSROOM FORMAT, EXPECTATIONS, GROUND RULES

Seating Format

Each class we will sit in one circle in which each student can see each other student.

Discussion Format

I will expect and rely on your participation, and on your buying into us as a group discussing texts and ideas together. Listen to your fellow students. My hope is for discussion I do not need to always triangulate – though I will guide discussion as appropriate.

I will come prepared with questions to ask, and a handful of ideas to cover and dig into, and I will sometimes have a handout. But the means we shall use to explore will center on discussion of the text. And I expect that what you see in the text, and how our discussion goes, will affect what we cover and in what manner.

Expectations

I expect you to come to class...

1. ...having carefully completed all the reading for that class day,
2. ...with the texts for that day in hand,
3. ...with your Reading Response Assignment (RRA, see below) having already been submitted on Blackboard by 7:30am that morning (see also note about Professor Geiman),
4. ...prepared to engage in discussion,
5. ...and ready to take good notes.

Ground Rules

1. There will be absolutely no technology in the classroom. If I notice you on your phone, I will ask you to put it away.
2. Be kind and respectful.
3. No need to ask for permission to use the restroom.

GRADING AND POLICIES

Components of Course Grade

Attendance (see Participation in Discussion)

Participation in Discussion	10%
-----------------------------	-----

Reading Response Assignments	20%
------------------------------	-----

Midterm Exam	15%
--------------	-----

Final Exam	20%
------------	-----

Meetings Over Drafts (see *Grade Penalties*)

First Paper	15%
-------------	-----

Second Paper	20%
--------------	-----

Extra Credit (see *Extra Credit*)

The grading scale that will be used is as follows: A = 93-100, A- = 90-92, B+ = 87-89, B = 83-86, B- = 80-82, C+ = 77-79, C = 73-76, C- = 70-72, D+ = 67-69, D = 63-66, D- = 60-62, F = 59 and below.

Important Dates:

First Paper Due: September 25th

Midterm Exam Due: October 7th

Second Paper Due: December 4th

Final Exam: December 10th

Grade Penalties

Meeting Over Drafts: A week or more prior to the due date for each paper, each of you will meet with me for 30 minutes in my office over a completed first draft of your paper. (Thus, the “First Paper” you submit for a grade on Blackboard will be that paper’s *second* draft (at least); similarly for the “Second Paper”.) Please bring two hardcopies of your paper to this meeting. I will read the paper and provide feedback, then and there. For best results, please put your very best efforts into this first draft. If you miss the meeting, or do not have a draft, there will be a 2% course grade penalty. If you make the meeting and have a draft, but the draft is incomplete or otherwise indicative of only partial effort on your part, there will be a 1% course grade penalty.

Lateness Policy

I do not accept late Reading Response Assignments, unless you can document a medical or family emergency that prevented you from submitting it when it was due. Exams cannot be rescheduled, unless you can document a medical or family emergency that prevented you from taking the exam. Regarding the Papers, the lateness policy is as follows. If the paper is not turned in when it is due, it is automatically reduced by 1/3 of a letter grade. (So, for example, a B paper becomes a B-, etc.) For each additional week the paper is late, there is an additional reduction of this amount. This policy holds, and there are no extensions, unless you can document a medical or family emergency that is preventing you from finishing the paper on time. (Note: The grade penalties and lateness policy described above are negotiable *only if* you have Access and Accommodations.)

Honor Code

The Honor Code must be written and signed on every assignment and exam. In accord with the Code, all students must pledge not to give or receive unauthorized aid. Additionally, students are obligated to report violations of the Honor Code to the Honor Council. Violations may result in (a) zero credit on the assignment in question *and* a 1/3 letter-grade reduction in the final course grade; (b) failing this course; or (c) in being suspended or expelled from the University. For details see: <http://www.valpo.edu/honor-council/>

In this course, unauthorized aid includes but is not limited to:

- Collaboration of any kind on exams.
- Attempting to pass off someone else's work as your own.

Note:

1. Faculty are expected to report all suspected uses of unauthorized aid.*
2. It is easy for faculty to tell the difference between original work and plagiarized work.

Email and Class Cancellation

I generally reply to email within 24 hours on weekdays, so feel free to email with any questions. I also love to be available to you in office hours, and I can make an appointment if the hours do not work for you. I make appointments best by email. In the event of an unscheduled class cancellation, I will send an email to your Valpo email address.

* From the Faculty Handbook, section 3.1: "If a faculty member suspects from evidence in the papers received—whether or not the Honor Pledge has been signed—that unauthorized aid has been given, such evidence should be turned over to the chair of the Honor Council, ... A faculty member is not authorized to determine guilt and assess penalties in this kind of matter. The Honor Council conducts its own investigation, which may include an interview with the instructor, and, after assembling and weighing the evidence, determines guilt. If there has been an infraction of the Honor Code, the Council recommends the appropriate discipline to the Provost of the University, who finally penalizes the offending student."

Access and Accommodations

The Access & Accommodations Resource Center (AARC) is the campus office that works with students to provide access and accommodations in cases of diagnosed mental or emotional health issues, attentional or learning disabilities, vision or hearing limitations, chronic diseases, or allergies. You can contact the office at aarc@valpo.edu or 219.464.5206. Students who need, or think they may need, accommodations due to a diagnosis, or who think they have a diagnosis, are invited to contact AARC to arrange a confidential discussion with the AARC office. Further, students who are registered with AARC are required to contact their professor if they wish to exercise the accommodations outlined in their letter from the AARC.

Emergencies

VU's Emergency Notification System (ENS) uses multiple forms of communication, including e-mail, building alarms, outdoor sirens, message boards, computer alerts, Twitter, and public address messaging. Please review the specific procedures for this class found in Blackboard. Remember: "Siren inside, GO outside; Siren outside, GO inside." To evacuate, gather your personal belongings quickly and proceed to the nearest exit. Do not use the elevator. To shelter in place, move away from the windows and stay low to the ground; lock or barricade the door if there is a threat of violence.

Graded Components

Participation in Discussion: Participation in Discussion is graded on a 0-10 scale at the end of the semester. Imagine that you not only consistently participate in discussion each class day, but also that your contributions are timely, thoughtful, show the mark of listening well to your fellow classmates, and also help draw your fellow classmates into the discussion. What you have imagined is ideal Participation in Discussion, which would secure a 10. It is not easy, requiring your full attention during the entire 50 minutes, each and every class day. Scores less than 10 are based on how close they are to this ideal. Do notice that not speaking at all in class would result in a 0. And speaking very little would result in low numbers. If you feel uncomfortable speaking during class, please talk to me privately after class or in office hours so that we can think together about how to make it easier for you to speak in class.

Attendance: Notice also the essential connection between participation and attendance. I will make note of attendance each class day for myself. I will allow at most two unexcused absences before automatically factoring your missed attendances into how I think about your participation grade (put differently, *it is impossible to get a 10 for Participation in Discussion with three or more missed attendances*). For an excused attendance, contact me and provide evidence of a medical, family, etc., emergency.

Reading Response Assignments: Reading Response Assignments (RRAs) have five elements:

1. With honesty, you will type out in full either (a), (b), or (c), below:
 - a. I did not complete all the required reading for this class day.
 - b. I completed all the required reading for this class day.
 - c. I completed all the required reading for this class day, and I spent significant time re-reading part or all of the required reading for this class day.
2. Immediately underneath the above, you will write out the Honor Code and sign your name.
3. Response to Textual Question. Answers should be entirely in your own words, and adequately yet concisely demonstrate your understanding of the text. Find the Textual Questions for each class day in the Tentative Course Schedule at the end of the syllabus.
4. Immediately underneath the above, include the word count for your Response to the Textual Question. The acceptable range is **200 to 300 words**.
5. Two Discussion Questions. Offer two questions you believe it would be interesting or illuminating to discuss in class.

RRAs are graded on a **1-10 scale**. **2 points** depend on (1) and (2), above. If you write out (c) and include the Honor Code with your signature (this may be electronic), you will receive 2 points. If you write out (b) and include the Honor Code with your signature, you will receive 1 point. Otherwise, if you write (a) or if you write (c) or (b) but fail to include the Honor Code, you will receive 0 points. **8 points** depend on (3)-(5). I will be looking for adequate, accurate explanation in response to the textual question – and do be aware that this will require reading and coming to an understanding of the *whole* assigned text – and for worthwhile discussion questions.

RRAs are due on Blackboard no later than 7:30am on the day the reading will be discussed in class.[†] I will aim to grade them before class and, in addition to a numerical score, to provide a brief response to your RRA. The response may be a brief explanation of the score – though, often, a more complete explanation may only become clear by means of class that day. Hopefully more often, my response will make a connection, point to a follow-up question, or otherwise relay how your assignment influenced my thinking. You are encouraged, if you wish, to read these responses prior to class.

RRAs not turned in receive a 0. **The five lowest scoring RRAs in the semester will be dropped.** (Related to this, see “Un-Drop-Able” Reading Response Assignments’ under *Extra Credit*.)

Note on Professor Geiman: When Professor Geiman covers this class after my wife gives birth, reading response assignments will be due each class, graded, etc. However, Professor Geiman will explain the format, expectations, etc., that he will be looking for with reading response assignments (hardcopy rather than on Blackboard, etc.).

[†] Note well: Blackboard detects whenever any part of an assignment is lifted from the internet. Doing so constitutes plagiarism.

The rest of this page is a template for RRAs.

Student Name, Date

Ancient and Medieval Philosophy, Fall 2019

RRA# [Replace '#' with appropriate number]

I completed all the required reading for this class day. [Notice that this is (b) from the above options. Use the response which is accurate.]

I have neither given or received, nor tolerated others' use of, unauthorized aid.

Student Signature

Response to Textual Question:

One sentence that is part of my adequate yet concise explanation in response to the textual question. Another sentence that is part of my adequate yet concise explanation in response to the textual question. Another sentence that is part of my adequate yet concise explanation in response to the textual question. Another sentence that is part of my adequate yet concise explanation in response to the textual question. Another sentence that is part of my adequate yet concise explanation in response to the textual question. Another sentence that is part of my adequate yet concise explanation in response to the textual question. Another sentence that is part of my adequate yet concise explanation in response to the textual question. Another sentence that is part of my adequate yet concise explanation in response to the textual question.

Another sentence that is part of my adequate yet concise explanation in response to the textual question. Another sentence that is part of my adequate yet concise explanation in response to the textual question. Another sentence that is part of my adequate yet concise explanation in response to the textual question. Another sentence that is part of my adequate yet concise explanation in response to the textual question.

Another sentence that is part of my adequate yet concise explanation in response to the textual question. Another sentence that is part of my adequate yet concise explanation in response to the textual question. Another sentence that is part of my adequate yet concise explanation in response to the textual question.

Word Count: 238 [Notice that this is within the acceptable range of 200-300 words]

First Discussion Question: [state your question]

Second Discussion Question: [state your question]

Exams: Exams will be non-cumulative, and on anything in the required readings and anything discussed in class. They will be take-home exams, and due on Blackboard, though we will also meet in person for the final exam. Since take-home, you will be able to refer to the texts. However, I suspect you will be lost if you have not been reading consistently throughout the semester, or if you have not been taking good notes consistently throughout the semester, both on the readings and during class. Study guides will be released in due course.

Papers: Each Paper will be **2,000-3,000 words** (this is approximately 6.5 to 10 pages), double-spaced, with your name, etc. For the First Paper, you will select one primary text from Plato; for the Second Paper, you will select one primary text from any reading in the course, so long as it is a different primary text from the one selected for the First Paper. (It may be the same author, though; so, for example, you may write on Plato's *Gorgias* for the First Paper, and then Plato's *Republic* for the Second Paper, etc.)

Your overall goal will be to shed light on the text you have chosen. Put differently, your goal is to increase your reader's understanding of the text and the author's concepts, views, arguments, concerns, worldview, etc. This can look many different ways. For example, it may involve:

- explaining an otherwise puzzling or seemingly irrelevant aspect of the text,
- proposing a clarification of the main concepts factoring in the author's argument,
- clarifying the structure of the author's argument,
- identifying an apparent inconsistency in the author's views and then, using the resources available to the author, showing that the inconsistency is only apparent,
- *and so on and so on!*

Do notice that the above is only a suggestive list, and by no means complete. One thing I will discourage is simply pulling out one idea from the text and then arguing that that particular idea is incorrect. The idea may or may not be incorrect, and your objection may or may not be a good one. But doing this and nothing else may not shed any light on the text. Of course, an objection to an idea you find may be an important *element* of shedding light on the text, as this may give rise to the question of *how the author would deal with that objection*. Diving into this question may end up illuminating the text, as you may find that the author's view is more subtle and interesting than first supposed.

Before each Paper is due, you will be required to meet with me over a complete first draft of the paper, in time for you to take into account my feedback and improve your paper before it is turned in for a grade.

Note: If you feel strongly that you would like to write your Second Paper on the same text as the first, we can talk about it. If you have a clear plan, I may allow you to expand your 2,000-3,000 word First Paper into a 4,000-5,000 word Second Paper on the same text, but developed more in depth. You will need permission from me to do this, though.

Extra Credit

Colloquia: You will receive 0.5% on top of your course grade for each of the following colloquium you attend. I will be at these talks; if you attend, please come up to me afterwards to record your name.

Dr. Hatcher, "On Praying Without Ceasing"	September 10 th , 5:00-6:15pm Location: TBA
Dr. Sullivan, "Contemplation and Well-Being"	November 7 th , 6:30-7:30pm Location: TBA

“Un-Drop-Able” Reading Response Assignments: Remember that the five lowest-scoring RRAs in the semester are dropped at the end of the semester. If somehow it is not possible for me to drop five RRAs – for example, in the limit and perhaps quite unlikely case in which you turn in each RRA *and* receive a 10 on each one – then for each “un-drop-able” RRA you will receive 0.25% on top of your course grade.

Tentative Course Schedule

Wed 8/21	<p>Required Readings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Aristotle, <i>Metaphysics</i> I.1-2 and Plato, <i>Symposium</i> 197c-212c <p>Due</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA1 by 7:30am <p>Textual Question: Given what Aristotle and Plato write in these selections, what is philosophy? (Hint: ‘philosophy’, in Greek, means simply ‘love of wisdom’: <i>philia</i> = love; <i>sophia</i> = wisdom.)</p>
Fri 8/23	<p>Required Readings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Presocratic Philosophers, selected fragments 2. Jones, <i>The Classical Mind</i>, Ch. 1 <p>Due</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA2 by 7:30am <p>Textual Question: Pick the Presocratic metaphysical theory other than Parmenides’ theory which you find most promising, and explain why you find it promising. Then discuss how Parmenides would criticize that theory.</p>

Mon 8/26	<p>Required Readings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Barnes, <i>Protagoras</i>: Man the measure and Knowledge and relativity, 541-553 2. Plato, <i>Protagoras</i>, part one (i.e., 309a-328d – these are the numbers on the side of the page, not the page numbers on the top) <p>Due</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA3 by 7:30am <p>Textual Question: Briefly explain Barnes' interpretation of Protagoras' famous 'Of all things a measure is man...' view. In Plato's dialogue <i>Protagoras</i>, is there any point where, either implicitly or explicitly, Protagoras relies on this view? Explain why or why not.</p>
Wed 8/28	<p>Required Readings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Plato, <i>Protagoras</i>, part two (i.e., 328e-362a) <p>Due</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA4 by 7:30am <p>Textual Question: Identify what is, in your view, the weakest point in Socrates' argumentation. Explain what you think is weak about it.</p>
Fri 8/30	<p>Required Readings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Plato, <i>Gorgias</i> (part one, i.e., the discussion between Socrates, Gorgias, and Polus, i.e. 447a-480e) <p>Due</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA5 by 7:30am <p>Textual Question: Get to the bottom of Socrates' disagreement with Gorgias and Polus on the nature and purpose of oratory, and weigh in on whose argument is most persuasive.</p>
Mon 9/2	<p>Required Readings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Plato, <i>Gorgias</i> (part two, i.e., the discussion between Socrates and Callicles, 480e-527e) <p>RRA Question: Due</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA6 by 7:30am <p>Textual Question: What is Callicles' account of what is good for a person? How does he argue for this account? Are you convinced?</p>

Fri 9/13	<p>Required Readings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Plato, <i>Republic</i> Book IV <p>Due</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA11 by 7:30am <p>Textual Question: What is Socrates' account of justice? Explain.</p>
Mon 9/16	Meetings over first drafts of First Paper. No class.
Wed 9/18	<p>Required Readings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Plato, <i>Republic</i> Book V <p>Due</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA12 by 7:30am <p>Textual Question: What is Socrates' explanation of his suggestion that women and children should be had in common?</p>
Fri 9/20	<p>Required Readings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Plato, <i>Republic</i> Book VI <p>Due</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA13 by 7:30am <p>Textual Question: How does Socrates use the word 'idea'? What is the idea of the good?</p>
Mon 9/23	<p>Required Readings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Plato, <i>Republic</i> Book VII <p>Due</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA14 by 7:30am <p>Textual Question: Explain how dialectic relates to Socrates' story about the cave.</p>
Wed 9/25	<p>Required Readings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Plato, <i>Republic</i> Book VIII <p>Due</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA15 by 7:30am <p>Textual Question: Explain how the aristocratic or kingly man becomes a democratic man.</p>

Fri 9/27	<p>Required Readings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Plato, <i>Republic</i> Book IX <p>Due</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA16 by 7:30am 2. First Paper before midnight <p>Textual Question: Explain how Socrates argues that justice is more profitable to a person than injustice.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>*study guide for Midterm Exam*</i></p>
Mon 9/30	<p>Required Readings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Plato, <i>Republic</i> Book X <p>Due</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA17 by 7:30am <p>Textual Question: What is Socrates' complaint about poetry? What does Socrates believe about the human soul?</p>
Wed 10/2	<p>Required Readings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Aristotle, <i>Physics</i> I.1-II.3, II.7-III.3 <p>Due</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA18 by 7:30am <p>Textual Question: TBA</p>
Fri 10/4	<p>Required Readings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. None! <p>Review for Midterm Exam</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>*Midterm Exam provided*</i></p>
Mon 10/7	<p>Required Readings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Aristotle, <i>Metaphysics</i> VII.1-17 2. Ainsworth, Form vs. Matter: Intro, Sections 1-3 <p>Due</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA19 by 7:30am 2. Midterm Exam before midnight

Wed 10/9	<p>Required Readings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Aristotle, <i>Nicomachean Ethics</i> I.1-III.9 <p>Due</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA20 by 7:30am <p>Textual Question: TBA</p>
Fri 10/11	Fall Break – No Class
Mon 10/14	<p>Required Readings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Aristotle, <i>Nicomachean Ethics</i> V.1-11, VII.11-14, X.1-9 <p>Due</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA21 by 7:30am <p>Textual Question: TBA</p>
Wed 10/16	<p>Required Readings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Epicurus, Letter to Herodotus, Letter to Menoeceus, and Ancient Collections of Maxims <p>Due</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA22 by 7:30am <p>Textual Question: TBA</p>
Fri 10/18	<p>Required Readings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Stoic Selections: On Fate and Ethics (p. 179-203) <p>Due</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA23 by 7:30am <p>Textual Question: TBA</p>
Mon 10/21	<p>Required Readings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Plotinus, First Ennead, Tractates 6-9 <p>Due</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA24 by 7:30am <p>Textual Question: TBA</p>

Wed 10/23	<p>Required Readings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Augustine, <i>Confessions</i> Book VII <p>Due</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA25 by 7:30am <p>Textual Question: TBA</p>
Fri 10/25	<p>Required Readings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Augustine, <i>Confessions</i> Book II <p>Due</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA26 by 7:30am <p>Textual Question: TBA</p>
Mon 10/28	<p>Required Readings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Augustine, <i>Confessions</i> Book XI <p>Due</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA27 by 7:30am <p>Textual Question: TBA</p>
Wed 10/30	<p>Required Readings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Augustine, Concerning the Nature of the Good, Against the Manichaeans <p>Due</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA28 by 7:30am <p>Textual Question: TBA</p>
Fri 11/1	<p>Required Readings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Erigena, The Division of Nature (Periphyseon) (in Part) [brief, but read it carefully!] <p>Due</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA29 by 7:30am <p>Textual Question: TBA</p>

Mon 11/4	<p>Required Readings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Boethius, <i>The Consolation of Philosophy</i> Book I-II <p>Due</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA30 by 7:30am <p>Textual Question: TBA</p>
Wed 11/6	<p>Required Readings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Boethius, <i>The Consolation of Philosophy</i>, Book III <p>Due</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA31 by 7:30am <p>Textual Question: TBA</p>
Thur 11/7	<p>Extra Credit</p> <p>Dr. Sullivan, “Contemplation and Well-Being” 6:30-7:30pm Location: TBA</p>
Fri 11/8	<p>Required Readings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Boethius, <i>The Consolation of Philosophy</i>, Book IV-V <p>Due</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA32 by 7:30am <p>Textual Question: TBA</p>
Mon 11/11	<p>Required Readings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Aquinas, The Existence of God (<i>ST</i> I, Q. 2, Art. 1-3) <p>Due</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA33 by 7:30am <p>Textual Question: TBA</p>

Wed 11/13	<p>Required Readings (Reread these!)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Aristotle, <i>Metaphysics</i> VII.1-17 2. Ainsworth, Form vs. Matter: Intro, Sections 1-3 <p>Due</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA34 by 7:30am <p>Textual Question: Which meanings (plural) of the word ‘substance’ does Aristotle discuss, and which meaning does he find most important? Why? Explain.</p>
Fri 11/15	<p>Required Readings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Aquinas, The Nature of God (ST I, Q3, A1-8; Q4, A1-3; Q5, A1-4) <p>Due</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA35 by 7:30am <p>Textual Question: Explain two of the most important lessons about the nature of God which Aquinas wants us to learn.</p>
Mon 11/18	<p>Required Readings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Aquinas, God’s Love, Providence, and Predestination (ST I, Q20, A1-4; Q22, A1-4; Q23, A1-8) <p>Due</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA36 by 7:30am <p>Textual Question: According to Aquinas, what explains why some are saved and some are not?</p>
Wed 11/20	Meetings over first drafts of Second Paper. No Class.
Fri 11/22	<p>Required Readings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Aquinas, Sin and Need for Grace (ST II.1, Q82, A1-4; Q85, A1-6; Q109, A1-10) <p>Due</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA37 by 7:30am <p>Textual Question: According to Aquinas, what is sin and why do we need the grace of God?</p>
Mon 11/25	Thanksgiving Break – No Class

Wed 11/27	Thanksgiving Break – No Class
Fri 11/29	Thanksgiving Break – No Class
Mon 12/2	<p>Required Readings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Aquinas, Faith (Selections from ST) <p>Due</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA38 by 7:30am <p>Textual Question: According to Aquinas, what is the object of faith? What is faith itself? Why is it meritorious?</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>*study guide for Final Exam*</i></p>
Wed 12/4	<p>Required Readings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Aquinas <p>Due</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA39 by 7:30am 2. Second Paper before midnight <p>Textual Question: For Aquinas, what is hope, what is charity, and what is the relationship between them?</p>
Fri 12/6	<p>Required Readings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. None! <p>Review for Final Exam, Pics of New Baby, Holiday Treats, Evals</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>*Final Exam provided*</i></p>

FINAL EXAM: Tuesday December 10th, 10:30am-12:30pm

PHIL 330 / THEO 335: PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION

Professor: Michael Hatcher

Email: michael.hatcher@valpo.edu

Cell: (714) 875-4343

Class and Class Times: in ASB 234, TR 10:30am-11:45am

Office and Office Hours: in ASB 253, TWF 2:00pm-4:00pm, and by appointment

COURSE DESCRIPTION

Is there a God? Philosophers approach this question by means of *argument*: they try to find reasons available to whoever is willing to stop, look, and think about it. There are a variety of arguments that God exists. Some appeal to the existence and order of the physical universe. Others appeal to the existence of conscious people such as you or me.

The course begins by exploring these arguments. Notice, though, that even if effective, these arguments do not settle *who* God is – i.e., whether God is who Christians say he is, or who Muslims say he is, or etc. One thing the diversity of religious belief illustrates is that it is not just argument which influences faith. Religious experience does so, as well. Now, some infer from the diversity of religious belief and experience that each religion is on a par. Others take their religious experience to be a window into the unique truth of their religion. These are difficult, but extremely important, questions. Also related is the question of the nature of faith. Some hold that faith goes beyond the evidence. We shall wonder about that, as well as what it might mean to say, in the first place, that faith goes beyond the evidence.

Philosophers do more than argue about God's existence and how to respond to the diversity of religious belief. They also use the tools of philosophy – such as precise argumentation – to explore the possible meanings of the doctrines central to various religions. In this course, we shall focus on the doctrines central to Christianity. In particular, we shall focus on the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Atonement, and Heaven and Hell. Much of the course will be taken up with exploring these doctrines and the philosophical problems they involve. This is worthwhile because it matters not only whether God exists but also what he is like if he does exist. For it matters whether he is good, whether he is worthy of our trust, and how one might go about interacting with him. And one way to get clearer on what God is like is to get clearer on what he *could* be like. The doctrines central to Christianity offer a picture of what God could be like.

TEXTS

Hardcopies of texts will be provided in class. They will also be on Blackboard; however, hardcopies will be necessary in class.

STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES

Those who put consistent effort into this course will increase their...

4. ...skill in reading and understanding texts in philosophy of religion,
5. ...ability to productively discuss ideas at the intersection of philosophy and Christianity,
6. ...and insight into what God could be like.

CLASSROOM FORMAT, EXPECTATIONS, GROUND RULES

Seating Format

Each class, those in your row on your side of the classroom are your teammates. Sit in a row with people, try for three or four people per team.

Format of Questions

I will ask three main kinds of questions. The first, default kind of question is to the class as a whole; any student can respond immediately. The second kind of question is to be discussed first within your teams, after which I will call on teams. The third kind of question is for individual reflection and writing for a few minutes, before I will ask for responses.

Expectations

I expect you to come to class...

6. ...with the reading done and your Reading Response Assignment having already been submitted on Blackboard by 7:30am that morning,
7. ...prepared to engage in discussion,
8. ...and ready to take good notes.

Ground Rules

4. There will be absolutely no technology in the classroom. If I notice you on your phone, I will ask you to put it away. This policy begins *5 minutes before class begins; so, at 10:25am*. If you absolutely need to send an email between 10:25am and 10:30am, please do so outside the classroom.
5. Be kind and respectful.
6. No need to ask for permission to use the restroom.

GRADING AND POLICIES

Components of Course Grade

Attendance (see *Grade Penalties*)

Non-Tardiness and Non-Technology (see *Grade Penalties*)

Participation	5%
Reading Response Assignments	25%
Midterm Exam	15%
Final Exam	15%
First Argumentative Paper	15%
Meeting Over First Argumentative Paper (see <i>Grade Penalties</i>)	
Second Argumentative Paper	15%
Reflective Paper	10%
Extra Credit (see <i>Extra Credit</i>)	

The grading scale that will be used is as follows: A = 93-100, A- = 90-92, B+ = 87-89, B = 83-86, B- = 80-82, C+ = 77-79, C = 73-76, C- = 70-72, D+ = 67-69, D = 63-66, D- = 60-62, F = 59 and below.

Important Note on Blackboard: Blackboard will *not* accurately represent your overall course grade, but only your grades on individual components of the course. This is because Blackboard does *not* weight components that are entered according to the percentage of the course grade they are worth. So, if you want to check how you are doing in the course at any given time, you need to use this syllabus to weight the components on Blackboard according to the percentage of the course grade they are worth, and then do the math.

Important Dates:

First Argumentative Paper Due:	October 4 th
Midterm Exam:	October 9 th
Second Argumentative Paper Due:	November 15 th
Reflective Paper Due:	December 6 th
Final Exam:	December 10 th

Grade Penalties

Attendance: After the second unexcused absence, there will be a 1% course grade penalty for each of the next two unexcused absences, and a 0.5% course grade penalty for each of the next two unexcused absences after that. An excused absence must be documented with, for example, a doctor's note, proof of a family emergency, or etc. I cap the total possible grade penalty for attendance at 3% because missing class will negatively affect your grade on the exams, etc., anyways. In brief: *If you want to pass this course, much less do well in it, you should attend essentially every class. If you are not willing to commit to this, drop this course now.*

Non-Tardiness and Non-Technology: If you are tardy to a given class, but present for most of it, I will still allow you to mark the attendance sheet. However, if I have noticed by the end of the semester that you have a habit of being tardy, I will impose a grade penalty of 1% to 3%, depending on the severity of your tardiness habit. In addition, if I have noticed by the end of the semester that you have a habit of using your phone during class, or within 5 minutes prior to class, and that I often have to ask you to put it away, I will impose a grade penalty of 1% to 3%, depending on the severity of your technology habit.

Meeting Over First Argumentative Paper: If you do not meet with me over your First Argumentative Paper at least one full week before the Second Argumentative Paper is due, there will be a 2% course grade penalty. I will send you a sign-up sheet for meetings well in advance of when the Second Argumentative Paper is due.

Lateness Policy

I do not accept late Reading Response Assignments, unless you can document a medical or family emergency that prevented you from submitting it when it was due. Exams cannot be rescheduled, unless you can document a medical or family emergency that prevented you from taking the exam. Regarding the Writing Assignments, the lateness policy is as follows. After midnight of the date of the deadline, the paper, if not turned in, is automatically reduced by 1/3 of a letter grade. (So, for example, a B paper becomes a B-, etc.) For each additional week the paper is late, there is an additional reduction of this amount. This policy holds, and there are no extensions, unless you can document a medical or family emergency that is preventing you from finishing the paper on time. (Note: The grade penalties and lateness policy described above are negotiable *only if* you have Access and Accommodations.)

Honor Code

The Honor Code must be written and signed on every assignment and exam. In accord with the Code, all students must pledge not to give or receive unauthorized aid. Additionally, students are obligated to report violations of the Honor Code to the Honor Council. Violations may result in (a) zero credit on the assignment in question *and* a 1/3 letter-grade reduction in the final course grade; (b) failing this course; or (c) in being suspended or expelled from the University. For details see: <http://www.valpo.edu/honor-council/>

In this course, unauthorized aid includes but is not limited to:

- Collaboration of any kind on exams.
- Consulting any supporting materials during exams.
- Attempting to pass off someone else's work as your own.

Note:

3. Faculty are expected to report all suspected uses of unauthorized aid.[‡]

[‡] From the Faculty Handbook, section 3.1: "If a faculty member suspects from evidence in the papers received—whether or not the Honor Pledge has been signed—that unauthorized aid has been given, such evidence should be turned over to the chair of the Honor Council, ... A faculty member is not authorized to determine guilt

4. It is easy for faculty to tell the difference between original work and plagiarized work.

Email and Class Cancelation

I generally reply to email within 24 hours, so feel free to email with any questions. I also love to be available to you in office hours, and I can make an appointment if the hours do not work for you. I make appointments best by email. In the event of an unscheduled class cancelation, I will send an email to your Valpo email address.

Access and Accommodations

The Access & Accommodations Resource Center (AARC) is the campus office that works with students to provide access and accommodations in cases of diagnosed mental or emotional health issues, attentional or learning disabilities, vision or hearing limitations, chronic diseases, or allergies. You can contact the office at aarc@valpo.edu or 219.464.5206. Students who need, or think they may need, accommodations due to a diagnosis, or who think they have a diagnosis, are invited to contact AARC to arrange a confidential discussion with the AARC office. Further, students who are registered with AARC are required to contact their professor if they wish to exercise the accommodations outlined in their letter from the AARC.

Graded Components

Participation: Participation is graded on a 1-5 scale at the end of the semester. A score of 5 means you not only consistently participated in discussion during class, your contributions were also timely, thoughtful, and showed the mark of listening well to your fellow classmates. A score of 4 means you consistently participated in discussion. A score of 3 or less means that, to varying degrees, you did not consistently participate in discussion.

Reading Response Assignments: Reading Response Assignments (RRAs) are responses to the Questions for Understanding and the Questions for Application on the Tentative Schedule at the end of this syllabus, which will be available a few weeks in advance of when answers are due. They will have the following components:

1. *A Response to the Question for Understanding.* Answers should be entirely in your own words, and adequately yet concisely demonstrate your understanding of the text. **Include the word count after your answer. The acceptable range is 100 to 200 words.**
2. *A Quotation Rephrased and Connected to the Response to the Question for Understanding.* Select and reproduce one quotation from the text that is 1 or 2 sentences long. Underneath it, do two things:

and assess penalties in this kind of matter. The Honor Council conducts its own investigation, which may include an interview with the instructor, and, after assembling and weighing the evidence, determines guilt. If there has been an infraction of the Honor Code, the Council recommends the appropriate discipline to the Provost of the University, who finally penalizes the offending student."

- a. In 1-2 sentences, say what the quotation means in your own words.
 - b. In 1-2 sentences, connect the quotation to your response to the question for understanding.
3. *A Response to the Question for Application.* With creativity and thoughtfulness, answer the question for application. **Include the word count after your answer. The acceptable range is 50 to 100 words.**

Use the following headings in the following sequence to organize your RRAs:

Response to Question for Understanding:

Word Count:

Quotation:

Quotation Rephrased:

Quotation Connected to Answer:

Response to Question for Application:

Word Count:

There are **24** RRAs in the course, of which you may complete as few as **18** of your choosing. They are graded on a scale of 1.5, 2.5, or 3. If you complete more than 18, I will begin dropping the lowest scoring RRAs.

So, at any point in the semester, if you have 18 RRAs with a score of 3, then pat yourself on the back, you have the maximum score for RRAs! If you find yourself in this fortunate scenario late in the semester, it is still a good idea to do the readings before class, to better enable you to learn the content for the papers and final exam. But, alas, there is no extra credit if you submit an RRA which would give you 19 RRAs with a score of 3. If at some point late in the semester you already have 18 RRAs with a 3, then you have proven to me that you can read the text with care and thoughtfulness before class, and, for the remaining classes, I will be allowing you to monitor that always advisable activity yourself.

RRAs are due on Blackboard no later than 7:30am on the day the reading will be discussed in class.[§] I will aim to grade each of them before 9:00am. A score of 3 means you have demonstrated sufficiently correct understanding of the text in your response to the question for understanding as backed up by your treatment of the quotation, and also have put thought into your response to the question for application. A score of 2.5 means it is clear to me that you read all the text, but either you have significant misunderstandings of the text, or you did not put sufficient thought into the question for application, or both. A score of 1.5 means it is unclear to me whether you read all the assigned text, or, in any case, there is little understanding of the text on display in your response to either of the questions.

In addition to the numerical score, I will also provide a brief response to your RRA. The response may be a brief explanation of why the score is less than 3 – though, often, a more complete

[§] Note well: Blackboard detects whenever any part of an assignment is lifted from the internet. Doing so constitutes plagiarism.

explanation may only become clear by means of class that day. Hopefully more often, my response will make a connection, point to a follow-up question, or otherwise relay how your assignment influenced my thinking. You are encouraged, if you wish, to read these responses prior to class. But do not worry about it if you are unable to do so on any given day.

I encourage you to start off the semester strong with completing RRAs. Not only will it get you into the swing of things, it will give you the opportunity to develop the skill of monitoring whether you understand the text. This is an important skill to develop throughout the semester, especially because philosophy texts can be difficult.

Exams: On the exams, you will be asked to demonstrate your understanding of the ideas covered in the course. Some questions will ask for written paragraphs in response. Some of these will ask you to present, from memory, an argument presented and discussed in class. Others will first give you an argument that was discussed in class, and then ask you to explain various aspects or features of the argument - for example, the justification of its crucial premise, the most important objection to the argument, etc. And finally, some of these questions will ask you to select an argument and present an objection to it. Other questions ask for definitions of concepts presented in class, definitions I recommend you memorize. Content from the readings as well as content unique to the lectures will be tested. The exams will not be cumulative. I will provide a study guide a week or two before each exam.

Argumentative Papers: For each of your Argumentative Papers, you may choose any text – but just one text – from the Tentative Schedule at the end of this syllabus. I aim to provide hardcopies of these texts in class a few weeks in advance, and I will also put each text on Blackboard. You are encouraged to read texts on a topic you find especially interesting, and you may choose a text from any part of the Tentative Schedule.

Argumentative Papers will have the following sections:

§1 Introduction

In one paragraph, briefly do three things, in this order: First, tell me the question or topic you are addressing. (Start out being specific, there is no need to make any general statement about how people throughout history have wondered about the question, or etc.) Second, tell me the thesis for which you will argue. (Feel free to say something like, “In this paper, I will argue that...”.) Third, tell me what you are going to do in each of the following sections of the paper. (For each section, use no more than one sentence to tell me what you are going to do in that section.) Do nothing else in the introduction. (Advice: (re)-write your introduction last, after you have written the other sections, and so are clear on what the paper is doing, and also clear on how you should phrase your thesis.)

§2 [Author’s] Argument

In this section, summarize the argument from the author that your paper will be about. In the next section, you will need to raise an objection to this argument, but that objection needs to be one the author has not considered in the text. So, part of expressing the author’s

argument, in this section, may involve explaining his replies to various objections to his argument.

§3 Objection

In this section, develop an objection to the author's argument. This objection must be one the author has not considered in the text.

§4 Response

In this section, explain how the author could respond to your objection.

§5 The Upshot

In this section, argue for a specific upshot concerning what you have discussed in §3 and §4. (By the way, this upshot should be the thesis you stated in §1 – another reason to (re)-write §1 after writing the rest of the paper.) There are different shapes this upshot can take, but here are some of the main ones. The upshot could be that the objection you raised in §3 turns out to be conclusive, which implies that the response to that objection in §4 is inadequate. If that is the upshot, you will need to argue that that response is inadequate. Then your thesis, which you would also state in §1, would be something like “[author’s] argument fails given the objection that...”. Alternatively, the upshot could be that the response to the objection, detailed in §4, is actually adequate. Then you have supported the author, by showing that an objection he did not address can be dealt with. Then your thesis, which you would also state in §1, would be something like “[author’s] argument faces the objection that..., but this objection can be addressed by...”. And finally, the upshot could be something more complicated, e.g., that there is a standoff and that only by answering certain questions could the standoff be settled. If the upshot is complicated in this way, be clear what the questions are which would help settle things, and also say something about what it would take to answer these questions.

In good Argumentative Papers, §§3-5 will generally constitute at least half of the paper, and usually significantly more than half. What this means is that if you are merely explaining the author's argument for the lion's share of the paper, the paper will generally be weak. Accurately explaining the author's argument is a necessity – if this starting point is off, the whole paper will be off. But you will also need to creatively engage with that argument, beginning with an objection to it that comes from you. We will model coming up with objections to arguments in class. But this can be a new, difficult task. If you feel stuck here please visit office hours as soon as possible.

Argumentative Papers are to be submitted on Blackboard before midnight on the date they are due. Use double-spaced, Times New Roman font. **Include a word count on the first page.** The First Argumentative Paper has an acceptable word count range of 1,500 to 1,800 words. (This is approximately 5-6 pages.)

After I grade them and write up comments on Blackboard, each of you will individually meet with me about your First Argumentative Paper.

Concerning your Second Argumentative Paper, you will have two options:

First Option: Stay on the same topic and text, but revamp, revise, and develop your paper in response to my feedback. If you take this option, the acceptable word count range is **2,000 to 2,500 words.** (That is approximately 6.5-8 pages.)

Second Option: Pick a new text, and then write a brand-new paper. If you take this option, the acceptable word count range is **1,500 to 1,800 words.**

A Special Note If Your First Argumentative Paper Is Excellent, i.e. A-range: Philosophy papers can be quite difficult. But suppose that your First Argumentative Paper turns out to be excellent – in particular, suppose it turns out to be either an A or A-. Suppose, in addition, that you want to take the First Option, i.e., suppose that you want to stay on the same topic and text for the Second Argumentative Paper. If you do so, you *must* add an additional section to your Second Argumentative Paper, namely, “§6 Response to Professor”. In §6, you will address objections or lines of inquiry that I will make clear in my comments on your First Argumentative Paper. As the word max for the First Argumentative Paper is 1,800, you will have plenty of space, i.e., an additional 700 words with the new max of 2,500, to address my comments. I will still expect you to revise the rest of your paper in light of any comments I have. But with your First Argumentative Paper being in the A-range, and with you staying on the same topic and text, you might have less substantial revision to do on §§1-5. Either way, I shall expect you to put good, creative, thoughtful work into §6.

What I'll Be Looking For In Argumentative Papers: I'll be looking for you to accurately, clearly, and fully explain each concept and step in each section of the paper. Explain each concept clearly and fully, as you would to someone who is not taking the course. At the same time, be concise. Make sure each sentence, and each word in each sentence, does real work.

Also, put things in your own words. In §2, you will need to paraphrase the author's arguments in your own words, providing citation to page numbers. If absolutely necessary, you may use direct quotations, *but keep these quotations few, and keep them short.* In particular, only when the author's own language is crucial to understanding his or her point, directly quote no more than five words in a row. You must not only integrate these quoted words into your own sentence, but also explain them in your own words.

I will be looking for understanding of the author's argument and depth of thought, originality, nuance, and clarity in your development of the objection, response, and your argument for what upshot we should draw.

Reflective Paper: In this course, we will explore the meaning of some of the core doctrines of the Christian faith. These doctrines give us a picture of what God could be like. Now, if there is a God, what he is like affects how one can, or should, interact with him. This is an instance of a general fact: what a person is like affects how one can, or should, interact with him or her. The goal of the Reflective Paper is to reflect on how a particular account of a doctrine, if true, would influence how one could, or should, interact with God. Notice that one can reflect on this question whether or not one believes there actually is a God, and whether or not one believes the relevant account of the doctrine is actually true. If necessary, exercise your imagination.

Use double-spaced, Times New Roman font. **Include a word count on the first page.** The word count is to be **between 800 to 1,000 words.** (That is approximately 3 pages.) **Reflective Papers are to be submitted on Blackboard before midnight on the date they are due.**

The reflective paper will have the following three sections:

§1 An Account of a Doctrine

In this section, state and briefly clarify an account of a particular doctrine developed by one of the authors discussed in this course. It could be any doctrine; examples include the doctrine of the Trinity, the doctrine of the Incarnation, the doctrine of the Atonement, the doctrine of Heaven and Hell, etc.

§2 What if the Account is False?

In this section, explore how one could, or should, interact with God under the supposition that the account is false. To do this effectively, you may need to say something about the account's nearest competitor (e.g., the nearest competitor of the Kenotic View of the Incarnation is the Two Minds View). The idea is to imagine that the relevant account of the doctrine is false, and then reflect on what that could mean for how one could, or should, interact with God.

§3 What if the Account is True?

In this section, explore how one could, or should, interact with God under the supposition that the account is true. Get creative. Be as personal with your reflections as you wish. Be sure to contrast what you say in this section with what you said in the previous section. Draw out, as clearly as you can, how the account of the doctrine, if true, would affect how one could, or should, interact with God.

Notice that there is no introduction. In §1, please jump right into explaining an account of the doctrine, with no introduction.

What I'll Be Looking For In Reflective Papers: In your own words, I'll be looking for you to accurately, clearly, and fully explain each concept and step in each section of the paper. Explain each concept clearly and fully, as you would to someone who is not taking the course. At the same time, be concise. Make sure each sentence, and each word in each sentence, does real work.

I will look for thoughtful, creative reflections grounded in understanding of the content of the course.

Extra Credit

Extra Credit: You will receive 0.5% on top of your course grade for each of the following colloquium you attend. I will be at these talks; if you attend, please come up to me afterwards to record your name.

Joshua Spencer: "Toward a Philosophy of Poverty"

Thursday, September 20th, 5:00-6:30pm, Urschel 202

Aaron Preston: "The Disappearance of Moral Knowledge and the Degradation of Empathy"

Thursday, November 1st, 5:00-
6:30pm, Urschel 202

TENTATIVE SCHEDULE FOR PHIL 330 / THEO 335: PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION

Introductory

1	T	8/21	Introduction, Syllabus	
2	R	8/23	Logic	* <i>explanation of Reading Response Assignments (RRAs)</i> *

Arguments for God's Existence

3	T	8/28	William Rowe: "The Idea of God" (p. 4-17) <i>Reading Response Assignment 1</i> Question for Understanding: How does Rowe's definition of omnipotence solve the paradox of the stone? Question for Application: What reasons might there be to think God is not actually omnipotent?	
4	R	8/30	William Rowe: "The Cosmological Argument" (p. 19-32) <i>Reading Response Assignment 2</i> Question for Understanding: Rowe claims that <i>the fact that there are and have always been dependent beings</i> cannot be explained if only dependent beings exist. What is Rowe's reasoning for this claim? Question for Application: Reflect on the fact that you are a dependent being. What does this make you think or feel?	
5	T	9/4	Dallas Willard: "Language, Being, God, and the Three Stages of Theistic Evidence" (p. 7-28); William Rowe: "The Cosmological Argument" (p. 33-35) <i>Reading Response Assignment 3</i> Question for Understanding: What does Willard take to be the result of stage one? What does he take to be the result of stage two? (Define any relevant terms!) Question for Application: What is Willard' own view about stage three, and what is yours? Why?	
6	R	9/6	William Rowe: "The Design Argument (Old and New)" (p. 54-68) <i>Reading Response Assignment 4</i> Question for Understanding: What would it mean to say that the universe is a teleological system, and how would Hume object to that idea?	

Question for Application: Does the universe seem like it was intelligently designed to you? Why or why not?

- 7 T 9/11 Samuel Clarke: "A Demonstration of the Being and Attributes of God" (p. 101-118)
explanation of Argumentative Papers

Reading Response Assignment 5

Question for Understanding: What is Samuel Clarke's argument that there is a God?

Question for Application: Do you think it is possible to create conscious computers or robots? Why or why not?

- 8 R 9/13 J.P. Moreland: "Dualism Defended" (p. 94-98)

Reading Response Assignment 6

Question for Understanding: What is the indiscernibility of identicals, and why is it relevant to whether Mind/Body Physicalism is true?

Question for Application: Suppose, Moreland's arguments notwithstanding, that Mind/Body Physicalism is true. Would this alter how you think about your life? Why or why not?

Religious Diversity, Religious Experience, and Faith

- 9 T 9/18 Joseph Runzo: "God, Commitment, and Other Faiths: Pluralism vs. Relativism" (p. 343-364)

Reading Response Assignment 7

Question for Understanding: According to Runzo, what is the difference between Religious Pluralism and Religious Relativism?

Question for Application: Of Religious Exclusivism, Religious Inclusivism, Religious Subjectivism, Religious Pluralism, and Religious Relativism, which do you find most attractive? Why?

- 10 R 9/20 Gregg Ten Elshof: "Religious Experience, Conceptual Contribution and the Problem of Diversity: How Not to Make the Problem Worse" (p. 236-250)

Reading Response Assignment 8

Question for Understanding: According to Gregg Ten Elshof, what is a concept? Why does this matter?

Question for Application: Do you think religious experience can confirm religious belief? Why or why not?

- 11 T 9/25 Stephen T. Davis: "Religious Belief and Unbelief" (p. 9-23)

Reading Response Assignment 9

study guide for midterm exam

Question for Understanding: According to Davis, what are the two senses of the word 'know', and how does this help him interpret Romans 1:19?

Question for Application: Identify and unpack anything that a committed non-Christian might find offensive or off-putting in what Davis argues or suggests in this reading.

- 12 R 9/27 William Rowe: "Faith and Reason" (p. 91-98)
Reading Response Assignment 10
Question for Understanding: What does Clifford mean by the word 'credulous', and why does he think it is dangerous?
Question for Application: Can credulity ever be appropriate? Why or why not?
- 13 T 10/2 William Rowe: "Faith and Reason" (p. 98-110)
Reading Response Assignment 11
Question for Understanding: According to Plantinga, what is properly basic belief?
Question for Application: Does the notion of properly basic belief help you explain your own religious faith (or lack thereof)? Why or why not?
- 14 R 10/4 Review for Midterm Exam
First Argumentative Paper Due
- 15 T 10/9 **Midterm Exam**
- 16 R 10/11 FALL BREAK *google sign-up sheet for meetings over First Argumentative Papers*

The Trinity

- 17 T 10/16 Brian Leftow: "A Latin Trinity" (p. 76-106)
Reading Response Assignment 12
Note: While you may feel free to read all of Leftow's article, you may also simply read the following sections (in addition to the one-paragraph intro): "The Latin View" (p. 76-79), "Time-Travel, Tap-Dancing, and the Trinity" (p. 79-82), and "Events and the Trinity" (p. 85-92). This will provide plenty of information for you to reply to the following prompts.
Question for Understanding: Leftow uses Jane and the Rockettes as an analogy for the Trinity. Explain this analogy, and explain how Leftow applies it to the Trinity.
Question for Application: Imagine you used a time machine to travel back in time and talk to yourself. What might be distinctive about this conversation, in contrast with more ordinary conversations?
- 18 R 10/18 J.P. Moreland and William Lane Craig: "The Trinity" (p. 21-43)
Reading Response Assignment 13
Note: While you may feel free to read all of Moreland and Craig's article, you may also simply read p. 30 to p. 43, beginning with "2.4 Models of the Trinity". This will provide plenty of information for you to reply to the following prompts.
Question for Understanding: Moreland and Craig use Cerberus as an analogy for the Trinity. Explain this analogy, and explain how Moreland and Craig apply it to the Trinity.

Question for Application: Siamese twins share part of the same human body, but yet are different persons. Would you enjoy being a Siamese twin? Why or why not?

meetings over First Argumentative Papers begin

- 19 T 10/23 Stephen T. Davis: "Perichoretic Monotheism" (p. 60-78)

Reading Response Assignment 14

Question for Understanding: Imagine someone asks Davis the following question, "Why is God a Trinity?" How would Davis answer this question?

Question for Application: Suppose that you and your significant other both gained telepathy, i.e., the power to read the other's thoughts. Would you use it on each other? Why or why not? Would you develop rules? Why or why not?

The Incarnation

- 20 R 10/25 Thomas V. Morris: "The Metaphysics of God Incarnate" (p. 211-224)

Reading Response Assignment 15

Question for Understanding: Explain the two-minds view, according to Morris.

Question for Application: Some psychologists hold that one can *consciously* believe a proposition p and, at the same time, *unconsciously* believe the negation of that proposition, i.e., $\text{not-}p$. Suppose this is true. If one consciously believes p and unconsciously believes $\text{not-}p$, what does one *really* believe? p or $\text{not-}p$? Both? Neither? Explain.

- 21 T 10/30 Peter Forrest: "The Incarnation: A Philosophical Case for Kenosis" (p. 225-238)

Reading Response Assignment 16

Question for Understanding: What is Forrest's explanation of how it is possible for Jesus to be the same person as the pre-incarnate Word?

Question for Application: Suppose that you were in a car accident which left you with total amnesia (i.e., loss of all memories up to that moment in time). There is your family, affirming that you are the same person, using your name, etc. Is your family correct? Are you identical with the person your family knew, or are you a new person whose life began after the accident? Why or why not?

The Atonement

- 22 R 11/1 Steven L. Porter: "Swinburnian Atonement and the Doctrine of Penal Substitution" (p. 314-327)

Reading Response Assignment 17

Question for Understanding: What does Porter argue is missing from Swinburne's account of the atonement?

Question for Application: Coach's policy is five laps around the track for any teammate who is late for practice. A teammate is late for practice, but the team captain volunteers to run the five laps instead of the late teammate, and the coach agrees to this. Is this unjust? Why or why not?

- 23 T 11/6 David Lewis: "Do We Believe in Penal Substitution?" (p. 308-313)
Reading Response Assignment 18
 Question for Understanding: Why does David Lewis think we are all of two minds about penal substitution?
 Question for Application: Do you believe penal substitution makes sense? Why or why not?
- 24 R 11/8 Dallas Willard: "Salvation is a Life" (p. 28-43); "The Nature of Life" (p. 56-74)
Reading Response Assignment 19
 Question for Understanding: Define 'life', according to Willard. Then explain and illustrate the meaning of 'spiritual life', according to Willard.
 Question for Application: Does a spiritual life seem achievable to you? If achievable, does it seem attractive to you?
- 25 T 11/13 William P. Alston: "The Indwelling of the Holy Spirit" (p. 121-150)
Reading Response Assignment 20
 Question for Understanding: Define and briefly explain the fiat model, the interpersonal model, and the sharing model of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit.
 Question for Application: Which of the three models do you find most attractive? Why?

The Problem of Evil

- 26 R 11/15 William Rowe: "The Problem of Evil and Some Varieties of Atheism" (p. 317-327) *explanation of Reflective Papers*
Reading Response Assignment 21
 Question for Understanding: Explain what Rowe is getting at when he gives the example of the fawn who is burned in a forest fire.
 Question for Application: Think about your own life and try to identify cases of suffering which felt meaningless to you at the time. Which instances later seemed to be meaningful? None of them? All of them? Some but not all of them? Explain.
Second Argumentative Paper Due
- 27 T 11/20 THANKSGIVING RECESS
- 28 R 11/22 THANKSGIVING RECESS

- 29 T 11/27 Eleonore Stump: "The Problem of Evil" (p. 394-419)
 Note: Feel free to read the entire text; however, a close reading of sections II and III (p. 399-414) will give you enough information to answer the following prompt.

Reading Response Assignment 22

Question for Understanding: According to Stump, what is the explanation of evil?

Question for Application: Philosophers and theologians often say that free will is necessary for certain good things. Specify a particular good which may require free will, and then explain and illustrate this good.

Heaven

- 30 R 11/29 Bernard Williams: "The Makropulos Case: Reflections on the Tedium of Immortality" (p. 82-100)
Reading Response Assignment 23 *study guide for final exam*
 Question for Understanding: Williams holds the view that there is no good reason to hope for immortality. What is his argument for this view?
 Question for Application: Do you believe there is good reason to hope for immortality? Why or why not?
- 31 T 12/4 Eric J. Silverman: "Conceiving Heaven as a Dynamic Rather than Static Existence" (p. 1-23)
Reading Response Assignment 24
 Question for Understanding: First, briefly explain the difference between static and dynamic conceptions of paradise. Then, identify and explain one of the reasons why Silverman prefers a dynamic conception.
 Question for Application: Suppose, for the sake of argument, that there is an afterlife and a heaven. Given this supposition, describe what you think heaven will be like for its inhabitants. Be sure to include any specifics and details you can think of.
- 32 R 12/6 Review for Final Exam
Reflective Paper Due

FINAL EXAM: **10:30am – 12:30pm Monday, December 10th**

To Be Announced portions of the course schedule, and any updates or changes to the above, will be posted on Blackboard. (I will send the class an email whenever I update the course schedule.)

PHIL 125: THE GOOD LIFE

Professor Michael Hatcher

Email: michael.hatcher@valpo.edu

Cell: (714) 875-4343

Class: TR 8:30am-9:45am in ASB 237 for PHIL 125-A;
TR 10:30am-11:45am in MEH 134 for PHIL 125-B

Office and Office Hours: in ASB 253, Tues 1:00pm-3:00pm, Wedn 10:00am-12:00pm, Thur 1:00pm-3:00pm, and by appointment

COURSE DESCRIPTION

When we bring to mind those who have a good life, who do we think of? We may think of those with financial success, free time, good health, invigorating hobbies, and a fulfilling family life. Or we may think those who take risks, invent new technologies, and develop new ideas. Or we may think of those who serve others selflessly, or love God devotedly.

But what *is* the good life, and how might we achieve it? In this course, we will get leverage on this question by investigating *ethics*. There are a few reasons to suspect we might get leverage in this way. For one, there is some plausibility to the idea that one cannot have a good life without being an ethical, moral, or good person. In addition, ethics centrally concerns the notion of goodness, so studying ethics may help us see what it could mean to say a life is *good*, in the first place.

We shall begin by considering arguments for and against controversial ethical positions. That is, we will *apply* our ethical concepts to concrete situations or questions. This part of ethics is known as *applied ethics*. Our discussions in applied ethics will raise important questions about the fundamental meaning of ethics. Chief among these questions is whether there are objective moral facts. This part of ethics is known as *metaethics*. After surveying the metaethical terrain, we shall consider a variety of substantive theories about what makes something right or wrong. These theories belong to *normative ethics*. Next, we shall investigate *the good life*, and ask what light is shed by our discussions in applied ethics, metaethics, and normative ethics. We shall end the course with discussion of how a person could make progress towards gaining various *virtues*. In particular, we shall consider discussions of *disciplines* people throughout history have thought central to making this kind of progress.

REQUIRED TEXT

The Ethical Life: Fundamental Readings in Ethics and Moral Problems, 4th Edition, by Russ Shafer-Landau. ISBN-13: 978-0190631314. ISBN-10: 0190631317.

Required readings not in the textbook will be provided in class in hardcopy format.

STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES

Those who put consistent effort into this course will increase their...

7. ...skill in reading and understanding texts in ethics,
8. ...ability to productively discuss ethical ideas,
9. ...capacity to connect ethical ideas to the good life, and
10. ...insight into the good life and how one might go about pursuing it.

CLASSROOM FORMAT, EXPECTATIONS, GROUND RULES

Seating Format

Each class, those in your row on your side of the classroom are your teammates. Sit in a row with people, try for three or four people per team. If there is an odd student out, the row in front of them will include them in their team.

Format of Questions

I will ask three main kinds of questions. The first, default kind of question is to the class as a whole; any student can respond immediately. The second kind of question is to be discussed first within your teams, after which I will call on teams. The third kind of question is for individual reflection and writing for a few minutes, before I will ask for responses.

Expectations

I expect you to come to class...

9. ...with the reading done and your Reading Response Assignment ready to turn in,
10. ...prepared to engage in discussion,
11. ...and ready to take good notes.

Ground Rules

7. There will be absolutely no technology in the classroom. Any reading not in the textbook will be provided for you in hardcopy form. If I notice you on your phone, I will ask you to put it away.
8. Be kind and respectful, even if you disagree with another student. Work to understand perspectives you disagree with by listening well.
9. No need to ask for permission to use the restroom.

GRADING AND POLICIES

Components of Course Grade

Attendance (see <i>Grade Penalties</i>)	
Participation	5%
Reading Response Assignments	25%
Midterm Exam	20%
Final Exam	20%
First Draft of Argumentative Paper	10%
Meeting Over First Draft (see <i>Grade Penalties</i>)	
Second Draft of Argumentative Paper	10%
Reflective Paper	10%
Extra Credit (see <i>Extra Credit</i>)	

The grading scale that will be used is as follows: A = 93-100, A- = 90-92, B+ = 87-89, B = 83-86, B- = 80-82, C+ = 77-79, C = 73-76, C- = 70-72, D+ = 67-69, D = 63-66, D- = 60-62, F = 59 and below.

An Important Note on Blackboard: Blackboard will not accurately represent your overall course grade, but only your grades on individual components of the course. This is because Blackboard does not weight components that are entered according to the percentage of the course grade they are worth. So, if you want to check how you are doing in the course at any given time, you need to use this syllabus to weight the components on Blackboard according to the percentage of the course grade they are worth, and then do the math.

Important Dates:

First Draft of Argumentative Paper due in class:	Thursday, February 22 nd
Midterm Exam:	Thursday, March 1 st
Meetings Over First Drafts begin:	Tuesday, March 20 th
Second Draft of Argumentative Paper due in class:	Tuesday, April 10 th
Reflective Paper due in class:	Thursday, May 3 rd

The date and time of the Final Exam depends on which section of PHIL 125 you are in:

If you are in PHIL 125-A, which meets TR 8:30am-9:45am in ASB 237, the **Final Exam is held 8:00am-10:00am Friday, May 11th.**

If you are in PHIL 125-B, which meets TR 10:30am-11:45am in MEH 134, the **Final Exam is held 10:30am-12:30pm Thursday, May 10th.**

Grade Penalties

Attendance: After the second unexcused absence, there will be a 1% course grade penalty for each of the next two additional unexcused absences. An excused absence must be documented with, for example, a doctor's note, proof of a family emergency, or etc. (I cap the total possible grade penalty at 2% because missing lecture content will negatively affect your grade on the exams, etc., anyways. In brief: *If you want to pass this course, much less do well in it, you should attend essentially every class. If you are not willing to commit to this, drop this course now.*)

Meeting Over First Draft: If you miss our one-on-one meeting over your first draft of the argumentative paper, there will be a 2% course grade penalty. I will send you a sign-up sheet for meetings well in advance of when the second draft is due.

Lateness Policy

I do not accept late Reading Response Assignments, unless you can document a medical or family emergency that prevented you from attending class on the day the assignment was due. Exams cannot be rescheduled, unless you can document a medical or family emergency that prevented you from taking the exam. Regarding the Argumentative and Reflective papers, the lateness policy is as follows. After the date and time of the deadline (beginning of class), the paper, if not turned in, is automatically reduced by 1/3 of a letter grade. (So, for example, a B paper becomes a B-, etc.) For each additional week the paper is late, there is an additional reduction of this amount. This policy holds, and there are no extensions, unless you can document a medical or family emergency that is preventing you from finishing the paper on time. Also, for obvious reasons, to avoid the 2% grade penalty for missing the one-on-one meeting over the first draft of your argumentative paper, you must meet with me before the second draft is due. (Note: The grade penalties and lateness policy described above are negotiable *only if* you have Access and Accommodations.)

Honor Code

The Honor Code must be written and signed on every assignment and exam. In accord with the Code, all students must pledge not to give or receive unauthorized aid. Additionally, students are obligated to report violations of the Honor Code to the Honor Council. Violations may result in (a) zero credit on the assignment in question *and* a 1/3 letter-grade reduction in the final course grade; (b) failing this course; or (c) in being suspended or expelled from the University. For details see: <http://www.valpo.edu/honor-council/>

In this course, unauthorized aid includes but is not limited to:

- Collaboration of any kind on exams.
- Consulting any supporting materials during exams.
- Attempting to pass off someone else's work as your own.

Note:

5. Faculty are expected to report all suspected uses of unauthorized aid.**
6. It is easy for faculty to tell the difference between original work and plagiarized work.

Email and Class Cancelation

I generally reply to email within 24 hours, so feel free to email with any questions. I also love to be available to you in office hours, and can make an appointment if the hours do not work for you. I make appointments best by email.

In the event of an unscheduled class cancelation, I will send an email to your Valpo email address.

Access and Accommodations

The Access & Accommodations Resource Center (AARC) is the campus office that works with students to provide access and accommodations in cases of diagnosed mental or emotional health issues, attentional or learning disabilities, vision or hearing limitations, chronic diseases, or allergies. You can contact the office at aarc@valpo.edu or 219.464.5206. Students who need, or think they may need, accommodations due to a diagnosis, or who think they have a diagnosis, are invited to contact AARC to arrange a confidential discussion with the AARC office. Further, students who are registered with AARC are required to contact their professor if they wish to exercise the accommodations outlined in their letter from the AARC.

Graded Components

Participation: Participation is graded on a 1-5 scale at the end of the semester. A score of 5 means you not only consistently participated in discussion, your contributions were also timely, thoughtful, and showed the mark of listening well to your fellow classmates. A score of 4 means you consistently participated in discussion. A score of 3 or less means that, to varying degrees, you did not consistently participate in discussion.

Reading Response Assignments: There are a total of 23 Reading Response Assignments in the course, of which you are to complete 18 of your choosing. (And, to anticipate: no, there is no extra credit for completing 19 or more Reading Response Assignments; and yes, it is still wise to do the reading even if you're done with these assignments.) I encourage you to start off the semester strong with completing these assignments: not only will it get you into the swing of things, you will begin to learn the skill of monitoring whether you understand the text, which is the primary basis on which these assignments are graded. Reading Response Assignments are **due in hardcopy form**

** From the Faculty Handbook, section 3.1: "If a faculty member suspects from evidence in the papers received—whether or not the Honor Pledge has been signed—that unauthorized aid has been given, such evidence should be turned over to the chair of the Honor Council, ... A faculty member is not authorized to determine guilt and assess penalties in this kind of matter. The Honor Council conducts its own investigation, which may include an interview with the instructor, and, after assembling and weighing the evidence, determines guilt. If there has been an infraction of the Honor Code, the Council recommends the appropriate discipline to the Provost of the University, who finally penalizes the offending student."

at the beginning of the class on which the reading will be discussed. They will have the following components:

4. *Reading Response Answer.* Reading response questions will be released a few weeks in advance of the class when answers are due. Answers should be entirely in your own words, and adequately yet concisely demonstrate your understanding of the text. **Include the word count after your answer. The acceptable range is between 100 to 200 words.**
5. *Two Quotations Rephrased and Connected to Reading Response Answer.* Select and reproduce two different quotations from the text, each 1-2 sentences long. (Note: these quotations *cannot* come from the summaries in front of the articles; they must come from the main article itself.) Underneath each of these quotations, do two things:
 - a. In 1-2 sentences, say what the quotation means in your own words.
 - b. In 1-2 sentences, connect the quotation to your reading response answer. For example, say how it supports your answer to the reading response question.
6. *How Might This Idea Matter?* In 1 sentence, tell me how you think the idea discussed in the reading response answer might matter. If you cannot think of a way it might matter, it is acceptable for your sentence to simply say so.

Use the following headings in the following sequence to organize your assignment:

Reading Response Answer:

Word Count of Answer:

First Quotation:

First Quotation Rephrased:

First Quotation Connected to Answer:

Second Quotation:

Second Quotation Rephrased:

Second Quotation Connected to Answer:

How the Idea Might Matter:

Reading Response Assignments will be graded as either 1.5, 2.5, or 3. A score of 1.5 means it is unclear to me whether you read all the assigned text or, in any case, there is little understanding of the text. A score of 2.5 means it is clear to me you read the text and have partial understanding of it, but there remains significant misunderstanding. A score of 3 means you have demonstrated correct understanding of the text. These grades will be posted on Blackboard; the assignments will not be handed back.

Tips if you receive less than 3 on a Reading Response Assignment: (i) for the next assignment, read the text an additional time and trouble-shoot until you are more confident of your interpretation; (ii) for the assignment you already received less than 3 on, compare that assignment to your notes from the class on which the reading was discussed, to help diagnose the misunderstanding; (iii) visit office hours and ask about the content of the course, feeling free to bring your assignment with you.

Exams: On the exams, you will be asked to demonstrate your understanding of the ethical ideas covered in the course. Some questions will ask for written paragraphs in response. Some will ask for definitions of concepts presented in class, definitions I would recommend you memorize. Content from the readings as well as content unique to the lectures will be tested. The exams will be cumulative. I will provide a study guide a week or two before each exam.

Argumentative Paper: Except for David Hume's "Moral Distinctions Not Derived From Reason", you may choose any text – but just one text – covered in class before the Midterm Exam. You will do your argumentative paper on this text. There will be a first draft and a second draft of the paper. (Notice that I do not call the first draft "rough" and the second draft "final": *both* drafts are *final* drafts – that is, *each draft* is to represent your best effort to write the best paper you can.)

Use double-spaced, Times New Roman font. **Include a word count on the first page.** For the First Draft, the word count is to be **between 1,500 to 1,800 words**. (This is approximately 5-6 pages.) For the Second Draft, the range is **between 1,800 to 2,100 words**. (This is approximately 6-7 pages.) On the day they are due, Argumentative Papers are due **in hardcopy at the beginning of class, and are also to be submitted on Blackboard before class.**

The argumentative paper will have five sections, as follows:

§1 Introduction

In one paragraph, you will briefly tell me what you are going to do in each of the other sections of the paper. Feel free to use 'I'. (Advice: Write your introduction last, after you have written the other sections, and are clear on what the paper is doing.)

§2 [insert author's name here]'s Argument

In this section, summarize the author's main argument.

§3 Objection

In this section, present an objection to the author's argument. This objection can either be your own, or it can be one that the author already discusses.

§4 Response

In this section, explain how the author could respond. This should not be a way of responding that the author has already discussed. It needs to come from you.

§5 Whether the Objection Succeeds

In this section, explain why the objection either succeeds or fails. (Or, if you think the success of the objection depends on a question we do not yet know the answer to, say what this question is, and develop a suggestion about how we might go about answering it.)

By doing the above, you can, ultimately, either support the author's argument or undermine it. You can ultimately support the author's argument by raising an objection and then showing how there is a good response to it. You can, on the other hand, ultimately undermine the author's argument by raising an objection and then showing that even the best response to that objection falls short.

What I'll Be Looking For In Argumentative Papers: I'll be looking for you to accurately, clearly, and fully explain each concept and step in each section of the paper. Explain each concept clearly and fully, as you would to someone who is not taking the course. At the same time, be concise. Make sure each sentence, and each word in each sentence, does real work.

Also, put things in your own words. In §2, you will need to paraphrase the author's arguments in your own words, providing citation to page numbers. If absolutely necessary, you may use direct quotations, *but keep these quotations few, and keep them short*. In particular, only when the author's own language is crucial to understanding his or her point, directly quote no more than five words in a row. You must not only integrate these quoted words into your own sentence, but also explain them in your own words.

I will be looking for understanding of the author's argument and depth of thought, originality, nuance, and clarity in your development of the objection, response, and ultimate evaluation of the success of the objection.

Reflective Paper: In this course, we will see some possible connections emerge between *virtues* – character traits such as patience, courage, kindness, wisdom, etc. – and the good life. We will also explore some of the *disciplines* traditionally used as aids to help one grow into these virtues. The goal of the reflective paper is to select the ideas here that you find most useful, and reflect on how they could be applied.

Use double-spaced, Times New Roman font. **Include a word count on the first page.** The word count is to be **between 800 to 1,000 words.** (That is approximately 3 pages.) On the day they are due, Reflective Papers are due **in hardcopy at the beginning of class, and are also to be submitted on Blackboard before class.**

The reflective paper will have the following three sections:

§1 The Good Life

In this section, state and briefly clarify an account of the good life that was presented in this course and which you find particularly attractive or intriguing. Then give an example of something that would be a component of the good life, on this account.

§2 [insert here the name of a virtue you have selected]

In this section, state and briefly define a virtue that you find particularly intriguing, interesting, or relevant. (It need not be a virtue discussed in the course, so long as it is clear, or you can make a plausible case, that it is indeed a virtue and not a vice.) Then do two things: First, illustrate the virtue you selected with an example. Second, explain how this virtue relates to the good life as understood by the account you clarified in §1. In particular, say whether, and if so in what ways, the virtue could help one live the good life on that account.

§3 [insert here the name of a discipline you have selected]

In this section, explain a discipline that one could use to help one grow into the virtue that you discussed in §2. Then give an example of the discipline. Then, to conclude, reflect on

your own life. Make note of potential obstacles to engaging in that discipline, as well as factors that may encourage you or enable you to do so. Feel free to make note of things that are more important than that discipline at this time in your life.

Notice that there is no introduction. In §1, please jump right into explaining an account of the good life, with no introduction.

What I'll Be Looking For In Reflective Papers: In your own words, I'll be looking for you to accurately, clearly, and fully explain each concept and step in each section of the paper. Explain each concept clearly and fully, as you would to someone who is not taking the course. At the same time, be concise. Make sure each sentence, and each word in each sentence, does real work.

A chief way to stay on topic, and give yourself space within the word count to adequately respond to the above prompt, is to *follow the prompt carefully and put nothing else in the paper*. You could highlight each sentence underneath the three sections, and turn it into a different color when you have finished that part of the prompt, or etc. I will be looking for thoughtful reflections grounded in understanding of the content of the course.

Extra Credit

Extra Credit: You will receive 1% on top of your course grade for each of the following colloquium you attend. I will be at these talks; if you attend, please come up to me afterwards to record your name.

Jeff Koperski: "Should an Atheist Trust Science?"

Thursday, February 1st, 7:00pm-8:30pm, Neils 234

Jeff Koperski: "Science and Religion"

Friday, February 2nd, 3:30pm-4:30pm, Neils 234

Sandra Visser: "Can Anselm Have Everything He Wants?"

Tuesday, April 3rd, 5:00pm-6:30pm, Urschel 202

TENTATIVE COURSE SCHEDULE FOR PHIL 125: THE GOOD LIFE

Introductory

- 1 Thurs 1/11 Introduction, Syllabus
- 2 Tues 1/16 Logic **explanation of Reading Response Assignments (RRAs)**

Applied Ethics

- 3 Thurs 1/18 R. G. Frey: "Moral Standing, the Value of Lives, and Speciesism", 283-300
Reading Response Question: How does Frey argue for the unequal value thesis without relying on speciesism? **example of an RRA**
- 4 Tues 1/23 Judith Jarvis Thomson: "A Defense of Abortion", 333-345
Reading Response Question: According to Thomson, what is the argument against abortion that is based on the premise that fetuses are persons? How does Thomson object to this argument with the case of the violinist?
- 5 Thurs 1/25 Don Marquis: "Why Abortion Is Immoral", 346-356
Reading Response Question: Why does Marquis think his account of the wrongness of killing is better than personhood theories at explaining why it is wrong to kill babies?
- 6 Tues 1/30 Igor Primoratz: "Justifying Legal Punishment", 370-379
Reading Response Question: According to Primoratz, why is the right to life not absolute?
- 7 Thurs 2/1 Michael Huemer: "Is There a Right to Own a Gun?", 396-410
Reading Response Question: How does Huemer argue that a gun ban would be a serious violation of the right to self-defense?

Metaethics

- 8 Tues 2/6 David Hume: "Moral Distinctions Not Derived From Reason", 171-180
Reading Response Question: When Hume says that reason is "perfectly inert", "wholly inactive", etc., what does he mean?
example of an Argumentative Paper
- 9 Thurs 2/8 J. L. Mackie: "The Subjectivity of Values", 181-190
Reading Response Question: When Mackie says that objective values would be "queer", what does he mean?
- 10 Tues 2/13 Gilbert Harman: "Ethics and Observation", 190-198
Reading Response Question: According to Harman, how does ethics differ

from science?

- 11 Thurs 2/15 Harry Gensler: "Cultural Relativism", 199-207
Reading Response Question: What is Gensler's argument that cultural relativism is not a tolerant view? *study guide for midterm exam*
- 12 Tues 2/20 David Enoch: "Why I am an Objectivist about Ethics (And Why You Are, Too)", 208-221
Reading Response Question: According to Enoch, what does it mean to say morality is objective? What is an example of a subject matter that is not objective?
- 13 Thurs 2/22 Review for Midterm Exam: Applied Ethics
Argumentative Paper Due (First Draft)
- 14 Tues 2/27 Review for Midterm Exam: Metaethics
- 15 Thurs 3/1 **Midterm Exam**
- SPRING RECESS *google form sign-up sheet for meetings over First Draft*

Normative Ethics

- 16 Tues 3/20 Thomas Hobbes: "Leviathan", 120-130
Reading Response Question: According to Hobbes, why is it not rational to have anarchy? *meetings over First Draft begin*
- 17 Thurs 3/22 John Stuart Mill: "Utilitarianism", 97-106
Reading Response Question: According to Mill, how do we know what will promote the general happiness?
- 18 Tues 3/27 Immanuel Kant: "The Good Will and the Categorical Imperative", 107-119
Reading Response Question: What is a maxim of action? Offer a general characterization, and then give an example of a maxim of a particular action.
- 19 Thurs 3/29 W.D. Ross: "What Makes Right Acts Right?", 131-142
Reading Response Question: According to Ross, how do we figure out what our real duty is in a given situation?
- 20 Tues 4/3 Aristotle: "Nicomachean Ethics", 143-154
Reading Response Question: According to Aristotle, what is a state of character? Give an example of a state of character, and explain why it is a state of character.

The Good Life

- 21 Thurs 4/5 John Stuart Mill: "Hedonism", 11-20
Reading Response Question: What are the reasons why we ought to pursue virtue, according to Mill?
- 22 Tues 4/10 Robert Nozick: "The Experience Machine", 21-24
Reading Response Question: Nozick mentions three different kinds of machines. What are these three machines, and what can each do? For each, give a brief (for example, one-sentence) example to illustrate what it can do.
Argumentative Paper Due (Second Draft)
- 23 Thurs 4/12 Brad Hooker: "The Elements of Well-Being", 37-52
Reading Response Question: What is Hooker's argument that "living a morally good life" is not, by itself, a benefit to one?
- 24 Tues 4/17 Chris Heathwood: "Faring Well and Getting What You Want", 25-36
Reading Response Question: According to Heathwood, can an evil person have welfare?
explanation of Reflective Papers
- 25 Thurs 4/19 Susan Wolf: "Happiness and Meaning: Two Aspects of the Good Life", 53-71
Reading Response Question: Give an example of a meaningful life, and explain why it is meaningful using Wolf's account of meaning.
- 26 Tues 4/24 Dallas Willard: "Selections from *The Renovation of the Heart* and *The Spirit of the Disciplines*" [on BB at 'Content' tab, and provided in hardcopy]
Reading Response Question: According to Willard, why are good intentions not enough?
study guide for Final Exam
- 27 Thurs 4/26 Norman Fischer: "Selections from *Training in Compassion: Zen Teachings on the Practice of Lojong*" [on BB at 'Content' tab, and provided in hardcopy]
Reading Response Question: According to Fischer, what is the practice of "sending and receiving"?
study guide for Final Exam
- 28 Tues 5/1 Pierre Hadot: "Selections from *Philosophy as a Way of Life*" [on BB at 'Content' tab, and provided in hardcopy]
Reading Response Question: How would Epicureans suggest we train our soul to relax?
- 29 Thurs 5/3 Review for Final Exam: Normative Ethics
Reflective Paper Due
- 30 Tues 5/8 Review for Final Exam: The Good Life

The date and time of the Final Exam depends on which section of PHIL 125 you are in:

If you are in PHIL 125-A, which meets TR 8:30am-9:45am in ASB 237, the Final Exam is held 8:00am-10:00am Friday, May 11th.

If you are in PHIL 125-B, which meets TR 10:30am-11:45am in MEH 134, the Final Exam is held 10:30am-12:30pm Thursday, May 10th.

PHIL 145-A: ELEMENTARY LOGIC & CRITICAL THINKING, SP2020

Professor: Michael Hatcher

Email: michael.hatcher@valpo.edu

Cell: (714) 875-4343

Class and Class Times: in Meier Hall, Room 134, MWF 9:00am-9:50am

Office and Office Hours: in ASB 352, MWF 2:15pm-4:15pm, and by appointment

TA: Landon Fisher

TA email: landon.fisher@valpo.edu

TA Study Sessions Room and Times: T 6pm-8pm in ASB 102, and R 5-7pm in ASB 114

COURSE DESCRIPTION

Logic is the formal study of reasoning. It studies how conclusions are supported by, or not supported by, the reasons from which they are drawn. The aim of logic, in particular, is to tell us when reasons *guarantee* the truth of the conclusion, when they make that conclusion *probable*, and when they do neither of these things.

The way logic does this is study *arguments*, which are groups of statements that represent internal processes of reasoning in an external format. By studying arguments, we can improve our everyday reasoning, in much the same way that writing down our mathematical computations can improve our mathematical reasoning. I don't know about you, but when a math problem gets complicated, my accuracy improves when I have a piece of paper and a pencil to work it out on. If you engage with this course, you will similarly be able to increase the power of your reasoning, because you will learn the tools to represent it and check it for strength.

Sometimes reasoning is *deductive*, which means that one's reasons are meant to guarantee the conclusion one draws from them. Other times, reasoning is not deductive but instead *inductive*, which means that one's reasons are meant only to make probable the conclusion one draws from them. Our purpose in this course will be to explore both types of reasoning—deductive and inductive. In the first two-thirds of the course, we will study formal logic, as a way to understand deductive reasoning. In the final third we will turn our attention to inductive reasoning. What you learn in this class will empower you to reason well, and to discern when others, who try to influence your beliefs, are reasoning well or poorly.

REQUIRED TEXTS

Stan Baronett, *Logic, Third Edition*. Cengage Learning, 2015. **ISBN: 978-0199383405 OR ISBN: 978-0190266202** [Concise Edition].

Philip Woodward, *Inductive Reasoning*. Will be made available in hardcopy and on Blackboard.

Other required readings will be available in hardcopy and posted on Blackboard.

STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES

Those who put consistent effort into this course will...

11. ...develop a vocabulary for recognizing, reconstructing, and evaluating arguments,
12. ...learn how to use formal logic to construct proofs and test deductive inferences,
13. ...become acquainted with ways evidence can be used well or poorly in inductive argument, and
14. ...learn how to analyze the logical structure of articles in applied ethics.

CLASSROOM FORMAT, EXPECTATIONS, GROUND RULES

Seating Format

Each class, the three or four students nearest you are your teammates.

Format of Questions

I will ask mainly two kinds of questions. The first, default kind of question is to the class as a whole; any student can respond immediately. The second kind of question is to be worked on individually for a few minutes, then discussed with your teammates, after which I will call on teams.

Expectations

I expect you to come to class...

12. ...with the reading done and your homework ready to turn in,
13. ...prepared to do logic exercises both individually and with your teammates,
14. ...and ready to take good notes.

Ground Rules

10. There will be absolutely no technology in the classroom. If I notice you on your phone, I will ask you to put it away.
11. Be kind and respectful.

GRADING AND POLICIES

Components of Course Grade

Non-Tardy Attendance	2%
Homework	28%
First Exam	15%
Second Exam	15%
Final Exam	20%
Argument Analysis Project	
Essay Selection	1%
Argument Reconstruction, Round One	3%
Argument Reconstruction, Round Two, & Evaluation of Premises	4%
Final Paper	12%
Extra Credit (see <i>Extra Credit</i>)	

The grading scale that will be used is as follows: A = 93-100, A- = 90-92, B+ = 87-89, B = 83-86, B- = 80-82, C+ = 77-79, C = 73-76, C- = 70-72, D+ = 67-69, D = 63-66, D- = 60-62, F = 59 and below. At the end of the semester, I will round up to the nearest half point.

Note on Reading the Textbook: While there is no direct penalty for not doing the reading before class, the pace of this course is *fast*. The way to “slow things down” for yourself is to do the readings beforehand, which are generally quite short. This way you will have exposure to the basic ideas, probably have some questions or things to sort out in your mind, and you will be ready for how I will introduce the concepts in class. Concepts are introduced at the speed they are because I am expecting each of you to do the reading and to be ready to solidify new concepts each class. Students who have taken the class in the past have given the advice that reading before class is important.

Also, the structure of the course is deeply *cumulative*: each concept builds on the last. Failing to understand one concept can have rippling consequences throughout the course. Staying on top of the reading, attendance, and homework can save you time later: you will be ready for exams rather than forced to (likely pretty ineffectively) cram for them.

Note on Blackboard: I have not yet figured out how to get Extra Credit to figure properly in your weighted running total on Blackboard. There will be extra credit columns on Blackboard, and if you earned that extra credit, the number you find in the column will be manually added to your weighted total at the end of the semester. So, to illustrate, if you did one extra credit, so there is one extra credit column with 0.5 in it for you, and your weighted running total is 82.9 at the end of the semester, then at the end of the semester I will manually make your total 83.4 – which, by the way, rounds up to the nearest half-point, in this case 83.5. (If you understand how to make Blackboard properly figure extra credit without this work-around, let me know.)

Note on Due Dates: Due dates for all assignments and times for all exams are listed on the Course Schedule at the end of this syllabus. Make this schedule your dear friend.

Lateness Policies

Homework is due in hardcopy format at the beginning of class. If you are unable to attend class on a given day, you may submit your homework over email before class begins; however, I strongly advise that you do not make a habit of this. (I need to print out the attachment and get it to the TA for grading; often this leads to that particular homework not getting graded and returned to you as quickly as those submitted in class.)

I do not accept late homework unless there was a medical, family, or etc., emergency that prevented you from submitted the work in time. Generally, such emergencies will need to be documented (e.g., a doctor's note); if there is an occasion in which documentation was not possible, you will need to talk to me about it in person.

Note for in-season athletes (and others who travel on official University business): When traveling, you are encouraged to submit homework assignments over email when they are due. If this is not possible, all homework due at a class or classes during which you were away is due the first class meeting you are back. This means that you may need to complete homework assignments that drill material for which you missed the in-class instruction. Please plan ahead by noting your travel days. Then read in advance carefully and come to office hours or TA review sessions in advance if you feel unable to complete the homework based on the readings. A rationale for this policy is that it is crucial to not fall behind in the homework and thereby the concepts in the course; also, homework always receives effort points in addition to success points (as explained below). Always complete homework assignments on time rather than delaying past the time when you can receive any credit at all for them.

Exams cannot be rescheduled, unless you can document a medical or family emergency that prevented you from taking the exam. Other than the Final Paper, elements of the Argument Analysis Project receive credit only if submitted on time. For the Final Paper, there is the following policy. After its due date and time, the paper is automatically reduced by one third of a letter grade. A week later, there is an additional reduction of this amount. This lateness policy holds, and there are no extensions, unless you can document a medical or family emergency that is preventing you from finishing the paper on time. (Note: The lateness policies described are negotiable *only if* you have Access and Accommodations.)

Honor Code

The Honor Code must be written and signed on every assignment and exam. In accord with the Code, all students must pledge not to give or receive unauthorized aid. Additionally, students are obligated to report violations of the Honor Code to the Honor Council. Violations may result in (a) zero credit on the assignment in question *and* a 1/3 letter-grade reduction in the final course grade; (b) failing this course; or (c) in being suspended or expelled from the University. For details see: <http://www.valpo.edu/honor-council/>

In this course, unauthorized aid includes but is not limited to:

- Collaboration of any kind on exams.
- Copying exam answers.

- Consulting any supporting materials during exams, other than those explicitly sanctioned by the instructor.
- Attempting to pass off someone else's work as your own.
- Copying homework.
- Consulting someone else's Argument Analysis Paper as a jumping-off point for completing your paper.

Students are, however, encouraged to assist one another in understanding course material and in solving difficult homework problems.

Note:

7. Faculty are expected to report all suspected uses of unauthorized aid.^{††}
8. It is easy for faculty to tell the difference between original work and plagiarized work.

Email and Class Cancelation

I enjoy replying to your emails. I process email thoroughly each weekday and Saturday morning and sometimes also in the late afternoon of those days before I start walking home for dinner with my wife and kids at around 4:40pm. I do not generally process email on weekdays or Saturdays after 4:40pm, nor at any time on Sunday. Do note, though, that if something is urgent, you can always send my cell number a text.

I also love to be available to you in office hours, and I can make an appointment if the hours do not work for you. I make appointments best by email. In the event of an unscheduled class cancelation, I will send an email to your Valpo email address.

Access and Accommodations

The Access & Accommodations Resource Center (AARC) is the campus office that works with students to provide access and accommodations in cases of diagnosed mental or emotional health issues, attentional or learning disabilities, vision or hearing limitations, chronic diseases, or allergies. You can contact the office at aarc@valpo.edu or 219.464.5206. Students who need, or think they may need, accommodations due to a diagnosis, or who think they have a diagnosis, are invited to contact AARC to arrange a confidential discussion with the AARC office. Further, students who are registered with AARC are required to contact their professor if they wish to exercise the accommodations outlined in their letter from the AARC.

^{††} From the Faculty Handbook, section 3.1: "If a faculty member suspects from evidence in the papers received—whether or not the Honor Pledge has been signed—that unauthorized aid has been given, such evidence should be turned over to the chair of the Honor Council, ... A faculty member is not authorized to determine guilt and assess penalties in this kind of matter. The Honor Council conducts its own investigation, which may include an interview with the instructor, and, after assembling and weighing the evidence, determines guilt. If there has been an infraction of the Honor Code, the Council recommends the appropriate discipline to the Provost of the University, who finally penalizes the offending student."

Graded Components

Non-Tardy Attendance: After the second unexcused absence, each subsequent unexcused absence decreases your attendance grade by 0.5. This means that if you have six or more unexcused absences, your attendance grade will be 0 (attendance counts for 2% of your course grade). I begin taking attendance exactly when class begins by calling your names and marking a sheet. If you come too late, such that I have already called your name and moved on to the next, you are marked absent. Notice that this means that a tardy attendance counts as an absence. Please plan things so you are present at the beginning of class.

I encourage you to use the time when I am taking attendance *mindfully*. (I will explain what this means in the first class.)

An absence is excused only if there was a medical, family, or etc., emergency. Generally, these emergencies will need to be documented (e.g., with a doctor's note); if there is an occasion in which documentation was not possible, you will need to talk to me about it in person.

Attendance grades will be put into Blackboard at the end of the semester. If you are not aware of how many unexcused absences you have, you may email me regarding this.

My attendance policy only concerns 2% of your overall grade because missing class will negatively affect your grade on the exams, etc., anyways. In brief: *If you want to pass this course, much less do well in it, you should attend essentially every class. If you are not willing to commit to this, drop this course now.*

Homework: Homework assignments are available at the 'Homework' tab on Blackboard. Homework is due most class sessions. Half of your score for each homework assignment consists of *effort points*—points you automatically earn for each exercise you make a good-faith effort to complete entirely; the other half of your score consists of *success points*—points you earn only if you complete the exercise correctly. Homework assignments will vary in length and level of difficulty. Your lowest-scoring homework assignment will not be counted in grade calculations.

Exams: Exams will test the logical skills covered in the course, as well as your understanding of logical concepts covered in the course. Exams will be cumulative.

Argument Analysis Project: The Argument Analysis Project culminates in a Final Paper. In this project, you will (i) reconstruct and formalize the central argument(s) of an essay in applied ethics, (ii) evaluate the argument(s) for logical strength, (iii) evaluate selected premise(s) of the argument(s) for truth, and (iv) persuasively explain your own position on the selected premise(s). More information on the Argument Analysis Project will be provided later in the semester.

Extra Credit

Philosophy Colloquia: You will receive 0.5% on top of your course grade for each philosophy colloquia you attend. I will be at each of them; if you attend, please come up to me afterwards to record your name:

“In Models We Trust: Climate Models and Their Evaluation” Suzanne Kawamleh
 Thursday January 23rd, 5:00pm-6:15pm, in Christopher Center 205

Full Participation in Both Peer Reviews: You will receive 0.5% on top of your course grade if you participate fully in both peer review experiences with your teammates on 4/15 and 4/22. By ‘participate fully’ I mean your full engagement for both 50-minute sessions – so that you are proud of the way you helped your teammates and persisted in staying on task and focused so as to improve your project and theirs. To secure this extra credit, after you have participated fully in both peer review experiences, sometime on 4/22, send me an email with the subject line “Extra Credit for Peer Review”, type into the email that you participated fully in both peer review processes, and write the honor code and your name.

COURSE SCHEDULE

Date	Theme / Reading Assignment	Due
Wed 1/8	Introduction, Syllabus	
	UNIT 1: INTRODUCING ARGUMENTS	
Fri 1/10	<i>Logic</i> Ch. 1 Introduction, 1A ‘Statements and Arguments,’ 1B ‘Recognizing Arguments,’ 1C ‘Arguments and Explanations’	
Mon 1/13	<i>Logic</i> 1D ‘Truth and Logic,’ 1E ‘Deductive and Inductive Arguments,’ 1F ‘Deductive Arguments: Validity and Soundness’ (just p. 29), 1G ‘Inductive Arguments: Strength and Cogency’	*HW1
Wed 1/15	<i>Logic</i> 1F ‘Counterexamples’ (just p. 36-39)	*HW2
	UNIT 2: PROPOSITIONAL LOGIC	
Fri 1/17	<i>Logic</i> Ch. 7 Introduction, 7A ‘Logical Operators and Translations,’ 7B ‘Compound Statements’	*HW3
Mon 1/20	MLK DAY – NO CLASS	
Wed 1/22	<i>Logic</i> 7C ‘Truth Functions’	*HW4
Fri 1/24	<i>Logic</i> 7D ‘Truth Tables for Propositions,’ 7E ‘Contingent and Noncontingent Statements,’ 7G ‘Validity’	*HW5 / In-Class Quiz on Logical Operators
Mon 1/27	<i>Logic</i> 7H ‘Indirect Truth Tables’	*HW6
Wed 1/29	Logic Races, Day 1	*HW7

Fri 1/31	Review Day	*HW8
Mon 2/3	First Exam	
Wed 2/5	<i>Logic</i> Ch. 8 Introduction, 8A ‘Implication Rules I’, 8B ‘Tactics and Strategy,’ 8C ‘Implication Rules II’	
Fri 2/7	<i>Logic</i> 8E ‘Replacement Rules I’	*HW9
Mon 2/10	<i>Logic</i> 8F ‘Replacement Rules II’	*HW10
Wed 2/12	<i>Logic</i> 8G ‘Conditional Proof’	*HW11
Fri 2/14	Logic Races, Day 2	*HW12 / In-Class Quiz on 18 Rules
	UNIT 3: CATEGORICAL LOGIC	
Mon 2/17	<i>Logic</i> Ch. 5 Introduction, 5A ‘Categorical Propositions,’ 5D ‘The Modern Square of Opposition and Venn Diagrams’	*HW13
Wed 2/19	<i>Logic</i> 5F “Missing Plural Nouns,” “Nonstandard Verbs,” Singular Propositions,” “Implied Quantifiers,” “Nonstandard Quantifiers,” “It is False That...”, “Conditionals”	*HW14
Fri 2/21	<i>Logic</i> 6A ‘Standard-Form Categorical Syllogisms,’ 6C ‘Diagramming in the Modern Interpretation’	*HW15
Mon 2/24	Logic Races, Day 3	*HW16
Wed 2/26	Review Day	*HW17
Fri 2/28	Second Exam	
SPRING RECESS		
	UNIT 4: INDUCTIVE REASONING	
Mon 3/16	<i>IR</i> Ch. 1 Inductive Arguments: Strength, Cogency, Completeness’ + Getting Used to Google Meet	
Wed 3/18	<i>IR</i> Ch. 2 ‘Proportional Syllogism’	
Fri 3/20	<i>IR</i> Ch. 3 ‘Argument from Analogy’	*HW18
Mon 3/23	<i>IR</i> Ch. 4 ‘Inductive Generalization’	*HW19
Wed 3/25	<i>IR</i> 7.1 “Reconstructing Inferences to the Best Explanation”	*HW20
Fri 3/27	<i>IR</i> 7.2 “Evaluating Inferences to the Best Explanation”	*HW21 / In-Class Quiz on Inductive Argument Forms
Mon 3/30	Logic Races, Day 4	*HW22

	UNIT 5: PUTTING IT ALL TOGETHER	
Wed 4/1	Argument Analysis Project Guidelines [BLACKBOARD] Huemer, "Is there a Right to Own a Gun?" [BLACKBOARD]	*HW23
Fri 4/3	<i>IR</i> 8.1 "Introducing Moral Arguments", 8.5 "From Giving Arguments to Having Productive Discussions"	
Mon 4/6	Advice on Reconstructing Arguments	*HW24 / *Argument Analysis Project: Essay Selection
Wed 4/8	Huemer, "America's Unjust Drug War" [BLACKBOARD]	*HW25
Fri 4/10	GOOD FRIDAY – NO CLASS	
Mon 4/13	<i>Logic</i> 6I Sorites Kagan, "Arguments for the Existence of the Soul" [BLACKBOARD]	*HW26
Wed 4/15	Peer Review	*Argument Analysis Project: Argument Reconstruction, Round One
Fri 4/17	Advice on Evaluating Premises	
Mon 4/20	<i>Logic</i> 8H 'Indirect Proof'	*HW27
Wed 4/22	Peer Review	*Argumentation Project: Argument Reconstruction, Round Two, & Evaluation of Premises
Fri 4/24	Logic Races, Day 5	*HW28
Mon 4/27	<i>Logic</i> Ch. 4 Introduction, 4B 'Fallacies based on Personal Attacks': 1-4 (types of Ad Hominems); 4D 'Fallacies of Unwarranted Assumption or Diversion': 15. "Begging the Question", 21. "Straw Man"	
Wed 4/29	MEETINGS OVER ARGUMENT ANALYSIS PROJECT – NO CLASS	
Fri 5/1	Review Day	
Mon 5/4	Review and Student Evals	*Argument Analysis Project: Final Paper

Final Exam: Saturday, May 9th, 8:00am-10:00am

Core 115 – The Human Experience Spring 2019

Instructor	Professor Michael Hatcher	Phone	(714) 875-4343
Office	ASB 253	E-mail	michael.hatcher@valpo.edu
Office Hours	M 4pm-5pm; WF 2:30pm-5pm	Core Lab	valpo.edu/valpocore/core-lab/
Core Website	valpo.edu/valpocore/	Facebook	facebook.com/valpocore/

Valparaiso University - Mission Statement: "Valparaiso University, a community of learning dedicated to excellence and grounded in the Lutheran tradition of scholarship, freedom, and faith, prepares students to lead and serve in both church and society."

Valparaiso University – Vision Statement: "Valparaiso University will be renowned worldwide for preparing women and men who are highly sought for their knowledge, character, integrity, and wisdom."

Justice in Action

Description

What is justice? Why should we care about it? How do we know whether a given action or policy is just? What can I do to promote a more just society? How can I become a just person? In this course, we shall think hard about and discuss vigorously these questions.

This course is writing-intensive. In terms of the skills they require, writing assignments will build on each other – from the application of a concept of justice to a text, to the critique of an approach to justice, to your own argument concerning a justice-related issue. At the end of the semester, we will celebrate the completion of the Core sequence with a Core Symposium on Justice on Friday, May 3rd, at which selected students will step onto the academic stage and present their research.

Student Learning Objectives (SLOs)

University-wide SLOs:

1. Solve both conceptual and applied problems by integrating broad-based knowledge, evidence-based reasoning, and information literacy.
2. Practice experiential, interdisciplinary, and collaborative learning in both academic and co-curricular pursuits.
3. Communicate effectively in oral, written, and digital forms in increasingly complex contexts.
4. Engage in cross-cultural dialogue and experiences with the requisite knowledge to succeed in a diverse, global community.
5. Develop character, integrity, and wisdom as they discern their vocations and prepare to lead ethically and to serve church and society.

General Education SLOs:

1. Students will demonstrate recognition and understanding of cultural differences encountered in texts and articulate connections that may transcend them.
2. Students will show an understanding and basic appreciation of the affective dimension of a text.

University Writing and Information Literacy SLOs:

1. Communicate effectively in oral, written, and digital forms in increasingly complex contexts.
2. Solve both conceptual and applied problems by integrating broad-based knowledge, evidence-based reasoning, and information literacy.
3. To develop a writing process that includes brainstorming, planning, drafting, using sources effectively, revising comprehensively, editing, proofreading, reviewing peers' writing, and receiving feedback reflectively.
4. To write clear, compelling, thesis-driven arguments in proofread prose that reflects standards for written communication adapted for particular audiences, purposes, genres, and situations.
5. To use critical reading to generate and synthesize ideas, language, and structure for writing.

REQUIRED TEXTS to be purchased by students

- *Reading Critically, Writing Well* (11th Student Edition). Axelrod, Cooper & Warriner. Bedford/Saint Martin's MacMillan, 2017. ISBN: 9781319032753. **You also used this in Core 110.**
- *In Conversation: A Writer's Guidebook*. Bedford/St. Martin's 2018, ISBN: 978-131923584-0. **Used throughout the University Writing Program in WIC, WID, and Senior Capstone courses.**
- *Antigone*, Sophocles. Translation by Paul Woodruff. Hackett Publishing Company, Inc. (September 15, 2001) ISBN: 9780872205710
- *Justice: What's the Right Thing To Do?*, Michael J. Sandel. Farrar, Straus and Giroux; Reprint edition (August 17, 2010) ISBN: 9780374532505
- *When the Emperor Was Divine*, Julie Otsuka. Anchor (October 14, 2003) ISBN: 9780385721813
- *Just Mercy*, Bryan Stevenson. Spiegel & Grau; Reprint edition (August 18, 2015) ISBN: 9780812984965

REQUIRED TEXTS on Blackboard, and which the instructor will also provide in hardcopy in class

- Maiese, Michele. "Types of Justice." *Beyond Intractability*. Eds. Guy Burgess and Heidi Burgess. Conflict Information Consortium, University of Colorado, Boulder. Posted: July 2003 <<http://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/types-of-justice>>.
- Enoch, David. "Why I am an Objectivist about Ethics (And Why You Are, Too)", in Shafer-Landau (ed) *The Ethical Life: Fundamental Readings in Ethics and Moral Problems*, 4th Edition. 208-221.
- Heathwood, Chris. "Faring Well and Getting What You Want", in Shafer-Landau (ed) *The Ethical Life: Fundamental Readings in Ethics and Moral Problems*, 4th Edition. 25-36.

- Wolf, Susan. "Happiness and Meaning: Two Aspects of the Good Life", in Shafer-Landau (ed) *The Ethical Life: Fundamental Readings in Ethics and Moral Problems*, 4th Edition. 53-71.
- Selections from Plato's *Republic*
- Selections from Dallas Willard's *The Renovation of the Heart* and *The Spirit of the Disciplines*
- Selections from Norman Fischer's *Training in Compassion: Zen Teachings on the Practice of Lojong*

Summary of Grading

The grading scale that will be utilized is as follows: A = 93-100, A- = 90-92, B+ = 87-89, B = 83-86, B- = 80-82, C+ = 77-79, C = 73-76, C- = 70-72, D+ = 67-69, D = 63-66, D- = 60-62, F = 59 and below.

Core Lab

MLK Day Celebration, Convocation, and Reflection	1%
Conference with me to review your plan	1%
Film and Reflection	1%
Service Event and Reflection	2%
Event of Your Choice #1 and Reflection	0.5%
Event of Your Choice #2 and Reflection	0.5%
Event of Your Choice #3 and Reflection	0.5%
Event of Your Choice #4 and Reflection	0.5%
In-Class Presentation on Your Core Lab	3%

Writing Assignment One (WA1) – Analysis of justice in a literary text

Thesis and Outline	0.5%
WA1.1	3%
Reflections on Peer Review of WA1.2	1%
WA1.3	15%

Writing Assignment Two (WA2) – Evaluation of a justice-related argument

Thesis and Outline	0.5%
WA2.1	3%
Reflections on Peer Review of WA2.2	1%
WA2.3	15%

Writing Assignment Three (WA3) – Independent research project

Thesis and Outline	0.5%
WA3.1	3%
Reflections on Peer Review of WA3.2	1%
WA3.3	15%

Reading Response Assignments (RRAs)	10%
Midterm Exam	10%
Final Exam	10%
Verbal Participation in Class	1.5%
<hr/> Total	100%
Grade Penalties (see <i>Grade Penalties</i>)	
Extra Credit (see <i>Extra Credit</i>)	

My Expectations of You

Before explaining each graded component summarized above, I want to be clear about my expectations of you as an individual student. I expect you to

- Attend each class.
- Have no technology out; have a notebook and pen at the ready each moment of class.
- Take detailed notes during class.
- Keep your notes organized.
- Engage in discussion.
- Listen well to your classmates.

- Carefully read the course schedule to know precisely what is required each class day (the schedule will at times be updated on Blackboard – on these occasions I will email the class).
- Carefully read all of the assigned text.
- Submit your Reading Response Assignment on BB by 11:00am that morning.
- Submit any other assignments when they are due.
- Bring the assigned text to class that day.

- Start working on your papers early.
- Write solid drafts of your writing assignments.

Format of Class

During class, the normal format shall be as follows:

Seating Format

Each class, seat with three or four other teammates. You may sit with whomever you wish, though on occasion I may organize alternate groupings.

Format of Questions

I will ask three main kinds of questions. The first, default kind of question is to the class as a whole; any student can respond immediately. The second kind of question is to be discussed first within your teams, after which I will call on teams. The third kind of question is for individual reflection and writing for a few minutes, before I will ask for responses.

Classroom "Liturgy"

Class will begin with a *mindfulness minute*. After asking you to put away your technology if necessary, we will take one minute to practice a mindfulness exercise. These exercises train us to take control of our attention – to focus on the present.

Another element of classroom liturgy will be *small group discussion*.

Yet another element of classroom liturgy will be *text time*. I will write page numbers on the board, and ask a question which will require you, in your groups, to look at the text and together come up with an interpretation.

These elements of classroom liturgy will be interspersed with small lectures in which I will aim to clarify some of the main ideas and arguments from the readings, of which you will need to have good, detailed notes going forward.

Breakdown of Components of Grade

Writing Assignments:

All Core papers that are designated as part of the Writing Program process or are labeled as formal Writing Assignments must be turned in with all assigned drafts. **No papers will be accepted which are submitted only in their final form. Any paper submitted without drafts will receive a zero.**

Writing Process:

Good writing flows from understanding; so, the real first step in the writing process is consistently engaging with the readings and reflecting productively on them – a process which I hope the RRAs will aid (discussed below). You will need to understand and engage with these concepts in your writing.

You will get started with the writing process early. There will be workshops in which a thesis and outline of your assignment will be due. Each Writing Assignment comes in three drafts – WA1.1, WA1.2, WA1.3, etc. – and both the first and the third of these drafts will be graded by me, and comments will be provided on Blackboard. In addition, for the first draft, you will meet with me one-on-one, and it is strongly encouraged that you read the comments on Blackboard before coming to the meeting. Failing to make a one-on-one meeting over a first draft results in a grade penalty (discussed below). To facilitate these meetings, I will send out a google sign-up sheet in advance.

After reflecting on my feedback both on Blackboard and through our meeting, you will complete a second draft of each Writing Assignment. This draft will go through peer review. For peer review, in addition to uploading the second draft (together with the initial first draft) on Blackboard, you will come to class with two hardcopies of your second draft. After this, before midnight of that class day, you will upload to Blackboard your reflections on peer review. I will

grade these reflections on the basis of how much evidence they present of engagement with the peer review process.

When you submit the final draft on Blackboard, you will also submit the first and second drafts, to enable me to compare and verify that each is a genuinely different draft which has taken seriously the feedback provided through this process.

Core Lab:

Core Lab is your opportunity to design part of this course! All Core 115 students will attend Core lab events during the Spring 2019 semester. You will receive a handout with more information from your professor. "Core Approved" events are listed on the Core Lab Calendar:

<http://www.valpo.edu/valpocore/core-lab/>

The Core Lab is designed to help each student explore events outside of class that connect with our themes in the classroom. These offerings will also serve the purpose of helping first-year students become aware of and connected to campus life. All students will complete **four required events, attend four additional events** of your own choosing, and **write reflections on all these events**. We hope you take full advantage of the opportunity to shape your own Core Lab in ways that are meaningful to you!

Required Core Lab Activities:

- ❖ Monday, January 21: MLK Day Celebration track (9:30 a.m.) and Convocation (2:00 p.m.)
- ❖ Conference with instructor to review your Core Lab design and service event proposal
- ❖ Film screening and discussion: Kawergosk: Home Made of Cloth; days/times TBA
- ❖ Service event

Core Lab Process:

A google form will be sent to you, which can be updated indefinitely many times. (Note: each time you update it, be sure to click 'Submit' so that all changes are saved.) This form is your friend. It will allow you to plan your Core Lab, initially, and then, also, it will be where you record your reflections on each event. These reflections are required for any credit on the events you attend.

For the one-on-one conference with me, please come with the 'Plan' portion of the google form filled out, having consulted the online Core Lab calendar. Also, come with a proposal for your service event.

At the end of the course, you will present on your Core Lab to your classmates. Your presentation will be between 6 and 7 minutes long. I will have more information on the presentation later in the semester. But here is some advice: since you will need to convey what you've learned through the events you've attended, it is a good idea to record your reflections on the google form *immediately* after you complete the event, when the experience is still fresh. This will allow you, at the end of the semester, to have easy-access to good notes from which to build your presentation. And besides, these reflections are required for credit for each event.

Reading Response Assignments:

For each reading we will discuss in class, there will be a Reading Response Assignment (RRA) due on Blackboard by **11:00am of the day of class**. This will give me time to grade your RRA before class, and comment on it. RRAs are responses to Textual Questions and Critical Questions, and are also to include a Quotation, which you will then connect in your own words to your answer to the Textual Question. That is, they will include the following components:

1. Response to *Textual Question*. Answers should be entirely in your own words, and adequately yet concisely demonstrate your understanding of the text. **Include the word count after your answer. The acceptable range is 100 to 200 words.**
2. Quotation. Select and reproduce one quotation from the text that is 1 or 2 sentences long. Be sure to provide the page number of this quotation.
3. Quotation Connected to Response to *Textual Question*. In your own words, explain how the quotation you selected undergirds or supports your response to the textual question. **Include the word count afterwards. The acceptable range is 30 to 50 words.**
4. A Response to the *Critical Question*. Answers should be entirely in your own words, and demonstrate thoughtfulness, engagement, and creativity. **Include the word count after your answer. The acceptable range is 50 to 100 words.**

Use the following headings in the following sequence to organize your RRA document:

Response to Textual Question:

Word Count:

Quotation:

Quotation Connected to Response to Textual Question:

Word Count:

Response to Critical Question:

Word Count:

There will be 26 RRAs due throughout the semester. I will aim to grade and comment on each of them by 1:00pm of the day of class. In my grading, you will either receive 50% of the credit for the RRA, 80%, or 100%. 100% means you have demonstrated sufficiently correct understanding of the text in your response to the textual question as backed by your quotation, and also have put thought into your response to the critical question. 80% means it is clear to me that you read all the text, but either you have significant misunderstandings of the text, or you did not put sufficient thought into the critical question, or both. 50% means it is unclear to me whether you read all the assigned text, or, in any case, there is little understanding of the text on display in your response to either of the questions.

My comment on your RRA may be a brief explanation of why the score is less than 100% - though, often, a more complete explanation may only become clear by means of class that day. Hopefully more often, my response will make a connection, point to a follow-up question, or otherwise relay how your assignment influenced my thinking. You are encouraged, if you wish, to read these responses prior to class. But do not worry about it if you are unable to do so on any given day.

Exams:

Exams will include three sections. First, there will be a vocabulary section, in which you will be asked to write out definitions that we have learned in the course, from memory. Six definitions will be requested, totally 30 points. Second, there will be a textual portion, where you will be asked specific questions of passages. These passages will be selected from the passages discussed in the text time portion of class time. Three passages will be tested, totally 30 points. Third, there will be an essay question requiring a written essay in response, totally 40 points. A more detailed study guide will be provided for both the midterm and the final.

Verbal Participation in Class:

Participation is graded on a 0, 1, 1.5 scale at the end of the semester. A score of 1.5 means you not only consistently participated in discussion during class, your contributions were also timely, thoughtful, and showed the mark of listening well to your fellow classmates. A score of 1 means you consistently participated in discussion. A score of 0 means that you did not consistently participate in discussion.

Extra Credit:

There will be a quiz on the syllabus early in the semester. There will be 10 multiple choice questions: a perfect score secures 1% course grade extra credit, 9 correct secures 0.9% course grade extra credit, etc.

Grade Penalties:Attendance

All Core students are expected to attend all classes. If a student misses three classes in a row, or 4 hours of class overall, an Unsatisfactory Academic Progress (UAP) report will be sent. See information about UAPs above. Please let your instructor know if you have to be absent due to other Valparaiso University commitments such as music, athletics, etc. The specific absence policy for this class is: After the second unexcused absence, there will be a 1% course grade penalty for each of the next two unexcused absences, and a 0.5% course grade penalty for each of the next two unexcused absences after that. An excused absence must be documented with, for example, a doctor's note, proof of a family emergency, or etc. I cap the total possible grade penalty for attendance at 3% because missing class will negatively affect your grade on the exams, etc., anyways.

Meetings Over First Drafts

Meeting with me over each of your first drafts is mandatory. For each of these meetings that you miss, there is a 1% course grade penalty. I will send out a sign-up sheet for these meetings.

Lateness Policy for Assignments

RRAs are due on Blackboard at 11:00am on the day the reading will be discussed. Late RRAs are not accepted, unless a medical or family emergency can be documented which prevented the RRA from being turned in on time. Writing Assignment drafts are also due on Blackboard at 11:00am on the day they are due. The lateness policy for these drafts is as follows: In the

absence of a medical or family excuse, the draft's grade will be reduced by 1/3 of a letter grade for each week it is late. While the Second Drafts are not graded, a Third Draft can be turned in only after a Second Draft truly distinct from both the First Draft and the Third Draft has been turned in. So, if your Second Draft is late, this will make it incredibly hard to turn in the Third Draft on time – and the Third Draft carries the most weight with your grade.

Honor Code

All students in this course are expected to uphold the Valparaiso University Honor Code.

[Valparaiso University's Honor Code - http://www.valpo.edu/student/honorcouncil/](http://www.valpo.edu/student/honorcouncil/)

"I have neither given or received, nor have I tolerated others' use of unauthorized aid."

Authorized aid for the purpose of this class is defined as the following: your own personal knowledge on all exams and your own writing, in every instance. In other words, you are to do your own work at all times. Copying any text verbatim from a book or article, except for cited quotations, constitutes plagiarism and a violation of the Honor Code. Similarly, copying and pasting text from web sites into your papers, except for cited quotations, constitutes plagiarism and a violation of the Honor Code. This means you should pay careful attention on each formal writing assignment to citing any sources you use properly. Copying answers, in whole or in part, from a classmate's test or using a book, note sheet, cell phone, or other wireless device during an exam is also a violation of the Honor Code.

This does not mean, however, that you may not have help in editing your essays. You are authorized and encouraged to take your written assignments to the Writing Center to be reviewed. You may follow any of the suggestions you may get at the Center. You may also allow fellow classmates to review your writing and offer suggestions on ways to improve it. Just keep in mind at all times that the actual writing is to remain your own.

Your RRAs are to come from your own reading of the assigned text. In some cases, there might be SparkNotes, or etc., which seem to address the RRA prompt (notice how I say 'seem'). Consulting such sources is a violation of the Honor Code. Please note that Blackboard will have a plagiarism check on, and this can detect similarities to anything on the internet.

The Fine Print

[UAP \(Unsatisfactory Academic Progress\)](#)

Unsatisfactory Academic Progress notifications are sent by faculty members to students, their advisers, the Dean of Students, and Academic Deans. These notifications are sent in a variety of situations and are used to notify students that some aspect of their academic performance needs to improve. Examples of situations when a UAP might be sent are: student does not contribute regularly to discussions, student fails to complete assignments or exams, a student exhibits behavior in class that disrupts the learning environment, or a student misses several classes. This list is not exhaustive and faculty are encouraged to file a UAP when students first show signs of poor academic performance.

[Library Support Services:](#)

Prof. Nora Belzowski is the librarian assigned to work with the Valpo Core program. While all librarians are available to help you, she is the librarian best able to help you navigate information resources for independent research or additional

reading listed on the library research guide for CORE. Please contact Prof. Belzowski if you need additional help finding sources for your Core writing assignments: nora.belzowski@valpo.edu.

Judith L. Beumer Writing Center:

We encourage you to make use of the Writing Center located on the lower level of the Christopher Center. It is free for undergraduate and graduate students. The Writing Center offers individual peer consultations and workshops on writing to support your growth as a writer. Make an appointment at any time by going to valpo.mywconline.com. The sessions provide strategies and guidance on writing assignments from any discipline, at any stage in the writing process, and for writers at all skill levels. Their goal is for you to become a credible, more confident writer who is able to make the best choices in any writing situation.

Access and Accommodations Resource Center:

The Access & Accommodations Resource Center (AARC) is the campus office that works with students to provide access and accommodations in cases of diagnosed mental or emotional health issues, attentional or learning disabilities, vision or hearing limitations, chronic diseases, or allergies. You can contact the office at aarc@valpo.edu or [219.464.5206](tel:219.464.5206). Students who need, or think they may need, accommodations due to a diagnosis, or who think they have a diagnosis, are invited to contact AARC to arrange a confidential discussion with the AARC office. Further, students who are registered with AARC are required to contact their professor(s) if they wish to exercise the accommodations outlined in their letter from the AARC.

University Counseling Center:

The University Counseling Center is located on the Northwest side of Alumni Hall. This is a wonderful resource that is available to all VU students. Students may use the counseling center to enhance their current functioning or wellbeing as well as receive help with any issues they are facing. Individual counseling is available free of charge for full-time undergraduate, graduate or law students. Intake appointments can be arranged by going in person to the Counseling Center in Alumni Hall or by calling [219-464-5002](tel:219-464-5002).

Diversity & Inclusion:

Valparaiso University aspires to be a welcoming community, one built on participation, mutual respect, freedom, faith, competency, positive regard, and inclusion. We see difference as a strength and reason for celebration. As such, we do not tolerate language or behavior that demeans members of our classrooms based on age, ethnicity, race, color, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity, biological sex, disabilities (visible and invisible), socio-economic status, and national origin. Instead we commit ourselves to the values of diversity and nondiscrimination, conducting our classroom as "a learning community where students are encouraged to question, to engage, to challenge, to explore, and ultimately, to embark on a rewarding personal and professional journey. This can be done only in an environment where diversity is honored and respected. Diversity of thought. Diversity of background. Diversity of faith." (President Mark Heckler)

Title IX Support:

Valparaiso University strives to provide an environment free of discrimination, harassment, and sexual misconduct (sexual harassment, sexual violence, dating violence, domestic violence, and stalking). If you have been the victim of sexual misconduct, we encourage you to report the incident. If you report the incident to a University faculty member or instructor, she or he must notify the University's Title IX Coordinator about the basic facts of the incident. Disclosures to University faculty or instructors of sexual misconduct incidents are not confidential under Title IX. Confidential support services available on campus include: Sexual Assault Awareness & Facilitative Education Office "SAAFE" (219-464-6789), Counseling Center (219-464-5002), University Pastors (219-464-5093), and Student Health Center (219- 464-5060). For more information, visit <http://www.valpo.edu/titleix/>.

Student Athletes

Student athletes are excused from class for university-sponsored competitions; however, an excused absence does not excuse students from completing course work missed during absences. The manner in which work will be made up is at the discretion of instructors, and students are responsible for obtaining any class notes or other course material missed due to absences prior to subsequent exams or deadlines for graded assignments.

To receive accommodations that ensure athletes are not penalized for excused absences for university athletic events, student athletes must contact instructors on or before the first day of class to provide a written list of upcoming games or meets. They are expected to highlight the athletic competitions that will conflict with the class and provide contact

information for coaches and academic counselors in athletics. The purpose of this information is to help faculty members enter into a network of support with coaches and counselors to promote student athlete success in the classroom. Additionally, student athletes are marked on DATAVU class rosters. Their schedules should be posted by their names.

[Academic Support Services:](#)

To get help in this course, the best place to start is to work with your instructor during office hours and ask your professor if there are any Help Sessions or department-level tutoring offered for this course. The next step is to use the Academic Success Center (ASC) online directory (valpo.edu/academicsuccess) or contact the ASC (academic.success@valpo.edu) to help point you in the right direction for academic support resources for this course. Valpo's learning centers (Writing Center, Language Resource Center, [Hesse Learning Resource & Assessment Center] and Academic Success Center) offer a variety of programs and services that provide group and individual learning assistance for many subject areas.

[Class Cancellation Method:](#)

Notifications of class cancellations will be made via e-mail with as much advance notice as possible. It will be sent to your Valpo e-mail address. If you don't check your Valpo e-mail account regularly or have it set-up to be forwarded to your preferred e-mail account, you may not get the message. Please check your Valpo e-mail (or the e-mail address it was forwarded to) before coming to class.

[Academic Calendar & Final Exam Schedule](#)

Final Exams are required and must be given in their assigned time slot unless an exception has been provided by the Dean's office. Visit the Registrar's website for the latest information. <https://www.valpo.edu/registrar/calendar/>

Course Schedule

Note: Please check this schedule consistently to know what is due, when. Some elements are to be decided (TBA). When I update these elements, I will upload an updated syllabus on Blackboard, and I will also email the class. I expect you to keep track of each of these updates.

Date	Readings and Assignments
W 1/9 Day 1	Ø
F 1/11 Day 2	<p>Readings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Syllabus 2. Maiese, "Types of Justice" <p>Assignments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA1, due on Blackboard by 11am 2. In-Class Quiz on the Syllabus for Extra Credit <p>RRA1 Prompt: Textual Question: In your own words, explain and illustrate each of the kinds of justice Maiese distinguishes. Critical Question: Is the distribution of benefits and burdens in America just or unjust? Explain why or why not.</p>
M 1/14 Day 3	<p>Readings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Enoch, "Why I am an Objectivist about Ethics (And Why You Are, Too)" <p>Assignments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA2, due on Blackboard by 11am <p>RRA2 Prompt: Textual Question: What does Enoch mean by 'objective'? How does he argue that morality is objective? Critical Question: Do you agree with Enoch? Why or why not?</p>

W 1/16 Day 4	<p>Readings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sandel, <i>Justice</i>, Chapter 1: Doing the Right Thing <p>Assignments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA3, due on Blackboard by 11am <p>RRA3 Prompt: Textual Question: Distinguish and define the three approaches to justice Sandel describes. Explain each of them in terms of the example of price-gouging. Critical Question: Is price-gouging just? Explain why or why not.</p>
F 1/18 Day 5	<p>Readings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sandel, <i>Justice</i>, Chapter 2: The Greatest Happiness Principle / Utilitarianism <p>Assignments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA4, due on Blackboard by 11am <p>RRA4 Prompt: Textual Question: Define utilitarianism and explain the two main objections to it. Critical Question: Suppose we have strong, but not conclusive evidence that Bob knows the location of a bomb set to go off in downtown Chicago in one hour. Is it just to torture Bob? Explain why or why not.</p>
M 1/21	<p>MLKJ Day</p> <p>Attend track and convocation</p>
W 1/23 Day 6	<p>Readings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sandel, <i>Justice</i>, Chapter 3: Do We Own Ourselves? / Libertarianism <p>Assignments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA5, due on Blackboard by 11am <p>RRA5 Prompt: Textual Question: Explain the three main components of libertarianism, as well as Nozick's argument for libertarianism.</p>

	<p>Critical Question: Should you be allowed to sell your kidney? Explain why or why not.</p> <p>Note: You should meet with me one-on-one tomorrow (1/24) over your core lab design (or have already scheduled a different meeting if that day does not work for you).</p>
F 1/25 Day 7	<p>Readings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sandel, <i>Justice</i>, Chapter 6: The Case for Equality / John Rawls <p>Assignments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA6, due on Blackboard by 11am <p>RRA6 Prompt: Textual Question: What is "the difference principle" and what is Rawls' reasoning on its behalf? Critical Question: Suppose that either <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) each student in your Core class, including yourself, will receive \$10,000, or (b) one student in your Core class, but there is no way to tell who, will receive \$1,000,000, and the rest nothing. Which is more fair, (a) or (b)? Which would you pick, were it up to you?</p>
M 1/28 Day 8	<p>Readings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sandel, <i>Justice</i>, Chapter 8: Who Deserves What? / Aristotle <p>Assignments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA7, due on Blackboard by 11am <p>RRA7 Prompt: Textual Question: How does Aristotle connect justice to virtue? Give a general characterization, and then illustrate it with an example. Critical Question: Who or what decides what is good for you? You? God? Human nature? Evolutionary history? Explain your thinking.</p>
W 1/30 Day 9	CLASS CANCELED DUE TO THE INTENSE COLD

F 2/1 Day 10	<p>Readings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sandel, <i>Justice</i>, Chapter 9: What Do We Owe One Another? / Dilemmas of Loyalty <p>Assignments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA8, due on Blackboard by 11am <p>RRA8 Prompt:</p> <p>Textual Question: Explain the difference between the moral individualist's conception of the person and the narrative conception of the person.</p> <p>Critical Question: Should we have open borders with unfettered immigration? Why or why not?</p>
M 2/4 Day 11	<p>Readings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sandel, <i>Justice</i>, Chapter 10: Justice and the Common Good <p>Assignments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA9, due on Blackboard by 11am <p>RRA9 Prompt:</p> <p>Textual Question: Sandel argues neutrality is impossible in politics. What does he mean by this claim, and how does he argue for it?</p> <p>Critical Question: Should the US legally recognize polygamous marriages? Why or why not?</p>
W 2/6 Day 12	<p>Readings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Antigone</i>, p. 1-34 <p>Assignments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA10, due on Blackboard by 11am <p>RRA10 Prompt:</p> <p>Textual Question: Contrast Antigone and Creon's views about what is just, as well as why it is just.</p> <p>Critical Question: Would you join Antigone in her endeavor, or hang back like Ismene? Why or why not?</p>

F 2/8 Day 13	<p>Readings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Antigone</i>, p. 35-58 <p>Assignments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA11, due on Blackboard by 11am <p>RRA11 Prompt: Textual Question: Despite its tragic results, Antigone stands by her decision. Why? What is her reasoning? Critical Question: Eurydice blames Creon for Haemon's death. Is Eurydice right? Is Creon to blame?</p>
M 2/11 Day 14	<p>Readings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RCWW, Ch. 6, 183-184, 205-206, 229-232. 2. <i>In Conversation</i>, section 9, pp. 136-148; section 12.4, pp. 172-173; and section 27, pp. 341-379 <p>Assignments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Thesis and Outline of WA1, due on Blackboard by 11am, AND pasted onto the google form for Writing Workshops.
W 2/13 Day 15	<p>Readings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Antigone</i>, "Introduction" <p>Assignments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA12, due on Blackboard by 11am <p>RRA12 Prompt: Textual Question: Explain and illustrate something you learned about Creon from the Introduction, as well as something you learned about Antigone from the Introduction. Critical Question: Apply the concept of "procedural justice" to the play. Which procedures were used to come to decisions? Were these processes fair?</p>

F 2/15 Day 16	<p>Readings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RCWW, Statsky, "Children Need to Play, Not Compete" (p. 334-339) 2. RCWW, Romano, "Jessica Statsky's 'Children Need to Play, Not Compete': An Evaluation" (p. 274-277) <p>Assignments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA13, due on Blackboard by 11am 2. WA1 First Draft, due on Blackboard by 11am <p>RRA13 Prompt: Textual Question: Stratsky argues against competitive sports for children. First, briefly summarize the part of Stratsky's argument which you consider to be the weakest. Then develop an objection to this part of her argument. Critical Question: How does your objection to Stratsky's argument differ from Romano's objections? Or, what are the similarities?</p>
M 2/18 Day 17	<p>Library Session (Meet in Library)</p> <p>Readings and Videos (use the links):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Video 1: A Threat to Internet Freedom – NY Times: https://www.nytimes.com/2014/07/10/opinion/a-threat-to-internet-freedom.html?_r=2 2. Video 2: FCC Chair Ajit Pai Explains Why He Wants to Scrap Net Neutrality - PBS NewsHour: https://youtu.be/6Q5_oV4JB10 3. Article: "Net Neutrality was Never Enough" - The Atlantic: https://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2017/12/net-neutrality-was-never-enough/548549/
W 2/20 Day 18	<p>No Class – Meetings with Professor Over WA1 First Draft (please read Blackboard comments on your paper before your meeting!)</p>
F 2/22 Day 19	<p>Readings: Pick either the Wolf reading or the Heathwood reading, and complete the corresponding RRA prompt:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Heathwood, "Faring Well and Getting What You Want" 2. Susan Wolf, "Happiness and Meaning: Two Aspects of the Good Life" <p>Assignments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA14, due on Blackboard by 11am

	<p>RRA14 Prompt Heathwood Version: Heathwood uses the title "Objectivist" in a special sense. First clarify what he means by that word, and then present his argument against what he means by Objectivism.</p> <p>Critical Question: Before he was caught, do you think Ted Bundy had a good life? Why or why not?</p> <p>RRA14 Prompt Wolf Version: What is Wolf's account of a meaningful life? Give an example of a life which would qualify as meaningful on Wolf's account.</p> <p>Critical Question: Which projects in which you are engaged seem to you to be most worthwhile?</p>
M 2/25 Day 20	<p>Readings: none.</p> <p>Assignments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WA1 Second Draft, due on Blackboard by 11am, AND bring two hardcopies for Peer Review. 2. Reflections on Peer Review for WA1, due on Blackboard before midnight.
W 2/27 Day 21	Review for Midterm Exam
F 3/1 Day 22	<p>Readings: none.</p> <p>Assignments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WA1 Final Draft, due on Blackboard by 11am. <p style="text-align: center;">****MIDTERM EXAM****</p>
M 3/4 – F 3/15	Spring Break
M 3/18 Day 23	<p>Readings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Otsuka, <i>When the Emperor was Divine</i>, p. 1-105 <p>Assignments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA15, due on Blackboard by 11am 2. Thesis and Outline of WA2, due on Blackboard by 11am, AND bring 4 hardcopies of it to class. <p>RRA15 Prompt:</p> <p>Textual Question: Briefly indicate when the story is from the perspective of the woman, and when the story is from the perspective of the boy. Then</p>

	<p>spend time on this question: How are these two perspectives similar, and how are they different?</p> <p>Critical Question: Who do you relate to more, the woman or the boy? Why?</p>
W 3/20 Day 24	<p>EEE (Explore, Engage, Express) Workshop</p> <p>Location and Time: Christopher Center Community Room, 2:30pm-3:20pm</p>
F 3/22 Day 25	<p>Readings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Otsuka, <i>When the Emperor was Divine</i>, p. 106-144 <p>Assignments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA16, due on Blackboard by 11am 2. WA2 First Draft, due on Blackboard by 11am <p>RRA16 Prompt:</p> <p>Textual Question: Select and describe in detail a few specific ways this family was changed by their incarceration.</p> <p>Critical Question: Use one of Sandel's accounts of justice to explain why the Japanese incarceration during WWII was unjust.</p>
M 3/25 Day 26	<p>Readings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Stevenson, <i>Just Mercy</i>, Introduction and Chapter 1 <p>Assignments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA17, due on Blackboard by 11am <p>RRA17 Prompt:</p> <p>Textual Question: Briefly describe Stevenson's run-in with the police, and then discuss this question: For what reasons did the police act as they did?</p> <p>Critical Question: Suppose, for the sake of argument, the following: during that year, in the city Stevenson's apartment was in, 62% of burglaries were committed by African Americans. Should this affect how police interact with people? Why or why not?</p>
W 3/27 Day 27	<p>No Class – Meetings with Professor Over WA2 First Draft (please read Blackboard comments on your paper before your meeting!)</p>

F 3/29 Day 28	<p>Readings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Stevenson, <i>Just Mercy</i>, Chapters 2-4 <p>Assignments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA18, due on Blackboard by 11am <p>RRA18 Prompt:</p> <p>Textual Question: Why was Walter McMillian convicted of murder?</p> <p>Critical Question: Do you think that those who convicted Walter McMillian knew, deep down, that he was innocent? Why or why not?</p>
M 4/1 Day 29	<p>Readings: none.</p> <p>Assignments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WA2 Second Draft, due on Blackboard by 11am, AND bring two hardcopies for Peer Review. 2. Reflections on Peer Review for WA2, due on Blackboard before midnight.
W 4/3 Day 30	<p>Note: Physical class is canceled for this day, though the RRA is still due. I will post some questions on a shared google document, and check on 'attendance and participation' on Thursday 4/4 by checking to see who has contributed to the discussion on the google document.</p> <p>Readings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Stevenson, <i>Just Mercy</i>, Chapters 5-7 <p>Assignments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA19, due on Blackboard by 11am <p>RRA19 Prompt:</p> <p>Textual Question: Explaining any necessary background, answer this question: In your view, why did Charlie shoot his mother's boyfriend?</p> <p>Critical Question: How is Charlie and his actions similar to Herbert Richardson and his actions in Chapter 4?</p>

F 4/5 Day 31	<p>Readings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Stevenson, <i>Just Mercy</i>, Chapters 8-10 <p>Assignments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA20, due on Blackboard by 11am 2. WA2 Final Draft, due on Blackboard by 11am <p>RRA20 Prompt: Textual Question: Describe the background and childhood experiences of Trina, Ian, and Antonio. Critical Question: Select either Trina, Ian, or Antonio. What punishment do you believe they should receive, and why? Be specific.</p>
M 4/8 Day 32	<p>Readings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Stevenson, <i>Just Mercy</i>, Chapters 11-13 <p>Assignments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA21, due on Blackboard by 11am 2. Tentative Abstract or Notes for WA3, due on Blackboard by 11am, AND three hardcopies for class. <p>RRA21 Prompt: Textual Question: Though Walter McMillian was eventually released, what did he lose in the process? Be specific. Is it true that he can never get it back? Explain. Critical Question: Make a guess about whether Thomas Tate, the Sheriff of Monroe County who prosecuted Walter, is still Sheriff of Monroe County – and explain why you guessed as you did. (No googling!)</p>
W 4/10 Day 33	<p>Readings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Stevenson, <i>Just Mercy</i>, Chapter 14-Epilogue <p>Assignments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA22, due on Blackboard by 11am <p>RRA22 Prompt: Textual Question: What does Stevenson mean by 'brokenness'? According to Stevenson, how has America responded to people's brokenness, and why? Critical Question: How should we respond to our brokenness?</p>

F 4/12 Day 34	<p>Readings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Plato's Republic (first excerpts) <p>Assignments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA23, due on Blackboard by 11am 2. WA3 First Draft, due on Blackboard by 11am <p>RRA23 Prompt:</p> <p>Textual Question: In these excerpts, Socrates and those discussing with him arrive at a definition of justice. What is it? (Note: Accurately understanding and communicating this definition will require a careful reading of <i>the whole excerpt.</i>)</p> <p>Critical Question: Consider these two dictums:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Follow your head *Follow your heart <p>Which do you resonate with more? Why?</p>
M 4/15 Day 35	<p>Readings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Plato's Republic (second excerpts) <p>Assignments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA24, due on Blackboard by 11am <p>RRA24 Prompt:</p> <p>Textual Question: In light of his notion of 'the good' and his story about the cave, what does Socrates believe is the nature of true education?</p> <p>Critical Question: Do you think the story about the cave has applications to today's world? Why or why not? Be specific.</p>
W 4/17 Day 36	<p>No Class – Meetings with Professor Over WA3 First Draft.</p> <p>Note: I will try to get your first draft graded by Monday or Tuesday. But check Blackboard a day before your meeting, and if I don't have comments and grade up, please come to the meeting with <u>two hardcopies</u> of your draft. I will read your paper and give you feedback right then, and also give comments and grade on BB as soon as is possible for me.</p>

F 4/19	No Class – Good Friday
M 4/22 Day 37	<p>Readings: none.</p> <p>Assignments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WA3 Second Draft, due on Blackboard by 11am, AND bring two hardcopies for Peer Review. 2. Reflections on Peer Review for WA3, due on Blackboard before midnight.
W 4/24 Day 38	<p>Readings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Selections from Dallas Willard's <i>The Renovation of the Heart and The Spirit of the Disciplines</i> <p>Assignments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA25, due on Blackboard by 11am <p>RRA25 Prompt:</p> <p>Textual Question: In light of his account of the various aspects or dimensions of a human life, why does Dallas Willard hold that intending to do what is right is not enough to ensure right action?</p> <p>Critical Question: Willard suggests that the discipline he calls "silence" is "frightening". Does that discipline frighten you? Why or why not?</p>
F 4/26 Day 39	<p>Readings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Selections from Norman Fischer's <i>Training in Compassion: Zen Teachings on the Practice of Lojong</i> <p>Assignments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RRA26, due on Blackboard by 11am 2. WA3 Final Draft, due on Blackboard by 11am 3. Core Lab Google Form, due by 11am <p>RRA26 Prompt:</p>

	<p>Textual Question: According to Fischer, what is the practice of "sending and receiving"?</p> <p>Critical Question: What do you think should be done to increase people's capacity for compassion?</p>
M 4/29 Day 40	Core Lab Presentations
W 5/1 Day 41	Core Lab Presentations
F 5/3 Day 42	Core Symposium
M 5/6 Day 43	Review for Final Exam
	<p style="text-align: center;">****Final Exam****</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Saturday, May 11th, 1:00pm-3:00pm</p>

Core 110 – The Human Experience Fall 2018

Instructor	Michael Hatcher	Phone	(714) 875-4343
Office	ASB 253	E-mail	michael.hatcher@valpo.edu
Office Hours	TWF 2:00pm-4:00pm, and by appointment	Class	MEH 140; M 11:30am-1:20pm, WF 11:30am-12:30pm

Overall Theme: Empathy and Dialogue

Description:

The primary goal of this course is the exploration of the human experience, particularly as it relates to the development of empathy and dialogue. Students will examine the themes through reading and writing assignments, discussion, and Core Lab events. We will begin with an exploration of the self we bring to college and the contexts in which we find ourselves. We will explore how texts are similarly situated in particular contexts. Our focus on empathy and dialogue will help us bridge the gap between ourselves and others as we learn to appreciate new perspectives. Academic writing, as we will stress, participates in a conversation that we can join.

Another aim of the course is to welcome and initiate new students into this university community and academic life generally by putting them in dialogue with great teachers, great texts and with each other to explore as a community some of the most essential aspects of what it means to be human.

First-year students need special skills to enter fully into the academic world and become successful students in the fullest sense. The Valpo Core is designed to help students develop necessary academic skills such as argumentative writing, close reading, and critical thinking. Additionally, students will work to develop their discussion skills (both leading and participating) as well as presentation skills. Great opportunities also exist in the course for students to become more adept at retrieving, evaluating, and managing information, as they connect to the rest of the world through our electronic information services.

Student Learning Objectives (SLOs):

University Writing and Information Literacy SLOs:

- Communicate effectively in oral, written, and digital forms in increasingly complex contexts
- Solve both conceptual and applied problems by integrating broad-based knowledge, evidence-based reasoning, and information literacy

Goals for first-year writing and information literacy courses (Core and Christ College):

- To develop a writing process that includes brainstorming, planning, drafting, using sources effectively, revising comprehensively, editing, proofreading, reviewing peers' writing, and receiving feedback reflectively
- To write clear, compelling, thesis-driven arguments in proofread prose that reflects standards for written communication adapted for particular audiences, purposes, genres, and situations
- To use critical reading to generate and synthesize ideas, language, and structure for writing

In Core 110, students will engage the above goals and objectives in these daily tasks:

- Read a diverse range of texts, attending especially to relationships between assertion and evidence, to patterns of organization, and to how these features function in different genres for audiences and situations
- Use methods such as interpretations, synthesis, response, critique and design/redesign to compose evidence-based prose that integrates the writer's ideas with those from appropriate sources
- Engage in small and large group discussions based on students' close reading of the texts and outside experiences
- Develop flexible strategies for reading, drafting, reviewing, collaborating, revising, rewriting, rereading, and editing.

REQUIRED TEXTS to be purchased by students:

- *Reading Critically, Writing Well* (11th Student Edition). Axelrod, Cooper & Warriner. Bedford/Saint Martin's MacMillan, 2017. ISBN: 9781319032753. **Also used in Core 115.**
- *In Conversation: A Writer's Guidebook*. Bedford/St. Martin's 2018, ISBN: 978-131923584-0. **Also used in Core 115.**
- *Frankenstein: The 1818 Text*, Mary Shelley, Penguin Books, 2018. ISBN: 978-0143131847
- *Cosmopolitanism*, Kwame Anthony Appiah. Norton, 2010. ISBN: 978-0393329339
- *Things Fall Apart*, Chinua Achebe (1959), Penguin Books, 2017. ISBN: 978-0385474542

Additional texts supplied in hardcopy in class and also available on Blackboard:

"Theme for English B," Langston Hughes

"The Empathy Gap" excerpts, J. D. Trout

"The Empathy Diaries" and "The Flight from Conversation," Sherry Turkle

"Letter from Birmingham Jail," Martin Luther King, Jr.

"Birmingham's Racial Segregation Ordinances"

"Public Statement by Eight Alabama Clergymen"

"After Ten Years", Dietrich Bonhoeffer

Genesis 1-3, ESV

Excerpt from *Paradise Lost*, Milton

Prometheus in Greek Mythology, excerpts from Ovid and Hesiod

Prometheus, a short poem by Lord Byron

Universal Declaration of Human Rights

AAA Statement on Human Rights

Unit 1: Empathy and Contexts

Unit 2: Texts in Dialogue

Unit 3: Conversations and Society

Classroom Format, Expectations, and Ground Rules

Seating Format

Each class, those in your row on your side of the classroom are your teammates. Sit in a row with people, try for three or four people per team.

Format of Questions

I will ask three main kinds of questions. The first, default kind of question is to the class as a whole; any student can respond immediately. The second kind of question is to be discussed first within your teams, after which I will call on teams. The third kind of question is for individual reflection and writing for a few minutes, before I will ask for responses.

Expectations

I expect you to come to class...

15. ...with the reading done and your Reading Response Assignment having already been submitted on Blackboard by 7:30am that morning,
16. ...prepared to engage in discussion,
17. ...and ready to take good notes.

Ground Rules

12. There will be absolutely no technology in the classroom. If I notice you on your phone, I will ask you to put it away. This policy begins 5 minutes before class begins; so, at 11:25am. If you absolutely need to send an email between 11:25am and 11:30am, please do so outside the classroom.
13. Be kind and respectful.
14. No need to ask for permission to use the restroom.

Core Policies

Paper Drafts:

All Core papers that are designated as part of the Writing Program Process or are labeled as formal Writing Assignments must be turned in with all assigned drafts. **No papers will be accepted which are submitted only in their final form. Any paper submitted without drafts will receive a zero.** Each paper will go through *three* drafts: a first draft after which you will meet with me one-on-one, a second draft for peer review, and a final draft which will receive a grade.

Core Lab Events:

Core Lab is your opportunity to design part of this course! All Core 110 students will attend Core lab events during the Fall 2018 semester, four required and four of your own choosing. University events are listed on the Core Lab Calendar; <http://www.valpo.edu/valpocore/core-lab/>

The Core Lab is designed to help each student explore events outside of class that connect with our themes in the classroom. These offerings will also serve the purpose of helping first-year students become aware of and connected to campus life. All students will complete the **three required events, conduct an interview and attend and reflect on four additional events.** We hope you take full advantage of the opportunity to shape your own Core Lab in ways that are meaningful to you!

Required Core Lab Activities:

- ❖ Conference with instructor to review your Core Lab design
- ❖ Core Keynote: Dr. David Western 7pm Sept. 4 Union Ballrooms
- ❖ Interview – interviewee must differ either in nationality or (political or religious) ideology; interview form due Monday November 26th
- ❖ Film screening: *To Be and To Have* (Nicolas Philibert) days/times/location TBA

Note: The google document, Core Lab Plan and Reflect Form, is to be completely filled out and submitted by Monday November 26th, 7:30am, which is also when the Interview Form is due on Blackboard. 5-minute presentations on your individual Core Lab experience will be held on Wednesday November 28th and Friday November 30th. It is strongly advised that you continually update the Core Lab Plan and Reflect Form as you complete its elements.

The Interview Form is found at the 'Core Lab Materials' tab on Blackboard. There is also an Interview Guide at that tab.

Grading:

The grading scale that will be utilized is as follows: A = 93-100, A- = 90-92, B+ = 87-89, B = 83-86, B- = 80-82, C+ = 77-79, C = 73-76, C- = 70-72, D+ = 67-69, D = 63-66, D- = 60-62, F = 59 and below.

Writing Assignment One (Personal narrative reflection)	15%
Writing Assignment Two (Analysis of a text in its context)	15%
Writing Assignment Three (Analysis of a text through a concept)	15%
Writing Process (see Writing Process)	10%
Attendance	see Grade
<i>Penalties</i>	
Non-Tardiness	see Grade
<i>Penalties</i>	
Non-Technology	see Grade
<i>Penalties</i>	
One-on-One Meetings Over First Drafts	see Grade
<i>Penalties</i>	
Core Lab	10%
Midterm Exam	10%
Final Exam	10%
Reading Response Assignments	10%
Participation	5%
	100

Important Note on Blackboard: Blackboard will not accurately represent your overall course grade, but only your grades on individual components of the course. This is because Blackboard does not weight components that are entered according to the percentage of the course grade they are worth. So, if you want to check how you are doing in the course at any given time, you need to use this syllabus to weight the components on Blackboard according to the percentage of the course grade they are worth, and then do the math.

Grade Penalties:**Attendance**

All Core students are expected to attend all classes. If a student misses three classes in a row, or 4 hours of class overall, an Unsatisfactory Academic Progress report will be sent by the instructor to the student, the advisor and the academic dean. Please let your instructor know if you have to be absent due to other Valparaiso University commitments such as music, athletics, etc. The specific absence policy for this class is: After the second unexcused absence, there will be a 1% course grade penalty for each of the next two unexcused absences, a 0.5% course grade penalty for each of the next two unexcused absences after that, and a 0.25% course grade penalty for each subsequent unexcused absence. An excused absence must be documented with, for example, a doctor's note, proof of a family emergency, or etc. In brief: *If you want to pass this course, much less do well in it, you should attend essentially every class.*

Non-Tardiness and Non-Technology

If you are tardy to a given class, but present for most of it, I will still allow you to mark the attendance sheet. However, if I have noticed by the end of the semester that you have a habit of being tardy, I will impose a grade penalty of 1% to 3%, depending on the severity of your tardiness habit. In addition, if I have noticed by the end of the semester that you have a habit of using your phone during class, or within 5 minutes prior to class, and that I often have to ask you to put it away, I will impose a grade penalty of 1% to 3%, depending on the severity of your technology habit.

One-on-One Meetings Over First Drafts

Part of the writing process, as you will see below, is meeting with me over the first draft of each of your three Writing Assignments. For each meeting over a first draft which you miss, there is a 1% course grade penalty.

Reading Response Assignments:

In Core 110, you have the opportunity to read and think about significant, great texts across the humanities. Reading these carefully and thoughtfully is an important precondition for your learning in this class.

Reading Response Assignments have two components:

7. A Summary. Here, you will summarize the main ideas or aspects of the assigned text in your own words. **Include the word count after your answer. The acceptable range is 150 to 200 words.**
8. A Response. Here you will respond to the text with your own ideas and questions. There are many ways this can look. You can raise objections, ask questions, explore implications, etc. But I want to see engagement, thoughtfulness, and creativity. **Include the word count after your answer. The acceptable range is 100 to 150 words.**

Use the following headings in the following sequence to organize your RRAs:

Summary:

Word Count:

Response:

Word Count:

I strongly advise you to write your RRA immediately after reading the assigned text. (It may also be a good idea to jot down notes as you read, to prepare to write the RRA.) I expect RRAs to be proofread at least once, and spellchecked, and so on. However, with so many due over the course of the semester, RRAs should be a *rhythm* of your preparation for class. You will not have the time to agonize over every sentence. What I will be looking for is evidence that you *have read all of the assigned text with care and spent some time thinking about it*. If you have really done this, this evidence will flow out of you as you write, and I will be able to see it – similar to how I can immediately tell, by talking to them, not only whether someone has seen *The Last Jedi*, but also whether they watched the movie with care, and thought about it. In addition,

writing after you read is *extremely beneficial*: writing is a skill that requires not only highly scrutinized bits of writing – as the writing assignments will be – but also a quantity of writing. (Just as skill in speaking requires not only preparing for presentations, but also just talking to people.) These RRAs give you a chance to hit the ground writing.

There will be **22** RRAs total, of which you are to submit at least **17**. They are **due on Blackboard by 7:30am on the day of class.**^{‡‡} So, unless you are an early bird, you will need to get these done and submit them the night before. They are graded on a scale of 1.5, 2.5, or 3.

If you complete more than 17 RRAs, I will begin dropping the lowest scoring RRAs. So, at any point in the semester, if you have 17 RRAs with a score of 3, then pat yourself on the back, you have the maximum score for RRAs! If you find yourself in this fortunate scenario late in the semester, it is still a very good idea to do the readings before class, to enable you to learn the content for the papers and exams. But, alas, there is no extra credit if you submit an RRA which would give you 18 RRAs with a score of 3. If at some point late in the semester you already have 17 RRAs with a 3, then you have proven to me that you can read the text with care and thoughtfulness before class, and, for the remaining classes, I will be allowing you to monitor that always advisable activity yourself.

I will aim to grade RRAs before 9:00am the day of class. A score of 3 means you have demonstrated sufficiently correct understanding of the text in your summary, and also have put some thought into your response. A score of 2.5 means it is clear to me that you read all the text, but either you have significant misunderstandings of the text, or you did not put sufficient thought into your response. A score of 1.5 means it is unclear to me whether you read all the assigned text, or, in any case, there is little understanding of the text on display in your summary or response.

In addition to the numerical score, I will also provide a one-sentence response to your RRA. The response may be a brief explanation of why the score is less than 3 – though, often, a more complete explanation may only become clear by means of class that day. Hopefully more often, my response will make a connection, point to a follow-up question, or otherwise relay how your assignment influenced my thinking. You are encouraged, if you wish, to read these responses prior to class. But do not worry about it if you are unable to do so on any given day.

I encourage you to start off the semester strong with completing RRAs. Not only will it get you into the swing of things, it will give you the opportunity to develop the skill of monitoring whether you understand the text. This is an important skill to develop throughout the semester.

Writing Process:

Each of the three Writing Assignments will go through the same general process. 10% of your grade depends on putting your best efforts into this process. There are *three* drafts for each Writing Assignment. Each draft will be uploaded to Blackboard when due, and when the second and third drafts are uploaded, their previous drafts are to be uploaded together with them.

Each of you will meet with me over the first draft. You will bring two hardcopies of your paper with you to our meeting, and I will read your paper right there and give you feedback. In so

^{‡‡}

Note well: Blackboard detects whenever any part of an assignment is lifted from the internet. Doing so constitutes plagiarism.

doing, I will be modeling what you will be asked to do during the second draft stage of the process – namely, peer review.

You will rewrite your paper in light of my feedback. This second draft of the paper will be for peer review, two hardcopies of which you will bring to class. Each student will have one 50-minute class period to give feedback per paper. After this process, each student will reflect on what it was like for them to review their peers' papers, and then will write up these reflections as Reflections on Peer Review. As there are three Writing Assignments, you will write three Reflections on Peer Review. These Reflections will be guided and fairly brief. More information on peer review and these Reflections will be provided at the relevant time.

Finally, you will rewrite your paper in light of the feedback from your peers. This will be your third and final draft, and I will provide for it a letter grade which determines 15% of course grade. As you will see, the more you put into the writing process, the higher quality the final product will be.

	Percentage	Due
First Draft of Writing Assignment One:	1%	Sept. 7 th , 7:30am
Second Draft of Writing Assignment One:	1%	Sept. 17 th , 7:30am
Reflections on Peer Review, Writing Assignment One:	1.33%	Sept. 19 th , 7:30am
Final Draft of Writing Assignment One:	15%	Sept. 24 th , 7:30am
First Draft of Writing Assignment Two:	1%	Oct. 5 th , 7:30am
Second Draft of Writing Assignment Two:	1%	Oct. 15 th , 7:30am
Reflections on Peer Review, Writing Assignment Two:	1.33%	Oct. 17 th , 7:30am
Final Draft of Writing Assignment Two:	15%	Oct. 22 nd , 7:30am
First Draft of Writing Assignment Three:	1%	Nov. 9 th , 7:30am
Second Draft of Writing Assignment Three:	1%	Nov. 26 th , 7:30am
Reflections on Peer Review, Writing Assignment Three:	1.33%	Nov. 28 th , 7:30am
Final Draft of Writing Assignment Three:	15%	Dec. 3 rd , 7:30am

Notice that all due dates are by 7:30am of the relevant day, on Blackboard. But also remember to bring the necessary hardcopies of the Writing Assignments, whether to the meeting with me or for peer review.

There is either credit or no credit for the drafts. For credit, the second draft must be significantly revised from the first draft. Reflections on Peer Review are graded on a scale of 1.5, 2.5, and 3. A score of 3 means they show evidence of helpful, constructively critical, patient, and thoughtful review of others' papers. A score of 2.5 means they show evidence of helpful review of others' papers, but perhaps only at a surface level, and not engaging as deeply with the structure or ideas of the paper. A score of 1.5 means that while there may be some evidence that peer review was completed, insufficient effort was put forth to provide helpful review of others' papers.

University Policies & Resources

Honor Code:

- All participants in Core 110 will uphold the Valparaiso University Honor Code.
- [Valparaiso University's Honor Code](http://www.valpo.edu/student/honorcouncil/) - <http://www.valpo.edu/student/honorcouncil/>
 - “I have neither given or received, nor have I tolerated others' use of unauthorized aid.”

Access and Accommodations Resource Center:

The Access & Accommodations Resource Center (AARC) is the campus office that works with students to provide access and accommodations in cases of diagnosed mental or emotional health issues, attentional or learning disabilities, vision or hearing limitations, chronic diseases, or allergies. You can contact the office at aarc@valpo.edu or [219.464.5206](tel:219.464.5206). Students who need, or think they may need, accommodations due to a diagnosis, or who think they have a diagnosis, are invited to contact AARC to arrange a confidential discussion with the AARC office. Further, students who are registered with AARC are required to contact their professor(s) if they wish to exercise the accommodations outlined in their letter from the AARC.

University Counseling Center:

The University Counseling Center is located on the Northwest side of Alumni Hall. This is a wonderful resource that is available to all VU students. Students may use the counseling center to enhance their current functioning or wellbeing as well as receive help with any issues they are facing. Individual counseling is available free of charge for full-time undergraduate, graduate or law students. Intake appointments can be arranged by going in person to the Counseling Center in Alumni Hall or by calling [219-464-5002](tel:219-464-5002).

Diversity & Inclusion:

Valparaiso University aspires to be a welcoming community, one built on participation, mutual respect, freedom, faith, competency, positive regard, and inclusion. We see difference as a strength and reason for celebration. As such, we do not tolerate language or behavior that demeans members of our classrooms based on age, ethnicity, race, color, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity, biological sex, disabilities (visible and invisible), socio-economic status, and national origin. Instead we commit ourselves to the values of diversity and nondiscrimination, conducting our classroom as “a learning community where students are encouraged to question, to engage, to challenge, to explore, and ultimately, to embark on a rewarding personal and professional journey. This can be done only in an environment where diversity is honored and respected. Diversity of thought. Diversity of background. Diversity of faith.” (President Mark Heckler)

Title IX Support:

Valparaiso University strives to provide an environment free of discrimination, harassment, and sexual misconduct (sexual harassment, sexual violence, dating violence, domestic violence, and stalking). If you have been the victim of sexual misconduct, we encourage you to report the incident. If you report the incident to a University faculty member or instructor, she or he must notify the University's Title IX Coordinator about the basic facts of the incident. Disclosures to University faculty or instructors of sexual misconduct incidents are not confidential under Title IX. Confidential support services available on campus include: Sexual Assault Awareness & Facilitative Education Office "SAAFE" (219-464-6789), Counseling Center (219-464-5002), University Pastors (219-464-5093), and Student Health Center (219- 464-5060). For more information, visit <http://www.valpo.edu/titleix/>.

Academic Support Services:

To get help in this course, the best place to start is to work with your instructor during office hours and ask your professor if there are any Help Sessions or department-level tutoring offered for this course. The next step is to use the Academic Success Center (ASC) online directory (valpo.edu/academicsuccess) or contact the ASC (academic.success@valpo.edu) to help point you in the right direction for academic support resources for this course. Valpo's learning centers (Writing Center, Language Resource Center, [Hesse Learning Resource & Assessment Center] and Academic Success Center) offer a variety of programs and services that provide group and individual learning assistance for many subject areas.

Student Athletes

Student athletes are excused from class for university-sponsored competitions; however, an excused absence does not excuse students from completing course work missed during absences. The manner in which work will be made up is at the discretion of instructors, and students are responsible for obtaining any class notes or other course material missed due to absences prior to subsequent exams or deadlines for graded assignments.

To receive accommodations that ensure athletes are not penalized for excused absences for university athletic events, student athletes must contact instructors on or before the first day of class to provide a written list of upcoming games or meets. They are expected to highlight the athletic competitions that will conflict with the class and provide contact information for coaches and academic counselors in athletics. The purpose of this information is to help faculty members enter into a network of support with coaches and counselors to promote student athlete success in the classroom.

Library Support Services:

Prof. Nora Belzowski is the librarian assigned to work with the Valpo Core program. While all librarians are available to help you, she the librarian best able to help you navigate information resources for independent research or additional reading listed on the library research guide for CORE. Please contact Prof. Belzowski if you need additional help finding sources or constructing your Core writing assignments nora.belzowski@valpo.edu.

Class Cancellation Method:

Notifications of class cancellations will be made via e-mail with as much advance notice as possible. It will be sent to your Valpo e-mail address. If you don't check your Valpo e-mail account regularly or have it set-up to be forwarded to your preferred e-mail account, you may not get the message. Please check your Valpo e-mail (or the e-mail address it was forwarded to) before coming to class.

Tentative Course Schedule:

Remember: All assignments are due by 7:30am on BB that day; e.g. RRA1 is due 7:30am on Friday August 24th.

WEEK	DAY	DATE	Length	DESCRIPTION	REQUIRED READING	ASSIGNMENTS
1	Tue	21-Aug		Classes Begin		
	Wed	22-Aug	50 min	Introductions, Syllabus		
	Fri	24-Aug	50 min	Discuss reading	Hughes "Theme for English B"	RRA1

2	Mon	27-Aug	1st 50 min	Core Lab Introduction Discuss reading	Trout "The Empathy Gap"	RRA2
	Mon	27-Aug	2nd 50 min			
	Wed	29-Aug	50 min	Discuss reading WA1 prompt	Turkle "The Empathy Diaries"	RRA3
	Fri	31-Aug	50 min	Discuss reading	Turkle "The Flight From Conversation"	RRA4
3	Mon	3-Sep	1st 50 min	Writing Workshop	RCWW (p. 57-60) <i>In Conversation</i> (p. 3-7; 39-43; 230-253)	
	Mon	3-Sep	2nd 50 min			
	Wed	5-Sep	50 min	Discuss reading	King "Letter From Birmingham Jail"	RRA5
	Fri	7-Sep	50 min	No Class Due to Meetings Over WA1 First Draft		WA1 First Draft
4	Mon	10-Sep	1st 50 min	Library Session Session continued: Introduction to WA2		
	Mon	10-Sep	2nd 50 min			
	Wed	12-Sep	50 min	Discuss readings	"Public Statement by Eight Alabama Clergymen" "Birmingham's Racial Segregation Ordinances"	RRA6 Core Lab Conferences
	Fri	14-Sep	50 min	Class canceled, though RRA is still due!!	Frankenstein, Preface and Vol. 1, Letters I-IV, Ch. I-IV	RRA7
5	Mon	17-Sep	1st 50 min	Peer Review		WA1 Second Draft
	Mon	17-Sep	2nd 50 min			
	Wed	19-Sep	50 min	Discuss reading	Frankenstein, Vol. 1, Ch. V-VII	RRA8 Reflections on Peer Review WA1
	Fri	21-Sep	50 min	Discuss reading	Frankenstein, Vol. 2, Ch. I-VII	RRA9

6	Mon	24-Sep	1st 50 min	Logic Discuss reading	<i>Frankenstein</i> , Vol. 2, Ch. VIII-IX	RRA10 WA1 Final Draft
	Mon	24-Sep	2nd 50 min			
	Wed	26-Sep	50 min	Discuss reading	<i>Frankenstein</i> , Vol. 3, Ch. I-VII	RRA11
	Fri	28-Sep	50 min	HOMECOMING		
7	Mon	1-Oct	1st 50 min	Discuss reading [Note: each of the readings is very short. Use a few sentences for each in your RRA summary.]	Genesis 1-3, ESV Milton "Paradise Lost" (excerpt) <i>Prometheus in Greek Mythology</i> Byron "Prometheus" RCWW (p. 281-289) <i>In Conversation</i> (p. 29-36; 51-54; 167-176)	RRA12
	Mon	1-Oct	2nd 50 min			
	Wed	3-Oct	50 min	Discuss reading	Bonhoeffer "After Ten Years"	RRA13
	Fri	5-Oct	50 min	Bonhoeffer Lecture @ Christopher Center Community Room, 12:30-1:20pm		WA2 First Draft
8	Mon	8-Oct	1st 50 min	Core Lab Check-In Review for Midterm		
	Mon	8-Oct	2nd 50 min			
	Wed	10-Oct	50 min	Midterm Exam		
	Thur	11-Oct		Fall Break		
	Fri	12-Oct		Fall Break		
9	Mon	15-Oct	1st 50 min	Peer Review		WA2 Second Draft
	Mon	15-Oct	2nd 50 min			
	Wed	17-Oct	50 min	Discuss reading	<i>Cosmopolitanism</i> , Intro	RRA14 Reflections on Peer

						Review WA2
	Fri	19-Oct	50 min	Discuss reading	Cosmopolitanism, Ch. 1-2	RRA15
10	Mon	22-Oct	1st 50 min	Discuss reading	Cosmopolitanism, Ch. 3-6	RRA16 WA2 Final Draft
	Mon	22-Oct	2nd 50 min			
	Wed	24-Oct	50 min	Discuss reading	Cosmopolitanism, Ch. 7-8	RRA17
	Fri	26-Oct	50 min	Discuss reading	Cosmopolitanism, Ch. 9-10	RRA18
11	Mon	29-Oct	1st 50 min	Wrap-up Discussion of Cosmopolitanism Introduce WA3		
	Mon	29-Oct	2nd 50 min			
	Wed	31-Oct	50 min	Discuss reading	Things Fall Apart, Part One	RRA19
	Fri	2-Nov	50 min	Discuss reading	Things Fall Apart, Part Two	RRA20
12	Mon	5-Nov	1st 50 min	Writing Workshop	RCWW (p. 183-184; 205-206) In Conversation (p. 136-147; 201-212)	
	Mon	5-Nov	2nd 50 min			
	Wed	7-Nov	50 min	Discuss reading	Things Fall Apart, Part Three	RRA21
	Fri	9-Nov	50 min	No Class Due to Meetings Over WA3 First Draft		WA3 First Draft
13	Mon	12-Nov	1st 50 min	Wrap-up Discussion of Things Fall Apart		
	Mon	12-Nov	2nd 50 min			
	Wed	14-Nov	50 min	Visit Brauer Museum		
	Fri	16-Nov	50 min	Discuss readings	Universal Declaration of Human Rights AAA Statement on Human Rights	RRA22

	Sat	17-Nov		Thanksgiving Recess Begins		
	Sun	25-Nov		Thanksgiving Recess Ends		
14	Mon	26-Nov	1st 50 min	Peer Review		WA3 Second Draft
	Mon	26-Nov	2nd 50 min			Interview Form
	Wed	28-Nov	50 min	Core Lab Presentations		Reflections on Peer Review WA3
	Fri	30-Nov	50 min	Core Lab Presentations		Core Lab Google Form
15	Mon	3-Dec	1st 50 min	Core Lab Presentations What have we learned?		WA3 Final Draft
	Mon	3-Dec	2nd 50 min			
	Wed	5-Dec	50 min	Review for Final		
	Fri	7-Dec	50 min	Review for Final and Evals		

Final Exam:

Friday, December 14th, 10:30am-12:30pm



#	1. Helped students to interpret subject matter from diverse perspective and (e.g., different cultures, religions, political views).	2. Demonstrated the importance of the subject matter.	3. Provided in-time and meaningful feedback on students' academic performance.	4. Stimulated students to effort beyond that required by most courses.	5. Explained intellectual material clearly and concisely.	6. Introduced stimulating ideas about the subject.	7. Involved students in hands-on activities to set and achieve goals such as research, which challenged studies or them.	8. Inspired students to set and achieve goals such as research, which challenged studies or them.	9. Gave projects, tests, or assignments that required original or creative thinking.	10. Encouraged student-faculty interaction outside of class.
	1	4	4	5	5	4	4	5	5	5
	2	5	4	5	5	5	5	4	3	5
	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Average:		4.75	4.50	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.75	4.75	4.50	5.00
Instructor Average: 4.78										

#	11. The amount of coursework was much more than other courses.	12. The difficulty of subject matter was much higher than other courses.	13. As a rule, I put forth more academic effort than other students.	14. Overall, I rate this instructor as an excellent teacher.	15. Overall, I rate this course as excellent.
	1	5	5	5	3
	2	4	5	4	5
	3	2	2	2	5
	4	5	5	4	3
Average:		4.00	4.25	3.75	4.00
Instructor Average: 3.75					

Optional Questions Feedback

#	1. Learn to analyse and critically evaluate information, ideas, arguments, and points of view.	2. Gain a basic understanding of the subject (e.g., factual knowledge, methods, principles, generalisations, theories).	3. Develop oral and written communication skills.	4. Learn to find, evaluate and use communication resources.	5. Learn to apply course material to solve problems and take decisions.	6. Develop creative capacities (inventing, designing, writing, performing in art, music, drama, etc.).	7. Develop specific skills, competencies, and points of view needed by professionals working in the field most closely related to this course.
	1						
	2						
	3						
	4						

Do you have any comments or suggestions to improve teaching effectiveness?

The course was unexpectedly heavy. However, the work as well as manner of discussion was very interactive and interesting, and prompted a lot of new ideas.

loved this course.

wished it was available as a major or minor



<p>Course : Critical Reasoning-CRTL101-UGTERM3E-2021/22S2</p>											
<p>1. Helped students to interpret subject matter from diverse perspective and (e.g., different cultures, religions, political views).</p> <p># 2. Demonstrated the importance of the subject matter.</p> <p>3. Provided in-time and meaningful feedback on students' academic performance.</p> <p>4. Stimulated students to effort beyond that required by most courses.</p> <p>5. Explained intellectual material clearly and concisely.</p> <p>6. Introduced stimulating ideas about the subject.</p> <p>7. Involved students in hands-on activities to set and achieve goals such as research, which challenged studies or them.</p> <p>8. Inspired students to set and achieve goals such as research, which challenged studies or them.</p> <p>9. Gave projects, tests, or assignments that required original or creative thinking.</p> <p>10. Encouraged faculty interaction outside of class.</p>											
1	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Average: 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00											
Instructor Average: 5.00											

<p># 11. The amount of coursework was much more than other courses.</p> <p>12. The difficulty of subject matter was much higher than other courses.</p> <p>13. As a rule, I put forth more academic effort than other students.</p> <p>14. Overall, I rate this instructor as an excellent teacher.</p> <p>15. Overall, I rate this course as excellent.</p>											
1	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Average: 3.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00											

Optional Questions Feedback

<p>1. Learn to analyse and critically evaluate information, ideas, arguments, and points of view.</p> <p># 2. Gain a basic understanding of the subject (e.g., factual knowledge, methods, principles, generalisations, theories).</p> <p>3. Develop oral and written communication skills.</p> <p>4. Learn to find, evaluate and use communication resources to explore problems and skills.</p> <p>5. Learn to apply course material to solve problems and take decisions to explore a topic in depth.</p> <p>6. Develop creative capacities (inventing, designing, writing, performing in art, music, drama, etc.).</p> <p>7. Develop specific skills, competencies, and points of view needed by professionals working in the field most closely related to this course.</p>											
1											

Do you have any comments or suggestions to improve teaching effectiveness?



#	1. Helped students to interpret subject matter from diverse perspective and (e.g., different cultures, religions, political views).	2. Demonstrated the importance and significance of the subject matter.	3. Provided in-time and meaningful feedback on students' academic performance required by most courses.	4. Stimulated students to effort beyond that required by most courses.	5. Explained intellectual course material clearly and concisely.	6. Introduced stimulating projects about the subject.	7. Involved students in hands-on activities to set and achieve goals such as research, which challenged studies or them.	8. Inspired students to set and achieve goals such as research, which challenged studies or them.	9. Gave projects, tests, or assignments that required original or creative thinking.	10. Encouraged student-faculty interaction outside of class.	
	1	3	3	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	
	2	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
	4	4	5	5	4	5	4	2	3	4	
Average:		4.25	4.50	4.75	4.50	4.50	4.25	3.75	4.25	4.50	4.75

Instructor Average: 4.40

#	11. The amount of coursework was much more than other courses.	12. The difficulty of subject matter was much higher than other courses.	13. As a rule, I put forth more academic effort than other students.	14. Overall, I rate this instructor as an excellent teacher.	15. Overall, I rate this course as excellent.	
	1	4	5	4	3	2
	2	3	4	5	5	5
	3	4	4	5	5	5
	4	3	2	2	5	5
Average:		3.50	3.75	4.00	4.50	4.25

Optional Questions Feedback

#	1. Learn to analyse and critically evaluate information, ideas, arguments, and points of view.	2. Gain a basic understanding of the subject (e.g., factual knowledge, methods, principles, generalisations, theories).	3. Develop oral and written communication skills.	4. Learn to find, evaluate and use communication resources.	5. Learn to apply course material to solve problems and take decisions.	6. Develop creative capacities (inventing, designing, writing, performing in art, music, drama, etc.).	7. Develop specific skills, competencies, and points of view needed by professionals working in the field most closely related to this course.
	1						
	2						
	3						
	4						

Do you have any comments or suggestions to improve teaching effectiveness?



- [Home](#)
- [Collaborate](#)
- [Academic >](#)
- [Assist >](#)
- [Booking >](#)
- [Time-Attendance >](#)
- [Research >](#)
- [Processes >](#)
- [Feedback >](#)
- [Minutes >](#)
- [Resources](#)
- [Quick Links](#)
- USER**
- [Michael Hatcher >](#)

#	<p>1. Helped students to interpret subject matter from diverse perspective and (e.g., different cultures, religions, political views).</p> <p>2. Demonstrated the importance of the subject matter.</p> <p>3. Provided in-time and meaningful feedback on students' academic performance required by most courses.</p> <p>4. Stimulated students to intellectual effort beyond that required by most courses.</p> <p>5. Explained material clearly and concisely.</p> <p>6. Introduced stimulating ideas about the subject.</p> <p>7. Involved students in hands-on projects such as research, case studies or them.</p> <p>8. Inspired students to set and achieve goals such as original or creative thinking.</p> <p>9. Gave projects, tests, or assignments that required original or creative thinking.</p> <p>10. Encouraged student-faculty interaction outside of class.</p>										
	1	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
	2	5	4	5	4	5	5	5	4	4	5
	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	4	5
	4	4	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	4
	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	5
Average:		4.80	4.80	5.00	4.60	5.00	5.00	4.80	4.20	4.60	4.80

Instructor Average: 4.76

#	<p>11. The amount of coursework was much more than other courses.</p> <p>12. The difficulty of subject matter was much higher than other courses.</p> <p>13. As a rule, I put forth more academic effort than other students.</p> <p>14. Overall, I rate this instructor as an excellent teacher.</p> <p>15. Overall, I rate this course as excellent.</p>						
	1	4	4	4	4	5	5
	2	2	2	2	2	4	3
	3	1	3	3	3	5	5
	4	3	5	4	4	5	5
	5	3	2	4	4	5	5
Average:		2.60	3.20	3.40	4.80	4.60	

Optional Questions Feedback

#	<p>1. Learn to analyse and critically evaluate information, ideas, arguments, and points of view.</p> <p>2. Gain a basic understanding of the subject (e.g., factual knowledge, methods, principles, generalisations, theories).</p> <p>3. Develop oral and written communication skills.</p> <p>4. Learn to find, evaluate and explore communication resources.</p> <p>5. Learn to apply course material to solve problems and take decisions.</p> <p>6. Develop creative capacities (inventing, designing, writing, performing in art, music, drama, etc.).</p> <p>7. Develop specific skills, competencies, and points of view needed by professionals working in the field most closely related to this course.</p>						
	1						
	2						
	3	5	5	5	5	2	3
	4						
	5						

Do you have any comments or suggestions to improve teaching effectiveness?

I enjoyed the course very much.

I have always had an interest in philosophy although never liked ethics as I believed it was very simple and something that is not worth discussing. The professor, Michael Hatcher made the course very enjoyable and I loved every session of this course. I have nothing but respect and admiration for him.

Maybe more individual engagement activities could be included since a lot of kids don't participate in the group ones, which has consequences in the final group discussion. Other than that, this has been one of my favorite courses. Keep teaching the same way!



- [Home](#)
- [Collaborate](#)
- [Academic >](#)
- [Assist >](#)
- [Booking >](#)
- [Time-Attendance](#)
- [Research >](#)
- [Processes >](#)
- [Feedback >](#)
- [Minutes >](#)
- [Resources](#)

#	<p>1. Helped students to interpret subject matter from diverse perspective and (e.g., different cultures, religions, political views).</p> <p>2. Demonstrated the importance of the subject matter.</p> <p>3. Provided in-time and meaningful feedback on students' academic performance required by most courses.</p> <p>4. Stimulated students to intellectual effort beyond academic performance required by most courses.</p> <p>5. Explained material clearly and concisely.</p> <p>6. Introduced stimulating ideas about the subject.</p> <p>7. Involved students in hands-on activities to set and achieve such as research, case studies or them.</p> <p>8. Inspired students to set and achieve such as goals such as research, which challenged real-life situations.</p> <p>9. Gave projects, tests, or assignments that required original or creative thinking.</p> <p>10. Encouraged student-faculty interaction outside of class.</p>										
	1	5	5	3	4	5	5	4	4	5	4
	2	4	4	4	5	4	5	3	2	4	3
	3	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
	4	5	5	4	4	4	4	5	3	4	4
	5	5	5	4	4	5	4	5	4	5	4
	6	4	4	5	4	5	4	5	3	5	3
	7	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
	8	4	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	2
	9	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Average:		4.67	4.67	4.22	4.56	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.00	4.78	3.89

Instructor Average: 4.49

#	<p>11. The amount of coursework was much more than other courses.</p> <p>12. The difficulty of subject matter was much higher than other courses.</p> <p>13. As a rule, I put forth more academic effort than other students.</p> <p>14. Overall, I rate this instructor as an excellent teacher.</p> <p>15. Overall, I rate this course as excellent.</p>								
	1	3	3	2	4	4	4	4	4
	2	2	2	4	4	4	4	4	4
	3	3	4	5	5	5	5	5	5
	4	2	3	4	4	4	4	4	4
	5	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4
	6	1	2	3	3	3	5	5	4
	7	2	2	5	5	5	5	5	5
	8	3	3	4	4	4	5	5	5
	9	2	2	2	2	2	5	5	5
Average:		2.33	2.67	3.67	4.56	4.56	4.44		

Optional Questions Feedback

#	<p>1. Learn to analyse and critically evaluate information, ideas, arguments, and points of view.</p> <p>2. Gain a basic understanding of the subject (e.g., factual knowledge, methods, principles, generalisations, theories).</p> <p>3. Develop oral and written communication skills.</p> <p>4. Learn to find, evaluate and use communication resources to explore a topic in depth.</p> <p>5. Learn to apply course material to solve problems and take decisions in real life situations.</p> <p>6. Develop creative capacities (inventing, designing, writing, performing in art, music, drama, etc.).</p> <p>7. Develop specific skills, competencies, and points of view needed by professionals working in the field most closely related to this course.</p>								
	1								
	2								
	3								
	4								
	5								
	6	5	5	4	5	4	3	3	3
	7								
	8								
	9								

Do you have any comments or suggestions to improve teaching effectiveness?

none

No. I had a great time in class!

no



USER

#	<p>1. Helped students to interpret subject matter from diverse perspective and (e.g., significance of different cultures, religions, political views).</p> <p>2. Demonstrated the importance of the subject matter.</p> <p>3. Provided in-time and meaningful feedback on students' academic performance required by most courses.</p> <p>4. Stimulated students to intellectual effort beyond that required by most courses.</p> <p>5. Explained material clearly and concisely.</p> <p>6. Introduced stimulating projects about the subject.</p> <p>7. Involved students in hands-on activities such as research, case studies or real-life situations.</p> <p>8. Inspired students to set and achieve goals such as research, which challenged them.</p> <p>9. Gave projects, tests, or assignments that required original or creative thinking.</p> <p>10. Encouraged faculty interaction outside of class.</p>										
	1	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
	2	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	3	4	5
	3	4	4	5	4	5	5	5	4	5	5
	4	4	3	4	5	5	4	5	2	4	4
Average:		4.50	4.25	4.50	4.75	5.00	4.75	4.75	3.50	4.50	4.75
Instructor Average: 4.53											
#	<p>11. The amount of coursework was much more than other courses.</p>			<p>12. The difficulty of subject matter was much higher than other courses.</p>			<p>13. As a rule, I put forth more academic effort than other students.</p>			<p>14. Overall, I rate this instructor as an excellent teacher.</p>	
	1	2	2	2	4	4	4	4	5	5	5
	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	5	5	5
	3	1	2	2	3	3	3	3	5	5	5
	4	3	2	2	4	4	4	4	5	5	5
Average:		2.25	2.25	2.25	3.50	3.50	4.50	4.50	5.00	5.00	5.00

Optional Questions Feedback

#	<p>1. Learn to analyse and critically evaluate information, ideas, arguments, and points of view.</p> <p>2. Gain a basic understanding of the subject (e.g., factual knowledge, methods, principles, generalisations, theories).</p> <p>3. Develop oral and written communication skills.</p> <p>4. Learn to find, evaluate and use communication resources to explore a topic in depth.</p> <p>5. Learn to apply course material to solve problems and take decisions in real life situations.</p> <p>6. Develop creative capacities (inventing, designing, writing, performing in art, music, drama, etc.).</p> <p>7. Develop specific skills, competencies, and points of view needed by professionals working in the field most closely related to this course.</p>										
	1	4	5	4	5	5	5	3	5	5	5
	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
	3										
	4										

Do you have any comments or suggestions to improve teaching effectiveness?

I enjoyed the course to the masses. it made me realize that my thinking capacity is far greater than I ever expected. i was able to open up and it felt good.

Just want to tell you that you are an amazing person Michael. It feels good to have a professor that is vulnerable when it needs to be and has a warm heart.

One thing I do feel is that you were not able to steer the discussions during the class. It kind of went free-flowing. You did try to do that but it wasn't as effective as it should have been. I understand that it is a difficult task because people may feel ignored or being pushed down. But it is a skill I think you should master.

Other than that, I have no regrets that you were my Professor. Good luck for your career ^_^



#	1. Helped students to interpret subject matter from diverse perspective and (e.g., different cultures, religions, political views). 2. Demonstrated the importance of the subject matter. 3. Provided in-time and meaningful feedback on students' academic performance required by most courses. 4. Stimulated students to effort beyond that required by most courses. 5. Explained intellectual material clearly and concisely. 6. Introduced stimulating ideas about the subject. 7. Involved students in hands-on projects such as research, which challenged studies or them. 8. Inspired students to set and achieve goals such as case studies or real-life situations. 9. Gave projects, tests, or assignments that required original or creative thinking. 10. Encouraged faculty interaction outside of class.										
	1	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
2	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
4	5	5	5	5	4	5	4	4	3	5	
5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	
6	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	
7	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
8	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	
9	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	5	5	5	
10	5	4	5	5	4	4	5	5	4	5	
11	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	
12	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	4	3	
13	5	3	4	3	4	5	4	4	4	3	
14	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
15	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
16	4	4	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	
17	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	4	
Average:		4.82	4.65	4.82	4.76	4.65	4.76	4.71	4.47	4.76	4.53

Instructor Average: 4.69

#	11. The amount of coursework was much more than other courses.		12. The difficulty of subject matter was much higher than other courses.		13. As a rule, I put forth more academic effort than other students.		14. Overall, I rate this instructor as an excellent teacher.		15. Overall, I rate this course as excellent.	
	1	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	3	
2	4	3	3	3	3	3	5	5	5	
3	5	4	4	3	3	3	5	5	3	
4	4	2	2	4	4	4	5	5	5	
5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
6	3	2	2	2	2	2	5	5	5	
7	3	3	3	3	3	3	5	5	4	
8	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	
9	2	2	2	3	3	3	5	5	4	
10	4	4	4	3	3	3	5	5	5	
11	3	4	4	3	3	3	5	5	5	
12	4	5	5	4	4	4	5	5	5	
13	2	2	2	4	4	4	4	4	1	
14	1	2	2	2	2	2	5	5	5	
15	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	
16	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	5	
17	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	
Average:		3.47	3.18	3.41	4.65	4.65	4.24			

Optional Questions Feedback

#	1. Learn to analyse and critically evaluate information, ideas, arguments, and points of view.		2. Gain a basic understanding of the subject (e.g., factual knowledge, methods, principles, generalisations, theories).		3. Develop oral and written communication skills.		4. Learn to find, evaluate and use communication resources.		5. Learn to apply course material to solve problems and take decisions.		6. Develop creative capacities (inventing, designing, writing, performing in art, music, drama, etc.).		7. Develop specific skills, competencies, and points of view needed by professionals working in the field most closely related to this course.	
	1													
2														
3														
4	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	3	3				
5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4				
6														
7														
8														
9														
10														
11														
12														
13														
14														
15														
16														
17														

Do you have any comments or suggestions to improve teaching effectiveness?

Ethics with Prof. Hatcher has been one of the best courses I've taken at FLAME so far. Micheal Hatcher has immense knowledge about philosophy, and as his concepts are clear about the topics he is teaching, it is easier for us as students to understand. Overall, he is an excellent teacher. And if it is possible, we would like him to take advanced classes in philosophy.

na.



	1. Helped students to interpret subject matter from diverse perspective and (e.g., different cultures, religions, political views).	2. Demonstrated the importance of the subject matter.	3. Provided in-time and meaningful feedback on students' academic performance.	4. Stimulated students to effort beyond what required by most courses.	5. Explained material clearly and concisely.	6. Introduced stimulating ideas about the subject.	7. Involved students in hands-on projects, such as research, which challenged studies or them.	8. Inspired students to set and achieve goals such as research, which challenged studies or them.	9. Gave projects, tests, or assignments that required original or creative thinking.	10. Encouraged faculty interaction outside of class.
1	5	4	5	4	5	5	5	3	5	4
2	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
5	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	4
6	3	4	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	2
7	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
8	4	4	5	4	5	5	5	4	5	2
9	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
10	2	2	5	3	4	4	3	3	3	4
11	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Average:	4.09	4.27	4.82	4.45	4.64	4.64	4.64	4.36	4.73	4.18

Instructor Average: 4.48

#	11. The amount of coursework was much more than other courses.	12. The difficulty of subject matter was much higher than other courses.	13. As a rule, I put forth more academic effort than other students.	14. Overall, I rate this instructor as an excellent teacher.	15. Overall, I rate this course as excellent.
1	3	3	2	5	5
2	2	3	1	5	5
3	5	5	5	5	5
4	2	4	4	5	5
5	5	4	5	3	2
6	3	3	4	5	5
7	3	3	3	5	5
8	3	4	3	5	5
9	3	3	5	4	4
10	3	3	4	3	4
11	2	2	3	5	5
Average:	3.09	3.36	3.55	4.55	4.55

Optional Questions Feedback

1. Learn to analyse and critically evaluate information, ideas, arguments, and points of view.	2. Gain a basic understanding of the subject (e.g., factual knowledge, methods, principles, generalisations, theories).	3. Develop oral and written communication skills.	4. Learn to find, evaluate and use communication resources.	5. Learn to apply course material to solve problems and take decisions.	6. Develop creative capacities (inventing, designing, writing, performing in art, music, drama, etc.).	7. Develop specific skills, competencies, and points of view needed by professionals working in the field most closely related to this course.
1						
2	5	5	5	5	5	5
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						
11						

Do you have any comments or suggestions to improve teaching effectiveness?

Wish this course was there for the minor. The feedbacks provided to me helped me a lot.

Although this course is extremely great. Discussing ethical issues at 8 am seemed a bit too exhausting. The class tried their best to answer questions and think from multiple perspectives. Also, the readings given for the course before each class just seemed like a lot. It seemed like a lot to read in such a short period of time. Other than that the course is extremely great, I've learnt a lot.

excellent teacher!!



- [Home](#)
- [Collaborate](#)
- [Academic >](#)
- [Assist >](#)
- [Booking >](#)
- [Time-Attendance](#)
- [Research >](#)
- [Processes >](#)
- [Feedback >](#)
- [Minutes >](#)
- [Resources](#)
- [Quick Links](#)

USER

- [Michael Hatcher >](#)

#	1. Helped students to interpret subject matter from diverse perspective and (e.g., different cultures, religions, political views).	2. Demonstrated the significance of the subject matter.	3. Provided in-time and meaningful feedback on students' academic performance.	4. Stimulated students to effort beyond that required by most courses.	5. Explained intellectual material clearly and concisely.	6. Introduced stimulating projects about the subject.	7. Involved students in hands-on research, which case studies or them.	8. Inspired students to set and achieve goals such as research, which challenged real-life situations.	9. Gave projects, tests, or assignments that required original or creative thinking.	10. Encouraged faculty interaction outside of class.
	1	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5
	2	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
	6	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
	7	5	5	5	4	5	5	4	5	5
	8	4	4	5	5	5	4	4	3	4
	9	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
	10	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
	11	4	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	4
	12	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
	13	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
	14	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Average:		4.79	4.79	4.93	4.79	4.86	4.79	4.71	4.71	4.71
Instructor Average: 4.78										

#	11. The amount of coursework was much more than other courses.	12. The difficulty of subject matter was much higher than other courses.	13. As a rule, I put forth more academic effort than other students.	14. Overall, I rate this instructor as an excellent teacher.	15. Overall, I rate this course as excellent.
	1	4	4	3	5
	2	3	3	3	5
	3	4	4	2	5
	4	5	5	3	5
	5	1	2	5	5
	6	4	3	4	5
	7	4	3	3	5
	8	3	4	3	4
	9	3	3	5	5
	10	5	5	5	5
	11	5	4	4	5
	12	4	4	5	5
	13	3	4	3	5
	14	4	3	5	5
Average:		3.71	3.64	3.79	4.93
4.57					

Optional Questions Feedback

#	1. Learn to analyse and critically evaluate information, ideas, arguments, and points of view.	2. Gain a basic understanding of the subject (e.g., factual knowledge, methods, principles, generalisations, theories).	3. Develop oral and written communication skills.	4. Learn to find, evaluate and use communication resources.	5. Learn to apply course material to solve problems and take decisions.	6. Develop creative capacities (inventing, designing, writing, performing in art, music, drama, etc.).	7. Develop specific skills, competencies, and points of view needed by professionals working in the field most closely related to this course.
	1						
	2						
	3						
	4						
	5						
	6						
	7						
	8						
	9						
	10						
	11						
	12						
	13						
	14	5	5	5	5	5	5

Do you have any comments or suggestions to improve teaching effectiveness?

He is very joyous and makes the sessions quite engaging .

No

no

No, this class has a great learning environment

**USER**

#	<p>1. Helped students to interpret subject matter from diverse perspective and (e.g., different cultures, religions, political views).</p> <p>2. Demonstrated the importance and significance of the subject matter.</p> <p>3. Provided in-time and meaningful feedback on students' academic performance required by most courses.</p> <p>4. Stimulated students to intellectual effort beyond that required by most courses.</p> <p>5. Explained material clearly and concisely.</p> <p>6. Introduced stimulating projects about the subject.</p> <p>7. Involved students in hands-on activities to set and achieve goals such as research, which challenged studies or them.</p> <p>8. Inspired students to set and achieve goals such as research, which challenged studies or them.</p> <p>9. Gave projects, tests, or assignments that required original or creative thinking.</p> <p>10. Encouraged assignments outside of class.</p>										
	1	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	5
2	5	5	5	5	3	5	4	4	3	5	5
3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
4	2	2	3	2	3	2	4	2	2	2	2
5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
6	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	4	5	5
7	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
8	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
9	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
10	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	4	4	5	4
11	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5
12	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	4	5	4
13	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
14	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
15	5	3	4	3	5	5	5	4	4	4	4
16	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Average:		4.81	4.69	4.75	4.50	4.69	4.75	4.75	4.38	4.75	4.62

Instructor Average: 4.67

#	11. The amount of coursework was much more than other courses.		12. The difficulty of subject matter was much higher than other courses.		13. As a rule, I put forth more academic effort than other students.		14. Overall, I rate this instructor as an excellent teacher.		15. Overall, I rate this course as excellent.	
	1	1	1	1	4	4	5	5	5	5
2	2	2	2	3	3	3	5	5	4	4
3	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	5
4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
5	3	3	3	3	3	3	5	5	5	5
6	4	4	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	4
7	3	3	2	3	3	3	5	5	5	5
8	3	3	3	3	3	3	5	5	5	5
9	4	4	1	1	1	1	5	5	5	5
10	4	4	4	4	3	3	5	5	4	4
11	3	3	3	3	4	4	5	5	5	5
12	3	3	3	3	3	3	5	5	5	5
13	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	5	5	5
14	3	3	3	3	4	4	5	5	5	5
15	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	4
16	4	4	3	3	5	5	5	5	5	5
Average:		2.88	2.50	3.00	4.56	4.56	4.50			

Optional Questions Feedback

#	1. Learn to analyse and critically evaluate information, ideas, arguments, and points of view.		2. Gain a basic understanding of the subject (e.g., factual knowledge, methods, principles, generalisations, theories).		3. Develop oral and written communication skills.		4. Learn to find, evaluate and use communication resources.		5. Learn to apply course material to solve problems and take decisions.		6. Develop creative capacities (inventing, designing, writing, performing in art, music, drama, etc.).		7. Develop specific skills, competencies, and points of view needed by professionals working in the field most closely related to this course.	
	1	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	5
2														
3														
4														
5														
6														
7														
8														
9														
10														
11														
12														
13														
14														
15														
16														

Do you have any comments or suggestions to improve teaching effectiveness?

An extraordinary teacher who inspired me through this whole course.

I really enjoyed this course and class

I loved this course! It was very thought-provoking and Professor Hatcher did a great job at teaching us various difficult concepts in an easy manner. I wish for him to continue his teaching style, and for this course to be a discussion-based class.



- [Home](#)
- [Collaborate](#)
- [Academic >](#)
- [Assist >](#)
- [Booking >](#)
- [Time-Attendance](#)
- [Research >](#)
- [Processes >](#)
- [Feedback >](#)
- [Minutes >](#)
- [Resources](#)
- [Quick Links](#)

USER

- [Michael Hatcher >](#)

#	1. Helped students to interpret subject matter from diverse perspective and (e.g., different cultures, religions, political views).	2. Demonstrated the importance of the subject matter.	3. Provided in-time and meaningful feedback on students' academic performance.	4. Stimulated students to effort beyond required by most courses.	5. Explained intellectual material clearly and concisely.	6. Introduced stimulating projects ideas about the subject.	7. Involved students in hands-on studies or them.	8. Inspired students to set and achieve goals such as research, which challenged real-life situations.	9. Gave projects, tests, or assignments that required original or creative thinking.	10. Encouraged faculty interaction outside of class.
	1	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
	2	4	4	4	5	5	4	5	4	5
	3	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	1
	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
	6	4	3	5	4	5	5	3	2	5
	7	2	4	5	5	5	5	4	3	4
	8	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
	9	5	4	5	4	5	5	3	4	5
	10	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5
	11	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
	12	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
	13	4	5	4	4	5	4	5	5	4
Average:		4.38	4.54	4.77	4.69	4.85	4.92	4.46	4.85	4.46

Instructor Average: 4.64

#	11. The amount of coursework was much more than other courses.	12. The difficulty of subject matter was much higher than other courses.	13. As a rule, I put forth more academic effort than other students.	14. Overall, I rate this instructor as an excellent teacher.	15. Overall, I rate this course as excellent.
	1	4	3	3	5
	2	3	4	4	5
	3	4	4	3	5
	4	4	4	4	5
	5	4	4	2	5
	6	3	3	3	5
	7	4	2	4	5
	8	4	4	3	5
	9	2	3	3	5
	10	4	3	4	5
	11	3	3	4	5
	12	5	5	3	5
	13	4	3	4	5
Average:		3.69	3.46	3.38	5.00
5.00					

Optional Questions Feedback

#	1. Learn to analyse and critically evaluate information, ideas, arguments, and points of view.	2. Gain a basic understanding of the subject (e.g., factual knowledge, methods, principles, generalisations, theories).	3. Develop oral and written communication skills.	4. Learn to find, evaluate and use communication resources to explore a topic in depth.	5. Learn to apply course material to solve problems and take decisions in real life situations.	6. Develop creative capacities (inventing, designing, writing, performing in art, music, drama, etc.).	7. Develop specific skills, competencies, and points of view needed by professionals working in the field most closely related to this course.
	1						
	2						
	3						
	4						
	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
	6						
	7						
	8						
	9						
	10						
	11	5	5	5	4	5	4
	12						
	13						

Do you have any comments or suggestions to improve teaching effectiveness?

It's a very fun class!

No

n/a, love the interactiveness of classrooms and breakout sessions.

This class made it worth waking up at 8. It's extremely difficult to teach someone how to think, and the professor did this very well. He's very helpful and I learned a lot.

Professor Hatcher is my favourite

[Home](#)[Collaborate](#)[Academic](#) >[Assist](#) >[Booking](#) >[Time-Attendance](#)[Research](#) >[Processes](#) >[Feedback](#) >[Minutes](#) >[Resources](#)[Quick Links](#)[USER](#)[Michael Hatcher](#) >[Hatcher](#)

#	1. Helped students to interpret subject matter from diverse perspective (e.g., different cultures, religions, political views).	2. Demonstrated the importance and significance of the subject matter.	3. Provided in-time and meaningful feedback on students' academic performance.	4. Stimulated students to intellectual effort beyond that required by most courses.	5. Explained course material clearly and concisely.	6. Introduced students in hands-on projects such ideas about the subject.	7. Involved students in research, case studies or real-life situations.	8. Inspired students to achieve goals that required them.	9. Gave original or creative thinking.	10. Encouraged student-faculty interaction outside of class.	
1	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	
2	5	5	5	4	5	5	4	3	5	4	
3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	
4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	4	
5	4	4	5	4	5	5	5	4	5	5	
6	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
7	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	1	
8	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
9	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	3	
10	4	4	5	3	3	4	4	3	5	2	
11	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	3	
12	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	4	
13	5	5	5	4	5	5	4	4	4	5	
14	4	4	5	4	4	4	5	3	5	3	
15	4	4	5	3	4	5	4	3	5	5	
16	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	5	
17	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
18	5	4	5	5	5	4	5	3	4	5	
19	4	4	5	4	5	5	5	2	5	3	
20	4	4	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	
Average:		4.60	4.60	5.00	4.55	4.75	4.80	4.80	3.85	4.90	4.00
Instructor Average: 4.59											

#	11. The amount of coursework was much more than other courses.	12. The difficulty of subject matter was much higher than other courses.	13. As a rule, I put forth more academic effort than other students.	14. Overall, I rate this instructor as an excellent teacher.	15. Overall, I rate this course as excellent.	
1	2	1	5	5	5	
2	3	3	3	5	5	
3	3	3	4	5	5	
4	3	3	4	5	5	
5	2	2	3	5	4	
6	4	4	3	5	5	
7	3	1	3	4	5	
8	3	3	3	5	5	
9	4	3	4	5	5	
10	3	3	3	4	4	
11	4	4	4	5	5	
12	1	1	3	5	5	
13	3	3	5	4	4	
14	4	2	3	4	5	
15	2	2	3	5	4	
16	4	2	3	5	5	
17	3	3	4	5	5	
18	2	3	3	5	4	
19	3	3	4	5	5	
20	3	3	4	5	5	
Average:		2.95	2.60	3.55	4.80	4.75

Optional Questions Feedback

1	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
2									
3									
4	5	5	4	5	4	4	3	4	4
5									
6									
7									
8									
9									
10	4	3	4	4	3	3	3	3	3
11	5	4	4	4	5	5	4	5	5
12									
13									
14									
15	5	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4
16									
17									
18									
19									
20									

Do you have any comments or suggestions to improve teaching effectiveness?

No

None for this class – Professor Hatcher was an excellent teacher and I found his classes engaging and very interesting.

While the continuous assessments were challenging at times, they were worth every bit of effort thanks to the continuous, in-depth feedback we got. The course matter was presented in an interesting, discussion evoking manner, the assignments were creative and interesting and the professor was patient and precise. This would definitely be the course I've learnt the most from and found the most interesting this term and I wouldn't change a single thing about it.

michael sir is the best teacher ive seen so far attending university online. The feedback sir gives is always transparent straightforward and encouraging and it always seems as if we arent in class but having a informal discussion but he completes everything planned for class and he is always there to help after classes or in office hours to guide u if u havent understood anything.

With the amount of debates that happen in class, debating should be an official part of the course

no. it's amazing as it is

No I am satisfied with the course and the teacher

2020SP PHIL-341-AX Survey - Valparaiso University

Course:	PHIL-341-AX Biomedical Ethics
Department:	PHIL
Faculty:	Hatcher, Michael
Response/Expected:	6/7 (85.7%)

Student Assessment of Instruction (SAI) Report Guidelines

The primary purpose of student evaluations of teaching is to improve teaching effectiveness. For this purpose, data from this report should be interpreted within the following guidelines.

- 1. Faculty and administrators should use the overall score and the subscale scores, not individual items, for evaluation purposes.** Faculty might reflect on their students' responses to individual questions, but administrators should be cautious in using data from individual questions for evaluative purposes.
- 2. SAI data should be used to assess multi-year trends in a faculty member's teaching in a specific class, NOT to compare the single semester scores of faculty to each other.** Evaluating multi-year trends provides an appropriate context for evaluating a faculty member's teaching for a given course. Multi-year trends help to identify faculty members who are improving their teaching effectiveness.
- 3. A single semester's SAI scores should not be used to compare individual faculty members to each other.** SAI scores may be influenced by factors such as students' implicit biases, interest level in the course subject, course level, and satisfaction with the time and day of the course. Given that individual faculty teach different courses that vary in all of these factors, direct cross faculty comparisons are not appropriate with the SAI.
- 4. Evaluation results should be viewed in the context of sample size and response rate.** Ideally, response rates should be as high as possible and faculty should be mindful that they can improve response rates by stressing the importance of the evaluations as a means to improve teaching effectiveness, by clearly communicating that student responses will be taken seriously, and by providing frequent reminders to complete the evaluations.
- 5. The SAI should only be considered one component of a multi-component evaluation process.** While students are able to provide a

valuable measure of teaching effectiveness, their opinions alone do not provide sufficient evidence to make decisions about a faculty member's overall teaching effectiveness, especially when such opinions inform decisions about annual reviews, merit raises, tenure, and promotion. Additional evaluation components are described in the Faculty Handbook.

6. **Answers to the free response questions may not be representative of the class as a whole and care must be taken when using free response comments in an evaluative manner.** Student comments consistent with the survey results may be used for evaluative purposes. Inconsistent comments have value from a formative standpoint, but their use in an evaluative manner are not appropriate as they may incorrectly represent the results of the validated survey.
7. **Faculty should not allow fear of lower SAI scores to dictate rigor or pedagogy in their courses.** Department chairs, faculty peers, and administrators should encourage faculty (especially tenure-track faculty) to create courses that help students learn, even if that learning process requires making students feel uncomfortable in some way (e.g., encouraging students to consider viewpoints they do not support) or requires significant work and rigor. Faculty should be mindful of SAI feedback and open to making changes to their courses, but they should not allow student feedback to have a negative influence on the learning process in their courses.
8. **Self-reflection items are for information only, and not a part of the validated SAI scale.** The report will include a factor mean, an average across all five self-reflection items, as well as the mean for each individual item. These items are not included in the Overall SAI Score reported in the executive summary.

Executive Summary

Scale	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Overall SAI Score	6	4.75	0.37
Organization and Clarity	6	4.63	0.38
Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation	6	4.83	0.24
Rapport and Respect	6	4.75	0.56
Feedback and Accessibility	6	4.63	0.73
Student Perceptions of Learning	6	4.92	0.19

Responses: strongly disagree=1 disagree=2 neutral=3 agree=4 strongly agree=5

Student Self-Reflection Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
I regularly attended course meetings.	6	4.83	0.37
I was regularly prepared for course meetings.	6	4.5	0.5
I was actively engaged during course meetings.	6	4.33	0.47
I upheld the Honor Code in all work for this course.	6	4.83	0.37
I was able to achieve the stated learning objectives for this course.	6	4.83	0.37
<i>Average of Student Self Reflection Items</i>	6	4.67	0.25

Organization and Clarity Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor is well prepared for class meetings.	6	4.83	0.37
My instructor explains the subject matter clearly.	6	4.33	0.47
My instructor clearly communicates course goals and objectives.	6	4.67	0.47
My instructor answers questions appropriately.	6	4.67	0.47
<i>Average of Organization and Clarity Items</i>	6	4.63	0.38

Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor is enthusiastic about teaching this course.	6	5	0
My instructor presents the subject in an interesting manner.	6	4.83	0.37
My instructor stimulates my thinking.	6	4.83	0.37
My instructor motivates me to do my best work.	6	4.67	0.47
<i>Average of Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation Items</i>	6	4.83	0.24

Rapport and Respect Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor helps students sufficiently with course-related issues.	6	4.67	0.75
My instructor is regularly available for consultation.	6	4.83	0.37
My instructor is impartial in dealing with students.	6	4.83	0.37
My instructor respects opinions different from his or her own.	6	4.67	0.75
<i>Average of Rapport and Respect Items</i>	6	4.75	0.56

Feedback and Accessibility Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Assessment methods accurately assess what I have learned in this course.	6	4.5	1.12
Grades are assigned fairly.	6	4.67	0.75
The basis for assigning grades is clearly explained.	6	4.67	0.75
The instructor provides feedback on my progress in the course on a regular basis.	6	4.67	0.47
<i>Average of Feedback and Accessibility Items</i>	6	4.63	0.73

Student Perceptions of Learning Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor advances my knowledge of course content.	6	4.83	0.37
My instructor promotes my understanding of important conceptual themes.	6	4.83	0.37
My instructor enhances my capacity to communicate effectively about the course subject matter.	6	5	0
My instructor encourages me to value new viewpoints related to the course.	6	5	0
<i>Average of Student Perceptions of Learning Items</i>	6	4.92	0.19

What were the most effective aspects of this instructor's teaching?

- Professor Hatcher has a very expansive knowledge base in philosophy and it allows him to create very productive discussions in class. He is very enthusiastic and engaging, which makes every class enjoyable.
- I loved being in class for this class and the group discussions were very productive. Prof. Hatcher prompted discussion very well.

- The daily reading assignments helped me understand the reading better, but I feel they were graded too harshly.
- Dr. Hatcher loves to teach philosophy from analogy, which really worked for a lot of students. He is very friendly and approachable, he engages the class rather than making it a stone cold lecture, and he's very adaptable. He was really good at fielding questions, even really bizarre ones, and was really unashamed to admit his weaknesses, which is refreshing from a prof. Lastly, this class had everything from business, to biochem and nursing to philosophy majors, and I think he did a great job relating to everyone well.
- Professor Hatcher is very motivated and enthusiastic while teaching his students. He explains things pretty clearly and encourages us to participate in discussions. He was very understanding with any issues with the online material.

In what ways could this instructor improve his or her teaching?

- Professor Hatcher does tend to use some jargon that is usually only understood by people who study philosophy, which can make some class material less accessible for those who take his classes as electives.
- I felt as though we spent a lot of time on abortion when there were other topics in bioethics we could have spent a more even time on. Such as genetic engineering, euthanasia, etc.
- He could be a little more lenient. I feel he was very strict and expected way to much of the class for an elective class.
- He gets lost on tangents sometimes and I think sometimes he focuses on the wrong _root_ of a problem.
- I think he could have used the online discussion boards on blackboard before meeting in class. This has helped me a lot in other classes and I think one discussion board a week is helpful for students who feel anxiety with the thought of raising their hand in class, but allows them to still be heard and a chance to participate.

Please feel free to share any further comments you have for this instructor.

- A very interesting class and Professor Hatcher is very nice and knowledgeable about the topic
- This is my second semester with Dr. Hatcher and he has been phenomenal as a professor. I'm really sad to see him go.

2020SP THEO-341-AX Survey - Valparaiso University

Course:	THEO-341-AX Bioethics
Department:	THEO
Faculty:	Hatcher, Michael
Response/Expected:	14/23 (60.9%)

Student Assessment of Instruction (SAI) Report Guidelines

The primary purpose of student evaluations of teaching is to improve teaching effectiveness. For this purpose, data from this report should be interpreted within the following guidelines.

- 1. Faculty and administrators should use the overall score and the subscale scores, not individual items, for evaluation purposes.** Faculty might reflect on their students' responses to individual questions, but administrators should be cautious in using data from individual questions for evaluative purposes.
- 2. SAI data should be used to assess multi-year trends in a faculty member's teaching in a specific class, NOT to compare the single semester scores of faculty to each other.** Evaluating multi-year trends provides an appropriate context for evaluating a faculty member's teaching for a given course. Multi-year trends help to identify faculty members who are improving their teaching effectiveness.
- 3. A single semester's SAI scores should not be used to compare individual faculty members to each other.** SAI scores may be influenced by factors such as students' implicit biases, interest level in the course subject, course level, and satisfaction with the time and day of the course. Given that individual faculty teach different courses that vary in all of these factors, direct cross faculty comparisons are not appropriate with the SAI.
- 4. Evaluation results should be viewed in the context of sample size and response rate.** Ideally, response rates should be as high as possible and faculty should be mindful that they can improve response rates by stressing the importance of the evaluations as a means to improve teaching effectiveness, by clearly communicating that student responses will be taken seriously, and by providing frequent reminders to complete the evaluations.
- 5. The SAI should only be considered one component of a multi-component evaluation process.** While students are able to provide a

valuable measure of teaching effectiveness, their opinions alone do not provide sufficient evidence to make decisions about a faculty member's overall teaching effectiveness, especially when such opinions inform decisions about annual reviews, merit raises, tenure, and promotion. Additional evaluation components are described in the Faculty Handbook.

6. **Answers to the free response questions may not be representative of the class as a whole and care must be taken when using free response comments in an evaluative manner.** Student comments consistent with the survey results may be used for evaluative purposes. Inconsistent comments have value from a formative standpoint, but their use in an evaluative manner are not appropriate as they may incorrectly represent the results of the validated survey.
7. **Faculty should not allow fear of lower SAI scores to dictate rigor or pedagogy in their courses.** Department chairs, faculty peers, and administrators should encourage faculty (especially tenure-track faculty) to create courses that help students learn, even if that learning process requires making students feel uncomfortable in some way (e.g., encouraging students to consider viewpoints they do not support) or requires significant work and rigor. Faculty should be mindful of SAI feedback and open to making changes to their courses, but they should not allow student feedback to have a negative influence on the learning process in their courses.
8. **Self-reflection items are for information only, and not a part of the validated SAI scale.** The report will include a factor mean, an average across all five self-reflection items, as well as the mean for each individual item. These items are not included in the Overall SAI Score reported in the executive summary.

Executive Summary

Scale	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Overall SAI Score	14	4.62	0.62
Organization and Clarity	14	4.66	0.58
Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation	14	4.61	0.69
Rapport and Respect	14	4.77	0.59
Feedback and Accessibility	14	4.48	0.82
Student Perceptions of Learning	14	4.57	0.67

Responses: strongly disagree=1 disagree=2 neutral=3 agree=4 strongly agree=5

Student Self-Reflection Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
I regularly attended course meetings.	14	4.07	1.1
I was regularly prepared for course meetings.	14	4.36	0.72
I was actively engaged during course meetings.	14	4	0.85
I upheld the Honor Code in all work for this course.	14	4.86	0.35
I was able to achieve the stated learning objectives for this course.	14	4.21	0.67
<i>Average of Student Self Reflection Items</i>	14	4.3	0.54

Organization and Clarity Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor is well prepared for class meetings.	14	4.79	0.41
My instructor explains the subject matter clearly.	14	4.43	0.98
My instructor clearly communicates course goals and objectives.	14	4.57	0.9
My instructor answers questions appropriately.	14	4.86	0.35
<i>Average of Organization and Clarity Items</i>	14	4.66	0.58

Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor is enthusiastic about teaching this course.	14	4.86	0.35
My instructor presents the subject in an interesting manner.	14	4.5	0.91
My instructor stimulates my thinking.	14	4.57	0.9
My instructor motivates me to do my best work.	14	4.5	0.82
<i>Average of Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation Items</i>	14	4.61	0.69

Rapport and Respect Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor helps students sufficiently with course-related issues.	14	4.79	0.56
My instructor is regularly available for consultation.	14	4.86	0.35
My instructor is impartial in dealing with students.	14	4.71	0.8
My instructor respects opinions different from his or her own.	14	4.71	0.8
<i>Average of Rapport and Respect Items</i>	14	4.77	0.59

Feedback and Accessibility Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Assessment methods accurately assess what I have learned in this course.	14	4.43	0.9
Grades are assigned fairly.	14	4.5	0.82
The basis for assigning grades is clearly explained.	14	4.36	1.04
The instructor provides feedback on my progress in the course on a regular basis.	14	4.64	0.72
<i>Average of Feedback and Accessibility Items</i>	14	4.48	0.82

Student Perceptions of Learning Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor advances my knowledge of course content.	14	4.57	0.73
My instructor promotes my understanding of important conceptual themes.	14	4.43	0.9
My instructor enhances my capacity to communicate effectively about the course subject matter.	14	4.5	0.82
My instructor encourages me to value new viewpoints related to the course.	14	4.79	0.41
<i>Average of Student Perceptions of Learning Items</i>	14	4.57	0.67

What were the most effective aspects of this instructor's teaching?

- Always found ways to engage the class, knowledgeable regarding the subject matter, adapted to new ideas well
- After we switched to online, I liked how we still had class at the same time. It kept my schedule somewhat normal.
- I think it was very interesting and effective how Professor Hatcher had us explore multiple viewpoints on each argument and issue. He

provided us with really cool ways to think about a lot of issues within the course. Professor Hatcher is a very interesting and smart person and is able to think through and explain both his ideas and the arguments we are studying in a given class. He provides us with the arguments in very clear and understandable ways and describes the best ways to think over and critically think about an argument. I think his set up for reading response assignments was very effective and allowed for good refection on the material before class. He helped us be engaged in discussions and was effective in making us work together and formulate our thoughts. I thought this class was very interesting and I learned a lot from Professor Hatcher.

- Great conversation
- he provides feedback frequently and explains areas where I can improve in my assignments
- Prof. Hatcher was always available for any help that a student needed. If you had a question he was always available to answer. Also, we had a paper that was due every class and he would take the time to read them for every student.
- He is very organized with assignments and due dates Is efficient in answering questions and responding to emails He is readily available to meet with students if they have questions or concerns
- He is very engaged through class and tries to make information interesting to students
- You were able to stimulate someone who never thought he could think philosophically into someone who enjoys thinking that way. The discussions led by you were amazing and provocative.
- Openness to discussing controversial topics and not being biased in presenting arguments, despite his own personal beliefs on the subject matter.
- The RRAs forced one to actually read, pay attention, think and respond which was helpful. I actually felt prepared for class discussions and that I had a fair understanding of the topics. I really liked the way Prof. Hatcher presented the material because he did a great job playing devil's advocate and being able to argue for both sides of arguments. I learned a lot and felt challenged which was a new experience in such a course for me.
- we met on google meet at class time so this class was a great online transition! he did well to emulate in person class time on google meet!
- Professor Hatcher always provided handouts of broken down arguments we were studying that day that were always incredibly helpful, he was always receptive to input and respective of everyone's ideas

In what ways could this instructor improve his or her teaching?

- I would say for the RRAs to grade them a bit more lenient, most of the time I couldn't understand the readings because they were very long and with technical language and so I would write about what I thought it meant even if it was wrong but would still get a bad grade because I didn't understand.
- I honestly thought the structure and lay out of the course was really well-done and accurately covered the material and assessed what I knew about it. The first exam was very well-written and the style was easy to follow from the review sessions. I think his meetings for the argumentative paper was very helpful. I know they are somewhat open ended, but I think a little more structure in the expectations for the argumentative papers could be improved upon. Even just a little more explanation of how he wants us to formulate ideas or use the texts we've covered to write our own papers. Other than that I really don't know what else could be improved as I enjoyed the class a lot as a whole.
- Less assignments weekly, less readings.
- I believe that the way this class is formatted, I believe he does an exceptional job in explaining course material and also making the readers become more understanding to students.
- Not everyone is at the same level of learning, basing class discussion and work on higher levels is not fair
- Make questions for RRAs more precise, some were very vague and I did not know what you wanted for the answer. Explain the concepts we talk about in class more in depth, I was usually confused when we went over them.
- None, do the same thing and you will get great results once again.
- I can't think of anything - wonderful teacher.
- I, along with others, was initially intimidated by the course syllabus which surpassed 20 pages and the diction within it made it sound as if the professor was a real jerk. Some of my friends dropped the course without even going to the first class, but I stuck with it and found it to be one of the more interesting classes I've taken at VU. Prof. Hatcher turned out to be super nice and understanding and I am really glad to have been able to be in his class.
- I think Professor Hatcher was amazing, I wish he would stay at VU even if I couldn't take his class again, he is such an important asset to VU

Please feel free to share any further comments you have for this instructor.

- I really like how Professor Hatcher thought through the ideas with the class and really dug down and made sure we could understand what was happening in the argument and readings. I also thought the topics he chose and the articles that we read were really cool and

perfect for the class. I appreciated Professor Hatcher's kind words and encouragement through the online classes and being very reasonable and helpful with class. Overall I enjoyed this class a lot more than I would have expected and am extremely thankful that I was able to have Hatcher as my professor as he made the class super interesting and fun. I am not sure I would have enjoyed the class as much with a different professor, so I am glad I took it when I did, and overall really enjoyed the class.

- Difficult to do well in course without having some knowledge on philosophy. Stern grading and could potentially be more open minded to opinion in writings as opposed to a by the book mentality.
- I believe this class was very difficult but that is normal for an upper-level theology class i guess. The hardest thing about it was that the student was forced to put in a lot of time in this class by completing the reading for every single class. I decided to take this class pass/fail because I had a hard time balancing all of my classes while also dealing with other things. The material in the class is very interesting and when we were forced to move virtually I know it was difficult because this class requires a lot of discussion between students. Prof. Hatcher was able to accommodate and make it seem like we were still in person.
- Grades are assigned in a biased manner Exams are not a good reflection of learning done in this class I shared my opinion on a topic being learned, I was told I was wrong for the opinion I had; I thought this was very wrong and did the complete opposite of encouraging trusted discussion
- He is a really great professor, but it was hard for me to stay engaged throughout the class period.
- Thank you for a great semester.
- Thank you so much for everything, and I wish you all the best!!!
- Professor Hatcher, I am so thankful to have been in your class this semester! I feel so lucky to have gotten to meet you and take your class! I felt like you were so awesome and inclusive. You made me feel encouraged to share my thoughts in class, and always would put them in the notes, or tell me how glad you were for my participation. I'm really going to miss you, you were definitely one of my favorite teachers of all time. Thank you, thank you, thank you! Good luck at your new school!

2020SP PHIL-145-A Survey - Valparaiso University

Course:	PHIL-145-A Elem Logic /Critical Thinking
Department:	PHIL
Faculty:	Hatcher, Michael
Response/Expected:	17/25 (68%)

Student Assessment of Instruction (SAI) Report Guidelines

The primary purpose of student evaluations of teaching is to improve teaching effectiveness. For this purpose, data from this report should be interpreted within the following guidelines.

- 1. Faculty and administrators should use the overall score and the subscale scores, not individual items, for evaluation purposes.** Faculty might reflect on their students' responses to individual questions, but administrators should be cautious in using data from individual questions for evaluative purposes.
- 2. SAI data should be used to assess multi-year trends in a faculty member's teaching in a specific class, NOT to compare the single semester scores of faculty to each other.** Evaluating multi-year trends provides an appropriate context for evaluating a faculty member's teaching for a given course. Multi-year trends help to identify faculty members who are improving their teaching effectiveness.
- 3. A single semester's SAI scores should not be used to compare individual faculty members to each other.** SAI scores may be influenced by factors such as students' implicit biases, interest level in the course subject, course level, and satisfaction with the time and day of the course. Given that individual faculty teach different courses that vary in all of these factors, direct cross faculty comparisons are not appropriate with the SAI.
- 4. Evaluation results should be viewed in the context of sample size and response rate.** Ideally, response rates should be as high as possible and faculty should be mindful that they can improve response rates by stressing the importance of the evaluations as a means to improve teaching effectiveness, by clearly communicating that student responses will be taken seriously, and by providing frequent reminders to complete the evaluations.
- 5. The SAI should only be considered one component of a multi-component evaluation process.** While students are able to provide a

valuable measure of teaching effectiveness, their opinions alone do not provide sufficient evidence to make decisions about a faculty member's overall teaching effectiveness, especially when such opinions inform decisions about annual reviews, merit raises, tenure, and promotion. Additional evaluation components are described in the Faculty Handbook.

6. **Answers to the free response questions may not be representative of the class as a whole and care must be taken when using free response comments in an evaluative manner.** Student comments consistent with the survey results may be used for evaluative purposes. Inconsistent comments have value from a formative standpoint, but their use in an evaluative manner are not appropriate as they may incorrectly represent the results of the validated survey.
7. **Faculty should not allow fear of lower SAI scores to dictate rigor or pedagogy in their courses.** Department chairs, faculty peers, and administrators should encourage faculty (especially tenure-track faculty) to create courses that help students learn, even if that learning process requires making students feel uncomfortable in some way (e.g., encouraging students to consider viewpoints they do not support) or requires significant work and rigor. Faculty should be mindful of SAI feedback and open to making changes to their courses, but they should not allow student feedback to have a negative influence on the learning process in their courses.
8. **Self-reflection items are for information only, and not a part of the validated SAI scale.** The report will include a factor mean, an average across all five self-reflection items, as well as the mean for each individual item. These items are not included in the Overall SAI Score reported in the executive summary.

Executive Summary

Scale	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Overall SAI Score	17	4.24	0.82
Organization and Clarity	16	4.03	1.09
Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation	17	4.22	0.79
Rapport and Respect	17	4.43	0.7
Feedback and Accessibility	17	4.28	0.95
Student Perceptions of Learning	17	4.19	0.87

Responses: strongly disagree=1 disagree=2 neutral=3 agree=4 strongly agree=5

Student Self-Reflection Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
I regularly attended course meetings.	17	4.59	0.77
I was regularly prepared for course meetings.	17	4.59	0.69
I was actively engaged during course meetings.	17	4.18	0.71
I upheld the Honor Code in all work for this course.	17	4.82	0.51
I was able to achieve the stated learning objectives for this course.	17	4.12	1.08
<i>Average of Student Self Reflection Items</i>	17	4.46	0.54

Organization and Clarity Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor is well prepared for class meetings.	16	4.56	0.7
My instructor explains the subject matter clearly.	16	3.88	1.27
My instructor clearly communicates course goals and objectives.	15	4.07	1.29
My instructor answers questions appropriately.	16	3.63	1.45
<i>Average of Organization and Clarity Items</i>	16	4.03	1.09

Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor is enthusiastic about teaching this course.	17	4.76	0.55
My instructor presents the subject in an interesting manner.	17	3.82	1.2
My instructor stimulates my thinking.	17	4.18	0.92
My instructor motivates me to do my best work.	17	4.12	1.23
<i>Average of Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation Items</i>	17	4.22	0.79

Rapport and Respect Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor helps students sufficiently with course-related issues.	17	4.06	1.21
My instructor is regularly available for consultation.	17	4.71	0.46
My instructor is impartial in dealing with students.	17	4.65	0.59
My instructor respects opinions different from his or her own.	17	4.29	0.82
<i>Average of Rapport and Respect Items</i>	17	4.43	0.7

Feedback and Accessibility Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Assessment methods accurately assess what I have learned in this course.	17	4.24	1.21
Grades are assigned fairly.	17	4.35	0.9
The basis for assigning grades is clearly explained.	17	4.35	0.97
The instructor provides feedback on my progress in the course on a regular basis.	17	4.18	1.15
<i>Average of Feedback and Accessibility Items</i>	17	4.28	0.95

Student Perceptions of Learning Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor advances my knowledge of course content.	17	4.29	0.89
My instructor promotes my understanding of important conceptual themes.	17	4.18	1.04
My instructor enhances my capacity to communicate effectively about the course subject matter.	17	4.18	0.86
My instructor encourages me to value new viewpoints related to the course.	17	4.12	0.9
<i>Average of Student Perceptions of Learning Items</i>	17	4.19	0.87

What were the most effective aspects of this instructor's teaching?

- I liked the organization of the class and thought it moved at a good pace. You were very helpful in office hours; however, the times could be more helpful if changed.
- I'm really not sure.

- The days I learned the most were the review days we had but most times I had to go back to my room and re teach myself the concepts because the course was taught at an extremely fast pace. I know that I could not keep up and everyone else I talked to also could not keep up with the pace of the class.
- He's extremely passionate about the course context!
- The most effective aspects were the class handouts given at the beginning of each class so we had a guide throughout the class to take notes.
- He gave a lot of examples which were helpful and always provided a notes sheet for every class. That made things a lot easier to understand.
- I was nervous about doing proofs when I first registered for this course. Professor Hatcher has his students work on many proofs individually and then consult others for assistance if needed. In this time we were given to ourselves, I was really able to start doing proofs comfortably. Some of the proofs in the assignments were very difficult which prepared us to complete the easier proofs on the exams.
- He had handouts every day for new topics and did examples as a class before breaking up into smaller groups.
- Despite absolutely hating philosophy, Prof Hatcher made the class interesting and worth going to. I learned a lot and he is one of the best profs I've had at Valpo. He really is there for his students academically and you know he values his students. He even prays for us!! A very professional and intelligent man. I enjoyed that he holds us accountable for having read before class and then lectures on the material. I also was very grateful for the quizzes where we had to memorize things because it made me more prepared for the future.
- Tries to make the concepts as interesting as possible
- Professor Hatcher was always prepared for class and was very organized. He encourages his students to do their best work.
- The homework was a good way to practice what we learned in class, if a little excessive at times
- Still using visual aids during online class
- What I really enjoyed about professor Hatcher was how he was able to be a really nice, calm, understanding guy who was able to make class fun and inviting while also teaching a subject I usually don't enjoy. He's also very organized and communicative, so I was very happy with his teaching.

In what ways could this instructor improve his or her teaching?

- Because homework assignments were due at the beginning of each class, the office hours were not particularly helpful. If you were not working ahead on assignments the office hours were not at a good time.
- slowing down the content and use positive comments instead of ones that make students feel insecure.
- slow down the pace of the class and understand that it is a 100 level course and a lot of people do not have previous knowledge of the content
- Make his grading more clear and what he expects on the homework more clear so easy points aren't missed.
- I feel that when you ask him a question he does not help whatsoever with it. I feel like he just repeats the question back to you or he just repeats what he has already said. I feel like he is not efficient when it comes to helping students. I feel even more lost most the time when I ask him questions.
- There was homework for every class and some of them got really extensive especially when we were doing proofs.
- I just don't understand this class in general. Why is this even included in the classes needed for a business degree?
- He only has one style of teaching and does not know how to explain things in different ways when students are struggling with a topic.
- I did not enjoy Logic Race Days because I felt like I learned the least those days but I do understand why he had us do them in theory.
- No clear ways
- No more group/team work. Two people do all the work while the others slack off. And waiting for people to participate is not effective, the people who know the answers eventually get frustrated and answer all the questions and the others still never participate. If they do not want to say anything, let them

Please feel free to share any further comments you have for this instructor.

- To make office hours more helpful and allow students more time to understand concepts, I would recommend having all of the week's assignments due at the end of the week. Having them due the class after the concept is taught limits the amount of time students have to learn the concept and ask questions before it is due. Also students would appreciate if attendance was not taken right as class starts. If they arrive even a minute late they get no credit for being there.
- Overall was a good professor but with the questions issue is really frustrating. When you ask a professor for help you hope that they will help you with your question and not confuse you. This makes me not even want to ask him question because I get further confused.

- Overall, he was a really good instructor that was always approachable and easy to reach if you had any questions. He also is very passionate about the course and taught the material really well and in a way that was easy to understand.
- He was not accomodating to students at all during this difficult time.
- He is a really genuine guy and it is really sweet how he talks about his family :)

2020SP PHIL-145-B Survey - Valparaiso University

Course:	PHIL-145-B Elem Logic /Critical Thinking
Department:	PHIL
Faculty:	Hatcher, Michael
Response/Expected:	17/26 (65.4%)

Student Assessment of Instruction (SAI) Report Guidelines

The primary purpose of student evaluations of teaching is to improve teaching effectiveness. For this purpose, data from this report should be interpreted within the following guidelines.

- 1. Faculty and administrators should use the overall score and the subscale scores, not individual items, for evaluation purposes.** Faculty might reflect on their students' responses to individual questions, but administrators should be cautious in using data from individual questions for evaluative purposes.
- 2. SAI data should be used to assess multi-year trends in a faculty member's teaching in a specific class, NOT to compare the single semester scores of faculty to each other.** Evaluating multi-year trends provides an appropriate context for evaluating a faculty member's teaching for a given course. Multi-year trends help to identify faculty members who are improving their teaching effectiveness.
- 3. A single semester's SAI scores should not be used to compare individual faculty members to each other.** SAI scores may be influenced by factors such as students' implicit biases, interest level in the course subject, course level, and satisfaction with the time and day of the course. Given that individual faculty teach different courses that vary in all of these factors, direct cross faculty comparisons are not appropriate with the SAI.
- 4. Evaluation results should be viewed in the context of sample size and response rate.** Ideally, response rates should be as high as possible and faculty should be mindful that they can improve response rates by stressing the importance of the evaluations as a means to improve teaching effectiveness, by clearly communicating that student responses will be taken seriously, and by providing frequent reminders to complete the evaluations.
- 5. The SAI should only be considered one component of a multi-component evaluation process.** While students are able to provide a

valuable measure of teaching effectiveness, their opinions alone do not provide sufficient evidence to make decisions about a faculty member's overall teaching effectiveness, especially when such opinions inform decisions about annual reviews, merit raises, tenure, and promotion. Additional evaluation components are described in the Faculty Handbook.

6. **Answers to the free response questions may not be representative of the class as a whole and care must be taken when using free response comments in an evaluative manner.** Student comments consistent with the survey results may be used for evaluative purposes. Inconsistent comments have value from a formative standpoint, but their use in an evaluative manner are not appropriate as they may incorrectly represent the results of the validated survey.
7. **Faculty should not allow fear of lower SAI scores to dictate rigor or pedagogy in their courses.** Department chairs, faculty peers, and administrators should encourage faculty (especially tenure-track faculty) to create courses that help students learn, even if that learning process requires making students feel uncomfortable in some way (e.g., encouraging students to consider viewpoints they do not support) or requires significant work and rigor. Faculty should be mindful of SAI feedback and open to making changes to their courses, but they should not allow student feedback to have a negative influence on the learning process in their courses.
8. **Self-reflection items are for information only, and not a part of the validated SAI scale.** The report will include a factor mean, an average across all five self-reflection items, as well as the mean for each individual item. These items are not included in the Overall SAI Score reported in the executive summary.

Executive Summary

Scale	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Overall SAI Score	17	4.43	0.59
Organization and Clarity	17	4.43	0.59
Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation	17	4.43	0.65
Rapport and Respect	17	4.43	0.76
Feedback and Accessibility	17	4.37	0.71
Student Perceptions of Learning	17	4.49	0.6

Responses: strongly disagree=1 disagree=2 neutral=3 agree=4 strongly agree=5

Student Self-Reflection Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
I regularly attended course meetings.	17	4.82	0.38
I was regularly prepared for course meetings.	17	4.71	0.46
I was actively engaged during course meetings.	17	4.29	0.96
I upheld the Honor Code in all work for this course.	17	4.82	0.38
I was able to achieve the stated learning objectives for this course.	17	4.47	0.85
<i>Average of Student Self Reflection Items</i>	17	4.62	0.52

Organization and Clarity Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor is well prepared for class meetings.	17	4.71	0.46
My instructor explains the subject matter clearly.	17	4.06	0.94
My instructor clearly communicates course goals and objectives.	17	4.65	0.48
My instructor answers questions appropriately.	17	4.29	0.89
<i>Average of Organization and Clarity Items</i>	17	4.43	0.59

Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor is enthusiastic about teaching this course.	17	4.71	0.46
My instructor presents the subject in an interesting manner.	17	4.24	0.88
My instructor stimulates my thinking.	17	4.41	0.69
My instructor motivates me to do my best work.	17	4.35	0.76
<i>Average of Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation Items</i>	17	4.43	0.65

Rapport and Respect Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor helps students sufficiently with course-related issues.	17	4.29	0.89
My instructor is regularly available for consultation.	17	4.71	0.46
My instructor is impartial in dealing with students.	16	4.31	0.98
My instructor respects opinions different from his or her own.	17	4.35	0.97
<i>Average of Rapport and Respect Items</i>	17	4.43	0.76

Feedback and Accessibility Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Assessment methods accurately assess what I have learned in this course.	17	4.41	0.69
Grades are assigned fairly.	17	4.41	0.69
The basis for assigning grades is clearly explained.	17	4.35	0.76
The instructor provides feedback on my progress in the course on a regular basis.	17	4.29	0.82
<i>Average of Feedback and Accessibility Items</i>	17	4.37	0.71

Student Perceptions of Learning Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor advances my knowledge of course content.	17	4.53	0.78
My instructor promotes my understanding of important conceptual themes.	17	4.41	0.69
My instructor enhances my capacity to communicate effectively about the course subject matter.	17	4.47	0.61
My instructor encourages me to value new viewpoints related to the course.	17	4.53	0.5
<i>Average of Student Perceptions of Learning Items</i>	17	4.49	0.6

What were the most effective aspects of this instructor's teaching?

- Great Professor overall, way he teaches in class and even online are excellent. Willing to help students
- The most effective was how the instructor utilized logic races and homework to solidify the content we learned in class.
- It was helpful to have review sessions before exams. I also liked the format using handouts that we could follow along with during

class to ensure that we were doing active work, but it kept us all on the same page with each other.

- I liked the Logic Races.
- The surplus of examples that we did in class helped me grasp the content before I did the homework.
- He was very passionate about the course no matter the circumstances and offered valuable ways to approach a difficult class. Despite students lack of participation, he found new ways to involve people and meet the student's need to understand the difficult material. I enjoyed his teaching style very much as he had faith in our abilities to reason ourselves while being there for questions if we needed help. He was also extremely transparent about the difficulty of the course and turned it into a valuable life lesson about seeing results from continuous, earnest effort.
- How willing he was to help and how enthusiastic he was about teaching the subject! I was worried in the beginning that I would not do well, and without professor Hatcher's help, I could have never done it! He is a very good professor and always willing to help. He also really cares about his students as well as their success!
- Logic races
- Incredibly knowledgeable on course material, always willing to help 1:1
- Always available both in and out of class to help students and making everything a solid schedule.
- He is knowledgeable, always willing to help, and a genuinely good person
- The class handouts. Those helped me a lot especially when I needed to go back on review a subject.
- Enthusiasm

In what ways could this instructor improve his or her teaching?

- I think his late policy which states if a student is late they are marked absent isn't necessarily fair.
- He could improve by including directions in his notes for the examples.
- I thought the teaching method was fine while we were in person, but it became increasingly difficult when we transitioned to online learning. I didn't feel supported or motivated throughout these several weeks, and was especially taken off guard when we received an _encouragement_ email, which I expected to be uplifting, though the content was _I encourage you to keep doing your homework._ It seemed like all expectations of us remained the same, but the ability to learn and some of the things we benefited most from in class--like peer feedback and collaboration--were essentially eliminated when we made the switch.

- I think the amount of feedback could be improved. I never knew what I did wrong or why I did something wrong. I feel like on the homework it would only have the correct answers only.
- I think he did great and would recommend him to other students
- None so far that I can think of
- Remind studnets there is sometimes more than one way of solving the problems, and that they can look online (videos for example) to get tips and more explanations on how to work through problems. This helped me as the class lesson wasnt always enough practice to get it down.
- N/a
- Honestly this was probably the toughest course I've taken in college. I enjoyed the content but I always felt one step behind. It may be that we jumped to a new section and learned a whole new process every day of class but I would suggest not having homework every mon, wed, friday. Maybe 3 assignments one week and two the next to give your students a break. This semester it just felt like I was constantly working on logic homework and there was never a break.
- n/a
- Explanations of examples and concepts were often not clear. It would be useful to practice concise ways of explaining concepts in an easy to understand way.
- I would say that lowering the weight on the exams and distributing it to homework would help. I felt that the amount of weight on the final paper and the exams made the homework seem not nearly as important.
- Better explanations and examples

Please feel free to share any further comments you have for this instructor.

- Personally the chalk board (room we were located in) made it a little difficult to see everything he was doing. This class should be taught in a better more advanced classroom.
- This professor did very well with integrating coursework into the online format!
- I really liked the professor, but I just didn't like the lack of good feedback. I also was usually clueless on what I got wrong when it came to Logic Races.
- Keep this guy around. He makes you do the work, but if you listen to him and keep trying like he tells you then you definitely get

educated in life lessons and difficult subject matter.

- Professor Hatcher was one of my favorite professors at Valpo that made a significant lasting impact on my education. I will miss being challenged in this class and learning more in depth about philosophy.
- I really appreciate how eager he is to help people after class / after online class. He wants us to succeed and made philosophy a class I was not looking forward to, to one of the more enjoyable classes I had this semester.
- I felt that he did a great job transitioning from a offline class to an online class. There was no difference in the quality of the class and he worked very hard to make sure that everyone had as much help with understanding the subject being taught. I am glad that I decided to take the class with him as the teacher and I have already recommended him to my peers who are looking into taking this class. He is truly an amazing teacher.
- Overall good class

2020SP PHIL-145-C Survey - Valparaiso University

Course:	PHIL-145-C Elem Logic /Critical Thinking
Department:	PHIL
Faculty:	Hatcher, Michael
Response/Expected:	9/21 (42.9%)

Student Assessment of Instruction (SAI) Report Guidelines

The primary purpose of student evaluations of teaching is to improve teaching effectiveness. For this purpose, data from this report should be interpreted within the following guidelines.

- 1. Faculty and administrators should use the overall score and the subscale scores, not individual items, for evaluation purposes.** Faculty might reflect on their students' responses to individual questions, but administrators should be cautious in using data from individual questions for evaluative purposes.
- 2. SAI data should be used to assess multi-year trends in a faculty member's teaching in a specific class, NOT to compare the single semester scores of faculty to each other.** Evaluating multi-year trends provides an appropriate context for evaluating a faculty member's teaching for a given course. Multi-year trends help to identify faculty members who are improving their teaching effectiveness.
- 3. A single semester's SAI scores should not be used to compare individual faculty members to each other.** SAI scores may be influenced by factors such as students' implicit biases, interest level in the course subject, course level, and satisfaction with the time and day of the course. Given that individual faculty teach different courses that vary in all of these factors, direct cross faculty comparisons are not appropriate with the SAI.
- 4. Evaluation results should be viewed in the context of sample size and response rate.** Ideally, response rates should be as high as possible and faculty should be mindful that they can improve response rates by stressing the importance of the evaluations as a means to improve teaching effectiveness, by clearly communicating that student responses will be taken seriously, and by providing frequent reminders to complete the evaluations.
- 5. The SAI should only be considered one component of a multi-component evaluation process.** While students are able to provide a

valuable measure of teaching effectiveness, their opinions alone do not provide sufficient evidence to make decisions about a faculty member's overall teaching effectiveness, especially when such opinions inform decisions about annual reviews, merit raises, tenure, and promotion. Additional evaluation components are described in the Faculty Handbook.

6. **Answers to the free response questions may not be representative of the class as a whole and care must be taken when using free response comments in an evaluative manner.** Student comments consistent with the survey results may be used for evaluative purposes. Inconsistent comments have value from a formative standpoint, but their use in an evaluative manner are not appropriate as they may incorrectly represent the results of the validated survey.
7. **Faculty should not allow fear of lower SAI scores to dictate rigor or pedagogy in their courses.** Department chairs, faculty peers, and administrators should encourage faculty (especially tenure-track faculty) to create courses that help students learn, even if that learning process requires making students feel uncomfortable in some way (e.g., encouraging students to consider viewpoints they do not support) or requires significant work and rigor. Faculty should be mindful of SAI feedback and open to making changes to their courses, but they should not allow student feedback to have a negative influence on the learning process in their courses.
8. **Self-reflection items are for information only, and not a part of the validated SAI scale.** The report will include a factor mean, an average across all five self-reflection items, as well as the mean for each individual item. These items are not included in the Overall SAI Score reported in the executive summary.

Executive Summary

Scale	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Overall SAI Score	9	4.62	0.41
Organization and Clarity	9	4.67	0.39
Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation	9	4.67	0.49
Rapport and Respect	9	4.67	0.47
Feedback and Accessibility	9	4.53	0.49
Student Perceptions of Learning	9	4.58	0.49

Responses: strongly disagree=1 disagree=2 neutral=3 agree=4 strongly agree=5

Student Self-Reflection Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
I regularly attended course meetings.	9	4.78	0.42
I was regularly prepared for course meetings.	9	4.56	0.5
I was actively engaged during course meetings.	9	4.44	0.68
I upheld the Honor Code in all work for this course.	9	5	0
I was able to achieve the stated learning objectives for this course.	9	4.22	1.03
<i>Average of Student Self Reflection Items</i>	9	4.6	0.45

Organization and Clarity Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor is well prepared for class meetings.	9	4.78	0.42
My instructor explains the subject matter clearly.	9	4.56	0.5
My instructor clearly communicates course goals and objectives.	9	4.67	0.47
My instructor answers questions appropriately.	9	4.67	0.47
<i>Average of Organization and Clarity Items</i>	9	4.67	0.39

Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor is enthusiastic about teaching this course.	9	4.78	0.42
My instructor presents the subject in an interesting manner.	9	4.56	0.68
My instructor stimulates my thinking.	9	4.67	0.47
My instructor motivates me to do my best work.	9	4.67	0.47
<i>Average of Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation Items</i>	9	4.67	0.49

Rapport and Respect Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor helps students sufficiently with course-related issues.	9	4.67	0.47
My instructor is regularly available for consultation.	9	4.67	0.47
My instructor is impartial in dealing with students.	9	4.67	0.47
My instructor respects opinions different from his or her own.	9	4.67	0.47
<i>Average of Rapport and Respect Items</i>	9	4.67	0.47

Feedback and Accessibility Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Assessment methods accurately assess what I have learned in this course.	9	4.56	0.5
Grades are assigned fairly.	9	4.44	0.5
The basis for assigning grades is clearly explained.	9	4.44	0.68
The instructor provides feedback on my progress in the course on a regular basis.	9	4.67	0.47
<i>Average of Feedback and Accessibility Items</i>	9	4.53	0.49

Student Perceptions of Learning Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor advances my knowledge of course content.	9	4.78	0.42
My instructor promotes my understanding of important conceptual themes.	9	4.56	0.5
My instructor enhances my capacity to communicate effectively about the course subject matter.	9	4.56	0.5
My instructor encourages me to value new viewpoints related to the course.	9	4.44	0.68
<i>Average of Student Perceptions of Learning Items</i>	9	4.58	0.49

What were the most effective aspects of this instructor's teaching?

- Having students work together. Explaining many of the concepts.
- The handouts were great, really helped. When we transitioned to online, the google docs really helped!
- I think there were a lot of examples and problems to help understand concepts more clearly

- He is always accessible and the homework is relevant to what we do in the class.
- Professor Hatcher gave great comprehensive lectures on the course material. He supplied many examples which clearly explained the concepts. I believe the small group work within each class period was effective, as we could collaborate with other students while figuring out the answers. If any student had a question, he would make sure to answer it with a complete response.
- all

In what ways could this instructor improve his or her teaching?

- Given the circumstances, I think they did a great job
- Not count me late for being literally 4 seconds past 1 o'clock. But his teaching is good.
- I cannot think of anything at this moment.
- none

Please feel free to share any further comments you have for this instructor.

- This class was harder than many of my upper level classes.
- The BEST professor I have ever had. It is a very HARD class, but he was very engaging and encouraging. Between class, office hours, TA sessions, and help from other students the help was there. I struggled very much in the class, BUT I was still excited to go every day!
- Professor Hatcher is a bit chaotic, lots of emails and whatnot. But overall, I know philosophy 100% better than when I started. I know that if I email him or need help, he will be there to help me. I enjoyed being in class everyday face-to-face. He did the transition to online very well.
- Thank you for being very accessible during your office hours and always willing to help.
- none

2019FA PHIL-275-A Survey - Valparaiso University

Course:	PHIL-275-A Ancient & Medieval Philosophy
Department:	PHIL
Faculty:	Hatcher, Michael
Response/Expected:	8/8 (100%)

Student Assessment of Instruction (SAI) Report Guidelines

The primary purpose of student evaluations of teaching is to improve teaching effectiveness. For this purpose, data from this report should be interpreted within the following guidelines.

- 1. Faculty and administrators should use the overall score and the subscale scores, not individual items, for evaluation purposes.** Faculty might reflect on their students' responses to individual questions, but administrators should be cautious in using data from individual questions for evaluative purposes.
- 2. SAI data should be used to assess multi-year trends in a faculty member's teaching in a specific class, NOT to compare the single semester scores of faculty to each other.** Evaluating multi-year trends provides an appropriate context for evaluating a faculty member's teaching for a given course. Multi-year trends help to identify faculty members who are improving their teaching effectiveness.
- 3. A single semester's SAI scores should not be used to compare individual faculty members to each other.** SAI scores may be influenced by factors such as students' implicit biases, interest level in the course subject, course level, and satisfaction with the time and day of the course. Given that individual faculty teach different courses that vary in all of these factors, direct cross faculty comparisons are not appropriate with the SAI.
- 4. Evaluation results should be viewed in the context of sample size and response rate.** Ideally, response rates should be as high as possible and faculty should be mindful that they can improve response rates by stressing the importance of the evaluations as a means to improve teaching effectiveness, by clearly communicating that student responses will be taken seriously, and by providing frequent reminders to complete the evaluations.
- 5. The SAI should only be considered one component of a multi-component evaluation process.** While students are able to provide a valuable measure of teaching effectiveness, their opinions alone do not provide sufficient evidence to make decisions about a faculty member's overall teaching effectiveness, especially when such opinions inform decisions about annual reviews, merit raises, tenure, and promotion. Additional evaluation components are described in the Faculty Handbook.
- 6. Answers to the free response questions may not be representative of the class as a whole and care must be taken when using free response comments in an evaluative manner.** Student comments consistent with the survey results may be used for evaluative purposes. Inconsistent comments have value from a formative standpoint, but their use in an evaluative manner are not

appropriate as they may incorrectly represent the results of the validated survey.

7. **Faculty should not allow fear of lower SAI scores to dictate rigor or pedagogy in their courses.** Department chairs, faculty peers, and administrators should encourage faculty (especially tenure-track faculty) to create courses that help students learn, even if that learning process requires making students feel uncomfortable in some way (e.g., encouraging students to consider viewpoints they do not support) or requires significant work and rigor. Faculty should be mindful of SAI feedback and open to making changes to their courses, but they should not allow student feedback to have a negative influence on the learning process in their courses.
8. **Self-reflection items are for information only, and not a part of the validated SAI scale.** The report will include a factor mean, an average across all five self-reflection items, as well as the mean for each individual item. These items are not included in the Overall SAI Score reported in the executive summary.

Executive Summary

Scale	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Overall SAI Score	8	4.61	0.19
Organization and Clarity	8	4.69	0.3
Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation	8	4.72	0.29
Rapport and Respect	8	4.69	0.27
Feedback and Accessibility	8	4.22	0.42
Student Perceptions of Learning	8	4.72	0.4

Responses: strongly disagree=1 disagree=2 neutral=3 agree=4 strongly agree=5

Student Self-Reflection Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
I regularly attended course meetings.	8	3.88	1.05
I was regularly prepared for course meetings.	8	3.63	0.48
I was actively engaged during course meetings.	8	3.75	0.97
I upheld the Honor Code in all work for this course.	8	4.88	0.33
I was able to achieve the stated learning objectives for this course.	7	4	0.53
Average of Student Self Reflection Items	8	4.01	0.46

Organization and Clarity Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor is well prepared for class meetings.	8	4.88	0.33
My instructor explains the subject matter clearly.	8	4.63	0.48
My instructor clearly communicates course goals and objectives.	8	4.5	0.5
My instructor answers questions appropriately.	8	4.75	0.43
Average of Organization and Clarity Items	8	4.69	0.3

Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor is enthusiastic about teaching this course.	8	5	0
My instructor presents the subject in an interesting manner.	8	4.63	0.48
My instructor stimulates my thinking.	8	4.63	0.48
My instructor motivates me to do my best work.	8	4.63	0.48
Average of Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation Items	8	4.72	0.29

Rapport and Respect Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor helps students sufficiently with course-related issues.	8	4.75	0.43
My instructor is regularly available for consultation.	8	4.75	0.43
My instructor is impartial in dealing with students.	8	4.5	0.5
My instructor respects opinions different from his or her own.	8	4.75	0.43
Average of Rapport and Respect Items	8	4.69	0.27

Feedback and Accessibility Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Assessment methods accurately assess what I have learned in this course.	8	4.25	0.43
Grades are assigned fairly.	8	4.25	0.66
The basis for assigning grades is clearly explained.	8	4.25	0.66
The instructor provides feedback on my progress in the course on a regular basis.	8	4.13	0.6
Average of Feedback and Accessibility Items	8	4.22	0.42

Student Perceptions of Learning Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor advances my knowledge of course content.	8	4.75	0.66
My instructor promotes my understanding of important conceptual themes.	8	4.63	0.48
My instructor enhances my capacity to communicate effectively about the course subject matter.	8	4.88	0.33
My instructor encourages me to value new viewpoints related to the course.	8	4.63	0.48
Average of Student Perceptions of Learning Items	8	4.72	0.4

What were the most effective aspects of this instructor's teaching?

- There was good feedback on the daily write ups and often times the class sessions cleared up any confusion about the readings.
- The discussion to lecture proportion was fantastic. Being nearly all discussion and just steering in the right direction was perfect, especially for our smaller class.
- I think he did a really good job when it came to explaining the more complex material and putting it into more simple terms
- Professor Hatcher is not only exceptionally good with his clarity, grading, and teaching style, he is a very kind person too. It was clear that he is passionate about the topic and he knows what he is talking about. Although the classes are primarily question and discussion rich, he was able to give various answers to all inquiries with ease. He always made sure that everyone understood what he was explaining and used great examples to do so. I had a lot of questions, but he always made sure

to answer each of them. He is kind enough that you would not feel awkward for having a simply question. He was willing to read through the entire text that my paper was on, after his office hours ended, to make sure that I really understood beauty as Platinus explained it. This is a good example of the type of teacher he is. He facilitated fun and deep conversations about complex issues, and made me consider many foreign viewpoints. Overall Professor Hatcher is a very good teacher.

- Accepting others' views and not attacking the other person.
- Class discussions. Philosophy can be really hard to comprehend, thus making it difficult to talk about in class. The way you break things down so we understand makes everything clear and easier to understand.

In what ways could this instructor improve his or her teaching?

- I think sometimes we spent time running with either tangential or misled ideas, which I think could be stomped out quicker, even though they were often interesting conversations. Additionally, the papers had very vague prompts, which was confusing to a lot of students. It also felt like we jumped from reading to reading, and some weeks we had over 120 pages to read from deep philosophical texts, which is a lot of reading. I don't read that much for my other classes combined in two or three weeks.
- I think the one thing that could improve the course would be a more relaxed reading schedule. It was hard to keep up with all of the readings, it seemed that the reading took at least 2 or 3 hours per class period. This will also help when it comes to comprehension of the material in the readings as well.
- The amount of work that we had to do for each class was very large. This was the most reading I've done for any class. In every other reading intensive course I have taken, assignments are around 20pgs and 40pgs were an anomaly (usually reserved for the weekends). Though they were interesting, I spent hours reading/rereading each day's assignment, and many were hard to understand. This made RRA's difficult.
- Not make a discussion based class, and have something that makes class something people want to show up to.
- Less RRA's. Maybe have quizzes with essay questions instead. It is really hard to read 20-60 pages then write a 1 page summary or answer a question that is very limited on the word count. Answering specific questions is really nice but having it in different formats would make it better.

Please feel free to share any further comments you have for this instructor.

- I found the readings for this class to be incredibly long for a three day a week class. It was difficult to do a majority of the readings let alone complete any one of them. To complete some of the readings could take anywhere up to three hours to complete and most students don't have time for that three times a week on top of everything else.
- Dr. Hatcher was fantastic while he was there (gone for paternity leave). Students that did not regularly attend course meetings will rip into him for no reason, because he really was everything

you want out of a professor. Open minded, kind, intelligent, and the right balance of affable but professional. I have an extensive improvement section, but all of it is minor. Great class.

- It was a great semester! I am always glad to get to reread the classics.
- Though it was difficult in terms of workload, I am very satisfied with this class as a whole. I will miss philosophy, as it is a great excercise for the brain and was great conversation between considerate people.
- I love Professor Hatcher, I just did not agree with the course content
- Congrats on the baby! I hope you are getting some sleep. Additionally, I think that this course should be bumped up to a 300 level. It is very heavy on the workload. Also, the 7:30 turn in time is very weird and challenging to accomplish. Why not we bring the papers to class and have our questions so we can address them then? Also, the grading issues are kind of frustrating. Geiman didn't really keep up on that and it is difficult to know where we are at in the class if grades aren't being put in.

2019FA PHIL-145-A Survey - Valparaiso University

Course:	PHIL-145-A Elem Logic /Critical Thinking
Department:	PHIL
Faculty:	Hatcher, Michael
Response/Expected:	17/21 (81%)

Student Assessment of Instruction (SAI) Report Guidelines

The primary purpose of student evaluations of teaching is to improve teaching effectiveness. For this purpose, data from this report should be interpreted within the following guidelines.

- 1. Faculty and administrators should use the overall score and the subscale scores, not individual items, for evaluation purposes.** Faculty might reflect on their students' responses to individual questions, but administrators should be cautious in using data from individual questions for evaluative purposes.
- 2. SAI data should be used to assess multi-year trends in a faculty member's teaching in a specific class, NOT to compare the single semester scores of faculty to each other.** Evaluating multi-year trends provides an appropriate context for evaluating a faculty member's teaching for a given course. Multi-year trends help to identify faculty members who are improving their teaching effectiveness.
- 3. A single semester's SAI scores should not be used to compare individual faculty members to each other.** SAI scores may be influenced by factors such as students' implicit biases, interest level in the course subject, course level, and satisfaction with the time and day of the course. Given that individual faculty teach different courses that vary in all of these factors, direct cross faculty comparisons are not appropriate with the SAI.
- 4. Evaluation results should be viewed in the context of sample size and response rate.** Ideally, response rates should be as high as possible and faculty should be mindful that they can improve response rates by stressing the importance of the evaluations as a means to improve teaching effectiveness, by clearly communicating that student responses will be taken seriously, and by providing frequent reminders to complete the evaluations.
- 5. The SAI should only be considered one component of a multi-component evaluation process.** While students are able to provide a valuable measure of teaching effectiveness, their opinions alone do not provide sufficient evidence to make decisions about a faculty member's overall teaching effectiveness, especially when such opinions inform decisions about annual reviews, merit raises, tenure, and promotion. Additional evaluation components are described in the Faculty Handbook.
- 6. Answers to the free response questions may not be representative of the class as a whole and care must be taken when using free response comments in an evaluative manner.** Student comments consistent with the survey results may be used for evaluative purposes. Inconsistent comments have value from a formative standpoint, but their use in an evaluative manner are not

appropriate as they may incorrectly represent the results of the validated survey.

7. **Faculty should not allow fear of lower SAI scores to dictate rigor or pedagogy in their courses.** Department chairs, faculty peers, and administrators should encourage faculty (especially tenure-track faculty) to create courses that help students learn, even if that learning process requires making students feel uncomfortable in some way (e.g., encouraging students to consider viewpoints they do not support) or requires significant work and rigor. Faculty should be mindful of SAI feedback and open to making changes to their courses, but they should not allow student feedback to have a negative influence on the learning process in their courses.
8. **Self-reflection items are for information only, and not a part of the validated SAI scale.** The report will include a factor mean, an average across all five self-reflection items, as well as the mean for each individual item. These items are not included in the Overall SAI Score reported in the executive summary.

Executive Summary

Scale	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Overall SAI Score	17	4.28	0.66
Organization and Clarity	17	4.19	0.72
Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation	17	4.28	0.67
Rapport and Respect	17	4.37	0.73
Feedback and Accessibility	17	4.31	0.6
Student Perceptions of Learning	17	4.26	0.73

Responses: strongly disagree=1 disagree=2 neutral=3 agree=4 strongly agree=5

Student Self-Reflection Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
I regularly attended course meetings.	17	4.71	0.57
I was regularly prepared for course meetings.	17	4.24	0.88
I was actively engaged during course meetings.	17	4.29	0.57
I upheld the Honor Code in all work for this course.	17	4.71	0.57
I was able to achieve the stated learning objectives for this course.	17	4.41	0.69
Average of Student Self Reflection Items	17	4.47	0.54

Organization and Clarity Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor is well prepared for class meetings.	17	4.47	0.61
My instructor explains the subject matter clearly.	17	4	0.84
My instructor clearly communicates course goals and objectives.	17	4.18	0.86
My instructor answers questions appropriately.	17	4.12	0.96
Average of Organization and Clarity Items	17	4.19	0.72

Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor is enthusiastic about teaching this course.	17	4.47	0.61
My instructor presents the subject in an interesting manner.	17	4.06	0.8
My instructor stimulates my thinking.	17	4.35	0.76
My instructor motivates me to do my best work.	17	4.24	0.88
Average of Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation Items	17	4.28	0.67

Rapport and Respect Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor helps students sufficiently with course-related issues.	17	4.29	0.96
My instructor is regularly available for consultation.	17	4.35	0.9
My instructor is impartial in dealing with students.	17	4.35	0.76
My instructor respects opinions different from his or her own.	16	4.44	0.7
Average of Rapport and Respect Items	17	4.37	0.73

Feedback and Accessibility Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Assessment methods accurately assess what I have learned in this course.	17	4.41	0.69
Grades are assigned fairly.	17	4.35	0.68
The basis for assigning grades is clearly explained.	17	4.35	0.59
The instructor provides feedback on my progress in the course on a regular basis.	17	4.12	0.83
Average of Feedback and Accessibility Items	17	4.31	0.6

Student Perceptions of Learning Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor advances my knowledge of course content.	17	4.29	0.75
My instructor promotes my understanding of important conceptual themes.	17	4.24	0.88
My instructor enhances my capacity to communicate effectively about the course subject matter.	17	4.24	0.73
My instructor encourages me to value new viewpoints related to the course.	17	4.29	0.82
Average of Student Perceptions of Learning Items	17	4.26	0.73

What were the most effective aspects of this instructor's teaching?

- Going over examples in class related to the homework really helps us have a better understanding of how to do it.
- going over the homeworks after they were handed back was helpful
- Both Hatcher and Woodward were almost always enthusiastic and I could tell they appreciate what they do. Hatcher would rarely get impatient with answering student's questions and they both try their hardest to make their upmost goal to help their student's understand the concepts first before they go on. Of course it is still up the the student's commitment to the class to keep up, but the intention is there from both professors. The intention to actually teach rather than instruct.
- Professor Hatcher would regularly use pop culture references to help teach us the basics of logic and philosophy. I found this to be a great help because it allows me to relate to the content on a level I can understand.

- I honestly don't think I can answer half of these questions truthfully because the semester was so messed up from having both Prof Woodward and Prof Hatcher.
- Answering any and all questions, explaining each concept in depth to make sure everyone understands, and provides a lot of practice problems.
- I like how patient you are when devoting class time to clear up any issues that students may have during last nights assignments, those really helped.
- On time to class.
- I think working one on one with the professor helped me the most.
- Professor Hatcher, always offered help. This was very helpful since logic was very confusing at first. Through getting help during office hours and going to ta sessions I have improved my grade drastically.
- We were constantly kept on task through homework assignments, handouts, and lectures. The concepts were taught well. The work we were doing made sure that we were always understanding what was done in class without falling behind.
- The most effective aspect of his teaching was that he never got discouraged in teaching the class.
- Having handouts for each class and doing many practice problems in class. Also, having the ability to get extra practice from addition worksheets was very helpful.
- i think the amount of homework that was given was helpful
- Paper handouts with problems on them

In what ways could this instructor improve his or her teaching?

- Nothing comes to mind, difficult course I believe this is the best way to teach it.
- I think the use of PowerPoints or an agenda would be very helpful. Professor Hatcher can get off topic very easily and go on a little rant about something. He is good about bringing it full circle, however he loses the attention of students because of this.
- Woodward would visibly get impatient often with students. Hatcher would often get off tangent but is also great at collecting himself again. Sometime he should just let the student speak however.
- Make class readings mandatory and try to work that into points for the course
- I think maybe being more straightforward would help. As an overall eval of the course, take it slower. I had never taken philosophy before so it was sort of a shell shock jumping right into things.
- n/a
- This may be a nitpick, but I think that sometimes you talk way too fast when engaging with other student during consolation hours. When visiting with you to hopefully get tips on writing the final paper, I felt like I had to quickly write things down in fear of loosing important info that I could have been useful later.

- Examples are not always effective, sometimes you go so in depth of the concept it is confusing.
- I think at times he should slow down and explain certain concepts in more detail.
- When I could ask questions, the answer never seemed to be answered fully. Instead of getting right to the point, the main concepts were often avoided. This made me feel more confused most times.
- Sometimes it feels like the assignments are busywork, even though most of the homework is effective at making sure we know what we are doing.
- This instructor could put more time into helping his students understand certain areas of expertise in this class. though I do realize he had a child this semester was most likely adjusting to the changes.
- be more blunt with students and don't beat around the bush when answering questions, its already a confusing class

Please feel free to share any further comments you have for this instructor.

- I think that the daily homeworks are a lot, especially for students who are extremely busy. Luckily I personally was able to keep up on them and find a schedule ... but maybe in the future lessen the amount of homeworks that there are due and keep in mind when they are due.
- Congratulations on your baby
- For the logic course itself, it might be a good idea to include another step in the Argument Analysis project: on the wednesday before the final draft is due, have a rough draft following the final draft guidelines to peer review before turning in the final paper on Friday. Since this assignment is very difficult, the more edits the better.
- Good Luck on the baby.
- I appreciate your accessibility to students and your willingness to meet. It is obvious that you care about your students which is very meaningful to me as a student!
- Concepts must be explained more clearly, especially concepts relating to the final paper. The instructions were not clear enough, and sufficient help was not provided.

2019SP CORE-115-F01 Survey - Valparaiso University

Course:	CORE-115-F01 The Human Experience
Department:	CORE
Faculty:	Hatcher, Michael
Response/Expected:	19/20 (95%)

Student Assessment of Instruction (SAI) Report Guidelines

The primary purpose of student evaluations of teaching is to improve teaching effectiveness. For this purpose, data from this report should be interpreted within the following guidelines.

1. **Faculty and administrators should use the overall score and the subscale scores, not individual items, for evaluation purposes.** Faculty might reflect on their students' responses to individual questions, but administrators should be cautious in using data from individual questions for evaluative purposes.
2. **SAI data should be used to assess multi-year trends in a faculty member's teaching in a specific class, NOT to compare the single semester scores of faculty to each other.** Evaluating multi-year trends provides an appropriate context for evaluating a faculty member's teaching for a given course. Multi-year trends help to identify faculty members who are improving their teaching effectiveness.
3. **A single semester's SAI scores should not be used to compare individual faculty members to each other.** SAI scores may be influenced by factors such as students' implicit biases, interest level in the course subject, course level, and satisfaction with the time and day of the course. Given that individual faculty teach different courses that vary in all of these factors, direct cross faculty comparisons are not appropriate with the SAI.
4. **Evaluation results should be viewed in the context of sample size and response rate.** Ideally, response rates should be as high as possible and faculty should be mindful that they can improve response rates by stressing the importance of the evaluations as a means to improve teaching effectiveness, by clearly communicating that student responses will be taken seriously, and by providing frequent reminders to complete the evaluations.
5. **The SAI should only be considered one component of a multi-component evaluation process.** While students are able to provide a valuable measure of teaching effectiveness, their opinions alone do not provide sufficient evidence to make decisions about a faculty member's overall teaching effectiveness, especially when such opinions inform decisions about annual reviews, merit raises, tenure, and promotion. Additional evaluation components are described in the Faculty Handbook.
6. **Answers to the free response questions may not be representative of the class as a whole and care must be taken when using free response comments in an evaluative manner.** Student comments consistent with the survey results may be used for evaluative purposes. Inconsistent comments have value from a formative standpoint, but their use in an evaluative manner are not

appropriate as they may incorrectly represent the results of the validated survey.

7. **Faculty should not allow fear of lower SAI scores to dictate rigor or pedagogy in their courses.** Department chairs, faculty peers, and administrators should encourage faculty (especially tenure-track faculty) to create courses that help students learn, even if that learning process requires making students feel uncomfortable in some way (e.g., encouraging students to consider viewpoints they do not support) or requires significant work and rigor. Faculty should be mindful of SAI feedback and open to making changes to their courses, but they should not allow student feedback to have a negative influence on the learning process in their courses.
8. **Self-reflection items are for information only, and not a part of the validated SAI scale.** The report will include a factor mean, an average across all five self-reflection items, as well as the mean for each individual item. These items are not included in the Overall SAI Score reported in the executive summary.

Executive Summary

Scale	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Overall SAI Score	19	4.28	0.56
Organization and Clarity	19	4.36	0.74
Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation	19	4.37	0.56
Rapport and Respect	19	4.46	0.53
Feedback and Accessibility	19	4.13	0.59
Student Perceptions of Learning	19	4.09	0.8

Responses: strongly disagree=1 disagree=2 neutral=3 agree=4 strongly agree=5

Student Self-Reflection Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
I regularly attended course meetings.	19	4.74	0.44
I was regularly prepared for course meetings.	19	4.58	0.59
I was actively engaged during course meetings.	19	4.11	0.85
I upheld the Honor Code in all work for this course.	19	4.79	0.41
I was able to achieve the stated learning objectives for this course.	19	4.16	0.67
Average of Student Self Reflection Items	19	4.47	0.41

Organization and Clarity Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor is well prepared for class meetings.	19	4.68	0.46
My instructor explains the subject matter clearly.	19	4.11	1.07
My instructor clearly communicates course goals and objectives.	19	4.16	0.93
My instructor answers questions appropriately.	19	4.47	0.82
Average of Organization and Clarity Items	19	4.36	0.74

Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor is enthusiastic about teaching this course.	19	4.84	0.36
My instructor presents the subject in an interesting manner.	19	3.95	0.89
My instructor stimulates my thinking.	19	4.26	0.78
My instructor motivates me to do my best work.	19	4.42	0.67
Average of Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation Items	19	4.37	0.56

Rapport and Respect Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor helps students sufficiently with course-related issues.	19	4.32	0.8
My instructor is regularly available for consultation.	19	4.74	0.44
My instructor is impartial in dealing with students.	19	4.26	1.07
My instructor respects opinions different from his or her own.	19	4.53	0.75
Average of Rapport and Respect Items	19	4.46	0.53

Feedback and Accessibility Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Assessment methods accurately assess what I have learned in this course.	19	4.05	1
Grades are assigned fairly.	19	4.05	0.94
The basis for assigning grades is clearly explained.	19	4.05	0.76
The instructor provides feedback on my progress in the course on a regular basis.	19	4.37	0.67
Average of Feedback and Accessibility Items	19	4.13	0.59

Student Perceptions of Learning Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor advances my knowledge of course content.	19	4.11	0.79
My instructor promotes my understanding of important conceptual themes.	19	4.16	0.99
My instructor enhances my capacity to communicate effectively about the course subject matter.	19	4	0.92
My instructor encourages me to value new viewpoints related to the course.	19	4.11	1.02
Average of Student Perceptions of Learning Items	19	4.09	0.8

What were the most effective aspects of this instructor's teaching?

- He was very engaging in class and showed excitement.
- Class discussions
- Reenforcing prior ideas
- He had us in groups when discussing sections of a book or to tackle questions asked in class. This time was productively used, as it helped understand others understanding of the text. This was done by students, then the other groups would bring up other points not involved in the group.
- Drawings and real life examples
- When he promoted class discussion. We were able to understand easily what the subject matter was from multiple viewpoints.
- his enthusiasm and breaking things down to relate to

- Text times. taking notes.
- The most effective aspects were all the notes everyday.
- the way he has everything planned and always go over the reading that we had for that day to get a better understanding
- Writing on the board, and having visual representation really made it easier to understand the topics.
- He's very into the lessons and he tries his best to break it down for students.
- Because he is also a philosophy teacher he attacked everything with a levelheaded approach and if we came up with one answer he posed a question we had not thought about.
- Gives very strong and helpful feedback on all writing assignments.
- The best part of the course was how relatable it was to current life. Professor Hatcher explained things in ways that were easily understandable and if we were not understanding something, we could easily go into more depth and ask questions about it.

In what ways could this instructor improve his or her teaching?

- Spend more time going over the texts in class.
- Making homework less of the grade. I feel the papers should take more weight. Not having RRAs due at the same time as papers due. Explaining the major themes of Justice more in depth in class and in layman's terms better.
- Try to not only run the classroom like a philosophy class
- To explain in layman's terms and stay on task is the first thing that comes to mind. Although enthusiastic, Hatcher felt as if he was stumbling off into other topics others did not know about or understand. This was difficult for me because even when I asked for clarification, I would still not understand. Going to office hours, he would explain what he meant. This would increase my understanding, but I feel as if his goals and objectives should be able for everyone to understand during the class, not after.
- N/A
- Try to explain the scenarios that he is trying to use as a hypothetical scenario. I found a lot of people would take it very seriously.
- none
- Taking time on more difficult topics
- N/A
- to make the class more of partners and not just the instructor talking all the time
- I don't think there was anything that my instructor could do to improve his teaching, he is a very dedicated and enthusiastic professor.
- Sometimes material is not really clear and all content is taught by him just talking. This class needs

more interactive teaching like worksheets or charts.

- Professor Hatcher was my favorite teacher of my first year here on campus and I think he should just continue to be himself.
- Have prompt for writing assignments be more clear.
- I still think it would be a good idea to do peer reviews over the first draft of essays, then instructor meetings for the second draft.

Please feel free to share any further comments you have for this instructor.

- During the course, I felt like I was in a philosophy class and not a core class. I felt like this was an unfair advantage to the kids who are interested in things like philosophy. Understanding and thinking like a philosopher are very difficult, and not apart of most of the students gen Ed requirements. He tied it into Justice, but I felt the professor didn't use layman terms enough when explaining things, which is why I struggle to accurately reiterate these concepts. Until I went to office hours I didn't understand most of the philosophy ideas revolving around Justice, and I feel that the point of class is to understand the subject matter then, and not have to hear the lecture twice everytime to understand it. In addition to this I feel the homework was very time consuming, and was often due on the same day as papers. If the homework takes as long as writting the paper, it's unfair to double of the work load on students like this and expect their best work. Evening out the work load would have been most beneficial, so I could pour all my energy into writing my best paper.
- Nearly the entirety of the second half of the semester, it felt not like a CORE class. There were transitions to more ideas into philosophy. This is not necessarily a bad quality, but it conflicted compared to what I have heard in other classes that I felt I would have done better in. It was very rough to understand the last few weeks because it was so much more connected to philosophy that it was very difficult to understand and complete homework and class tasks. He is still a good person, and has been very understanding of other students and their situations.
- NA
- N/A
- very compassionate teacher who really wants the students to understand the material the best they can
- He is just a great professor who listens to students ideas
- Maybe change how RRAs are graded. Not just 10 8 or 0.
- Thank you for a great semester, the class was super enjoyable and I genuinely feel like I learned a lot from the class that I will take away to be a better person and live a better life.

2019SP PHIL-145-B Survey - Valparaiso University

Course:	PHIL-145-B Elem Logic /Critical Thinking
Department:	PHIL
Faculty:	Hatcher, Michael
Response/Expected:	24/29 (82.8%)

Student Assessment of Instruction (SAI) Report Guidelines

The primary purpose of student evaluations of teaching is to improve teaching effectiveness. For this purpose, data from this report should be interpreted within the following guidelines.

1. **Faculty and administrators should use the overall score and the subscale scores, not individual items, for evaluation purposes.** Faculty might reflect on their students' responses to individual questions, but administrators should be cautious in using data from individual questions for evaluative purposes.
2. **SAI data should be used to assess multi-year trends in a faculty member's teaching in a specific class, NOT to compare the single semester scores of faculty to each other.** Evaluating multi-year trends provides an appropriate context for evaluating a faculty member's teaching for a given course. Multi-year trends help to identify faculty members who are improving their teaching effectiveness.
3. **A single semester's SAI scores should not be used to compare individual faculty members to each other.** SAI scores may be influenced by factors such as students' implicit biases, interest level in the course subject, course level, and satisfaction with the time and day of the course. Given that individual faculty teach different courses that vary in all of these factors, direct cross faculty comparisons are not appropriate with the SAI.
4. **Evaluation results should be viewed in the context of sample size and response rate.** Ideally, response rates should be as high as possible and faculty should be mindful that they can improve response rates by stressing the importance of the evaluations as a means to improve teaching effectiveness, by clearly communicating that student responses will be taken seriously, and by providing frequent reminders to complete the evaluations.
5. **The SAI should only be considered one component of a multi-component evaluation process.** While students are able to provide a valuable measure of teaching effectiveness, their opinions alone do not provide sufficient evidence to make decisions about a faculty member's overall teaching effectiveness, especially when such opinions inform decisions about annual reviews, merit raises, tenure, and promotion. Additional evaluation components are described in the Faculty Handbook.
6. **Answers to the free response questions may not be representative of the class as a whole and care must be taken when using free response comments in an evaluative manner.** Student comments consistent with the survey results may be used for evaluative purposes. Inconsistent comments have value from a formative standpoint, but their use in an evaluative manner are not

appropriate as they may incorrectly represent the results of the validated survey.

7. **Faculty should not allow fear of lower SAI scores to dictate rigor or pedagogy in their courses.** Department chairs, faculty peers, and administrators should encourage faculty (especially tenure-track faculty) to create courses that help students learn, even if that learning process requires making students feel uncomfortable in some way (e.g., encouraging students to consider viewpoints they do not support) or requires significant work and rigor. Faculty should be mindful of SAI feedback and open to making changes to their courses, but they should not allow student feedback to have a negative influence on the learning process in their courses.
8. **Self-reflection items are for information only, and not a part of the validated SAI scale.** The report will include a factor mean, an average across all five self-reflection items, as well as the mean for each individual item. These items are not included in the Overall SAI Score reported in the executive summary.

Executive Summary

Scale	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Overall SAI Score	24	3.73	0.84
Organization and Clarity	24	3.61	1.11
Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation	24	3.83	0.8
Rapport and Respect	24	4	0.92
Feedback and Accessibility	24	3.68	0.97
Student Perceptions of Learning	24	3.54	1.11

Responses: strongly disagree=1 disagree=2 neutral=3 agree=4 strongly agree=5

Student Self-Reflection Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
I regularly attended course meetings.	24	4.79	0.41
I was regularly prepared for course meetings.	24	4.33	0.94
I was actively engaged during course meetings.	24	3.92	1.19
I upheld the Honor Code in all work for this course.	24	4.92	0.28
I was able to achieve the stated learning objectives for this course.	24	3.54	1.32
Average of Student Self Reflection Items	24	4.3	0.61

Organization and Clarity Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor is well prepared for class meetings.	24	4.21	0.91
My instructor explains the subject matter clearly.	24	3.21	1.41
My instructor clearly communicates course goals and objectives.	24	3.58	1.29
My instructor answers questions appropriately.	24	3.46	1.15
Average of Organization and Clarity Items	24	3.61	1.11

Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor is enthusiastic about teaching this course.	24	4.58	0.49
My instructor presents the subject in an interesting manner.	24	3.58	1.15
My instructor stimulates my thinking.	23	3.78	1.1
My instructor motivates me to do my best work.	24	3.38	1.15
Average of Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation Items	24	3.83	0.8

Rapport and Respect Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor helps students sufficiently with course-related issues.	24	3.75	1.23
My instructor is regularly available for consultation.	24	4.38	0.63
My instructor is impartial in dealing with students.	24	3.96	1.21
My instructor respects opinions different from his or her own.	24	3.92	1.22
Average of Rapport and Respect Items	24	4	0.92

Feedback and Accessibility Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Assessment methods accurately assess what I have learned in this course.	24	3.67	1.03
Grades are assigned fairly.	24	3.29	1.34
The basis for assigning grades is clearly explained.	24	3.79	1.15
The instructor provides feedback on my progress in the course on a regular basis.	24	3.96	1.02
Average of Feedback and Accessibility Items	24	3.68	0.97

Student Perceptions of Learning Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor advances my knowledge of course content.	24	3.54	1.26
My instructor promotes my understanding of important conceptual themes.	24	3.46	1.29
My instructor enhances my capacity to communicate effectively about the course subject matter.	24	3.46	1.26
My instructor encourages me to value new viewpoints related to the course.	24	3.71	1.02
Average of Student Perceptions of Learning Items	24	3.54	1.11

What were the most effective aspects of this instructor's teaching?

- He wasn't effective he made it harder to understand.
- Professor Hatcher has a way of explaining things in philosophy starting at a base knowledge level and progressively adding to it throughout the semester getting us to the knowledge point we have to be at.
- Group work was helpful
- Having worksheets
- Very excited to teach and wanted people to always participate.
- The most effective aspect of his teaching style was the interactive work. Have packets to follow along with and making this more of an interactive class than a lecture was really helpful.
- He was very easy to understand his expectations

- engagement
- the group work
- Good presentation of the material in lectures
- He usually showed up to class. He tried to teach. There were TA's, they were very helpful.
- N/A
- Lots of handouts and examples in class are helpful.
- Having homework due most days to ensure we are keeping up with the topics
- He never makes you feel stupid when you make a mistake or cannot answer
- The notes sheets that went with each lesson were helpful and the exams were exactly like the homework and lessons
- Often available to help. Prompt when responding to emails.

In what ways could this instructor improve his or her teaching?

- He could explain things better.
- I feel I was satisfied with the overall performance of Professor Hatcher. When it comes to TAs and the grading to furthermore explain why I thought the grading scale wasn't fair. The TAs would grade the same questions with same answers differently. There should be further communication of a baseline grade.
- Work on being less partial towards certain individuals in the course.
- Teach from the book
- Teach major themes a bit slower and repeat more examples. Once a single topic doesn't make sense, you get lost and fall behind for the rest of the semester.
- I think if the professor spent more time going through the complicated topics rather than just rushing through everything at the same speed, this would be really helpful.
- None
- more understandable
- be more clear
- By giving more understanding for issues that may arise due to outside factors.
- Wow, this is a hard question, there is a lot. No one understands the class...there is probably something wrong. He needs to answer questions more directly instead of contradicting himself. It would also be helpful if he slowed down while teaching and initially explained things more.
- more examples for each new unit. Have the examples be as hard as the homework questions.
- Slow down and explain things in more detail.

- He was fine
- When students are having a hard time, slow down. Help us through the homework
- He could be more direct and to the point. Also, his homework could better reflect what was taught in class. In addition, his explanations for the final project could be clearer and consistent instead of changing each time discussed with him.
- I was never given a straight answer in this class. I asked for help on multiple occasions inside and outside of class time and I was never told anything that did not contradict itself. I felt like my opinions were wrong because they did not match the ideas of my professor's even though the basis of parts of this class were based on opinion. Grading was not explained to me in a manner I fully understood. I was marked off on things that did not impede on what I was trying to say, but because it was not verbatim to what my professor had written, I was marked off despite understanding the concepts.

Please feel free to share any further comments you have for this instructor.

- He's not nice and he discouraged students. He made me feel terrible, and he doesn't respect others opinions. He doesn't even try to drop the lowest grade to help students like most teachers do. This class has made my semester very stressful.
- After trying to take this course with Woodward I would say that Hatcher is a more engaging professor to be taught by. He is able to take the knowledge someone already has and enhance it to a greater level maintaining their competence and understanding of topics. I would 100% retake this class with Hatcher again, and recommend him to many students over Woodward.
- The TAs don't always grade the homework in a consistent manner
- Check assignments after the TAs grade them because I faced many issues where there were many mistakes when I took the assignment back
- Just talk slower and more calmly
- I felt that the exams are too long. I knew very well what I was doing, however every exam I didn't have enough time to finish any of them. Having a final exam and a final paper leaves too much of our grade weighted on the end of the semester. Consider having one or the other. Keep in mind that not all students in this class are here because they want to be. This class is a requirement for a lot of majors. So, tailoring this class to other aspects would keep it more interesting. For example, use examples of how we can use this stuff in our marketing, accounting etc jobs.
- all good
- XX
- N/A
- I think this course is too intense for a required 3 credit course.
- I felt like it was not beneficial to me at all. As a business major in christ college I understand logic and formulating arguments so I felt like I was continually wasting my time everyday showing up to class

- I don't know how to put this, but there is a potent smell that arises during class and it appears to be the professor. It has made an even more negative impact on my experience in the class and I did not know how to address it, as I have never had this issue. It also affected the classes following this one as students and the professor noticed the lingering smell.

2019SP PHIL-145-C Survey - Valparaiso University

Course:	PHIL-145-C Elem Logic /Critical Thinking
Department:	PHIL
Faculty:	Hatcher, Michael
Response/Expected:	26/30 (86.7%)

Student Assessment of Instruction (SAI) Report Guidelines

The primary purpose of student evaluations of teaching is to improve teaching effectiveness. For this purpose, data from this report should be interpreted within the following guidelines.

1. **Faculty and administrators should use the overall score and the subscale scores, not individual items, for evaluation purposes.** Faculty might reflect on their students' responses to individual questions, but administrators should be cautious in using data from individual questions for evaluative purposes.
2. **SAI data should be used to assess multi-year trends in a faculty member's teaching in a specific class, NOT to compare the single semester scores of faculty to each other.** Evaluating multi-year trends provides an appropriate context for evaluating a faculty member's teaching for a given course. Multi-year trends help to identify faculty members who are improving their teaching effectiveness.
3. **A single semester's SAI scores should not be used to compare individual faculty members to each other.** SAI scores may be influenced by factors such as students' implicit biases, interest level in the course subject, course level, and satisfaction with the time and day of the course. Given that individual faculty teach different courses that vary in all of these factors, direct cross faculty comparisons are not appropriate with the SAI.
4. **Evaluation results should be viewed in the context of sample size and response rate.** Ideally, response rates should be as high as possible and faculty should be mindful that they can improve response rates by stressing the importance of the evaluations as a means to improve teaching effectiveness, by clearly communicating that student responses will be taken seriously, and by providing frequent reminders to complete the evaluations.
5. **The SAI should only be considered one component of a multi-component evaluation process.** While students are able to provide a valuable measure of teaching effectiveness, their opinions alone do not provide sufficient evidence to make decisions about a faculty member's overall teaching effectiveness, especially when such opinions inform decisions about annual reviews, merit raises, tenure, and promotion. Additional evaluation components are described in the Faculty Handbook.
6. **Answers to the free response questions may not be representative of the class as a whole and care must be taken when using free response comments in an evaluative manner.** Student comments consistent with the survey results may be used for evaluative purposes. Inconsistent comments have value from a formative standpoint, but their use in an evaluative manner are not

appropriate as they may incorrectly represent the results of the validated survey.

7. **Faculty should not allow fear of lower SAI scores to dictate rigor or pedagogy in their courses.** Department chairs, faculty peers, and administrators should encourage faculty (especially tenure-track faculty) to create courses that help students learn, even if that learning process requires making students feel uncomfortable in some way (e.g., encouraging students to consider viewpoints they do not support) or requires significant work and rigor. Faculty should be mindful of SAI feedback and open to making changes to their courses, but they should not allow student feedback to have a negative influence on the learning process in their courses.
8. **Self-reflection items are for information only, and not a part of the validated SAI scale.** The report will include a factor mean, an average across all five self-reflection items, as well as the mean for each individual item. These items are not included in the Overall SAI Score reported in the executive summary.

Executive Summary

Scale	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Overall SAI Score	26	4.23	0.76
Organization and Clarity	26	4.11	0.87
Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation	26	4.22	0.86
Rapport and Respect	26	4.41	0.7
Feedback and Accessibility	26	4.18	0.73
Student Perceptions of Learning	26	4.24	0.92

Responses: strongly disagree=1 disagree=2 neutral=3 agree=4 strongly agree=5

Student Self-Reflection Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
I regularly attended course meetings.	26	4.77	0.5
I was regularly prepared for course meetings.	26	4.5	0.64
I was actively engaged during course meetings.	26	4.42	0.69
I upheld the Honor Code in all work for this course.	26	4.85	0.36
I was able to achieve the stated learning objectives for this course.	26	4.35	0.87
Average of Student Self Reflection Items	26	4.58	0.44

Organization and Clarity Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor is well prepared for class meetings.	26	4.5	0.57
My instructor explains the subject matter clearly.	25	3.64	1.23
My instructor clearly communicates course goals and objectives.	26	4.31	0.99
My instructor answers questions appropriately.	26	3.92	1.11
Average of Organization and Clarity Items	26	4.11	0.87

Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor is enthusiastic about teaching this course.	26	4.69	0.46
My instructor presents the subject in an interesting manner.	26	4.12	1.05
My instructor stimulates my thinking.	26	4.08	1.11
My instructor motivates me to do my best work.	25	3.96	1.15
Average of Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation Items	26	4.22	0.86

Rapport and Respect Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor helps students sufficiently with course-related issues.	26	4.31	0.91
My instructor is regularly available for consultation.	26	4.58	0.57
My instructor is impartial in dealing with students.	25	4.4	0.8
My instructor respects opinions different from his or her own.	26	4.35	1
Average of Rapport and Respect Items	26	4.41	0.7

Feedback and Accessibility Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Assessment methods accurately assess what I have learned in this course.	25	4	1.13
Grades are assigned fairly.	26	4.23	0.89
The basis for assigning grades is clearly explained.	26	4.27	0.76
The instructor provides feedback on my progress in the course on a regular basis.	26	4.19	0.83
Average of Feedback and Accessibility Items	26	4.18	0.73

Student Perceptions of Learning Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor advances my knowledge of course content.	26	4.19	1.07
My instructor promotes my understanding of important conceptual themes.	26	4.23	1.01
My instructor enhances my capacity to communicate effectively about the course subject matter.	26	4.35	0.96
My instructor encourages me to value new viewpoints related to the course.	26	4.19	0.92
Average of Student Perceptions of Learning Items	26	4.24	0.92

What were the most effective aspects of this instructor's teaching?

- He repeats and brings different concepts throughout the semester back up for review which helps me better retain past material.
- use of examples
- Encourage of thinking
- Michael Hatcher is a fantastic professor. I really enjoyed learning from him throughout the Spring semester. He has great, clear explanations of material, and gives time to ask questions.
- He was always sure to help me when I needed it. I met with him outside of office hours and he went out of his way to ensure my questions were answered. It was appreciated.
- He was engaging
- Professor Hatcher bring a youthful, unpretentious attitude to the classroom.

- The way he assigns homework and his teaching style. He explains things clearly and answers any questions people may have.
- I appreciate that prof Hatcher returns our graded homework very fast. It's nice to know how I did and what I got wrong so that I can correct it. I also appreciate that we had homework almost every day. This helped me learn the concepts quicker.
- Very enthusiastic
- He always had us work on problems and made the class more inclusive.
- He was very interested in the topic
- Argument by analogy
- sample problems in class
- Let us practice for the questions.
- he is very knowledgeable on the subject matter and is a pretty nice guy
- There wasn't any. it was very confusing
- The practice problems that are done in class
- He makes the subject matter appear much more interesting and successfully inspires interest in the material from students.
- I liked the discussion style we used during class
- Professor Hatcher put together useful reference materials (packets, notes, etc) and clearly stated what would be on all the exams.

In what ways could this instructor improve his or her teaching?

- The material in this class is abstract and sometimes hard to explain, but if he explained some things differently or showed us more examples and walked through why he took certain steps this would increase understanding greatly
- Spread the content out more, very dense
- speed a little slow
- He could be a bit easier on the grades.
- Be more understanding that this is a very difficult class for many students. At time the coursework itself is so out of the scope of learning that it needs to be put in the most simple English terms as possible. Also, slowing down in class would be very helpful. There is so much course work in each class it is unreasonable for students to keep up and absorb this content. The course is all too packed with material to be able to take a step back and learn. It is essential to meet outside of class and the amount of work in comparison to the number of credit hours is not reflected.
- Hopefully this review inspires for confidence because that is all he needs.

- Maybe give a little more time for the construction of the essay, the end of the semester is a crunch time for all professors and having a large assignment piece due within about a week or so is a lot.
- The exams were relatively fair, but we never had enough time to complete them. When the time was up the entire class would still be in the room taking the test. I felt rushed so I feel I did not do as well on the exams as I should have. Hatcher could improve by either extending the allowed time on the exams, or making them shorter.
- More variety with the classwork we do, not just working on worksheets with our group
- He would rush through content and made me feel rushed when asking questions. I wish he was able to move the schedule around to push things back instead of staying on the schedule and confusing everyone more.
- Sometimes it felt as he confused himself when talking about the topic and when your professor is unsure it makes you feel unsure. Also he needs to work on how he comes across with information because he needs to dumb things down because I believe he is talking well over our heads.
- Got to explain material better
- understand what is confusing with students, and go over that material
- He suffers when explaining concepts. The best way to do well is to not think about something and just accept it for what it is and not think too much about it. Anytime when asked a question Professor Hatcher just rewords what he initially said that resulted in you asking the question and this will happen over and over till you get frustrated and say okay i get and walk away, with no understanding and just saying i dont understand why but that's the way it is.
- there isn't any.
- None
- N/A
- Mixing up groups during group discussions just so we can get new viewpoints.
- The class was sometimes a little slow in my opinion, and I wasn't a huge fan of some of the group activities.

Please feel free to share any further comments you have for this instructor.

- Felt like I have had to miss a class I was way behind in the content
- Good class
- Thanks, professor Hatcher!
- I do appreciate the outside help from the course and that is what ensures success in this class. Continuing to be readily available is so nice for students and very appreciated.
- Great young professor who is trying his best!
- I enjoyed your class, Professor Hatcher!

- With all do respect Prof Hatcher has a smell of BO. I mean this is in the nicest way. Hatcher is a wonderful Prof but needs to take care of his body odor because it is off putting in a professional situation. Over all I feel that I learned a lot from this professor.
- I struggled a lot with this class but it's not really Hatchers fault. Pretty much everyone I know who's taking this course strongly dislikes it, but that's more due to the subject matter than anything.
- Hatcher was a nice professor who made himself available to students. At times, he was quirky about homework and didn't understand that students make mistakes. For this class- I believe that this course is a waste of time for business majors. I can confidently say that I will not be using any of the information learned in this class in any aspect of my life and career. I can't believe that the College of Business requires this class of business students. Due to its specificity and outlandish topics, there is no way that the information learned in this class is applicable to real life and the way that I will develop arguments and ideas. Please reevaluate requiring this class. It is a waste of time and drops everyone's GPAs.
- On a personal level I like Professor Hatcher but he is a brick wall and is not open to any ideological thought at all, things are the way they are.
- nothing towards the instructor. but the university should look into making the class pass/fail because this class ruined numerous students GPA
- None
- N/A
- You did an amazing job teaching this subject. Learning these methods of analysis has helped me in my other classes. You truly are dedicated to making sure we learn and made this class a joy to be in.

2018FA PHIL-330-AX Survey - Valparaiso University

Course:	PHIL-330-AX Philosophy of Religion
Department:	PHIL
Faculty:	Hatcher, Michael
Response/Expected:	8/9 (88.9%)

Student Assessment of Instruction (SAI) Report Guidelines

The primary purpose of student evaluations of teaching is to improve teaching effectiveness. For this purpose, data from this report should be interpreted within the following guidelines.

- 1. Faculty and administrators should use the overall score and the subscale scores, not individual items, for evaluation purposes.** Faculty might reflect on their students' responses to individual questions, but administrators should be cautious in using data from individual questions for evaluative purposes.
- 2. SAI data should be used to assess multi-year trends in a faculty member's teaching in a specific class, NOT to compare the single semester scores of faculty to each other.** Evaluating multi-year trends provides an appropriate context for evaluating a faculty member's teaching for a given course. Multi-year trends help to identify faculty members who are improving their teaching effectiveness.
- 3. A single semester's SAI scores should not be used to compare individual faculty members to each other.** SAI scores may be influenced by factors such as students' implicit biases, interest level in the course subject, course level, and satisfaction with the time and day of the course. Given that individual faculty teach different courses that vary in all of these factors, direct cross faculty comparisons are not appropriate with the SAI.
- 4. Evaluation results should be viewed in the context of sample size and response rate.** Ideally, response rates should be as high as possible and faculty should be mindful that they can improve response rates by stressing the importance of the evaluations as a means to improve teaching effectiveness, by clearly communicating that student responses will be taken seriously, and by providing frequent reminders to complete the evaluations.
- 5. The SAI should only be considered one component of a multi-component evaluation process.** While students are able to provide a valuable measure of teaching effectiveness, their opinions alone do not provide sufficient evidence to make decisions about a faculty member's overall teaching effectiveness, especially when such opinions inform decisions about annual reviews, merit raises, tenure, and promotion. Additional evaluation components are described in the Faculty Handbook.
- 6. Answers to the free response questions may not be representative of the class as a whole and care must be taken when using free response comments in an evaluative manner.** Student comments consistent with the survey results may be used for evaluative purposes. Inconsistent comments have value from a formative standpoint, but their use in an evaluative manner are not appropriate as they may incorrectly represent the results of the validated survey.
- 7. Faculty should not allow fear of lower SAI scores to dictate rigor or pedagogy in their courses.** Department chairs, faculty peers, and administrators should encourage faculty (especially

tenure-track faculty) to create courses that help students learn, even if that learning process requires making students feel uncomfortable in some way (e.g., encouraging students to consider viewpoints they do not support) or requires significant work and rigor. Faculty should be mindful of SAI feedback and open to making changes to their courses, but they should not allow student feedback to have a negative influence on the learning process in their courses.

8. **Self-reflection items are for information only, and not a part of the validated SAI scale.** The report will include a factor mean, an average across all five self-reflection items, as well as the mean for each individual item. These items are not included in the Overall SAI Score reported in the executive summary.

Executive Summary

Scale	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Overall SAI Score	8	4.57	0.49
Organization and Clarity	8	4.58	0.51
Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation	8	4.63	0.54
Rapport and Respect	8	4.56	0.62
Feedback and Accessibility	8	4.38	0.38
Student Perceptions of Learning	8	4.69	0.48

Responses: strongly disagree=1 disagree=2 neutral=3 agree=4 strongly agree=5

Student Self-Reflection Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
I regularly attended course meetings.	8	4.75	0.43
I was regularly prepared for course meetings.	8	4.63	0.48
I was actively engaged during course meetings.	8	4.63	0.48
I upheld the Honor Code in all work for this course.	8	4.88	0.33
I was able to achieve the stated learning objectives for this course.	8	4.5	0.5
Average of Student Self Reflection Items	8	4.68	0.36

Organization and Clarity Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor is well prepared for class meetings.	8	4.63	0.48
My instructor explains the subject matter clearly.	8	4.5	0.71
My instructor clearly communicates course goals and objectives.	8	4.5	0.71
My instructor answers questions appropriately.	7	4.71	0.45
<i>Average of Organization and Clarity Items</i>	8	4.58	0.51

Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor is enthusiastic about teaching this course.	8	4.75	0.43
My instructor presents the subject in an interesting manner.	8	4.63	0.7
My instructor stimulates my thinking.	8	4.63	0.48
My instructor motivates me to do my best work.	8	4.5	0.71
<i>Average of Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation Items</i>	8	4.63	0.54

Rapport and Respect Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor helps students sufficiently with course-related issues.	8	4.5	0.71
My instructor is regularly available for consultation.	8	4.63	0.7
My instructor is impartial in dealing with students.	8	4.38	0.86
My instructor respects opinions different from his or her own.	8	4.75	0.43
<i>Average of Rapport and Respect Items</i>	8	4.56	0.62

Feedback and Accessibility Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Assessment methods accurately assess what I have learned in this course.	8	4.25	0.66
Grades are assigned fairly.	8	4.63	0.48
The basis for assigning grades is clearly explained.	8	4.25	0.66
The instructor provides feedback on my progress in the course on a regular basis.	8	4.38	0.48
<i>Average of Feedback and Accessibility Items</i>	8	4.38	0.38

Student Perceptions of Learning Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor advances my knowledge of course content.	8	4.63	0.48
My instructor promotes my understanding of important conceptual themes.	8	4.75	0.43
My instructor enhances my capacity to communicate effectively about the course subject matter.	8	4.63	0.7
My instructor encourages me to value new viewpoints related to the course.	8	4.75	0.43
<i>Average of Student Perceptions of Learning Items</i>	8	4.69	0.48

What were the most effective aspects of this instructor's teaching?

- I think the most effective part was a combination of the lecture, the group discussions, and the RRA's. Each of these challenged me to actually think about the topic we were discussing.
- The instructor is very knowledgeable about the subject and is able to answer questions appropriately and constructively. Nearly every comment/question resulted in a productive discussion.
- Professor Hatcher does an excellent job reconstructing arguments in ways that show students their logic and motivations.
- it is crucial for the class to participate in order to keep the flow of the discussion. It is great that he managed to find a way in which the students don't just listen to arguments and copy them, but they actually are encouraged to find their own objections and opinions.
- He was very enthusiastic and loved the stuff that he was teaching us.
- Professor Hatcher has made this class worthwhile for me and as a religious student at this institution, this course alone has challenged my thinking and advanced my faith in large part due to Professor Hatcher and his personality and character. Professor Hatcher is very clearly educated on the course materials and does a fantastic job of conveying the major points to those listening. His

humor makes the class enjoyable and his classroom is a comfortable environment that he has done a great job of facilitating. I am thankful for the helpful feedback that Professor Hatcher has given me on my papers, they have made me a better writer, and I am better off as a student and person for taking this class, in large part due to Hatcher.

In what ways could this instructor improve his or her teaching?

- I can't really think of anything. I loved this class so much.
- I felt that sometimes the pace was somewhat quick and I would feel lost.
- He could do more in-class assignments to help us further understand the material rather than just lecturing.
- Not sure how. Professor Hatcher knows the material well and makes it very clear and understandable for someone with no previous knowledge of a lot of these concepts.

Please feel free to share any further comments you have for this instructor.

- This class was absolutely amazing and is probably one of my favorite courses I have taken in my 3.5 years of college. I signed up for this course for fun because I wanted to be challenged to think about God and that is exactly what I got and this class and the readings really helped my faith develop and helped me understanding it so much more. I wish more courses like this were taught here!
- I sincerely enjoyed this course!!
- Thanks for everything, looking forward to taking CORE with you next semester! :-)

2018FA THEO-335-AX Survey - Valparaiso University

Course:	THEO-335-AX Philosophy of Religion
Department:	THEO
Faculty:	Hatcher, Michael
Response/Expected:	12/13 (92.3%)

Student Assessment of Instruction (SAI) Report Guidelines

The primary purpose of student evaluations of teaching is to improve teaching effectiveness. For this purpose, data from this report should be interpreted within the following guidelines.

- 1. Faculty and administrators should use the overall score and the subscale scores, not individual items, for evaluation purposes.** Faculty might reflect on their students' responses to individual questions, but administrators should be cautious in using data from individual questions for evaluative purposes.
- 2. SAI data should be used to assess multi-year trends in a faculty member's teaching in a specific class, NOT to compare the single semester scores of faculty to each other.** Evaluating multi-year trends provides an appropriate context for evaluating a faculty member's teaching for a given course. Multi-year trends help to identify faculty members who are improving their teaching effectiveness.
- 3. A single semester's SAI scores should not be used to compare individual faculty members to each other.** SAI scores may be influenced by factors such as students' implicit biases, interest level in the course subject, course level, and satisfaction with the time and day of the course. Given that individual faculty teach different courses that vary in all of these factors, direct cross faculty comparisons are not appropriate with the SAI.
- 4. Evaluation results should be viewed in the context of sample size and response rate.** Ideally, response rates should be as high as possible and faculty should be mindful that they can improve response rates by stressing the importance of the evaluations as a means to improve teaching effectiveness, by clearly communicating that student responses will be taken seriously, and by providing frequent reminders to complete the evaluations.
- 5. The SAI should only be considered one component of a multi-component evaluation process.** While students are able to provide a valuable measure of teaching effectiveness, their opinions alone do not provide sufficient evidence to make decisions about a faculty member's overall teaching effectiveness, especially when such opinions inform decisions about annual reviews, merit raises, tenure, and promotion. Additional evaluation components are described in the Faculty Handbook.
- 6. Answers to the free response questions may not be representative of the class as a whole and care must be taken when using free response comments in an evaluative manner.** Student comments consistent with the survey results may be used for evaluative purposes. Inconsistent comments have value from a formative standpoint, but their use in an evaluative manner are not appropriate as they may incorrectly represent the results of the validated survey.
- 7. Faculty should not allow fear of lower SAI scores to dictate rigor or pedagogy in their courses.** Department chairs, faculty peers, and administrators should encourage faculty (especially

tenure-track faculty) to create courses that help students learn, even if that learning process requires making students feel uncomfortable in some way (e.g., encouraging students to consider viewpoints they do not support) or requires significant work and rigor. Faculty should be mindful of SAI feedback and open to making changes to their courses, but they should not allow student feedback to have a negative influence on the learning process in their courses.

8. **Self-reflection items are for information only, and not a part of the validated SAI scale.** The report will include a factor mean, an average across all five self-reflection items, as well as the mean for each individual item. These items are not included in the Overall SAI Score reported in the executive summary.

Executive Summary

Scale	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Overall SAI Score	12	4.13	0.57
Organization and Clarity	12	4.33	0.71
Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation	12	4.38	0.39
Rapport and Respect	12	4.27	0.71
Feedback and Accessibility	12	3.67	0.91
Student Perceptions of Learning	12	4.02	0.7

Responses: strongly disagree=1 disagree=2 neutral=3 agree=4 strongly agree=5

Student Self-Reflection Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
I regularly attended course meetings.	12	4.75	0.43
I was regularly prepared for course meetings.	12	4.08	0.76
I was actively engaged during course meetings.	12	4.17	0.69
I upheld the Honor Code in all work for this course.	12	4.92	0.28
I was able to achieve the stated learning objectives for this course.	12	4.08	0.86
Average of Student Self Reflection Items	12	4.4	0.29

Organization and Clarity Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor is well prepared for class meetings.	12	4.67	0.47
My instructor explains the subject matter clearly.	12	4.33	0.85
My instructor clearly communicates course goals and objectives.	12	4.17	0.8
My instructor answers questions appropriately.	12	4.17	1.14
<i>Average of Organization and Clarity Items</i>	12	4.33	0.71

Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor is enthusiastic about teaching this course.	12	4.92	0.28
My instructor presents the subject in an interesting manner.	12	4.08	0.76
My instructor stimulates my thinking.	12	4.25	0.43
My instructor motivates me to do my best work.	12	4.25	0.6
<i>Average of Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation Items</i>	12	4.38	0.39

Rapport and Respect Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor helps students sufficiently with course-related issues.	12	4.25	0.83
My instructor is regularly available for consultation.	12	4.67	0.47
My instructor is impartial in dealing with students.	12	3.83	1.28
My instructor respects opinions different from his or her own.	12	4.33	1.11
<i>Average of Rapport and Respect Items</i>	12	4.27	0.71

Feedback and Accessibility Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Assessment methods accurately assess what I have learned in this course.	12	3.58	0.95
Grades are assigned fairly.	12	3.42	1.26
The basis for assigning grades is clearly explained.	12	3.83	0.9
The instructor provides feedback on my progress in the course on a regular basis.	12	3.83	1.14
<i>Average of Feedback and Accessibility Items</i>	12	3.67	0.91

Student Perceptions of Learning Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor advances my knowledge of course content.	12	3.75	0.83
My instructor promotes my understanding of important conceptual themes.	12	3.83	0.9
My instructor enhances my capacity to communicate effectively about the course subject matter.	12	4.08	0.76
My instructor encourages me to value new viewpoints related to the course.	12	4.42	0.64
<i>Average of Student Perceptions of Learning Items</i>	12	4.02	0.7

What were the most effective aspects of this instructor's teaching?

- Concepts were clearly defined. Readings were relevant and inspired deep thinking. Engaged in conversation with students. Respected student opinions.
- Professor Hatcher does a good job of providing real life examples and relatable scenarios so that we can better understand the material. He also is willing to listen to as many questions as possible and it often dictates the way the lecture progresses.
- I thought that the readings and the reading responses were set up in a way to help understand the material. I enjoyed the topics in the class.
- Open discussion that makes us think deeply
- Study guides for midterm and final were very helpful for preparing for exams.
- Organization and background knowledge. Efforts to make things easier to understand by analogies or examples.
- The professor displays a genuine care for students who show their appreciation of philosophy and the professor tries to harness that passion and help it grow.

- I think he was very passionate about this and knowledgeable of a lot of authors and people in this field. He encourages class participation and for people to share their opinion.
- I thought it was nice that professor Hatcher was available often when needing help with the material. the material can be confusing sometimes so it's just relieving to know that he is available to help.
- Mr. Hatcher was very knowledgeable on the information of this course. However not sure if it was the content I didn't understand or if it was that I lacked the background in philosophy
- Giving us the option to exceed the number of required assignments and to drop lower scores if we completed more than the requirement
- He was always there to meet with students whenever they had course issues

In what ways could this instructor improve his or her teaching?

- N/a
- I really think these classes would benefit from more student participation. We usually had one or two participation requirements a day but it would help keep everyone engaged.
- Though I enjoyed writing the first two argumentative papers, I thought that the reflective paper could have been explained slightly more. It was a bit confusing to understand what was supposed to be included in the second two paragraphs.
- Sometimes felt like it was too much writing where I was so focused on writing and wasn't listening as much. He could instead maybe pass out some notes or have us fill them out with word blanks.
- Less writing on the board. Perhaps provide a powerpoint so more material can be covered in one class period.
- I think this course could certainly use more structure. As I look back, I do not think there was any we kind of just went reading to reading
- I think he presents material in class very well it's easier to get the points from the readings.
- The midterm and final being an all essay, i think is very hard to be fair in grading a long with papers. This is a very opinion based class and I feel like if I'm not saying what he wants then it is wrong.
- teaching the reading before we read it. I think reading after having the lecture on it, in this case, would have been more beneficial for the class. The philosophy portion I think made it harder to understand and the reading would have been easier to understand if it was explained before. I think the professor thought all of us had a background or were knowledgeable in philosophy and we all aren't.
- In life there is always room for improvement

Please feel free to share any further comments you have for this instructor.

- Micheal Hatcher is a wonderful Professor. I looked forward to his lectures.
- Overall I enjoyed this class and I am glad that I chose to take it.

- Overall good class
- I enjoyed being in this class. I thought the material was super interesting, but when it came to grading I thought the professor was kind of rough. Don't ask for our opinions if they're wrong.
- I felt that the grading was very hard and that the grade was not clear to why we received it. Otherwise it was a fun class and helped me think outside of the box
- He did a great job while I was in his class.

2018FA CORE-110-D01 Survey - Valparaiso University

Course:	CORE-110-D01 The Human Experience
Department:	CORE
Faculty:	Hatcher, Michael
Response/Expected:	11/18 (61.1%)

Student Assessment of Instruction (SAI) Report Guidelines

The primary purpose of student evaluations of teaching is to improve teaching effectiveness. For this purpose, data from this report should be interpreted within the following guidelines.

- 1. Faculty and administrators should use the overall score and the subscale scores, not individual items, for evaluation purposes.** Faculty might reflect on their students' responses to individual questions, but administrators should be cautious in using data from individual questions for evaluative purposes.
- 2. SAI data should be used to assess multi-year trends in a faculty member's teaching in a specific class, NOT to compare the single semester scores of faculty to each other.** Evaluating multi-year trends provides an appropriate context for evaluating a faculty member's teaching for a given course. Multi-year trends help to identify faculty members who are improving their teaching effectiveness.
- 3. A single semester's SAI scores should not be used to compare individual faculty members to each other.** SAI scores may be influenced by factors such as students' implicit biases, interest level in the course subject, course level, and satisfaction with the time and day of the course. Given that individual faculty teach different courses that vary in all of these factors, direct cross faculty comparisons are not appropriate with the SAI.
- 4. Evaluation results should be viewed in the context of sample size and response rate.** Ideally, response rates should be as high as possible and faculty should be mindful that they can improve response rates by stressing the importance of the evaluations as a means to improve teaching effectiveness, by clearly communicating that student responses will be taken seriously, and by providing frequent reminders to complete the evaluations.
- 5. The SAI should only be considered one component of a multi-component evaluation process.** While students are able to provide a valuable measure of teaching effectiveness, their opinions alone do not provide sufficient evidence to make decisions about a faculty member's overall teaching effectiveness, especially when such opinions inform decisions about annual reviews, merit raises, tenure, and promotion. Additional evaluation components are described in the Faculty Handbook.
- 6. Answers to the free response questions may not be representative of the class as a whole and care must be taken when using free response comments in an evaluative manner.** Student comments consistent with the survey results may be used for evaluative purposes. Inconsistent comments have value from a formative standpoint, but their use in an evaluative manner are not appropriate as they may incorrectly represent the results of the validated survey.
- 7. Faculty should not allow fear of lower SAI scores to dictate rigor or pedagogy in their courses.** Department chairs, faculty peers, and administrators should encourage faculty (especially

tenure-track faculty) to create courses that help students learn, even if that learning process requires making students feel uncomfortable in some way (e.g., encouraging students to consider viewpoints they do not support) or requires significant work and rigor. Faculty should be mindful of SAI feedback and open to making changes to their courses, but they should not allow student feedback to have a negative influence on the learning process in their courses.

8. **Self-reflection items are for information only, and not a part of the validated SAI scale.** The report will include a factor mean, an average across all five self-reflection items, as well as the mean for each individual item. These items are not included in the Overall SAI Score reported in the executive summary.

Executive Summary

Scale	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Overall SAI Score	11	4.47	0.42
Organization and Clarity	11	4.52	0.52
Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation	11	4.41	0.47
Rapport and Respect	11	4.39	0.5
Feedback and Accessibility	11	4.5	0.38
Student Perceptions of Learning	11	4.52	0.49

Responses: strongly disagree=1 disagree=2 neutral=3 agree=4 strongly agree=5

Student Self-Reflection Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
I regularly attended course meetings.	11	4.82	0.39
I was regularly prepared for course meetings.	11	4.09	0.67
I was actively engaged during course meetings.	11	4	0.74
I upheld the Honor Code in all work for this course.	11	4.73	0.45
I was able to achieve the stated learning objectives for this course.	11	4.18	0.57
Average of Student Self Reflection Items	11	4.36	0.42

Organization and Clarity Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor is well prepared for class meetings.	11	4.73	0.45
My instructor explains the subject matter clearly.	11	4.36	0.64
My instructor clearly communicates course goals and objectives.	11	4.45	0.66
My instructor answers questions appropriately.	11	4.55	0.5
<i>Average of Organization and Clarity Items</i>	11	4.52	0.52

Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor is enthusiastic about teaching this course.	11	4.82	0.39
My instructor presents the subject in an interesting manner.	11	4.18	0.72
My instructor stimulates my thinking.	11	4.27	0.75
My instructor motivates me to do my best work.	11	4.36	0.64
<i>Average of Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation Items</i>	11	4.41	0.47

Rapport and Respect Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor helps students sufficiently with course-related issues.	11	4.27	0.62
My instructor is regularly available for consultation.	11	4.45	0.5
My instructor is impartial in dealing with students.	11	4.09	1.16
My instructor respects opinions different from his or her own.	11	4.73	0.45
<i>Average of Rapport and Respect Items</i>	11	4.39	0.5

Feedback and Accessibility Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Assessment methods accurately assess what I have learned in this course.	11	4.36	0.48
Grades are assigned fairly.	11	4.45	0.5
The basis for assigning grades is clearly explained.	11	4.64	0.48
The instructor provides feedback on my progress in the course on a regular basis.	11	4.55	0.5
<i>Average of Feedback and Accessibility Items</i>	11	4.5	0.38

Student Perceptions of Learning Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor advances my knowledge of course content.	11	4.36	0.64
My instructor promotes my understanding of important conceptual themes.	11	4.55	0.5
My instructor enhances my capacity to communicate effectively about the course subject matter.	11	4.45	0.66
My instructor encourages me to value new viewpoints related to the course.	11	4.73	0.45
<i>Average of Student Perceptions of Learning Items</i>	11	4.52	0.49

What were the most effective aspects of this instructor's teaching?

- Professor Hatcher is an amazing man! He cares so much about his students and is super understanding. He knows what he is talking about and makes class so interesting. He is one of my favorite professors because he makes me engaged in class and eager to learn, while grading very fairly.
- The professor was very much engaged in the course and the class.
- Involving the whole class in discussions was very effective
- He was very open minded about certain opinions and ways of thinking when we discussed different concepts during the semester. There was never no exact right answer which I liked. Because everyone has their own opinions and ways of thinking and he accepted that and encouraged us to fully explain WHY we felt that way.
- Professor Hatcher helped us come to our own conclusions about the material without influence of his own opinion which bettered my understanding of the course content.
- He brought up new ways to of thinking and had good conversation.

- His lecture
- He encouraged us to have discussions every time we finished reading a book. which really help to find another diffrent point of views.
- Mr. Hatcher was very engaged with his students.

In what ways could this instructor improve his or her teaching?

- I think more reminders about upcoming due dates would be more beneficial due to the amount we have.
- None.
- Don't ramble on about a certain concept, we then lose interest quickly when it's talked about more than it should be.
- I think he focuses too much on writing on the board.
- More notes
- having more time in the readings.

Please feel free to share any further comments you have for this instructor.

- None.
- I learned a lot about empathy and took a lot of what you taught to heart and will incorporate it into my life
- He was very nice and understanding. He is a very good professor and I enjoyed the class.
- He is a great professor and I would absolutely take another class taught by Mr. Hatcher.
- i appreciated that he always gave feedback on our RRA's and our essays, even if it was something I didnt want to hear, I always took it into consideration when writing my next essay or RRA. I truly enjoyed having class with him, he's such an interesting individual and you can tell that he's passionate about what he does. :)
- Sometimes he should slow down when he is explaining things or when he is writing on the board.

2018FA PHIL-145-A Survey - Valparaiso University

Course:	PHIL-145-A Elem Logic /Critical Thinking
Department:	PHIL
Faculty:	Hatcher, Michael
Response/Expected:	21/29 (72.4%)

Student Assessment of Instruction (SAI) Report Guidelines

The primary purpose of student evaluations of teaching is to improve teaching effectiveness. For this purpose, data from this report should be interpreted within the following guidelines.

- 1. Faculty and administrators should use the overall score and the subscale scores, not individual items, for evaluation purposes.** Faculty might reflect on their students' responses to individual questions, but administrators should be cautious in using data from individual questions for evaluative purposes.
- 2. SAI data should be used to assess multi-year trends in a faculty member's teaching in a specific class, NOT to compare the single semester scores of faculty to each other.** Evaluating multi-year trends provides an appropriate context for evaluating a faculty member's teaching for a given course. Multi-year trends help to identify faculty members who are improving their teaching effectiveness.
- 3. A single semester's SAI scores should not be used to compare individual faculty members to each other.** SAI scores may be influenced by factors such as students' implicit biases, interest level in the course subject, course level, and satisfaction with the time and day of the course. Given that individual faculty teach different courses that vary in all of these factors, direct cross faculty comparisons are not appropriate with the SAI.
- 4. Evaluation results should be viewed in the context of sample size and response rate.** Ideally, response rates should be as high as possible and faculty should be mindful that they can improve response rates by stressing the importance of the evaluations as a means to improve teaching effectiveness, by clearly communicating that student responses will be taken seriously, and by providing frequent reminders to complete the evaluations.
- 5. The SAI should only be considered one component of a multi-component evaluation process.** While students are able to provide a valuable measure of teaching effectiveness, their opinions alone do not provide sufficient evidence to make decisions about a faculty member's overall teaching effectiveness, especially when such opinions inform decisions about annual reviews, merit raises, tenure, and promotion. Additional evaluation components are described in the Faculty Handbook.
- 6. Answers to the free response questions may not be representative of the class as a whole and care must be taken when using free response comments in an evaluative manner.** Student comments consistent with the survey results may be used for evaluative purposes. Inconsistent comments have value from a formative standpoint, but their use in an evaluative manner are not appropriate as they may incorrectly represent the results of the validated survey.
- 7. Faculty should not allow fear of lower SAI scores to dictate rigor or pedagogy in their courses.** Department chairs, faculty peers, and administrators should encourage faculty (especially

tenure-track faculty) to create courses that help students learn, even if that learning process requires making students feel uncomfortable in some way (e.g., encouraging students to consider viewpoints they do not support) or requires significant work and rigor. Faculty should be mindful of SAI feedback and open to making changes to their courses, but they should not allow student feedback to have a negative influence on the learning process in their courses.

8. **Self-reflection items are for information only, and not a part of the validated SAI scale.** The report will include a factor mean, an average across all five self-reflection items, as well as the mean for each individual item. These items are not included in the Overall SAI Score reported in the executive summary.

Executive Summary

Scale	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Overall SAI Score	21	4.32	0.54
Organization and Clarity	21	4.21	0.63
Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation	21	4.25	0.66
Rapport and Respect	21	4.51	0.45
Feedback and Accessibility	21	4.23	0.74
Student Perceptions of Learning	21	4.42	0.59

Responses: strongly disagree=1 disagree=2 neutral=3 agree=4 strongly agree=5

Student Self-Reflection Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
I regularly attended course meetings.	21	4.76	0.43
I was regularly prepared for course meetings.	21	4.81	0.39
I was actively engaged during course meetings.	21	4.52	0.66
I upheld the Honor Code in all work for this course.	21	4.9	0.29
I was able to achieve the stated learning objectives for this course.	21	4.38	0.79
Average of Student Self Reflection Items	21	4.68	0.39

Organization and Clarity Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor is well prepared for class meetings.	21	4.52	0.59
My instructor explains the subject matter clearly.	21	3.86	0.94
My instructor clearly communicates course goals and objectives.	21	4.38	0.65
My instructor answers questions appropriately.	21	4.1	0.68
<i>Average of Organization and Clarity Items</i>	21	4.21	0.63

Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor is enthusiastic about teaching this course.	21	4.71	0.45
My instructor presents the subject in an interesting manner.	21	3.95	1.09
My instructor stimulates my thinking.	21	4.14	0.89
My instructor motivates me to do my best work.	21	4.19	0.66
<i>Average of Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation Items</i>	21	4.25	0.66

Rapport and Respect Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor helps students sufficiently with course-related issues.	21	4.29	0.76
My instructor is regularly available for consultation.	21	4.71	0.45
My instructor is impartial in dealing with students.	21	4.57	0.58
My instructor respects opinions different from his or her own.	21	4.48	0.5
<i>Average of Rapport and Respect Items</i>	21	4.51	0.45

Feedback and Accessibility Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Assessment methods accurately assess what I have learned in this course.	21	4.19	0.96
Grades are assigned fairly.	21	4.33	0.64
The basis for assigning grades is clearly explained.	21	4.38	0.84
The instructor provides feedback on my progress in the course on a regular basis.	21	4	1.11
<i>Average of Feedback and Accessibility Items</i>	21	4.23	0.74

Student Perceptions of Learning Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor advances my knowledge of course content.	21	4.43	0.49
My instructor promotes my understanding of important conceptual themes.	21	4.38	0.72
My instructor enhances my capacity to communicate effectively about the course subject matter.	21	4.48	0.59
My instructor encourages me to value new viewpoints related to the course.	20	4.4	0.73
<i>Average of Student Perceptions of Learning Items</i>	21	4.42	0.59

What were the most effective aspects of this instructor's teaching?

- Did a good job going through homework problems and helping me in places i got tripped up
- na
- Being able to explain difficult problems such as complex proofs
- The knowledgeable TA's were amazing!
- Making the flow chat of inductive vs deductive arguments was very helpful.
- He allows us to work in groups, which is beneficial to me and my other group members.
- Using the handouts and doing in class work was realy helpful. Study guides were great for exams. Giving lots of examples in class was helpful as well.
- Very enthusiastic about the course
- Very enthusiastic about teaching course material.
- The professor was very knowledgeable about the subject matter and was very enthusiastic about

getting the students to learn the course material. Although he was a little quirky, he was actively engaging all students and did a good job of making a usually boring topic into a somewhat interesting one.

- I think that the most effective part of his teaching was reviewing and explaining exactly what we needed to know for each section throughout the course.
- He is very knowledgeable in his field.
- His enthusiasm and the way he explained things
- His use of specific examples, doing in-class practice with immediate feedback, and daily enthusiasm regarding what was being taught.
- I would say that the worksheets are a big help. They make it easier to understand what is going on. I'd say that he is a solid teacher overall.
- Throughout the course we walked through each type of problem and consistently practice them, which was helpful in having a better understanding of the material.
- Prof Hatcher always had a different way to explain a concept if a student was not understanding, and some of the examples were fun enough to keep me interested.

In what ways could this instructor improve his or her teaching?

- Some concepts need more attention than others. Focus on pushing the more difficult concepts
- na
- There's a lot of weird concepts introduced in this class, and he doesn't always do a great job of explaining it. Also, I don't think homework should be graded off of correctness, because it's common to feel lost doing it.
- Nothing comes to mind. Great teacher and is passionate about the subject.
- no suggestion.
- Sometimes when I would ask questions he would explain the material in the same way he just did, so concepts weren't always clear because he couldn't explain another way
- Slow down on some of the more challenging topics like conditional proofs.
- Try not to give out as much homework and make tests easier. Sometimes, the tests are hard to understand and are not clear enough
- He could improve by providing more examples or taking more time to explain a subject that is difficult for the class as a whole. This can be done by explaining the significance or the reasoning as to why we are learning this topic or method.
- Sometimes he uses terms that we do not quite understand and fails to explain them in terms that we can understand.
- Maybe take more time to teach proofs. I felt like they were taught too fast and I needed more time to go through them to fully understand the content.
- I very much enjoy his teaching style. I would rather have him keep it as it is.
- I would say that sometimes his answers to questions were a little bit scattered in a sense. Just try to

answer questions without questions. Thanks.

- Allow for more time to ask questions on homework because not everyone can make it to the study sessions.

Please feel free to share any further comments you have for this instructor.

- would be great if we had our weighted grade in blackboard year round
- na
- When propositional logic is introduced, it's introduced at an absurdly quick pace. I missed the first day it was being talk about, and I was lost. True, I shouldn't have missed class, but I don't think he should fly through that material as quick as he did, because it can be hard to wrap your mind around that stuff. Other than that, I have to admit that this is a fair course
- I do not think business majors should have to take this course. It seems irrelevant in business careers.
- Modus Ponens!
- This was definitely a class that I went into dreading because I thought it was going to be hard and boring, however very quickly I partially changed my opinion. Although the class was difficult and that material was hard to understand at times this class turned out to be one of my favorites I took this semester, I found it very interesting and fun in a way.
- This class is so hard to take. Business students should not take philosophy at all. Waste of time, and another course would be advised.
- Workload is heavy but needed to retain level of material.
- This class was enjoyable, yet challenging. I hope he would be able to teach this class again with some improvements.
- N/A
- make the word documents for the homework into PDF's
- I really enjoyed this course

2018SP PHIL-125-A Survey - Valparaiso University

Course:	PHIL-125-A The Good Life
Department:	PHIL
Faculty:	Hatcher, Michael
Response/Expected:	19/24 (79.2%)

Student Assessment of Instruction (SAI) Report Guidelines

The primary purpose of student evaluations of teaching is to improve teaching effectiveness. For this purpose, data from this report should be interpreted within the following guidelines.

- 1. Faculty and administrators should use the overall score and the subscale scores, not individual items, for evaluation purposes.** Faculty might reflect on their students' responses to individual questions, but administrators should be cautious in using data from individual questions for evaluative purposes.
- 2. SAI data should be used to assess multi-year trends in a faculty member's teaching in a specific class, NOT to compare the single semester scores of faculty to each other.** Evaluating multi-year trends provides an appropriate context for evaluating a faculty member's teaching for a given course. Multi-year trends help to identify faculty members who are improving their teaching effectiveness.
- 3. A single semester's SAI scores should not be used to compare individual faculty members to each other.** SAI scores may be influenced by factors such as students' implicit biases, interest level in the course subject, course level, and satisfaction with the time and day of the course. Given that individual faculty teach different courses that vary in all of these factors, direct cross faculty comparisons are not appropriate with the SAI.
- 4. Evaluation results should be viewed in the context of sample size and response rate.** Ideally, response rates should be as high as possible and faculty should be mindful that they can improve response rates by stressing the importance of the evaluations as a means to improve teaching effectiveness, by clearly communicating that student responses will be taken seriously, and by providing frequent reminders to complete the evaluations.
- 5. The SAI should only be considered one component of a multi-component evaluation process.** While students are able to provide a valuable measure of teaching effectiveness, their opinions alone do not provide sufficient evidence to make decisions about a faculty member's overall teaching effectiveness, especially when such opinions inform decisions about annual reviews, merit raises, tenure, and promotion. Additional evaluation components are described in the Faculty Handbook.
- 6. Answers to the free response questions may not be representative of the class as a whole and care must be taken when using free response comments in an evaluative manner.** Student comments consistent with the survey results may be used for evaluative purposes. Inconsistent comments have value from a formative standpoint, but their use in an evaluative manner are not appropriate as they may incorrectly represent the results of the validated survey.
- 7. Faculty should not allow fear of lower SAI scores to dictate rigor or pedagogy in their courses.** Department chairs, faculty peers, and administrators should encourage faculty (especially

tenure-track faculty) to create courses that help students learn, even if that learning process requires making students feel uncomfortable in some way (e.g., encouraging students to consider viewpoints they do not support) or requires significant work and rigor. Faculty should be mindful of SAI feedback and open to making changes to their courses, but they should not allow student feedback to have a negative influence on the learning process in their courses.

8. **Self-reflection items are for information only, and not a part of the validated SAI scale.** The report will include a factor mean, average across all five self-reflection items, as well as the mean for each individual item. These items are not included in the Overall SAI Score reported in executive summary.

Executive Summary

Scale	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Overall SAI Score	19	4.59	0.41
Organization and Clarity	19	4.64	0.44
Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation	19	4.67	0.39
Rapport and Respect	19	4.62	0.51
Feedback and Accessibility	19	4.41	0.69
Student Perceptions of Learning	19	4.61	0.43

Responses: strongly disagree=1 disagree=2 neutral=3 agree=4 strongly agree=5

Student Self-Reflection Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
I regularly attended course meetings.	18	4.39	0.83
I was regularly prepared for course meetings.	19	4.05	0.94
I was actively engaged during course meetings.	19	4.05	0.89
I upheld the Honor Code in all work for this course.	19	4.63	0.67
I was able to achieve the stated learning objectives for this course.	19	4.26	0.78
Average of Student Self Reflection Items	19	4.28	0.59

Organization and Clarity Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor is well prepared for class meetings.	19	4.74	0.44
My instructor explains the subject matter clearly.	19	4.68	0.46
My instructor clearly communicates course goals and objectives.	19	4.47	0.82
My instructor answers questions appropriately.	19	4.68	0.46
<i>Average of Organization and Clarity Items</i>	19	4.64	0.44

Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor is enthusiastic about teaching this course.	19	4.89	0.31
My instructor presents the subject in an interesting manner.	19	4.58	0.59
My instructor stimulates my thinking.	19	4.74	0.55
My instructor motivates me to do my best work.	19	4.47	0.6
<i>Average of Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation Items</i>	19	4.67	0.39

Rapport and Respect Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor helps students sufficiently with course-related issues.	19	4.63	0.58
My instructor is regularly available for consultation.	19	4.53	0.68
My instructor is impartial in dealing with students.	19	4.58	0.75
My instructor respects opinions different from his or her own.	19	4.74	0.44
<i>Average of Rapport and Respect Items</i>	19	4.62	0.51

Feedback and Accessibility Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Assessment methods accurately assess what I have learned in this course.	19	4.63	0.48
Grades are assigned fairly.	19	4.53	0.75
The basis for assigning grades is clearly explained.	19	4.37	0.98
The instructor provides feedback on my progress in the course on a regular basis.	19	4.11	1.21
<i>Average of Feedback and Accessibility Items</i>	19	4.41	0.69

Student Perceptions of Learning Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor advances my knowledge of course content.	19	4.58	0.49
My instructor promotes my understanding of important conceptual themes.	19	4.63	0.48
My instructor enhances my capacity to communicate effectively about the course subject matter.	19	4.63	0.48
My instructor encourages me to value new viewpoints related to the course.	19	4.58	0.59
<i>Average of Student Perceptions of Learning Items</i>	19	4.61	0.43

What were the most effective aspects of this instructor's teaching?

- Philosophy is a hard class to take, especially when you're just doing it for a gen ed credit. Professor Hatcher tried his best to make the material understandable, especially with his energy. He made you want to be there.
- Providing clear explanations of the topics we are examining and concrete examples that allowed me to grasp all the concepts included in the course. Additionally, I really appreciated the days spent in class reviewing the course content for exams.
- Going over homework in detail.
- The most effective aspects of this instructor's teaching were his ability to rephrase concepts in different ways to ensure our understanding of the material and writing everything out on the board so that we could hear and see each concept and explanation. It made it easy to go back to my notes for different assignments without missing information.
- His entry to teach the course and giving his opinion about certain topics.
- He would explain things thoroughly which was very helpful in the long run.

- I like the group work that we did in class. I find it a very useful tool in learning the material better.
- Being able to relate the subject matter to daily life
- Professor Hatcher really cared to make sure that his students fully understood the information. He was enthusiastic about teaching which helped his students to stay engaged and be excited about learning. He was happy to answer any questions and more than willing to meet his students for office hours in order to give extra help.
- AWESOME study guides and review days!!! Help a TON.
- Very approachable and down to earth. Even though we discussed dark, heavy topics he always tried to keep the class in good spirits.
- He lectures every time, but it is a kind of lecture that I do not mind because he is very enthusiastic and funny and keeps me engaged. Also, the reading assignments were very helpful. Sometimes, I would read a section of our book and not understand it or not know what to look for in the reading, but when I read the question we were supposed to answer, it gave me something to look for and helped me understand the reading better. He also explained the reading very clearly in class. Sometimes, I would get to class and I had read the reading but not understood it, but by the end of class I understood it because he explains things clearly and writes notes on the board. I also like that he does not erase the notes too fast. He teaches at a good pace. He teaches each idea equally even though he prefers some over the others, and he is very respectful of other people's ideas. I also like when we get to discuss with our group members because it is interesting to see their philosophical thinking about what we are learning. I also love that we only have to do a certain number of reading assignments. I think that was a very good idea because a lot of us get busy and cannot do every single one. Also, he offered extra credit for attending certain philosophy-related events, which I think is smart because it helps us out but it also gathers an audience for whoever is speaking at the event. He is also a very helpful teacher, and I can tell that he really cares about his students and does want them to succeed. He is a wonderful teacher, and probably one of my favorites. The only way I can see someone hating him or his class is if they do not do the reading assignments which is their fault or they do not attend class, especially since we did not even have to do all of the reading assignments. Last thing, I love the class discussions, when we are all trying to think of objections for an argument. It gets super philosophical and my mind just gets blown every time.
- Made the topics relatable and easy to understand
- always had us thinking. funny guy, good sense of humour made the class enjoyable
- He is very patient with students and tries to explain it in ways so that students can understand the subjects that are being taught. He also gives examples to help students better understand and make it relatable for students.
- Hatcher likes to relate what he teaches to back to himself and other examples used in modern times.
- He emphasizes or states again important parts so that it was helpful to understand the outlining and main points. Though the meeting with the professor, we could have suggestions that were important for fixing the paper.

In what ways could this instructor improve his or her teaching?

- It's not his teaching, but there was several times where we just had to go to class so he could tell us what the readings were about because it was like reading Greek.

- While I learn great from lecture-style classes, maybe incorporate some different things in the class (like the day you showed The Matrix to help us understand the topic).
- Redefine grading and explain how they're weighed.
- I think this instructor has done a well enough job at teaching. I have no suggestions for improvement.
- There is no need for improvement
- There was a lot of writing that had to be done for students so maybe a handout at the beginning of class that gave an outline of what would be discussed.
- I would release all the homework at the same time instead in group, because it felt like a punishment for getting ahead in the class.
- Make the classes a little different each time. Same exact class structure every day of discussing what we read, writing down premises, and then talking in groups to object to a premise. Repetitiveness made the class occasionally be a little boring.
- Make RRA's due at the end of Tuesday's and Thursday's. That way if you did not understand the material until after the explanation in class you can still do well on the homework.
- Even if someone does not do one reading assignment, they still have to know what it was about because it will be on the final, so many people did most of the assignments anyway, even if they can't turn them in, because they want to prepare for the exam, so I think that people should get credit or extra credit for doing extra ones. Maybe not a full 3 points, but at least one point or half a point, so they could get a total of 2.5 extra credit points or 5 extra credit points, because there are 5 RRAs.
- Start the class later haha
- cant think of anything!
- It is his first year here and so far he is doing a great job.
- The slower speed of talking could be expected, which could help students to catch up main points.

Please feel free to share any further comments you have for this instructor.

- I didn't have to take this course but I'm glad I did! Thank you for making it interesting and for challenging me as a writer.
- I like the structure of the class: we learned about different theories and concepts that eventually led up to the concept of the good life. I can say that it was clear what the objective of the course was and the lessons were organized well to meet this objective.
- I enjoyed the class discussions because I like to hear other students thoughts and the professors as well. I just didn't enjoy getting up in the AM to go to class but it's a good course.
- Professor Hatcher was an amazing professor to have and made this course very interesting for a person like me who is not the biggest fan of Philosophy.
- I really enjoy your class. I think this class is very useful.
- Professor Hatcher is a wonderful teacher!!! I am so excited that I had the opportunity to be in his class. I learned so much throughout the semester including a plethora of things that will help me

outside the classroom and into my own life.

- You are a GREAT professor! You have been a delight to have in a class that I was not too interested in but your enthusiasm helps a lot with motivation in understanding concepts.
- I have heard that this is your first year teaching here and I just want to say that you are doing a wonderful job! I really enjoyed your class and all the different ways you made me think.
- Thanks for a fun semester
- really enjoyed the class
- I enjoyed this course and learned a lot from your teaching. Thank you.

2018SP PHIL-125-B Survey - Valparaiso University

Course:	PHIL-125-B The Good Life
Department:	PHIL
Faculty:	Hatcher, Michael
Response/Expected:	19/25 (76%)

Student Assessment of Instruction (SAI) Report Guidelines

The primary purpose of student evaluations of teaching is to improve teaching effectiveness. For this purpose, data from this report should be interpreted within the following guidelines.

- 1. Faculty and administrators should use the overall score and the subscale scores, not individual items, for evaluation purposes.** Faculty might reflect on their students' responses to individual questions, but administrators should be cautious in using data from individual questions for evaluative purposes.
- 2. SAI data should be used to assess multi-year trends in a faculty member's teaching in a specific class, NOT to compare the single semester scores of faculty to each other.** Evaluating multi-year trends provides an appropriate context for evaluating a faculty member's teaching for a given course. Multi-year trends help to identify faculty members who are improving their teaching effectiveness.
- 3. A single semester's SAI scores should not be used to compare individual faculty members to each other.** SAI scores may be influenced by factors such as students' implicit biases, interest level in the course subject, course level, and satisfaction with the time and day of the course. Given that individual faculty teach different courses that vary in all of these factors, direct cross faculty comparisons are not appropriate with the SAI.
- 4. Evaluation results should be viewed in the context of sample size and response rate.** Ideally, response rates should be as high as possible and faculty should be mindful that they can improve response rates by stressing the importance of the evaluations as a means to improve teaching effectiveness, by clearly communicating that student responses will be taken seriously, and by providing frequent reminders to complete the evaluations.
- 5. The SAI should only be considered one component of a multi-component evaluation process.** While students are able to provide a valuable measure of teaching effectiveness, their opinions alone do not provide sufficient evidence to make decisions about a faculty member's overall teaching effectiveness, especially when such opinions inform decisions about annual reviews, merit raises, tenure, and promotion. Additional evaluation components are described in the Faculty Handbook.
- 6. Answers to the free response questions may not be representative of the class as a whole and care must be taken when using free response comments in an evaluative manner.** Student comments consistent with the survey results may be used for evaluative purposes. Inconsistent comments have value from a formative standpoint, but their use in an evaluative manner are not appropriate as they may incorrectly represent the results of the validated survey.
- 7. Faculty should not allow fear of lower SAI scores to dictate rigor or pedagogy in their courses.** Department chairs, faculty peers, and administrators should encourage faculty (especially

tenure-track faculty) to create courses that help students learn, even if that learning process requires making students feel uncomfortable in some way (e.g., encouraging students to consider viewpoints they do not support) or requires significant work and rigor. Faculty should be mindful of SAI feedback and open to making changes to their courses, but they should not allow student feedback to have a negative influence on the learning process in their courses.

- Self-reflection items are for information only, and not a part of the validated SAI scale.** The report will include a factor mean, average across all five self-reflection items, as well as the mean for each individual item. These items are not included in the Overall SAI Score reported in executive summary.

Executive Summary

Scale	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Overall SAI Score	19	4.64	0.89
Organization and Clarity	19	4.68	0.91
Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation	19	4.63	0.9
Rapport and Respect	19	4.68	0.9
Feedback and Accessibility	19	4.55	0.92
Student Perceptions of Learning	19	4.64	0.9

Responses: strongly disagree=1 disagree=2 neutral=3 agree=4 strongly agree=5

Student Self-Reflection Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
I regularly attended course meetings.	19	4.79	0.89
I was regularly prepared for course meetings.	19	4.68	0.98
I was actively engaged during course meetings.	19	4.53	0.94
I upheld the Honor Code in all work for this course.	19	4.74	0.91
I was able to achieve the stated learning objectives for this course.	19	4.63	0.93
Average of Student Self Reflection Items	19	4.67	0.89

Organization and Clarity Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor is well prepared for class meetings.	19	4.68	0.92
My instructor explains the subject matter clearly.	19	4.74	0.91
My instructor clearly communicates course goals and objectives.	19	4.63	0.93
My instructor answers questions appropriately.	19	4.68	0.92
<i>Average of Organization and Clarity Items</i>	19	4.68	0.91

Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor is enthusiastic about teaching this course.	19	4.79	0.89
My instructor presents the subject in an interesting manner.	19	4.47	1.04
My instructor stimulates my thinking.	19	4.68	0.92
My instructor motivates me to do my best work.	17	4.53	1.04
<i>Average of Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation Items</i>	19	4.63	0.9

Rapport and Respect Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor helps students sufficiently with course-related issues.	19	4.63	0.93
My instructor is regularly available for consultation.	19	4.68	0.92
My instructor is impartial in dealing with students.	19	4.74	0.91
My instructor respects opinions different from his or her own.	19	4.68	0.92
<i>Average of Rapport and Respect Items</i>	19	4.68	0.9

Feedback and Accessibility Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Assessment methods accurately assess what I have learned in this course.	19	4.53	0.94
Grades are assigned fairly.	19	4.58	0.94
The basis for assigning grades is clearly explained.	19	4.58	0.94
The instructor provides feedback on my progress in the course on a regular basis.	19	4.53	0.99
<i>Average of Feedback and Accessibility Items</i>	19	4.55	0.92

Student Perceptions of Learning Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor advances my knowledge of course content.	19	4.63	0.93
My instructor promotes my understanding of important conceptual themes.	19	4.63	0.93
My instructor enhances my capacity to communicate effectively about the course subject matter.	19	4.58	0.94
My instructor encourages me to value new viewpoints related to the course.	19	4.74	0.91
<i>Average of Student Perceptions of Learning Items</i>	19	4.64	0.9

What were the most effective aspects of this instructor's teaching?

- He writes a lot on the board, gives us time to process the information and has us work in groups to come up with answers to in-class questions.
- Letting the students read the assigned readings previous to class and then him thoroughly explaining the readings to the students during class and letting us have discussions about it.
- This instructor has a method of student engagement by having us form groups and discuss specific questions. I feel that this type of activity fits the course and the content extremely well and it allows each student to share and explain their views.
- He encouraged us to talk in groups and that really helped me see other perspectives, he also regularly wrote on the board rather than using powerpoints which made it easier to follow along
- Professor Hatcher is extremely passionate and that makes his class interesting! He is always so helpful when you don't understand things.
- Real world examples that really helped me understand the meaning of different items and terms.
- I liked pausing lecture to break into groups and reflect on what is discussed

- He gave specific examples for each given topic that were very helpful in understanding what they all meant.
- Going over his passions and the views that are being taught.
- He is really excited about talking about different philosopher in the class and makes the class more welcoming and interesting.
- The depth of reason in the theories
- The questions that he had us answer for homework could be applied to our real life experiences and he gave examples in class that connected to us and got our attention.
- The amount of knowledge that he has on the subject of philosophy is really helpful, just so that we can get more perspectives when presented with a topic.
- The class was very involved and discussion based which made it more interesting and easier to learn and remember things. Professor Hatcher's enthusiasm and unique examples keep class interesting too.
- Feedback given on papers.
- Class discussions

In what ways could this instructor improve his or her teaching?

- N/A
- This class would be even better if the lesson plans had some variation and uniqueness throughout the semester. I believe every single day went through the same process, just discussing different topics.
- Some readings were much more difficult than others and the instructor did not give much leniency with that.
- I really enjoyed his teaching style and I really do not have anything that he could improve upon.
- I don't know of anything. It was an excellent course.
- Wish we could talk before homework.
- There is nothing to be approved in his class.
- Staying on track
- I really don't think any improvements need to be made he's a great professor that really knows his stuff.
- I think the day to day class structure could be better, I feel that they drag on a bit, and the group work is a bit forced. I am not entirely sure what to say to fix this but I think it is good to consider.
- Make writing assignments shorter
- The Reading Responses felt like busy-work.
- Sometimes we didn't have enough time for discussion during our little meetings with our groups. Calling on groups could be awkward at times.

Please feel free to share any further comments you have for this instructor.

- He's great with accommodations, super respectful and understanding!
- loved it.
- I hope your years as a professor in Valparaiso University are great and I really enjoyed your class.
- N/A
- Thank you!
- I enjoyed this class.
- Professor Hatcher was always so excited about the material and it made it more exciting and interesting. He was also super helpful with answering questions which were helpful.

2018SP PHIL-145-C Survey - Valparaiso University

Course:	PHIL-145-C Elem Logic /Critical Thinking
Department:	PHIL
Faculty:	Hatcher, Michael
Response/Expected:	28/29 (96.6%)

Student Assessment of Instruction (SAI) Report Guidelines

The primary purpose of student evaluations of teaching is to improve teaching effectiveness. For this purpose, data from this report should be interpreted within the following guidelines.

- 1. Faculty and administrators should use the overall score and the subscale scores, not individual items, for evaluation purposes.** Faculty might reflect on their students' responses to individual questions, but administrators should be cautious in using data from individual questions for evaluative purposes.
- 2. SAI data should be used to assess multi-year trends in a faculty member's teaching in a specific class, NOT to compare the single semester scores of faculty to each other.** Evaluating multi-year trends provides an appropriate context for evaluating a faculty member's teaching for a given course. Multi-year trends help to identify faculty members who are improving their teaching effectiveness.
- 3. A single semester's SAI scores should not be used to compare individual faculty members to each other.** SAI scores may be influenced by factors such as students' implicit biases, interest level in the course subject, course level, and satisfaction with the time and day of the course. Given that individual faculty teach different courses that vary in all of these factors, direct cross faculty comparisons are not appropriate with the SAI.
- 4. Evaluation results should be viewed in the context of sample size and response rate.** Ideally, response rates should be as high as possible and faculty should be mindful that they can improve response rates by stressing the importance of the evaluations as a means to improve teaching effectiveness, by clearly communicating that student responses will be taken seriously, and by providing frequent reminders to complete the evaluations.
- 5. The SAI should only be considered one component of a multi-component evaluation process.** While students are able to provide a valuable measure of teaching effectiveness, their opinions alone do not provide sufficient evidence to make decisions about a faculty member's overall teaching effectiveness, especially when such opinions inform decisions about annual reviews, merit raises, tenure, and promotion. Additional evaluation components are described in the Faculty Handbook.
- 6. Answers to the free response questions may not be representative of the class as a whole and care must be taken when using free response comments in an evaluative manner.** Student comments consistent with the survey results may be used for evaluative purposes. Inconsistent comments have value from a formative standpoint, but their use in an evaluative manner are not appropriate as they may incorrectly represent the results of the validated survey.
- 7. Faculty should not allow fear of lower SAI scores to dictate rigor or pedagogy in their courses.** Department chairs, faculty peers, and administrators should encourage faculty (especially

tenure-track faculty) to create courses that help students learn, even if that learning process requires making students feel uncomfortable in some way (e.g., encouraging students to consider viewpoints they do not support) or requires significant work and rigor. Faculty should be mindful of SAI feedback and open to making changes to their courses, but they should not allow student feedback to have a negative influence on the learning process in their courses.

8. **Self-reflection items are for information only, and not a part of the validated SAI scale.** The report will include a factor mean, average across all five self-reflection items, as well as the mean for each individual item. These items are not included in the Overall SAI Score reported in executive summary.

Executive Summary

Scale	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Overall SAI Score	28	4.18	0.64
Organization and Clarity	28	4.08	0.71
Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation	28	4.18	0.78
Rapport and Respect	28	4.33	0.57
Feedback and Accessibility	28	4.21	0.65
Student Perceptions of Learning	28	4.11	0.89

Responses: strongly disagree=1 disagree=2 neutral=3 agree=4 strongly agree=5

Student Self-Reflection Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
I regularly attended course meetings.	28	4.64	0.61
I was regularly prepared for course meetings.	28	4.25	0.78
I was actively engaged during course meetings.	28	4.11	0.86
I upheld the Honor Code in all work for this course.	28	4.82	0.47
I was able to achieve the stated learning objectives for this course.	28	4.04	0.82
Average of Student Self Reflection Items	28	4.37	0.51

Organization and Clarity Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor is well prepared for class meetings.	28	4.39	0.62
My instructor explains the subject matter clearly.	28	3.71	1.03
My instructor clearly communicates course goals and objectives.	28	4.14	0.74
My instructor answers questions appropriately.	28	4.07	0.96
<i>Average of Organization and Clarity Items</i>	28	4.08	0.71

Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor is enthusiastic about teaching this course.	28	4.64	0.48
My instructor presents the subject in an interesting manner.	28	3.93	1.03
My instructor stimulates my thinking.	28	4.11	0.98
My instructor motivates me to do my best work.	28	4.04	0.98
<i>Average of Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation Items</i>	28	4.18	0.78

Rapport and Respect Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor helps students sufficiently with course-related issues.	28	4.21	0.77
My instructor is regularly available for consultation.	28	4.5	0.57
My instructor is impartial in dealing with students.	28	4.21	0.98
My instructor respects opinions different from his or her own.	28	4.39	0.72
<i>Average of Rapport and Respect Items</i>	28	4.33	0.57

Feedback and Accessibility Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Assessment methods accurately assess what I have learned in this course.	28	4.32	0.66
Grades are assigned fairly.	28	4.18	0.76
The basis for assigning grades is clearly explained.	28	4.21	0.67
The instructor provides feedback on my progress in the course on a regular basis.	27	4.07	0.9
<i>Average of Feedback and Accessibility Items</i>	28	4.21	0.65

Student Perceptions of Learning Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor advances my knowledge of course content.	28	4.14	0.99
My instructor promotes my understanding of important conceptual themes.	28	4.18	0.8
My instructor enhances my capacity to communicate effectively about the course subject matter.	28	4.04	1.05
My instructor encourages me to value new viewpoints related to the course.	28	4.07	0.92
<i>Average of Student Perceptions of Learning Items</i>	28	4.11	0.89

What were the most effective aspects of this instructor's teaching?

- He was very interactive and helps students learn and understand difficult material.
- He is good at making sure we do examples and are well prepared. He does a good job of explaining everything and I can tell he is passionate about teaching.
- He would take time to clearly explain hard topics.
- Practice sheets
- The in class examples were the most effective aspects.
- The study sessions
- The beginning of the course I was really understanding everything
- Informing students about what will be on the exam
- He really likes philosophy
- He knew the material quite well

- Enthusiasm and knowledge of the subject
- I really enjoyed working in groups in this class.
- Enthusiasm and effort were there for every class.
- Professor connected understandable examples towards students, allowing us to digest the material easier than the text.
- I think working as teams allowed us to learn better when working on problems to put on the board.
- He would write very good notes on the board in good explanation
- Going over ways to solve problems
- White board

In what ways could this instructor improve his or her teaching?

- I thought he was great
- Give us a better explanation of times we will use what we are using in our future. It's hard to motivate yourself to do something you think you might never use.
- Going to the help sessions taught me more than the actual class did. The sheets handed out in class did a very average job of preparing students for the homework. Most classes I felt like I had no idea what was going on once I left the classroom.
- I think he did a good job and doesn't need to change anything.
- Teach more and less time on our own in class
- The paper was difficult and confusing
- Try to explain examples better. Be more concise with explanations and definitions.
- Take into account the opinions of the students sometimes
- There is no way someone could have improved to help me in this course. I think this course has been a waste of my time and resources. This is not relative to anything that I will ever do or care about doing.
- Some topics could have been more clearly explained. While not often, there were multiple classes where the majority of the class had no idea what was going on due to the fast pace of covering the material.
- I would make the homework problems a little more simple when first introducing them.
- Clarity of what he exactly wants us to prepare for tests.
- By being mindful of the little amounts of technical, higher level jargon that he sometimes throws around without explaining.
- He could perhaps slow down when going over a long or difficult proof in class.
- He could be better and more clear at explaining material. Often was confused in material because I felt he tried to teach in a too smart of a way

- Go over more slowly and detailed
- Drop the lowest homework grade
- Less group work
- Be more direct with explanations. Don't constantly change your mind, it confuses us even more in such a hard class.

Please feel free to share any further comments you have for this instructor.

- I was expecting to be mind blown but he really helped us understand tough material
- Great job!
- Great professor but needs to work on his teaching.
- You gave constant homework where you blew through a lesson and the class haven't yet grasped the concept
- I don't really think that this class helped me or why people from the college of business had to take this instead of calculus. I would have rather taken calculus 100 more times than take this class again. This class was 100% busy work and i feel like I didn't really get anything out of it.
- Overall I thought Professor Hatcher was a very good instructor who explained material at a quick pace which was well suited for the simpler material, but became more difficult to follow along later on in the class. Would recommend Professor Hatcher to other students taking PHIL-145.
- None
- I thoroughly enjoyed this class.
- N/a
- Very good professor for this tough class.

2017FA CORE-110-C03 Survey - Valparaiso University

Course:	CORE-110-C03 The Human Experience
Department:	CORE
Faculty:	Hatcher, Michael
Response/Expected:	18/20 (90%)

Student Assessment of Instruction (SAI) Report Guidelines

The primary purpose of student evaluations of teaching is to improve teaching effectiveness. For this purpose, data from this report should be interpreted within the following guidelines.

- Faculty and administrators should use the overall score and the subscale scores, not individual items, for evaluation purposes.** Faculty might reflect on their students' responses to individual questions, but administrators should be cautious in using data from individual questions for evaluative purposes.
- SAI data should be used to assess multi-year trends in a faculty member's teaching in a specific class, NOT to compare the single semester scores of faculty to each other.** Evaluating multi-year trends provides an appropriate context for evaluating a faculty member's teaching for a given course. Multi-year trends help to identify faculty members who are improving their teaching effectiveness.
- A single semester's SAI scores should not be used to compare individual faculty members to each other.** SAI scores may be influenced by factors such as students' implicit biases, interest level in the course subject, course level, and satisfaction with the time and day of the course. Given that individual faculty teach different courses that vary in all of these factors, direct cross faculty comparisons are not appropriate with the SAI.
- Evaluation results should be viewed in the context of sample size and response rate.** Ideally, response rates should be as high as possible and faculty should be mindful that they can improve response rates by stressing the importance of the evaluations as a means to improve teaching effectiveness, by clearly communicating that student responses will be taken seriously, and by providing frequent reminders to complete the evaluations.
- The SAI should only be considered one component of a multi-component evaluation process.** While students are able to provide a valuable measure of teaching effectiveness, their opinions alone do not provide sufficient evidence to make decisions about a faculty member's overall teaching effectiveness, especially when such opinions inform decisions about annual reviews, merit raises, tenure, and promotion. Additional evaluation components are described in the Faculty Handbook.
- Answers to the free response questions may not be representative of the class as a whole and care must be taken when using free response comments in an evaluative manner.** Student comments consistent with the survey results may be used for evaluative purposes. Inconsistent comments have value from a formative standpoint, but their use in an evaluative manner are not appropriate as they may

incorrectly represent the results of the validated survey.

7. **Faculty should not allow fear of “lower” SAI scores to dictate rigor or pedagogy in their courses.** Department chairs, faculty peers, and administrators should encourage faculty (especially tenure-track faculty) to create courses that help students learn, even if that learning process requires making students feel uncomfortable in some way (e.g., encouraging students to consider viewpoints they do not support) or requires significant work and rigor. Faculty should be mindful of SAI feedback and open to making changes to their courses, but they should not allow student feedback to have a negative influence on the learning process in their courses.
8. **Self-reflection items are for information only, and not a part of the validated SAI scale.** The report will include a factor mean, average across all five self-reflection items, as well as the mean for each individual item. These items are not included in the Overall SAI Score reported in executive summary.

Executive Summary

Scale	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Overall SAI Score	18	4.68	0.37
Organization and Clarity	18	4.67	0.45
Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation	18	4.71	0.47
Rapport and Respect	18	4.69	0.38
Feedback and Accessibility	18	4.58	0.53
Student Perceptions of Learning	18	4.72	0.39

Responses: strongly disagree=1 disagree=2 neutral=3 agree=4 strongly agree=5

Student Self-Reflection Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
I regularly attended	17	4.65	0.48

course meetings.			
I was regularly prepared for course meetings.	18	4.11	0.94
I was actively engaged during course meetings.	17	4.12	0.68
I upheld the Honor Code in all work for this course.	17	4.82	0.38
I was able to achieve the stated learning objectives for this course.	18	4.39	0.49
Average of Student Self Reflection Items	18	4.4	0.41

Organization and Clarity Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor is well prepared for class meetings.	18	4.78	0.42
My instructor explains the subject matter clearly.	18	4.61	0.59
My instructor clearly communicates course goals and objectives.	18	4.56	0.68
My instructor answers questions appropriately.	18	4.72	0.45
Average of Organization	18	4.67	0.45

<i>and Clarity Items</i>			
-------------------------------------	--	--	--

Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor is enthusiastic about teaching this course.	18	4.78	0.42
My instructor presents the subject in an interesting manner.	18	4.72	0.45
My instructor stimulates my thinking.	18	4.72	0.45
My instructor motivates me to do my best work.	18	4.61	0.76
<i>Average of Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation Items</i>	18	4.71	0.47

Rapport and Respect Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor helps students sufficiently with course-related issues.	18	4.72	0.45
My instructor is regularly available for consultation.	18	4.72	0.56

My instructor is impartial in dealing with students.	17	4.47	0.78
My instructor respects opinions different from his or her own.	18	4.83	0.37
Average of Rapport and Respect Items	18	4.69	0.38

Feedback and Accessibility Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Assessment methods accurately assess what I have learned in this course.	18	4.72	0.45
Grades are assigned fairly.	18	4.5	0.69
The basis for assigning grades is clearly explained.	18	4.44	0.68
The instructor provides feedback on my progress in the course on a regular basis.	18	4.67	0.58
Average of Feedback and Accessibility Items	18	4.58	0.53

Student Perceptions of Learning Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor advances my knowledge of course content.	18	4.61	0.49
My instructor promotes my understanding of important conceptual themes.	18	4.83	0.37
My instructor enhances my capacity to communicate effectively about the course subject matter.	18	4.72	0.45
My instructor encourages me to value new viewpoints related to the course.	18	4.72	0.56
Average of Student Perceptions of Learning Items	18	4.72	0.39

What were the most effective aspects of this instructor's teaching?

- The vivid explanations and writings in class.
- How he taught our class, used conversation with all of us to get us thinking on the right train of thought for the lesson.
- His enthusiasm.
- -Going over the books we read in class -Caring a lot about students grades -Being very engaged in class
- Always was very enthusiastic and got us all engaged in our learning.
- He was able to stimulate my mind.
- The added philosophical depth was good for inspiring topic sentences
- Professor Hatcher was very enthusiastic and willing to help. He explained concepts in ways that were easy to pick up. Was always willing to meet.♦
- His passion, and connection to students. He knows how to accommodate for everyone's needs and make sure everyone learns something.
- Enthusiasm with class material really helped when teaching, helps it stick
- He was always there to help us when needed

- He always gave very relevant examples from other literature, keeps us engaged, and really makes the novels we read interesting. I have learned a lot and felt challenged mentally coming to class. I felt like he individually challenged students in a good way everyday.
- He always comes to class with relevant discussion questions and our class is always engaged and on task. He is impartial and tries to engage everyone in our class and not just a few students. I always feel well prepared for our assignments and of all my classes I have learned the most in this class.
- You did a great job at making analogy and examples to relate to the writing that we did. These helped me out a lot. For example, when we talked about cosmopolitanism, you used examples about saving our sibling vs children in Africa. This really helped look at the ideas in the book from a personal level.

In what ways could this instructor improve his or her teaching?

- It's all good. :)
- Nothing all around pretty good
- I believe he was perfect.
- NOTHING!
- Relate book topics to our lives first before diving in to a deep philosophical question.
- None
- Take control of socratic seminar. Be more involved and more direct, because students are less likely to reach your goal when left to their own devices
- Sometimes it was hard to sort through the point of class discussions. It was hard to keep everything in line and organized.♦
- Nothing, great teacher, and great person.
- I can't think of anything, you're good
- He could do more group activities where we get to engage with the people in our class
- Maybe be more assertive with the class because some people consistently talk over him.
- It's hard to find major flaws in his teaching style. He comes to class always enthusiastic and ready to prepare us for our assignments. I really enjoyed having him in class.
- I think that sometimes your thought process is a little scattered. I think if we went into class knowing what all we were going to cover that day exactly it would be not as scattered. However, it is nice that we can build questions off of the discussions we have as we go.

Please feel free to share any further comments you have for this instructor.

- I liked how we could take class lessons on any direction we wanted to while answering questions.
- I would highly recommend him as a core professor
- Great professor!

- None
- Good communication with students and class
- I went through a lot more sickness than I normally do, and he was always supportive of me, and wanting me to succeed. Professor Hatcher is by far my favorite and best teacher that I have ever had.
- I really enjoyed having Hatcher as my professor
- I felt engaged and challenged everyday coming to your class. While Core is a class most students dislike, I found it very interesting the way we had open discussions and talked over certain topics. I felt as if my writing was getting better with every paper, and I appreciate you always being available even past your office hours to help students in our class. I feel like I will go into 115 as a better writer and reader, and I hope to have you as a professor in the future. So far you are one of my favorite professors of my freshman year.
- PLEASE GIVE THIS MAN A FULL TIME POSITION!!! HE DESERVES IT!!! I enjoyed this class so much and it has given the university a good name. This semester has been so enjoyable and I look forward to my coming years as a student here.
- I really appreciated how helpful you were when I seeked help at your office hours.

2017FA CORE-110-E06 Survey - Valparaiso University

Course:	CORE-110-E06 The Human Experience
Department:	CORE
Faculty:	Hatcher, Michael
Response/Expected:	12/19 (63.2%)

Student Assessment of Instruction (SAI) Report Guidelines

The primary purpose of student evaluations of teaching is to improve teaching effectiveness. For this purpose, data from this report should be interpreted within the following guidelines.

- Faculty and administrators should use the overall score and the subscale scores, not individual items, for evaluation purposes.** Faculty might reflect on their students' responses to individual questions, but administrators should be cautious in using data from individual questions for evaluative purposes.
- SAI data should be used to assess multi-year trends in a faculty member's teaching in a specific class, NOT to compare the single semester scores of faculty to each other.** Evaluating multi-year trends provides an appropriate context for evaluating a faculty member's teaching for a given course. Multi-year trends help to identify faculty members who are improving their teaching effectiveness.
- A single semester's SAI scores should not be used to compare individual faculty members to each other.** SAI scores may be influenced by factors such as students' implicit biases, interest level in the course subject, course level, and satisfaction with the time and day of the course. Given that individual faculty teach different courses that vary in all of these factors, direct cross faculty comparisons are not appropriate with the SAI.
- Evaluation results should be viewed in the context of sample size and response rate.** Ideally, response rates should be as high as possible and faculty should be mindful that they can improve response rates by stressing the importance of the evaluations as a means to improve teaching effectiveness, by clearly communicating that student responses will be taken seriously, and by providing frequent reminders to complete the evaluations.
- The SAI should only be considered one component of a multi-component evaluation process.** While students are able to provide a valuable measure of teaching effectiveness, their opinions alone do not provide sufficient evidence to make decisions about a faculty member's overall teaching effectiveness, especially when such opinions inform decisions about annual reviews, merit raises, tenure, and promotion. Additional evaluation components are described in the Faculty Handbook.
- Answers to the free response questions may not be representative of the class as a whole and care must be taken when using free response comments in an evaluative manner.** Student comments consistent with the survey results may be used for evaluative purposes. Inconsistent comments have value from a formative standpoint, but their use in an evaluative manner are not appropriate as they may

incorrectly represent the results of the validated survey.

7. **Faculty should not allow fear of “lower” SAI scores to dictate rigor or pedagogy in their courses.** Department chairs, faculty peers, and administrators should encourage faculty (especially tenure-track faculty) to create courses that help students learn, even if that learning process requires making students feel uncomfortable in some way (e.g., encouraging students to consider viewpoints they do not support) or requires significant work and rigor. Faculty should be mindful of SAI feedback and open to making changes to their courses, but they should not allow student feedback to have a negative influence on the learning process in their courses.
8. **Self-reflection items are for information only, and not a part of the validated SAI scale.** The report will include a factor mean, average across all five self-reflection items, as well as the mean for each individual item. These items are not included in the Overall SAI Score reported in executive summary.

Executive Summary

Scale	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Overall SAI Score	12	4.26	1
Organization and Clarity	12	4.29	1.1
Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation	12	4.5	0.68
Rapport and Respect	12	4.33	1.08
Feedback and Accessibility	12	4.08	1.14
Student Perceptions of Learning	12	4.08	1.16

Responses: strongly disagree=1 disagree=2 neutral=3 agree=4 strongly agree=5

Student Self-Reflection Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
I regularly attended	12	4.5	1.12

course meetings.			
I was regularly prepared for course meetings.	12	4.17	1.21
I was actively engaged during course meetings.	12	4.08	1.11
I upheld the Honor Code in all work for this course.	12	4.58	1.11
I was able to achieve the stated learning objectives for this course.	12	4.25	1.09
Average of Student Self Reflection Items	12	4.32	1.09

Organization and Clarity Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor is well prepared for class meetings.	12	4.58	1.11
My instructor explains the subject matter clearly.	12	4.25	1.16
My instructor clearly communicates course goals and objectives.	12	4.08	1.26
My instructor answers questions appropriately.	12	4.25	1.16
Average of Organization	12	4.29	1.1

<i>and Clarity Items</i>			
-------------------------------------	--	--	--

Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor is enthusiastic about teaching this course.	12	4.42	1.11
My instructor presents the subject in an interesting manner.	12	4.58	0.64
My instructor stimulates my thinking.	12	4.58	0.64
My instructor motivates me to do my best work.	12	4.42	0.64
<i>Average of Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation Items</i>	12	4.5	0.68

Rapport and Respect Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor helps students sufficiently with course-related issues.	12	4.25	1.16
My instructor is regularly available for consultation.	12	4.5	1.19

My instructor is impartial in dealing with students.	12	4.42	1.11
My instructor respects opinions different from his or her own.	12	4.17	1.21
Average of Rapport and Respect Items	12	4.33	1.08

Feedback and Accessibility Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Assessment methods accurately assess what I have learned in this course.	12	4	1.29
Grades are assigned fairly.	12	4.25	1.09
The basis for assigning grades is clearly explained.	12	4	1.22
The instructor provides feedback on my progress in the course on a regular basis.	12	4.08	1.32
Average of Feedback and Accessibility Items	12	4.08	1.14

Student Perceptions of Learning Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor advances my knowledge of course content.	12	4.08	1.11
My instructor promotes my understanding of important conceptual themes.	12	4.25	1.16
My instructor enhances my capacity to communicate effectively about the course subject matter.	12	4.08	1.19
My instructor encourages me to value new viewpoints related to the course.	12	3.92	1.44
Average of Student Perceptions of Learning Items	12	4.08	1.16

What were the most effective aspects of this instructor's teaching?

- Clearly explained subjects and got the class involved in an active discussion about several topics. Put a unique perspective over cosmopolitanism and how we could relate that to our own lives.
- Group discussions♦
- He was readily available to instruct me and help me with different papers I had to write.
- Helping us understand the concepts
- The most effective aspects of Hatcher's teaching included the background knowledge or themes he presented to us, and also the multiple alternative viewpoints he made us see. His background of philosophy really helped my understanding in this course.
- Open to understanding students' points of view.
- Professor Hatcher has great energy and enthusiasm, and his class is always enjoyable. I love that he can connect with his students and he makes Core more interesting.
- The most effective part of his teaching is how he asks us questions and then we all answer, which allows to have a good answer to the question.

- Helping me with my writing assignment during office hours really helped me.
- Professor Hatcher is very funny, and he keeps my attention in class. He puts things in very simple terms which makes them easy to understand, think about, and discuss.

In what ways could this instructor improve his or her teaching?

- Have more assignments that go along with the readings
- Staying on topic♦
- He could make the class more difficult.
- Nothing
- My instructor could be a little all over the place sometimes in class, which was kind of his personality, but he should know that he doesn't have to explain simple concepts to us or write down every single word he says on the board.
- A clear grading scale for essays.
- I think that he is a great teacher and I honestly don't know how he could improve teacher core.
- He could improve by calling on new people when they raise their hands.
- I think sometimes Professor Hatcher gets off topic, and it makes the class feel very broken up. If it were more fluid, the class would be much easier to understand.

Please feel free to share any further comments you have for this instructor.

- Great class! Interesting books and involved discussion
- I liked having him this semester and wish I could have him again next semester♦
- It was GREAT!
- He was a nice person in class
- none
- This was a great Core experience! Professor Hatcher is definitely one of my favorite Professors at Valpo.

2017FA PHIL-145-A Survey - Valparaiso University

Course:	PHIL-145-A Elem Logic /Critical Thinking
Department:	PHIL
Faculty:	Hatcher, Michael
Response/Expected:	19/26 (73.1%)

Student Assessment of Instruction (SAI) Report Guidelines

The primary purpose of student evaluations of teaching is to improve teaching effectiveness. For this purpose, data from this report should be interpreted within the following guidelines.

- Faculty and administrators should use the overall score and the subscale scores, not individual items, for evaluation purposes.** Faculty might reflect on their students' responses to individual questions, but administrators should be cautious in using data from individual questions for evaluative purposes.
- SAI data should be used to assess multi-year trends in a faculty member's teaching in a specific class, NOT to compare the single semester scores of faculty to each other.** Evaluating multi-year trends provides an appropriate context for evaluating a faculty member's teaching for a given course. Multi-year trends help to identify faculty members who are improving their teaching effectiveness.
- A single semester's SAI scores should not be used to compare individual faculty members to each other.** SAI scores may be influenced by factors such as students' implicit biases, interest level in the course subject, course level, and satisfaction with the time and day of the course. Given that individual faculty teach different courses that vary in all of these factors, direct cross faculty comparisons are not appropriate with the SAI.
- Evaluation results should be viewed in the context of sample size and response rate.** Ideally, response rates should be as high as possible and faculty should be mindful that they can improve response rates by stressing the importance of the evaluations as a means to improve teaching effectiveness, by clearly communicating that student responses will be taken seriously, and by providing frequent reminders to complete the evaluations.
- The SAI should only be considered one component of a multi-component evaluation process.** While students are able to provide a valuable measure of teaching effectiveness, their opinions alone do not provide sufficient evidence to make decisions about a faculty member's overall teaching effectiveness, especially when such opinions inform decisions about annual reviews, merit raises, tenure, and promotion. Additional evaluation components are described in the Faculty Handbook.
- Answers to the free response questions may not be representative of the class as a whole and care must be taken when using free response comments in an evaluative manner.** Student comments consistent with the survey results may be used for evaluative purposes. Inconsistent comments have value from a formative standpoint, but their use in an evaluative manner are not appropriate as they may

incorrectly represent the results of the validated survey.

7. **Faculty should not allow fear of “lower” SAI scores to dictate rigor or pedagogy in their courses.** Department chairs, faculty peers, and administrators should encourage faculty (especially tenure-track faculty) to create courses that help students learn, even if that learning process requires making students feel uncomfortable in some way (e.g., encouraging students to consider viewpoints they do not support) or requires significant work and rigor. Faculty should be mindful of SAI feedback and open to making changes to their courses, but they should not allow student feedback to have a negative influence on the learning process in their courses.
8. **Self-reflection items are for information only, and not a part of the validated SAI scale.** The report will include a factor mean, average across all five self-reflection items, as well as the mean for each individual item. These items are not included in the Overall SAI Score reported in executive summary.

Executive Summary

Scale	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Overall SAI Score	19	4.2	0.73
Organization and Clarity	19	4.25	0.65
Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation	19	4.28	0.81
Rapport and Respect	19	4.33	0.69
Feedback and Accessibility	19	4.14	0.75
Student Perceptions of Learning	19	4.04	0.98

Responses: strongly disagree=1 disagree=2 neutral=3 agree=4 strongly agree=5

Student Self-Reflection Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
I regularly attended	19	4.42	0.75

course meetings.			
I was regularly prepared for course meetings.	19	4.05	1
I was actively engaged during course meetings.	19	3.79	1
I upheld the Honor Code in all work for this course.	19	4.68	0.57
I was able to achieve the stated learning objectives for this course.	19	3.58	1.14
Average of Student Self Reflection Items	19	4.11	0.67

Organization and Clarity Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor is well prepared for class meetings.	19	4.63	0.67
My instructor explains the subject matter clearly.	19	4.16	0.81
My instructor clearly communicates course goals and objectives.	19	4.05	0.83
My instructor answers questions appropriately.	19	4.16	0.93
Average of Organization	19	4.25	0.65

<i>and Clarity Items</i>			
-------------------------------------	--	--	--

Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor is enthusiastic about teaching this course.	19	4.63	0.67
My instructor presents the subject in an interesting manner.	19	4.16	0.93
My instructor stimulates my thinking.	19	4	1.12
My instructor motivates me to do my best work.	19	4.32	0.92
<i>Average of Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation Items</i>	19	4.28	0.81

Rapport and Respect Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor helps students sufficiently with course-related issues.	19	4.37	0.74
My instructor is regularly available for consultation.	19	4.63	0.67

My instructor is impartial in dealing with students.	19	4	1.12
My instructor respects opinions different from his or her own.	19	4.32	0.73
Average of Rapport and Respect Items	19	4.33	0.69

Feedback and Accessibility Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Assessment methods accurately assess what I have learned in this course.	19	4.11	1.07
Grades are assigned fairly.	19	4.16	0.87
The basis for assigning grades is clearly explained.	18	4.22	0.85
The instructor provides feedback on my progress in the course on a regular basis.	19	4.05	0.69
Average of Feedback and Accessibility Items	19	4.14	0.75

Student Perceptions of Learning Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My instructor advances my knowledge of course content.	19	4.05	1.1
My instructor promotes my understanding of important conceptual themes.	18	4.11	1.05
My instructor enhances my capacity to communicate effectively about the course subject matter.	19	3.95	1.1
My instructor encourages me to value new viewpoints related to the course.	19	4	0.92
Average of Student Perceptions of Learning Items	19	4.04	0.98

What were the most effective aspects of this instructor's teaching?

- Prof. Hatcher obviously was enthusiastic about logic and he knew what he was talking about
- He always provided helpful feedback and was available whenever needed. He cares about his students and how they do in the class which I greatly appreciated.
- He would provide example problems and explain what he was doing while working through them after giving a lecture on how to do it.
- Assigning nightly homework. the style of notes also helped a lot.
- Nothing, awful course. Awful material.
- Going over the content of the course helped me to understand what was expected of the assignments given. A multitude of examples was what really sold me on Hatcher's teaching style.
- he was good in teaching
- Doing exercises in class together
- He always made sure that we understood the concepts, even if it meant he had to explain it more or explain it in a different way.

- The class was engaging and interesting class.
- He was enthusiastic and cared about us.
- The notes were very helpful, and a great way to learn for this course
- He has effective ways of communicating and transferring knowledge to the students, even in the most demanding topics he was able to make the terms understandable and clear.
- he seemed very enthusiastic and approachable
- Being very enthusiastic and providing a lot of examples.♦
- Very well prepared and enthusiastic about the course
- He was always available when I was struggling with certain content.

In what ways could this instructor improve his or her teaching?

- Understand. This is a REQUIRED COURSE! Very few, if anyone, WANT to be here! I understand that it is likely that he did not make the syllabus or perhaps even the tests from this course... this is a problem! Make the exams knowing that the students are not going to do well on them! I would have loved more extra credit, because I was either unaware or unable to attend the extra credit events because of WORK and other CLASSES.
- N/a
- He should not allow his TA to make his own requirements for our homework such as demanding us to staple our homework and in a specific place on the page.
- not really much to improve, this style of teaching works very well with this material.
- Find a new subject.
- When student's ask questions about turning work in late, he should be confident in saying either it is okay to turn the assignment in late, or that it is unacceptable to turn the assignment in after the time it was due.
- He teaches fast and his writing is not clear.
- Slow down.♦
- I would layout the class homework and schedule at the beginning of the year.
- Go into more detail before breaking us out to do an exercise.
- perhaps give clearer instructions on certain assignments (i.e spell everything out so it is crystal clear)
- Control the students. We have the redhead in the front row making cheesy jokes that aren't funny and make the classroom awkward to sit in and we have the bearded stoner kid in the middle row talking to everyone like they are stupid including the teacher.
- Be a little bit more strict. Spend less time going over homework assignments before they are turned in. Don't get sidetracked

Please feel free to share any further comments you have for this instructor.

- Less homework. Move slower.
- I am struggling in this class just because it is hard for me and I don't quite get it but

Prof Hatcher makes learning it fun and he has always been helpful.

- The professor was always happy and glad to answer questions but his TA sometimes wasn't sure how to grade our homework.
- instructor explained things in an easy way to understand, this was one of my less stressful classes because the instructor was able to actually teach the material instead of me teaching myself.
- I was misled by the course. The title is Critical thinking and elementary logic. However, there is little critical thinking involved. The whole course we learned logic. There was basically no background in philosophy that was taught even though this is supposed to be a basic philosophy class. I believe that there should be a separate course available in critical thinking and basic philosophy and this course changed to elementary logic. If I would have known it was just logic I would not have taken the course because it does not have any application outside of very specific circumstances.
- Second to worst class I've ever had.
- I am very surprised that this semester was Hatcher's first year teaching! He is a natural.
- The assignments are very hard and too long.
- Really good job. You made this class much better than I thought it would be
- Keep going, you did a great job!
- Overall very good professor, seemed well informed and very enthusiastic on the subject matter



USC University of
Southern California

Individual Report for Instructor Hatcher (49352-20153 : PHIL-256 Science Religion and the Making of the Modern Mind (49352))

USC Student Course Evaluations - Fall 2015

Project Audience 24

Responses Received 14

Response Ratio 58.33%

Creation Date Tue, May 10, 2016



Technology powered by blueXW

Please provide the name of your TA.

Teaching Assistant Evaluation Form

1. Clearly related the purpose and material in the discussion section to the lecture component of the course.



2. Was consistently punctual.



Statistics	Value
Response Count	14
Mean	4.50
Median	4.50
Mode	4, 5
Standard Deviation	+/-0.52
Population Standard Deviation	+/-0.50
Standard Error (base on SD)	+/-0.14
Standard Error (base on PSD)	+/-0.13

Statistics	Value
Response Count	14
Mean	4.43
Median	5.00
Mode	5
Standard Deviation	+/-0.76
Population Standard Deviation	+/-0.73
Standard Error (base on SD)	+/-0.20
Standard Error (base on PSD)	+/-0.19


3. Articulated the goals of the discussion section clearly.




Statistics	Value
Response Count	14
Mean	4.50
Median	5.00
Mode	5
Standard Deviation	+/-0.76
Population Standard Deviation	+/-0.73
Standard Error (base on SD)	+/-0.20
Standard Error (base on PSD)	+/-0.20

Statistics	Value
Response Count	13
Mean	4.15
Median	4.00
Mode	4
Standard Deviation	+/-0.55
Population Standard Deviation	+/-0.53
Standard Error (base on SD)	+/-0.15
Standard Error (base on PSD)	+/-0.15

5. Presented material in clear, understandable language.




6. Used chalkboard/whiteboard and other visual aids effectively.




Statistics	Value
Response Count	14
Mean	4.14
Median	4.00
Mode	4
Standard Deviation	+/-0.66
Population Standard Deviation	+/-0.64
Standard Error (base on SD)	+/-0.18
Standard Error (base on PSD)	+/-0.17

Statistics	Value
Response Count	14
Mean	4.50
Median	4.50
Mode	4, 5
Standard Deviation	+/-0.52
Population Standard Deviation	+/-0.50
Standard Error (base on SD)	+/-0.14
Standard Error (base on PSD)	+/-0.13

7. Was knowledgeable about the subject matter of the course.



8. Carefully explained difficult concepts, methods, and subject matter.




Statistics	Value
Response Count	14
Mean	4.64
Median	5.00
Mode	5
Standard Deviation	+/-0.50
Population Standard Deviation	+/-0.48
Standard Error (base on SD)	+/-0.13
Standard Error (base on PSD)	+/-0.13


Statistics	Value
Response Count	14
Mean	4.29
Median	4.00
Mode	4
Standard Deviation	+/-0.61
Population Standard Deviation	+/-0.59
Standard Error (base on SD)	+/-0.16
Standard Error (base on PSD)	+/-0.16

Teaching Assistant Evaluation Form (continued)

9. Provided useful insights into the way research is done in this field.




10. Was enthusiastic about communicating the subject matter.




Statistics		Value
Response Count	13	
Mean	4.00	
Median	4.00	
Mode	5	
Standard Deviation	+/-1.00	
Population Standard Deviation	+/-0.96	
Standard Error (base on SD)	+/-0.28	
Standard Error (base on PSD)	+/-0.27	

Statistics		Value
Response Count	14	
Mean	4.64	
Median	5.00	
Mode	5	
Standard Deviation	+/-0.50	
Population Standard Deviation	+/-0.48	
Standard Error (base on SD)	+/-0.13	
Standard Error (base on PSD)	+/-0.13	

11. Encouraged students to participate in their learning (e.g., through discussion, projects, study groups and other appropriate activities).




12. Was accessible to students (e.g., during office hours, before and after class, etc.).




Statistics		Value
Response Count	14	
Mean	4.36	
Median	4.50	
Mode	5	
Standard Deviation	+/-0.84	
Population Standard Deviation	+/-0.81	
Standard Error (base on SD)	+/-0.23	
Standard Error (base on PSD)	+/-0.22	

Statistics		Value
Response Count	14	
Mean	4.64	
Median	5.00	
Mode	5	
Standard Deviation	+/-0.63	
Population Standard Deviation	+/-0.61	
Standard Error (base on SD)	+/-0.17	
Standard Error (base on PSD)	+/-0.16	

13. Evaluated student work in fair and appropriate ways (if applicable).



14. Gave helpful feedback on assignments.




Statistics		Value
Response Count	14	

Statistics		Value
Response Count	14	

Response Count	14
Mean	4.36
Median	4.50
Mode	5
Standard Deviation	+/-0.74
Population Standard Deviation	+/-0.72
Standard Error (base on SD)	+/-0.20
Standard Error (base on PSD)	+/-0.19


Mean	4.21
Median	4.00
Mode	4
Standard Deviation	+/-0.70
Population Standard Deviation	+/-0.67
Standard Error (base on SD)	+/-0.19
Standard Error (base on PSD)	+/-0.18

Overall, how would you rate this teaching assistant?



Statistics	Value
Response Count	14
Mean	4.43
Median	4.50
Mode	5
Standard Deviation	+/-0.65
Population Standard Deviation	+/-0.62
Standard Error (base on SD)	+/-0.17
Standard Error (base on PSD)	+/-0.17

Overall, how would you rate this discussion section?



Statistics	Value
Response Count	14
Mean	4.36
Median	4.50
Mode	5
Standard Deviation	+/-0.74
Population Standard Deviation	+/-0.72
Standard Error (base on SD)	+/-0.20
Standard Error (base on PSD)	+/-0.19

What were this TA's main strengths?

Comment

Clear and Enthusiastic. Really wanted to help and see us succeed and learn.

He is really patient and polite.

Knew the content well, always available to discuss.

Gave helpful and relevant insight to material

punctuality, accessibility, enthusiasm, approachability

He presented the material in a clear and understandable way.

Kept people engaged, kept the mood light, was very good about explaining a very confusing class

was willing to meet outside of class when I was unavailable for office hours

overall, helpful and wanted his students to do well

Effectively communicated the goals of the course and how the material related to those goals for a professor who didn't do much to accomplish this himself.

He tried to explain things in detail.

He was able to clearly explain difficult concepts discussed in lecture. He is very enthusiastic about the subject, which encouraged others to become more involved in the discussion section.

He did not move on until he was sure all of his students understood what he taught us. He was very nice and understanding.

Very helpful in getting us the material we needed from lecture. Much lecture material was not brought up in evaluations.

Answered all questions asked by students and taught with passion.

How might this TA improve his or her teaching effectiveness?

Comment

Can't think of anything. Keep doing what you're doing.

give more example in the class

Articulate the ideas in a more tangible approach, use aids like handouts more

Sometimes went through concepts too quickly

Encourage more discussion from the class

He could perhaps have more in class assignments to help the students understand the material.

The problem with this class is in lecture, it is tough to pay attention and constantly off topic. I thought discussion really was as good as it could be.

.

More encouragement of discussion/debate between students might be helpful.

If he slows down with explaining concepts

He needs to clearly illustrate what he is writing on the board. It was very hard to read the comments from the back of the class.

More formal language. Sometimes it was hard to use my notes formally in writing because I learned it informally

Make the discussion a little more engaging.

Additional comments?

Comment

none

Thanks for a great semester!

None

Really nice guy!



USC University of
Southern California

Individual Report for Instructor Hatcher (49353-20153 : PHIL-256 Science Religion and the Making of the Modern Mind (49353))

USC Student Course Evaluations - Fall 2015

Project Audience 18

Responses Received 14

Response Ratio 77.78%

Creation Date Tue, May 10, 2016

Technology powered by blueXW


Please provide the name of your TA.

Comment
Michael
Michael Hatcher
Michael
Michael Hatcher
Michael

Teaching Assistant Evaluation Form


1. Clearly related the purpose and material in the discussion section to the lecture component of the course.

1 Poor	0	0.00%
2 Below Average	0	0.00%
3 Average	0	0.00%
4 Above Average	3	21.43%
5 Excellent	11	78.57%
Total	14	



2. Was consistently punctual.

1 Poor	0	0.00%
2 Below Average	0	0.00%
3 Average	0	0.00%
4 Above Average	1	7.14%
5 Excellent	13	92.86%
Total	14	




Statistics	Value
Response Count	14
Mean	4.79
Median	5.00
Mode	5
Standard Deviation	+/-0.43
Population Standard Deviation	+/-0.41
Standard Error (base on SD)	+/-0.11
Standard Error (base on PSD)	+/-0.11

Statistics	Value
Response Count	14
Mean	4.93
Median	5.00
Mode	5
Standard Deviation	+/-0.27
Population Standard Deviation	+/-0.26
Standard Error (base on SD)	+/-0.07
Standard Error (base on PSD)	+/-0.07


3. Articulated the goals of the discussion section clearly.

1 Poor	0	0.00%
2 Below Average	0	0.00%
3 Average	0	0.00%
4 Above Average	1	7.14%
5 Excellent	13	92.86%
Total	14	



4. Organized the discussion section to achieve those goals.


1 Poor	0	0.00%
2 Below Average	0	0.00%
3 Average	0	0.00%
4 Above Average	2	14.29%
5 Excellent	12	85.71%
Total	14	




Statistics	Value
Response Count	14
Mean	4.93
Median	5.00
Mode	5
Standard Deviation	+/-0.27
Population Standard Deviation	+/-0.26
Standard Error (base on SD)	+/-0.07
Standard Error (base on PSD)	+/-0.07

Statistics	Value
Response Count	14
Mean	4.86
Median	5.00
Mode	5
Standard Deviation	+/-0.36
Population Standard Deviation	+/-0.35
Standard Error (base on SD)	+/-0.10
Standard Error (base on PSD)	+/-0.09

5. Presented material in clear, understandable language.




6. Used chalkboard/whiteboard and other visual aids effectively.




Statistics	Value
Response Count	14
Mean	4.79
Median	5.00
Mode	5
Standard Deviation	+/-0.43
Population Standard Deviation	+/-0.41
Standard Error (base on SD)	+/-0.11
Standard Error (base on PSD)	+/-0.11

Statistics	Value
Response Count	14
Mean	4.71
Median	5.00
Mode	5
Standard Deviation	+/-0.47
Population Standard Deviation	+/-0.45
Standard Error (base on SD)	+/-0.13
Standard Error (base on PSD)	+/-0.12

7. Was knowledgeable about the subject matter of the course.



8. Carefully explained difficult concepts, methods, and subject matter.




Statistics	Value
Response Count	14
Mean	4.79
Median	5.00
Mode	5
Standard Deviation	+/-0.43
Population Standard Deviation	+/-0.41
Standard Error (base on SD)	+/-0.11
Standard Error (base on PSD)	+/-0.11

Statistics	Value
Response Count	14
Mean	4.79
Median	5.00
Mode	5
Standard Deviation	+/-0.43
Population Standard Deviation	+/-0.41
Standard Error (base on SD)	+/-0.11
Standard Error (base on PSD)	+/-0.11

Teaching Assistant Evaluation Form (continued)


9. Provided useful insights into the way research is done in this field.

1 Poor	0	0.00%
2 Below Average	1	7.14%
3 Average	2	14.29%
4 Above Average	2	14.29%
5 Excellent	9	64.29%
Total	14	



10. Was enthusiastic about communicating the subject matter.

1 Poor	0	0.00%
2 Below Average	0	0.00%
3 Average	0	0.00%
4 Above Average	2	14.29%
5 Excellent	12	85.71%
Total	14	




Statistics		Value
Response Count		14
Mean		4.36
Median		5.00
Mode		5
Standard Deviation		+/-1.01
Population Standard Deviation		+/-0.97
Standard Error (base on SD)		+/-0.27
Standard Error (base on PSD)		+/-0.26

Statistics		Value
Response Count		14
Mean		4.86
Median		5.00
Mode		5
Standard Deviation		+/-0.36
Population Standard Deviation		+/-0.35
Standard Error (base on SD)		+/-0.10
Standard Error (base on PSD)		+/-0.09


11. Encouraged students to participate in their learning (e.g., through discussion, projects, study groups and other appropriate activities).

1 Poor	0	0.00%
2 Below Average	0	0.00%
3 Average	3	21.43%
4 Above Average	3	21.43%
5 Excellent	8	57.14%
Total	14	



12. Was accessible to students (e.g., during office hours, before and after class, etc.).

1 Poor	0	0.00%
2 Below Average	0	0.00%
3 Average	0	0.00%
4 Above Average	2	14.29%
5 Excellent	12	85.71%
Total	14	




Statistics		Value
Response Count		14
Mean		4.36
Median		5.00
Mode		5
Standard Deviation		+/-0.84
Population Standard Deviation		+/-0.81
Standard Error (base on SD)		+/-0.23
Standard Error (base on PSD)		+/-0.22

Statistics		Value
Response Count		14
Mean		4.86
Median		5.00
Mode		5
Standard Deviation		+/-0.36
Population Standard Deviation		+/-0.35
Standard Error (base on SD)		+/-0.10
Standard Error (base on PSD)		+/-0.09


13. Evaluated student work in fair and appropriate ways (if applicable).

1 Poor	0	0.00%
2 Below Average	0	0.00%
3 Average	1	7.14%
4 Above Average	2	14.29%
5 Excellent	11	78.57%
Total	14	



14. Gave helpful feedback on assignments.

1 Poor	0	0.00%
2 Below Average	0	0.00%
3 Average	0	0.00%
4 Above Average	3	21.43%
5 Excellent	11	78.57%
Total	14	




Statistics		Value
Response Count		14

Response Count	14
Mean	4.71
Median	5.00
Mode	5
Standard Deviation	+/-0.61
Population Standard Deviation	+/-0.59
Standard Error (base on SD)	+/-0.16
Standard Error (base on PSD)	+/-0.16


Mean	4.79
Median	5.00
Mode	5
Standard Deviation	+/-0.43
Population Standard Deviation	+/-0.41
Standard Error (base on SD)	+/-0.11
Standard Error (base on PSD)	+/-0.11

Overall, how would you rate this teaching assistant?



Statistics	Value
Response Count	14
Mean	4.79
Median	5.00
Mode	5
Standard Deviation	+/-0.43
Population Standard Deviation	+/-0.41
Standard Error (base on SD)	+/-0.11
Standard Error (base on PSD)	+/-0.11

Overall, how would you rate this discussion section?



Statistics	Value
Response Count	14
Mean	4.57
Median	5.00
Mode	5
Standard Deviation	+/-0.76
Population Standard Deviation	+/-0.73
Standard Error (base on SD)	+/-0.20
Standard Error (base on PSD)	+/-0.19

What were this TA's main strengths?

Comment

He was enthusiastic and articulated the information from lecture.

Enthusiasm, accessibility, ability to clearly communicate and teach the material to us

Michael was wonderful to learn under. I enjoyed going to discussion, and went every week! He really added to the course, and I imagine that if it wasn't for him I wouldn't have bothered to stay in this particular course. Discussions were fun and insightful. It actually saddens me that I had to continually leave discussion early.

Michael was enthusiastic and everyone could tell that he likes this subject- which is really nice. He was always early, so I was able to talk with him before class. Overall he was great!

-explaining simply the key points of the readings and discussions

Extremely helpful and reachable. Is always willing to reach out to students and has helped me during times of need.

Clarity, Michael always provided a focused overview of the important themes from the week's lectures.

enthusiastic, knowledgeable, always willing to help

Clarity and being available

Michael was great at explaining concepts again and again if we didn't understand and he always came up with different ways of explaining things. He was always available to meet for office hours

He was always helpful and went at our pace - he was very enthusiastic and honestly one of the most genuine TAs I've ever had.

Clarity and Helpfulness with understanding.

How might this TA improve his or her teaching effectiveness?

Comment

Maybe help us set up context of how the discussion topics fit into the bigger theme of class a little more

I would suggest writing larger when utilizing the white/black boards. Personally, I have poor vision- and I imagine so do some others- and sometimes it was hard for me to read some of the material on the board. So, if I was going to suggest anything, then it would be for Michael to write just a little bit larger for all us poor-vision folks. Thanks!

-none

Class participation, it always felt like Michael was pulling teeth to get my fellow classmates to participate. This largely falls on my classmates for likely being unprepared.

n/a

Better handwriting

Nothing

Already does excellent job

Additional comments?

Comment

thanks for a great semester!

Keep up all your hard work! I'm really happy and grateful that I was in your discussion this semester.

Great TA !

It was great having you as a TA! This was my first philosophy class and I thoroughly enjoyed it.

n/a

Thank you, Michael!

none.



Individual Report for Instructor Hatcher (49590-20133 : PHIL-135 Legal Controversies and Ethical Principles)

USC Student Course Evaluations

Project Audience 117

Responses Received 67

Response Ratio 57.26%

Subject Details

Name PHIL-135 Legal Controversies and Ethical Principles

Section 49590-20133

Course Type Lecture

Course Department PHIL

First Name Michael David


Last Name Hatcher

Email michael.d.hatcher@gmail.com


Creation Date Thu, Jan 09, 2014

How would you rate instructor Hatcher's effectiveness on the following items?


1. Clearly articulated course goals.




2. Organized course to achieve those goals.




3. Carefully explained difficult concepts, methods, and subject matter.





4. Encouraged students to participate in their learning (e.g., through discussion, projects, study groups and other appropriate activities).



5. Was accessible to students (e.g., during office hours, before and after class, etc.).




6. Evaluated student work in fair and appropriate ways.




How would you rate instructor Hatcher's effectiveness on the following items? (continued)

7. Was enthusiastic about communicating the subject matter.




8. Stimulated student interest in the subject matter.




Statistics		Value
Mean		4.14
Median		4.00
Standard Deviation		+/-0.69

Statistics		Value
Mean		4.29
Median		5.00
Standard Deviation		+/-0.95

9. Presented subject matter in ways that were academically challenging.




10. Provided students a valuable learning experience.



Statistics		Value
Mean		4.14
Median		4.00
Standard Deviation		+/-0.90


Statistics		Value
Mean		4.14
Median		4.00
Standard Deviation		+/-0.90

Overall, how would you rate instructor Hatcher?



Statistics		Value
Mean		4.43
Median		5.00
Standard Deviation		+/-0.79

Overall, how would you rate this course?



Statistics	Value
Mean	3.28
Median	3.00
Standard Deviation	+/-1.18

What were instructor Hatcher's main strengths?

Comment
Easy to talk to and approach.
Accessibility, clarity, approachability. I learned more in Michael's 45 minute discussion than the biweekly lectures from Marmor.
Was very clear and helpful in explaining concepts and answering questions.
Very enthusiastic about subject matter, seemed to understand the concepts pretty well, encouraged students to participate in class.
Simplified the lectures really well into stages. Also he's available and really helpful at office hours
He was very enthusiastic and was able to draw attention from all students

How might instructor Hatcher improve his or her teaching effectiveness?

Comment
Did little during the lecture section of this course but did a lot during discussion. Perhaps go around to answer individual questions during lecture.
-
Possibly be more clear about what is expected in paper assignments.
He is effective
no need to improve, he's a great teacher.

Additional comments?

Comment
none
This class is horrible and it's only made worse by perhaps the worst professor I've had in my years at USC. It's shameful and embarrassing that this type of class is the best we can do and this guy has to teach it. For fuck sake he forces us all to buy a \$200 book that HE wrote full of useless articles that don't do anything for the class. Fuck this class and fuck the GE program. That's my additional comment.
none
The theories, concepts, and ideas we go over are very interesting, but since it is more of an introductory course it can be boring.
none
A quality class for thought!
Book and lecture covered exact same material. Couldn't understand half of what he said between accoustics, his accent, and his at times quiet tone
really enjoyed course

Sometimes the acoustics in the room made it difficult to hear the Professor speak.

All the instructors are great, but the class room is too large and cold, its really difficult to focus. The sound system is not the best, you cannot really hear the lecture clearly.

I think the topic of the course was very interesting, but that Professor Marmor could have done a little more in the lecture to keep the material engaging.

Pressman is great. Hatcher should teach the class with Pressman & Bero leading the discussions & Marnor NEVER "teaching" a general ed class.



Individual Report for Instructor Hatcher (49593-20133 : PHIL-135 Legal Controversies and Ethical Principles)

USC Student Course Evaluations

Project Audience 24

Responses Received 12

Response Ratio 50.0%

Subject Details

Name PHIL-135 Legal Controversies and Ethical Principles
Section 49593-20133
Course Type Discussion
Course Department PHIL
First Name Michael David
Last Name Hatcher
Email michael.d.hatcher@gmail.com


Creation Date Thu, Jan 09, 2014

Please provide the name of your TA.


How would you rate the teaching assistant's effectiveness in each of the following areas?

1. Clearly related the purpose and material in the discussion section to the lecture component of the course.

2. Was consistently punctual.




1 Poor	0	0.00%
2 Below Average	0	0.00%
3 Average	0	0.00%
4 Above Average	4	33.33%
5 Excellent	8	66.67%
Total	12	




Statistics	Value
Mean	4.67
Median	5.00
Standard Deviation	+/-0.49

3. Articulated the goals of the discussion section clearly.



1 Poor	0	0.00%
2 Below Average	0	0.00%
3 Average	4	33.33%
4 Above Average	4	33.33%
5 Excellent	4	33.33%
Total	12	




Statistics	Value
Mean	4.25
Median	4.00
Standard Deviation	+/-0.75

Statistics	Value
Mean	4.00
Median	4.00
Standard Deviation	+/-0.85


5. Presented material in clear, understandable language.

6. Used chalkboard/whiteboard and other visual aids effectively.

1 Poor	0	0.00%
2 Below Average	0	0.00%
3 Average	4	33.33%
4 Above Average	4	33.33%
5 Excellent	4	33.33%
Total	12	



1 Poor	0	0.00%
2 Below Average	2	16.67%
3 Average	1	8.33%
4 Above Average	4	33.33%
5 Excellent	5	41.67%
Total	12	




Statistics	Value
Mean	4.00
Median	4.00
Standard Deviation	+/-0.85


Statistics	Value
Mean	4.00
Median	4.00
Standard Deviation	+/-1.13

How would you rate the teaching assistant's effectiveness in each of the following areas? (continued)

7. Was knowledgeable about the subject matter of the course.




8. Carefully explained difficult concepts, methods, and subject matter.




Statistics		Value
Mean		4.33
Median		4.50
Standard Deviation		+/-0.78

Statistics		Value
Mean		4.33
Median		4.00
Standard Deviation		+/-0.65

9. Provided useful insights into the way research is done in this field.




10. Was enthusiastic about communicating the subject matter.




Statistics		Value
Mean		3.83
Median		3.50
Standard Deviation		+/-0.94

Statistics		Value
Mean		4.58
Median		5.00
Standard Deviation		+/-0.51

11. Encouraged students to participate in their learning (e.g., through discussion, projects, study groups and other appropriate activities).



12. Was accessible to students (e.g., during office hours, before and after class, etc.).




Statistics		Value
Mean		4.58
Median		5.00
Standard Deviation		+/-0.51

Statistics		Value
Mean		4.58
Median		5.00
Standard Deviation		+/-0.51


How would you rate the teaching assistant's effectiveness in each of the following areas? (continued)

13. Evaluated student work in fair and appropriate ways (if applicable).




Statistics	Value
Mean	4.17
Median	4.00
Standard Deviation	+/-0.94

14. Gave helpful feedback on assignments.




Statistics	Value
Mean	4.17
Median	4.00
Standard Deviation	+/-0.94

Overall, how would you rate this teaching assistant?



Statistics	Value
Mean	4.17
Median	4.00
Standard Deviation	+/-0.94

Overall, how would you rate this discussion section?



Statistics	Value
Mean	4.00
Median	4.00
Standard Deviation	+/-1.04

What were this TA's main strengths?

Comment
Michael tried to always ensure we understood material presented in lecture and explained concepts multiple ways, if necessary. He always encouraged us and was available during office hours and appointments to assist students who were finding the material difficult to master. He is an excellent TA and I would enjoy taking a discussion session led by Michael again.

Kept discussion relevant. Went over what the professor taught without being redundant, gave a lot of clarity in the information. Easy to approach, gave me the opportunity to articulate my thoughts and have an intellectual conversation without fear of saying the wrong thing. Learned a lot from bouncing ideas off of him as well as hearing his opposing views, always questioned my thoughts in a way that helped me form them better. Overall great teacher!

Friendly; thoroughly covers all topics from lecture; comes up with many different scenarios to demonstrate the point of each topic

He was very knowledgeable about the subject and was very enthusiastic about the course.

Open to questions

Very nice!

Mr. Hatcher is enthusiastic and extremely available for additional help.

His probing questions and thoughts

excitement in teaching topic

He was able and willing to help any of the students with questions we may have had about the subject matter. He took the time to understand which parts of the content the students were struggling with and made sure to address them and make sure the students fully understood the material.

Michael was always very patient with the students, very thorough in his explanations, was very accessible outside of classroom. Also, he always responded very quickly to our emails. Moreover, I absolutely appreciate how much time and effort he put in before our exams and papers in creating handouts, tools and tips for us.

How might this TA improve his or her teaching effectiveness?

Comment

Possibly returning papers/exams a bit quicker.

No way.

He could possibly be more organized in how he presents information on the whiteboard/chalkboard.

Organize the time better than just asking if we "had questions about anything"

Reiterate and review concepts

Explain in more complex terms, relating directly to the concepts in the lecture

He is sometimes unclear when explaining certain concepts and needs to rephrase things often. He also writes illegibly at times.

a little more clarity/organization of discussion

Everything is good.

Michael is flawless!!!!

Additional comments?

Comment

Mr. Hatcher is a very good TA especially because of his effort to make additional time for students. The things he needs to improve on will not be difficult to fix.

better/ larger handwriting on boards would be helpful



Individual Report for Instructor Hatcher (49596-20133 : PHIL-135 Legal Controversies and Ethical Principles)

USC Student Course Evaluations

Project Audience 24

Responses Received 13

Response Ratio 54.17%

Subject Details

Name PHIL-135 Legal Controversies and Ethical Principles

Section 49596-20133

Course Type Discussion

Course Department PHIL

First Name Michael David

Last Name Hatcher

Email michael.d.hatcher@gmail.com


Creation Date Thu, Jan 09, 2014

Please provide the name of your TA.


Comment
Micheal Hatcher
Michael Hatcher
Michael Hatcher
Michael Hatcher
Michael Hatcher
Hatcher
Michael Hatcher
Michael Hatcher
Michael Hatcher
Michael Hatcher
Michael Hatcher
Michael Hatcher

How would you rate the teaching assistant's effectiveness in each of the following areas?

1. Clearly related the purpose and material in the discussion section to the lecture component of the course.




2. Was consistently punctual.




Statistics	Value
Mean	4.38
Median	5.00
Standard Deviation	+/-0.77

Statistics	Value
Mean	4.77
Median	5.00
Standard Deviation	+/-0.60

3. Articulated the goals of the discussion section clearly.



4. Organized the discussion section to achieve those goals.




Statistics	Value
Mean	4.38
Median	5.00
Standard Deviation	+/-0.96

Statistics	Value
Mean	4.31
Median	5.00
Standard Deviation	+/-0.95


5. Presented material in clear, understandable

6. Used chalkboard/whiteboard and other visual

language.



aids effectively.




Statistics	Value
Mean	4.38
Median	5.00
Standard Deviation	+/-0.96


Statistics	Value
Mean	4.31
Median	5.00
Standard Deviation	+/-1.03

How would you rate the teaching assistant's effectiveness in each of the following areas? (continued)


7. Was knowledgeable about the subject matter of the course.




8. Carefully explained difficult concepts, methods, and subject matter.




9. Provided useful insights into the way research is done in this field.





10. Was enthusiastic about communicating the subject matter.



11. Encouraged students to participate in their learning (e.g., through discussion, projects, study groups and other appropriate activities).




12. Was accessible to students (e.g., during office hours, before and after class, etc.).




How would you rate the teaching assistant's effectiveness in each of the following areas? (continued)

13. Evaluated student work in fair and appropriate ways (if applicable).




Statistics	Value
Mean	4.15
Median	5.00
Standard Deviation	+/-1.28

14. Gave helpful feedback on assignments.




Statistics	Value
Mean	4.17
Median	5.00
Standard Deviation	+/-1.27

Overall, how would you rate this teaching assistant?



Statistics	Value
Mean	4.46
Median	5.00
Standard Deviation	+/-0.97

Overall, how would you rate this discussion section?



Statistics	Value
Mean	4.23
Median	4.00
Standard Deviation	+/-0.93

What were this TA's main strengths?

Comment
He is really helpful and really willing to help!
Easily approachable and easy to talk to.
Clearly explains all concepts

did this on the other form

He brought the class together and got everyone involved. When the lecture would be confusing and separate people by having more talking than questions, Mr. Hatcher was always asking for questions and covered entire units in depth in 50 minutes when it would take 2 sections of lecture to learn.

Knew his subject matter very well.

He was able to draw attention from all the students, and create a talkative atmosphere

His ability to explain complicated ideas in a concise manner was really helpful.

Enthusiasm, clarity, knowledge of material

Friendly, knowledgeable

Clearly explained all the difficult concepts.

How might this TA improve his or her teaching effectiveness?

Comment

Try and get more group participation from the class.

Possibly might not go as in-depth as possible.

-

Send out study guides, but when I missed class he would send me the notes I missed so maybe no change at all.

He really doesn't need to improve his effectiveness

Move at a faster pace

have more materials available for students' self-study

Make sure that your writing is readable.

Additional comments?

Comment

Michael is a great TA! He is very nice and very helpful. Every time I go to his office hour or have an appointment with him, he always tells me a lot and gives me many useful suggestions!

-

he is the man

I really enjoyed this class

DEPT: PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

EVALUATION SERVICES

INSTRUCTOR: HATCHER, M.

06/24/13

COURSE: 101

RESPONSES FROM TEACHING ASSISTANT FORM A - SPRING 2013

CLASS NUMBER: 49301

NUMBER OF STUDENTS COMPLETING EVALUATIONS: 17
PERCENTAGE OF ENROLLED STUDENTS COMPLETING EVALUATIONS: 71

THE FOLLOWING STATISTICS ARE BASED UPON THE ACTUAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS RESPONDING TO THE QUESTION.

FOR EACH QUESTION, THE PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS MAKING EACH RESPONSE (OR NOT RESPONDING), THE MEAN RESPONSE, AND THE STANDARD DEVIATION ARE PRESENTED. CAUTION SHOULD BE USED IN INTERPRETING RESULTS WHEN THE TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS COMPLETING EVALUATIONS IS SMALL. THE PERCENTAGE OF ENROLLED STUDENTS COMPLETING EVALUATIONS IS SMALL, OR THE PERCENTAGE OF "NON-RESPONSE" TO INDIVIDUAL ITEMS IS LARGE.

(SOME QUESTIONS HAVE BEEN ABBREVIATED)

----- PERCENTAGE RESPONDING -----

SPECIFIC QUESTIONS	NO RESP	PERCENTAGE RESPONDING				MEAN	STD DEV
		POOR (1)	BELOW (2)	Avg (3)	Above (4)		
1. CLEARLY RELATED PURPOSE & MATERIAL IN DISCUSSION SECTION TO LECTURE COMPONENT OF THE COURSE.	0	0	0	6	29	63	0.59
2. WAS CONSISTENTLY PUNCTUAL.	0	0	0	0	47	53	0.53
3. ARTICULATED GOALS OF THE DISCUSSION SECTION CLEARLY.	0	0	0	18	35	47	0.29
4. ORGANIZED DISCUSSION SECTION TO ACHIEVE THOSE GOALS.	0	0	0	12	41	47	0.70
5. PRESENTED MATERIAL IN CLEAR, UNDERSTANDABLE LANGUAGE.	0	0	0	12	53	35	0.24
6. USED CHALKBOARD & OTHER VISUAL AIDS EFFECTIVELY.	0	0	0	29	35	35	0.83
7. WAS KNOWLEDGEABLE ABOUT THE SUBJECT MATTER.	0	0	0	18	41	41	0.75
8. EXPLAINED DIFFICULT CONCEPTS, METHODS, SUB. MATTER.	0	0	0	18	35	47	0.29
9. PROVIDED INSIGHTS INTO WAY RESEARCH IS DONE.	0	0	12	29	24	35	3.62
10. WAS ENTHUSIASTIC ABOUT COMMUNICATING SUBJECT MATTER.	0	0	0	6	29	65	0.59
11. ENCOURAGED STUDENTS TO PARTICIPATE IN THEIR LEARNING.	0	0	0	6	59	35	0.29
12. WAS ACCESSIBLE TO STUDENTS.	0	0	0	0	29	71	0.71
13. EVALUATED STUDENT WORK IN FAIR & APPROPRIATE WAYS.	0	0	0	12	47	41	0.29
14. GAVE HELPFUL FEEDBACK ON ASSIGNMENTS.	0	0	0	18	41	41	0.24

GENERAL QUESTIONS

15. OVERALL, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THIS TEACHING ASSISTANT?	0	0	0	6	41	53	4.47	0.62
16. OVERALL, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THIS DISCUSSION SECTION?	0	0	6	18	47	29	4.00	0.87

QUESTIONS PROVIDED BY INSTRUCTOR

18. INSTRUCTOR PROVIDED QUESTION # 18	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+
19. INSTRUCTOR PROVIDED QUESTION # 19	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+
20. INSTRUCTOR PROVIDED QUESTION # 20	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+
21. INSTRUCTOR PROVIDED QUESTION # 21	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+
22. INSTRUCTOR PROVIDED QUESTION # 22	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+

DUE TO ROUNDING, PERCENTAGES MAY NOT ADD TO 100.

Michael Hatcher

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

PHIL

DEPARTMENT NAME

101

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

- What were this instructor's main strengths? Presented the material in a passionate way and you could tell he enjoyed teaching the subject of philosophy. Went over all the small details.

- How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? Encourage more students to participate in discussion.

- Additional comments? Made philosophy seem a bit interesting.

Michael Hatchett

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Phil Atchley

DEPARTMENT NAME

101g

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths?

Knowledge of the material

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness?

Actually making sure students know the material, moved quickly through a lot of topics

3. Additional comments?

Michael Hatcher

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Phil

DEPARTMENT NAME

101

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths?

Excited to teach, and did well even though the class as a whole was not always the most receptive.

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness?

3. Additional comments? It was a fun semester.

Michael Hatchner

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Philosophy

DEPARTMENT NAME

101

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths? He is intelligent; is able to respond to different questions quickly and effectively. He loves philosophy and communicating, so you'll learn a lot from talking to him.

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? Maybe more outgoing?

3. Additional comments? Thank you for your kind help throughout the semester! Have a nice summer holiday! :)

Hatcher

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Phyl

DEPARTMENT NAME

101

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths?

Encourages participation, carefully explains difficult lecture material, very helpful at office hours.

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness?

Find a way to get even more participation during discussion sections.

3. Additional comments?

Michael Hatcher

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Phil

DEPARTMENT NAME

101

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths? Enthusiasm

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? Find a way to make his students enthusiastic about philosophy

3. Additional comments? _____

Michael Hatcher

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Philosophy

DEPARTMENT NAME

101

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths? *He is really nice and keeps the discussion going*

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? *Ask students instead of always waiting for students to speak up.*

3. Additional comments?

Hatcher

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Philosophy

DEPARTMENT NAME

101

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths?

He was very clear and effective and constantly offered to help his students to develop their ideas. Great guy with awesome ideas and availability.

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness?

He can be a little more open to class discussions, meaning that he can ask the group randomly for their opinions to get people engaged more.

3. Additional comments?

Michael Hatcher
INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

PHIL
DEPARTMENT NAME

161-g
COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 280)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths? Very passionate on the subject and wanting students to get involved as possible. Michael is also very helpful and make himself available for help both on and off line

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? Explain harder concepts in easier ways and make subject more exciting

3. Additional comments?

Michael Hatcher

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Philosophy

DEPARTMENT NAME

101

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths?

He was excited to teach and was
always willing to help his students

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness?

/

3. Additional comments?

Michael was great. A great teacher and
even better person

Michael Hatch

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Philosophy

DEPARTMENT NAME

101

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to the instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths?

Clearly explained concepts, very accessible
extremely passionate about the content, very knowledgeable

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? More confident in
his teachings

3. Additional comments? Very good TA!!! Did a very
good job

Hatcher
INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Phil
DEPARTMENT NAME

101
COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

- What were this instructor's main strengths? Enthusiastic, informative, accessible, interesting, clear.

- How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? N/A

- Additional comments? Great TA

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME:

DEPARTMENT NAME:

COURSE NUMBER:

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths?

clear, available for questions/concerns, enthusiastic,
made discussion/subject matter interesting

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness?

n/a

3. Additional comments?

n/a

MICHAEL HATCHER
INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

PHIL
DEPARTMENT NAME

100g
COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

- What were this instructor's main strengths? being able to explain concepts well, being accessible through officehours

- How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? N/A

- Additional comments?

Michael Hatcher

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Philosophy

DEPARTMENT NAME

101

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths?

breaking down the concepts,
making office hours ^{more} available

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness?

using a power point and/or
providing class notes.

3. Additional comments?

good for overall!

Michael Hatcher

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Philosophy

DEPARTMENT NAME

1019

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (I.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths? *He was enthusiastic about the subject matter and always encouraged the students to participate in discussions.*

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? *provide more handouts on premise/conclusion writing for student practice.*

3. Additional comments?



Michael Hatcher
INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

~~PHIL~~ PHIL
DEPARTMENT NAME

101
COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths? Very enthusiastic

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? Make class more interesting & engaging

3. Additional comments?

DEPT: PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

EVALUATION SERVICES

INSTRUCTOR: MATCHER, M.

06/24/13

COURSE: 101

RESPONSES FROM TEACHING ASSISTANT FORM A - SPRING 2013

CLASS NUMBER: 49302

NUMBER OF STUDENTS COMPLETING EVALUATIONS: 16
PERCENTAGE OF ENROLLED STUDENTS COMPLETING EVALUATIONS: 70

THE FOLLOWING STATISTICS ARE BASED UPON THE ACTUAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS RESPONDING TO THE QUESTION.

FOR EACH QUESTION, THE PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS MAKING EACH RESPONSE (OR NOT RESPONDING), THE MEAN RESPONSE, AND THE STANDARD DEVIATION ARE PRESENTED. CAUTION SHOULD BE USED IN INTERPRETING RESULTS WHEN THE TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS COMPLETING EVALUATIONS IS SMALL, OR THE PERCENTAGE OF "NON-RESPONSE" TO INDIVIDUAL ITEMS IS LARGE.

(SOME QUESTIONS HAVE BEEN ABBREVIATED)

SPECIFIC QUESTIONS	NO RESP	PERCENTAGE RESPONDING					
		POOR (1)	BELOW (2)	Avg. (3)	Above (4)	Excellent (5)	MEAN
1. CLEARLY RELATED PURPOSE & MATERIAL IN DISCUSSION SECTION TO LECTURE COMPONENT OF THE COURSE.	0	0	0	19	44	38	4.19
2. WAS CONSISTENTLY PUNCTUAL.	0	0	0	6	19	75	4.69
3. ARTICULATED GOALS OF THE DISCUSSION SECTION CLEARLY.	0	0	0	13	44	44	4.31
4. ORGANIZED DISCUSSION SECTION TO ACHIEVE THOSE GOALS.	6	0	6	0	44	44	4.33
5. PRESENTED MATERIAL IN CLEAR, UNDERSTANDABLE LANGUAGE.	0	6	6	13	38	38	3.94
6. USED CHALKBOARD & OTHER VISUAL AIDS EFFECTIVELY.	0	0	6	19	25	50	4.19
7. WAS KNOWLEDGEABLE ABOUT THE SUBJECT MATTER.	6	0	0	0	31	63	4.67
8. EXPLAINED DIFFICULT CONCEPTS, METHODS, SUB. MATTER.	0	6	0	6	44	44	4.19
9. PROVIDED INSIGHTS INTO HOW RESEARCH IS DONE.	0	0	13	19	31	38	3.94
10. WAS ENTHUSIASTIC ABOUT COMMUNICATING SUBJECT MATTER.	0	0	0	0	31	69	4.69
11. ENCOURAGED STUDENTS TO PARTICIPATE IN THEIR LEARNING.	0	0	6	0	38	56	4.44
12. WAS ACCESSIBLE TO STUDENTS.	6	0	0	0	38	56	4.60
13. EVALUATED STUDENT WORK IN FAIR & APPROPRIATE WAYS.	0	6	0	6	38	50	4.25
14. GAVE HELPFUL FEEDBACK ON ASSIGNMENTS.	0	0	0	13	38	50	4.38
<hr/>							
GENERAL QUESTIONS:							
15. OVERALL, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THIS TEACHING ASSISTANT?	0	0	6	0	44	50	4.38
16. OVERALL, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THIS DISCUSSION SECTION?	0	0	13	25	25	38	3.88
<hr/>							
QUESTIONS PROVIDED BY INSTRUCTOR:							
18. INSTRUCTOR PROVIDED QUESTION # 18	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
19. INSTRUCTOR PROVIDED QUESTION # 19	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
20. INSTRUCTOR PROVIDED QUESTION # 20	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
21. INSTRUCTOR PROVIDED QUESTION # 21	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
22. INSTRUCTOR PROVIDED QUESTION # 22	0	0	0	0	0	0	-

DUE TO ROUNDING, PERCENTAGES MAY NOT ADD TO 100.

Michael Hatchett

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Philosophy

DEPARTMENT NAME

100

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. Those evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

- What were this instructor's main strengths? Funny, nice, approachable / Knowledgeable
of subject matter

- How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? Get the class more involved tho it is difficult w/ a 9am discussion

- Additional comments?

Michael Hatchett

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Ph.1

DEPARTMENT NAME

101

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to the instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths?

Patience. Tolerant of students' passion
for the subject matter. Intellect.

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? Ban computers earlier

3. Additional comments? Michael is a god among men. He is
one of the most passionate and patient teachers I have
ever had. He has very pure morals and values
and is an amazing influence among the students
in class. Michael needs a full-time job at USC
Great man Great teacher.

Michael Hatcher
INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

PHIL
DEPARTMENT NAME

101
COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths?

Michael is very good at explaining all the concepts we were confused by in from lecture.

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness?

maybe figure out a system of forced participation.

3. Additional comments?

Great TA. Very friendly & helpful

Hatcher

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

PHIL

DEPARTMENT NAME

101

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USIG administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths?

Enthusiastic, encouraged discussion,
knowledgeable, easy to talk to

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness?

Work on understanding and responding to students' arguments and cases (basically, thinking on your feet) - he tried to make sure that no one felt dismissed but could be better at picking out the useful vs. nonuseful parts of a comment made in section

3. Additional comments?

Michael Hatcher
INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Philosophy
DEPARTMENT NAME

PHIL 101
COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USCI administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths? He was very knowledgeable about the class material and he did a good job of encouraging students to participate in discussions.

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? He could add a bit more variation to the discussions in sections compared to the discussions in lecture.

3. Additional comments?

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME:

DEPARTMENT NAME:

COURSE NUMBER:

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths?

DIRECT, FOCUSED.

ENTERTAINING, ENTHUSIASTIC,

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness?

3. Additional comments?

HATCHER IS THE MAN!

Hatcher
INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Phil
DEPARTMENT NAME

101
COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

- What were this instructor's main strengths? Encouraging, logical, willing to communicate, fair.

- How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? Pretty good

- Additional comments?

Michael Fletcher
INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Philosophy 101
DEPARTMENT NAME

49362
COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths?

His ability to explain the concepts discussed in lecture in a clear and effective manner, and his ability to engage students.

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness?

N/A. He will only get better with experience.

3. Additional comments?

Great TA of a great discussion section.

Michael Hatchett
INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

PHL
DEPARTMENT NAME

101
COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths? He was very open to any questions.
He was also very knowledgeable.

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? I would like
some more visual examples.

3. Additional comments? Great job.

Michael Hatcher Phil

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

DEPARTMENT NAME

110

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

- What were this instructor's main strengths?

He was very open about discussion
and engaging students & making
sure we understood the material

- How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness?

Maybe more download might
help

- Additional comments?

Thank you for a great class

Michael Hatcher
INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

philosophy
DEPARTMENT NAME

101
COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths?

He was committed to the class and the subject matter. Really cared. Also available most the time outside of class.

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness?

Better clarify difficult concepts. More clearly explain reasoning on grading.

3. Additional comments?

The grading was rough/loosey and hard to follow. seemed circumstantial and not based off of any reasonable guidelines.

Michael Hatcher
INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Philosophy
DEPARTMENT NAME

101
COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths?

He is really kind and always in a happy mood. He was also always available to meet and willing to help explain material and help out however he could. He also made good handouts for discussion

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness?

Sometimes his examples for explaining arguments got too detailed and trivial, which was confusing at times.

3. Additional comments?

DEPT: PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

EVALUATION SERVICES

INSTRUCTOR: HATCHER ,H.

01/15/13

COURSE: 285

RESPONSES FROM TEACHING ASSISTANT FORM A - FALL 2012

CLASS NUMBER: 49572

NUMBER OF STUDENTS COMPLETING EVALUATIONS: 14
 PERCENTAGE OF ENROLLED STUDENTS COMPLETING EVALUATIONS: 82

THE FOLLOWING STATISTICS ARE BASED UPON THE ACTUAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS RESPONDING TO THE QUESTION.

FOR EACH QUESTION, THE PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS MAKING EACH RESPONSE (OR NOT RESPONDING), THE MEAN RESPONSE, AND THE STANDARD DEVIATION ARE PRESENTED. CAUTION SHOULD BE USED IN INTERPRETING RESULTS WHEN THE TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS COMPLETING EVALUATIONS IS SMALL, THE PERCENTAGE OF ENROLLED STUDENTS COMPLETING EVALUATIONS IS SMALL, OR THE PERCENTAGE OF "NON-RESPONSE" TO INDIVIDUAL ITEMS IS LARGE.

(SOME QUESTIONS HAVE BEEN ABBREVIATED)

SPECIFIC QUESTIONS	NO RESP	PERCENTAGE RESPONDING					STD DEV
		POOR	BELOW AVG	Avg	ABOVE AVG	EXCELLENT	
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	
1. CLEARLY RELATED PURPOSE & MATERIAL IN DISCUSSION SECTION TO LECTURE COMPONENT OF THE COURSE.	0	0	0	0	7	93	4.93 0.27
2. WAS CONSISTENTLY PUNCTUAL.	0	0	0	0	0	100	5.00 -
3. ARTICULATED GOALS OF THE DISCUSSION SECTION CLEARLY.	0	0	0	0	29	71	4.71 0.47
4. ORGANIZED DISCUSSION SECTION TO ACHIEVE THOSE GOALS.	0	0	0	7	29	64	4.57 0.65
5. PRESENTED MATERIAL IN CLEAR, UNDERSTANDABLE LANGUAGE.	0	0	0	0	21	79	4.79 0.43
6. USED CHALKBOARD & OTHER VISUAL AIDS EFFECTIVELY.	0	0	0	7	14	79	4.71 0.61
7. WAS KNOWLEDGEABLE ABOUT THE SUBJECT MATTER.	0	0	0	0	36	64	4.64 0.50
8. EXPLAINED DIFFICULT CONCEPTS, METHODS, SUB. MATTER.	7	0	0	0	36	57	4.62 0.51
9. PROVIDED INSIGHTS INTO HOW RESEARCH IS DONE	0	0	7	21	36	36	4.00 0.96
10. WAS ENTHUSIASTIC ABOUT COMMUNICATING SUBJECT MATTER.	0	0	0	0	14	86	4.86 0.36
11. ENCOURAGED STUDENTS TO PARTICIPATE IN THEIR LEARNING.	0	0	0	7	29	64	4.57 0.65
12. WAS ACCESSIBLE TO STUDENTS.	7	0	0	0	21	71	4.77 0.44
13. EVALUATED STUDENT WORK IN FAIR & APPROPRIATE WAYS.	0	0	0	21	43	36	4.14 0.77
14. GAVE HELPFUL FEEDBACK ON ASSIGNMENTS.	0	0	0	14	14	71	4.57 0.76

GENERAL QUESTIONS

15. OVERALL, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THIS TEACHING ASSISTANT?	3	0	0	0	21	71	4.77 0.44
16. OVERALL, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THIS DISCUSSION SECTION?	3	0	0	0	43	56	4.54 0.52

QUESTIONS PROVIDED BY INSTRUCTOR

18. INSTRUCTOR PROVIDED QUESTION # 18	0	0	0	0	0	0	- -
19. INSTRUCTOR PROVIDED QUESTION # 19	0	0	0	0	0	0	- -
20. INSTRUCTOR PROVIDED QUESTION # 20	0	0	0	0	0	0	- -
21. INSTRUCTOR PROVIDED QUESTION # 21	0	0	0	0	0	0	- -
22. INSTRUCTOR PROVIDED QUESTION # 22	0	0	0	0	0	0	- -

DUE TO ROUNDING, PERCENTAGES MAY NOT ADD TO 100.

Michael Hatcher Philosophy

285

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

DEPARTMENT NAME

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

- What were this instructor's main strengths?

ability to explain complicated concepts
office hours availability

- How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness?

not sure!

- Additional comments?

Michael was the best TA I've had. I found this course extremely difficult and on one occasion we sat w/ me for 1 hr 45 min going through material.

HATCHER
INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

PHIL
DEPARTMENT NAME

285
COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to the instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths? *Explained difficult concepts clearly and systematically. Very patient - willing to go over things until people understand. Open to questions & encouraged classroom discussion.*

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? *n/a*

3. Additional comments? *This section was extremely helpful to me in taking this course, and made the material vastly more accessible. Thank you.*

Michael Tschirhart

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Phil

DEPARTMENT NAME

205

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

- What were this instructor's main strengths? Engaging and helpful in reviewing material. He made sure we knew and understood the material

- How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? I think he's pretty effective already and that there isn't much room for improvement

- Additional comments? Not anything more than he was a good TA

Michael Hatcher
INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

PHIL
DEPARTMENT NAME

285
COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and turn them in a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name; Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths? *Friendly, kind, patient, open to discussion, answered questions well, helped prepare for exams. Graded assignments and exams quickly. Went over difficult class material. Very helpful.*

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? *Everything was fine.*

3. Additional comments? *Very Helpful Section!*

Michael Hatcher

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Philosophy

DEPARTMENT NAME

285Lg

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths?

He communicated material effectively and clearly. He was enthusiastic about the material. It was easy to participate and discuss in class.

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness?

N/A

3. Additional comments?

N/A

Michael Hatcher

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

PHIL

DEPARTMENT NAME

285

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths?

Explained concepts pretty clearly, funny

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness?

do over 100% more slowly

3. Additional comments?

Hatcher
INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Philosophy
DEPARTMENT NAME

285
COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USG administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths?

Enthusiastic, REALLY NICE & HELPFUL! Michael was also very approachable and did everything he could to help the class learn the material. Really thankful he was my instructor. It was a pleasure being in his section.

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness?

Have a better coordination with the main professor.

3. Additional comments?

No.

Hatcher

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Philosophy

DEPARTMENT NAME

285

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths? Made lecture much clearer and explained the material in ways that made sense. Also a very friendly and approachable person.

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness?

N/A

3. Additional comments?

Michael Fletcher

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

PHIL

DEPARTMENT NAME

285

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths? *He was very accessible outside of office hours and was very understanding when answering questions.*
2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? *Have a slightly more structured discussion*
3. Additional comments? _____

HATCHER, MICHAEL
INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

PHIL
DEPARTMENT NAME

285
COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths? *enthusiastic, great at explaining material covered in lecture, very helpful*
2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? *not so much his effectiveness, but professors lack of clarity that sometimes made it difficult to understand course material*
3. Additional comments? *USE BLACKBOARD*

Michael Hatcher
INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Philosophy
DEPARTMENT NAME

PHIL 205
COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name; Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths? He was very organized and helpful to understand the course material. This was more helpful than actual lecture to me. He was also very helpful during his office hours.

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? More handouts to students, better grading feedback that is fairer

3. Additional comments? This discussion is too long. 1 hr 30 min or less would be much more effective.

Michael Hatcher

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

PHIL

DEPARTMENT NAME

285

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

- What were this instructor's main strengths?

Explains difficult subject clearly and patiently.
Giving students thinking about those subjects, and uses vivid words to present ~~to~~ them.

- How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness?

- Additional comments?

Michael Hatcher

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Philosophy

DEPARTMENT NAME

285

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths? Michael was very helpful and enthusiastic!
He often met with me outside of class to discuss difficult material. He was excellent at explaining things that were not clear in lecture.
2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? I think sometimes he would get off topic to material related to the course. He would always talk about philosophy, but when answering peoples questions he would spend alot of time answering them then tell us it was not relevant to the course and test. I think this may have been more of a problem because of the students and not him.
3. Additional comments? Michael is great!

Michael Hatcher
INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Philosophy
DEPARTMENT NAME
(PHIL285)

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and turn them in a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

- What were this instructor's main strengths?

He is passionate about his work and he is prepared when he comes to class. He tries to make class enjoyable as possible.

- How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness?

Some concepts were difficult to understand and it was even difficult for the instructor to explain at some points. I'm not sure how this could be improved.

- Additional comments?

M. HATCHER

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

PHL

DEPARTMENT NAME

285

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths?

Very enthusiastic about material & accommodating to student needs.

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness?

[Handwriting is illegible]

3. Additional comments?

Glad to have this TA!

DEPT: PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

EVALUATION SERVICES

INSTRUCTOR: HATCHER ,M

01/15/11

COURSE: 285

RESPONSES FROM TEACHING ASSISTANT FORM A - FALL 2012

CLASS NUMBER: 49573

NUMBER OF STUDENTS COMPLETING EVALUATIONS: 10
PERCENTAGE OF ENROLLED STUDENTS COMPLETING EVALUATIONS: 67

THE FOLLOWING STATISTICS ARE BASED UPON THE ACTUAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS RESPONDING TO THE QUESTION.

FOR EACH QUESTION, THE PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS MAKING EACH RESPONSE (OR NOT RESPONDING), THE MEAN RESPONSE, AND THE STANDARD DEVIATION ARE PRESENTED. CAUTION SHOULD BE USED IN INTERPRETING RESULTS WHEN THE TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS COMPLETING EVALUATIONS IS SMALL, OR THE PERCENTAGE OF "NON-RESPONSE" TO INDIVIDUAL ITEMS IS LARGE.

(SOME QUESTIONS HAVE BEEN ABBREVIATED)

SPECIFIC QUESTIONS	NO RESP	PERCENTAGE RESPONDING					STD DEV
		POOR (1)	BELOW AVG (2)	AVG (3)	ABOVE AVG (4)	EXCELLENT (5)	
1. CLEARLY RELATED PURPOSE & MATERIAL IN DISCUSSION SECTION TO LECTURE COMPONENT OF THE COURSE.	0	0	0	0	40	60	4.60 0.52
2. WAS CONSISTENTLY PUNCTUAL.	0	0	0	0	0	100	5.00 *
3. ARTICULATED GOALS OF THE DISCUSSION SECTION CLEARLY.	0	0	0	10	40	50	4.40 0.70
4. ORGANIZED DISCUSSION SECTION TO ACHIEVE THOSE GOALS.	0	0	0	10	40	50	4.40 0.70
5. PRESENTED MATERIAL IN CLEAR, UNDERSTANDABLE LANGUAGE.	0	0	0	0	40	60	4.60 0.52
6. USED CHALKBOARD & OTHER VISUAL AIDS EFFECTIVELY.	0	0	0	20	20	60	4.40 0.84
7. WAS KNOWLEDGEABLE ABOUT THE SUBJECT MATTER.	0	0	0	0	20	80	4.80 0.42
8. EXPLAINED DIFFICULT CONCEPTS, METHODS, SUB. MATTER.	0	0	0	0	30	70	4.70 0.48
9. PROVIDED INSIGHTS INTO WAY RESEARCH IS DONE	0	0	0	30	50	20	3.90 0.74
10. WAS ENTHUSIASTIC ABOUT COMMUNICATING SUBJECT MATTER.	0	0	0	0	20	80	4.80 0.42
11. ENCOURAGED STUDENTS TO PARTICIPATE IN THEIR LEARNING.	0	0	0	10	40	50	4.40 0.70
12. WAS ACCESSIBLE TO STUDENTS.	0	0	0	0	30	70	4.70 0.48
13. EVALUATED STUDENT WORK IN FAIR & APPROPRIATE WAYS.	10	0	0	20	10	60	4.44 0.68
14. GAVE HELPFUL FEEDBACK ON ASSIGNMENTS.	0	0	0	10	30	60	4.50 0.71

GENERAL QUESTIONS

15. OVERALL, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THIS TEACHING ASSISTANT?	0	0	0	0	20	80	4.80 0.42
16. OVERALL, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THIS DISCUSSION SECTION?	0	0	0	0	50	50	4.50 0.53

QUESTIONS PROVIDED BY INSTRUCTOR

18. INSTRUCTOR PROVIDED QUESTION # 18	0	0	0	0	0	0	*
19. INSTRUCTOR PROVIDED QUESTION # 19	0	0	0	0	0	0	*
20. INSTRUCTOR PROVIDED QUESTION # 20	0	0	0	0	0	0	*
21. INSTRUCTOR PROVIDED QUESTION # 21	0	0	0	0	0	0	*
22. INSTRUCTOR PROVIDED QUESTION # 22	0	0	0	0	0	0	*

DUE TO ROUNDING, PERCENTAGES MAY NOT ADD TO 100.

Michael Hatcher
INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Philosophy
DEPARTMENT NAME

Phil-285
COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths? This instructor's main strengths were providing a friendly and inviting classroom environment, teaching the course material in an interesting and engaging manner that is easy to comprehend by breaking down the material in a way that is appropriate for the students. Being a dynamic and inviting presence in the classroom, and providing timely and excellent test prep.
2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness?

This instructor meets the needs of all the students.

3. Additional comments? This instructor is a great TA.

Michael Hatcher

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Phil ~~285~~

DEPARTMENT NAME

285

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e.: Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths?

He helped to clarify information and content presented in lecture, was always available to offer help outside of class, responded promptly to e-mails, used class time well - very organized. Helped make this course better. If it weren't for this lab, I may not be passing. He cares about his students!
2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness?

~~He~~ Too meticulous on written ~~as~~ assignments. I think he should have focused more on the main idea than reiterating exact verbiage. Just because we don't regurgitate the lecture completely doesn't mean students don't understand a concept. However, I think this may be
3. Additional comments?

more of the Professor's wishes coming into play.

Michael Hatcher
INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Philosophy
DEPARTMENT NAME

PHIL285
COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to the instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith; Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths? He is very fair & open-minded.

Very helpful & cares about his students. I got more out of one sitting with Michael for the 2nd test than I did the entire class.

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? Since this is

philosophy, perhaps grading less on specific wording & arguments in lecture, & more on things such as "what would a theist say about premise 2 of the Free Will Defense?" would be more beneficial.

3. Additional comments? Michael is the man.

Michael Hatchett

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Philosophy

DEPARTMENT NAME

285

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to UGC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop-off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths?

I feel that it is mostly due to his discussion sessions that I understand the material for this class. I felt also that he explained more thoroughly and expanded more on important topics than the main professor. He is also a fair grader.

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness?

Based on what I have seen of attendance this term, he should make attendance mandatory in some way, because it's hard to discuss with small numbers sometimes. However, it can be positive because only people who want to be here are here.

3. Additional comments?

Michael Hatcher

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Philosophy

DEPARTMENT NAME

285

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths? He was very knowledgeable about the subject and extremely helpful. He created very stimulating conversations in class. I found his discussion section to be the most helpful part of the course, and was actually the time when I really was able to learn and understand the material. Lecture was never that helpful, but he was. He was a fair grader and had review sessions before exams were extremely helpful.

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? He doesn't need to improve at all.

3. Additional comments? He was a great TA.

Hatcher

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

PHIL

DEPARTMENT NAME

285

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths?

TA is really nice and very helpful if your looking for it. Will take the time out to make sure you understand the concepts.

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness?

2 hour discussions are pretty long and sometimes we get into some boring topics when most of the class is not involved.

3. Additional comments?

Pretty good TA overall. Once again extremely helpful.

Michael Harber

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

PHIL-285

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to the instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths?

Comprehensive knowledge about Philosophy displayed in class. Able to explain problems if students don't understand Argument

All you need is love, love, love, love, love!

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness?

Take specific questions about anything relating to Philosophy, not just topic. More interesting examples

3. Additional comments?

Fun, but confusing class.

Michael Hatcher

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Philosophy

DEPARTMENT NAME

285

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administration to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

- What were this instructor's main strengths? *Michael is excellent at explaining concepts in ways that make sense. I found his discussion class to be more informative than the lecture sessions.*

- How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? *I don't have any suggestions as I see no need for improvement*

- Additional comments? *-*

Michael Hatcher
INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Philosophy
DEPARTMENT NAME

255
COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them in a time off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

- What were this instructor's main strengths? Amiable and knowledgeable, does a good job communicating enthusiasm for the material, while still being open to new ideas

- How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? Not really sure ☺

- Additional comments?

Michael Hatcher
INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Philosophy
DEPARTMENT NAME

285
COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

- What were this instructor's main strengths? Communicated with the class

- How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? I can't think of anything

- Additional comments? Nope

DEPT: PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

EVALUATION SERVICES

INSTRUCTOR: HATCHER ,H

01/15/13

COURSE: 285

RESPONSES FROM TEACHING ASSISTANT FORM A - FALL 2012

CLASS NUMBER: 49577

NUMBER OF STUDENTS COMPLETING EVALUATIONS: 13
PERCENTAGE OF ENROLLED STUDENTS COMPLETING EVALUATIONS: 81

THE FOLLOWING STATISTICS ARE BASED UPON THE ACTUAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS RESPONDING TO THE QUESTION.

FOR EACH QUESTION, THE PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS MAKING EACH RESPONSE (OR NOT RESPONDING), THE MEAN RESPONSE, AND THE STANDARD DEVIATION ARE PRESENTED. CAUTION SHOULD BE USED IN INTERPRETING RESULTS WHEN THE TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS COMPLETING EVALUATIONS IS SMALL, THE PERCENTAGE OF ENROLLED STUDENTS COMPLETING EVALUATIONS IS SMALL, OR THE PERCENTAGE OF "NON-RESPONSE" TO INDIVIDUAL ITEMS IS LARGE.

(SOME QUESTIONS HAVE BEEN ABBREVIATED)

----- PERCENTAGE RESPONDING -----

SPECIFIC QUESTIONS	NO RESP	POOR (1)	BELLOW AVG (2)	AVG (3)	ABOVE AVG (4)	EXCELLENT (5)	MEAN	STD DEV
1. CLEARLY RELATED PURPOSE & MATERIAL IN DISCUSSION SECTION TO LECTURE COMPONENT OF THE COURSE.	0	0	0	8	46	46	4.38	0.65
2. WAS CONSISTENTLY PUNCTUAL.	0	0	0	23	0	77	4.54	0.88
3. ARTICULATED GOALS OF THE DISCUSSION SECTION CLEARLY.	8	0	0	23	8	62	4.42	0.90
4. ORGANIZED DISCUSSION SECTION TO ACHIEVE THOSE GOALS.	0	0	0	31	0	69	4.38	0.96
5. PRESENTED MATERIAL IN CLEAR, UNDERSTANDABLE LANGUAGE.	0	0	0	8	23	62	4.38	0.96
6. USED CHALKBOARD & OTHER VISUAL AIDS EFFECTIVELY.	0	0	0	0	23	69	4.54	0.88
7. WAS KNOWLEDGEABLE ABOUT THE SUBJECT MATTER.	0	0	0	0	31	69	4.69	0.48
8. EXPLAINED DIFFICULT CONCEPTS, METHODS, SUB. MATTER.	0	0	0	15	15	62	4.31	1.03
9. PROVIDED INSIGHTS INTO WAY RESEARCH IS DONE	0	0	0	31	38	23	3.92	0.79
10. WAS ENTHUSIASTIC ABOUT COMMUNICATING SUBJECT MATTER.	0	0	0	0	31	62	4.38	1.12
11. ENCOURAGED STUDENTS TO PARTICIPATE IN THEIR LEARNING.	0	0	8	23	46	23	3.85	0.90
12. WAS ACCESSIBLE TO STUDENTS.	0	0	0	8	23	69	4.62	0.65
13. EVALUATED STUDENT WORK IN FAIR & APPROPRIATE WAYS.	0	0	31	15	15	38	3.62	1.31
14. GAVE HELPFUL FEEDBACK ON ASSIGNMENTS.	0	0	31	15	8	46	3.69	1.38

GENERAL QUESTIONS

15. OVERALL, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THIS TEACHING ASSISTANT?	8	0	8	15	23	46	4.17	1.03
16. OVERALL, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THIS DISCUSSION SECTION?	8	0	15	15	31	31	3.83	1.11

QUESTIONS PROVIDED BY INSTRUCTOR

18. INSTRUCTOR PROVIDED QUESTION # 18	0	0	0	0	0	0	.	.
19. INSTRUCTOR PROVIDED QUESTION # 19	0	0	0	0	0	0	.	.
20. INSTRUCTOR PROVIDED QUESTION # 20	0	0	0	0	0	0	.	.
21. INSTRUCTOR PROVIDED QUESTION # 21	0	0	0	0	0	0	.	.
22. INSTRUCTOR PROVIDED QUESTION # 22	0	0	0	0	0	0	.	.

DUE TO ROUNDING, PERCENTAGES MAY NOT ADD TO 100.

DEPT: PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

EVALUATION SERVICES

INSTRUCTOR: HATHER, M

06/11/12

COURSE: 262

RESPONSES FROM TEACHING ASSISTANT FORM A - SPRING 2012

CLASS NUMBER: 49373 - 10 AM SEC 1

NUMBER OF STUDENTS COMPLETING EVALUATIONS: 11
PERCENTAGE OF ENROLLED STUDENTS COMPLETING EVALUATIONS: 48

THE FOLLOWING STATISTICS ARE BASED UPON THE ACTUAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS RESPONDING TO THE QUESTION.

FOR EACH QUESTION, THE PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS MAKING EACH RESPONSE (OR NOT RESPONDING), THE MEAN RESPONSE, AND THE STANDARD DEVIATION ARE PRESENTED. CAUTION SHOULD BE USED IN INTERPRETING RESULTS WHEN THE TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS COMPLETING EVALUATIONS IS SMALL, THE PERCENTAGE OF ENROLLED STUDENTS COMPLETING EVALUATIONS IS SMALL, OR THE PERCENTAGE OF "NON-RESPONSE" TO INDIVIDUAL ITEMS IS LARGE.

(SOME QUESTIONS HAVE BEEN ABBREVIATED)

SPECIFIC QUESTIONS	PERCENTAGE RESPONDING						
	NO RESP	POOR (1)	BELOW AVG (2)	Avg (3)	ABOVE AVG (4)	EXCELLENT (5)	STD DEV
1. CLEARLY RELATED PURPOSE & MATERIAL IN DISCUSSION SECTION TO LECTURE COMPONENT OF THE COURSE.	0	9	0	27	18	45	3.91 1.30
2. WAS CONSISTENTLY PUNCTUAL.	0	0	0	27	27	45	4.18 0.87
3. ARTICULATED GOALS OF THE DISCUSSION SECTION CLEARLY.	0	9	9	9	55	18	3.64 1.21
4. ORGANIZED DISCUSSION SECTION TO ACHIEVE THOSE GOALS.	0	9	9	18	36	27	3.64 1.29
5. PRESENTED MATERIAL IN CLEAR, UNDERSTANDABLE LANGUAGE.	0	9	0	36	18	36	3.73 1.27
6. USED CHALKBOARD & OTHER VISUAL AIDS EFFECTIVELY.	0	9	9	18	36	27	3.64 1.29
7. WAS KNOWLEDGEABLE ABOUT THE SUBJECT MATTER.	0	0	9	18	9	64	4.27 1.10
8. EXPLAINED DIFFICULT CONCEPTS, METHODS, SUB. MATTER.	0	9	0	27	18	45	3.91 1.30
9. PROVIDED INSIGHTS INTO WAY RESEARCH IS DONE	0	18	9	27	18	27	3.27 1.49
10. WAS ENTHUSIASTIC ABOUT COMMUNICATING SUBJECT MATTER.	0	0	0	18	45	36	4.18 0.75
11. ENCOURAGED STUDENTS TO PARTICIPATE IN THEIR LEARNING.	0	0	9	27	36	27	3.82 0.98
12. WAS ACCESSIBLE TO STUDENTS.	18	0	9	9	18	45	4.22 1.09
13. EVALUATED STUDENT WORK IN FAIR & APPROPRIATE WAYS.	9	9	9	9	45	18	3.60 1.26
14. GAVE HELPFUL FEEDBACK ON ASSIGNMENTS.	0	9	0	27	27	36	3.82 1.25

GENERAL QUESTIONS

15. OVERALL, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THIS TEACHING ASSISTANT?	9	0	9	18	36	27	3.90 0.99
16. OVERALL, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THIS DISCUSSION SECTION?	9	0	18	36	36	0	3.20 0.79

QUESTIONS PROVIDED BY INSTRUCTOR

18. INSTRUCTOR PROVIDED QUESTION # 18	0	0	0	0	0	0	.	.
19. INSTRUCTOR PROVIDED QUESTION # 19	0	0	0	0	0	0	.	.
20. INSTRUCTOR PROVIDED QUESTION # 20	0	0	0	0	0	0	.	.
21. INSTRUCTOR PROVIDED QUESTION # 21	0	0	0	0	0	0	.	.
22. INSTRUCTOR PROVIDED QUESTION # 22	0	0	0	0	0	0	.	.

DUE TO ROUNDING, PERCENTAGES MAY NOT ADD TO 100.

Michael Fletcher

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Philosophy

DEPARTMENT NAME

262

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths?

Being careful about explaining things

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness?

Be more critical.

3. Additional comments?

Michael Hatcher

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

PHIL

DEPARTMENT NAME

262

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths?

Excited about material

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness?

Better structure
time spent in discussions. Do a full review of
philosophers before discussing views.

3. Additional comments?

Unstructured discussion section. He has
potential, just needs to learn how to better
formulate conversation.

Michael Hatcher
INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Phil
DEPARTMENT NAME

2625
COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

- What were this instructor's main strengths? He knew his material really well

- How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? Elaborate more on question

- Additional comments? He's really nice!

Michael Hatcher

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Phil

DEPARTMENT NAME

262

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths? _____

- Always available to students
- Engaged students

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? _____

- Maybe list on the board what ideas pertain to which readings - helpful to have a visual

3. Additional comments? _____

N/A

Michael Hatcher
INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

PHIL 262g
DEPARTMENT NAME

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths? *explained the readings and ideas exceptionally well. After discussions I understood the material so much better*

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? *let the students have more discussion and not make it into a small lecture.*

3. Additional comments? _____

Michael Hatcher

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Phil

DEPARTMENT NAME

262

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths?

Encouraged questions,
approachable, explained things in different
ways to make concepts clearer

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness?

organize the
class a little more. Handouts were helpful
but were sometimes a bit unorganized.
outline what you're looking for in the papers more

3. Additional comments?

Michael Hatcher

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Philosophy

DEPARTMENT NAME

262

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths?

He was really interested in everything he
was talking about, and was just generally engaging

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness?

None

3. Additional comments?

Very nice guy, did a great job!

Michael Hatcher
INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

PHIL
DEPARTMENT NAME

202
COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths? We covered a lot of material in discussion & would also go back & clarify when necessary. Good examples, made concepts easier to understand.

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? Maybe go a little slower. Sometimes I would get confused when we would have circular discussions.

3. Additional comments? I had a great semester! Thanks for all your help

MICHAEL HATCHER
INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

PHILOSOPHY
DEPARTMENT NAME

262
COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths?

Accessible

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness?
- Learn how to explain things! Discussion and free hours just made things more confusing most of the time. Comments on paper were not helpful and held no substance. Do not make students guess what papers are really supposed to talk about.

3. Additional comments?

Study philosophical concepts and ideas NOT scientific ideas and concepts.

fletcher

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Phil

DEPARTMENT NAME

262

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths? Enthusiastic + knowledgeable

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? involve

students in compulsory ways
ie attendance, small group discussion,
etc.

3. Additional comments? good job overall, but
too simplistic in general

Hatcher, Michael
INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Phil
DEPARTMENT NAME

262
COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths? In lecture, the professor was hard to follow and unclear. Michael did an excellent job of clarifying subject matter. His feedback on papers was also incredibly useful

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? He could improve by starting discussion sections with an overview of any required readings we had.

3. Additional comments? He has a goofy personality, which made the class even more enjoyable.

DEPT: PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

EVALUATION SERVICES

INSTRUCTOR: HATCHER , M

06/11/12

COURSE: 262

RESPONSES FROM TEACHING ASSISTANT FORM A - SPRING 2012

CLASS NUMBER: 49377 - *law section*NUMBER OF STUDENTS COMPLETING EVALUATIONS: 12
PERCENTAGE OF ENROLLED STUDENTS COMPLETING EVALUATIONS: 48

THE FOLLOWING STATISTICS ARE BASED UPON THE ACTUAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS RESPONDING TO THE QUESTION.

FOR EACH QUESTION, THE PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS MAKING EACH RESPONSE (OR NOT RESPONDING), THE MEAN RESPONSE, AND THE STANDARD DEVIATION ARE PRESENTED. CAUTION SHOULD BE USED IN INTERPRETING RESULTS WHEN THE TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS COMPLETING EVALUATIONS IS SMALL, THE PERCENTAGE OF ENROLLED STUDENTS COMPLETING EVALUATIONS IS SMALL, OR THE PERCENTAGE OF "NON-RESPONSE" TO INDIVIDUAL ITEMS IS LARGE.

(SOME QUESTIONS HAVE BEEN ABBREVIATED)

SPECIFIC QUESTIONS	PERCENTAGE RESPONDING						
	NO RESP	POOR (1)	BELOW AVG (2)	Avg (3)	ABOVE AVG (4)	EXCELLENT (5)	STD DEV
1. CLEARLY RELATED PURPOSE & MATERIAL IN DISCUSSION SECTION TO LECTURE COMPONENT OF THE COURSE.	0	0	0	8	17	75	4.67 0.65
2. WAS CONSISTENTLY PUNCTUAL.	0	0	0	17	33	50	4.33 0.78
3. ARTICULATED GOALS OF THE DISCUSSION SECTION CLEARLY.	0	0	0	8	25	67	4.58 0.67
4. ORGANIZED DISCUSSION SECTION TO ACHIEVE THOSE GOALS.	0	0	0	17	25	58	4.42 0.79
5. PRESENTED MATERIAL IN CLEAR, UNDERSTANDABLE LANGUAGE.	0	0	0	0	25	75	4.75 0.45
6. USED CHALKBOARD & OTHER VISUAL AIDS EFFECTIVELY.	0	0	0	0	42	58	4.58 0.51
7. WAS KNOWLEDGEABLE ABOUT THE SUBJECT MATTER.	0	0	0	0	33	67	4.67 0.49
8. EXPLAINED DIFFICULT CONCEPTS, METHODS, SUB. MATTER.	0	0	0	8	17	75	4.67 0.65
9. PROVIDED INSIGHTS INTO WAY RESEARCH IS DONE	0	0	0	33	17	50	4.17 0.94
10. WAS ENTHUSIASTIC ABOUT COMMUNICATING SUBJECT MATTER.	0	0	0	8	17	75	4.67 0.65
11. ENCOURAGED STUDENTS TO PARTICIPATE IN THEIR LEARNING.	0	0	0	8	33	58	4.50 0.67
12. WAS ACCESSIBLE TO STUDENTS.	0	0	0	8	17	75	4.67 0.65
13. EVALUATED STUDENT WORK IN FAIR & APPROPRIATE WAYS.	0	0	0	17	33	50	4.33 0.78
14. GAVE HELPFUL FEEDBACK ON ASSIGNMENTS.	0	0	0	8	33	58	4.50 0.67

GENERAL QUESTIONS

15. OVERALL, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THIS TEACHING ASSISTANT?	0	0	0	0	25	75	4.75 0.45
16. OVERALL, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THIS DISCUSSION SECTION?	0	0	0	0	33	67	4.67 0.49

QUESTIONS PROVIDED BY INSTRUCTOR

18. INSTRUCTOR PROVIDED QUESTION # 18	0	0	0	0	0	0	.	.
19. INSTRUCTOR PROVIDED QUESTION # 19	0	0	0	0	0	0	.	.
20. INSTRUCTOR PROVIDED QUESTION # 20	0	0	0	0	0	0	.	.
21. INSTRUCTOR PROVIDED QUESTION # 21	0	0	0	0	0	0	.	.
22. INSTRUCTOR PROVIDED QUESTION # 22	0	0	0	0	0	0	.	.

DUE TO ROUNDING, PERCENTAGES MAY NOT ADD TO 100.

Michael Hatcher

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

AH1

DEPARTMENT NAME

2622

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to UBC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths?

Very good at explaining concepts in a relatable way. Also very good at understanding where a student's confusion stems from.

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness?

I think he did a good job of doing this already, but he should focus his questions so they are direct but still invoke discussion,

3. Additional comments?

Hatcher, Michael

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Phil

DEPARTMENT NAME

262

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to UICG administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths?

understanding & patient
very necessary for a ue!

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness?

3. Additional comments? Overall good examples
for complicated concepts

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

DEPARTMENT NAME

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths?

office hours

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness?

Lay out main ideas at beginning & talk about them more objectively, rather than trying to extrapolate difficult information from long texts.

3. Additional comments?

Hatcher

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Philosophy

DEPARTMENT NAME

262

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

- What were this instructor's main strengths? *Very enthusiastic & knowledgeable,
Always there to help & understand & open to
questions & available to meet*

- How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? *More interaction in
discussion, maybe some sort of activities*

- Additional comments?

Michael Hatcher
INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

PHIL
DEPARTMENT NAME

262
COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

- What were this instructor's main strengths? His passion for the subject was evident through his continual preparedness.

- How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness?

- Additional comments?

Michael Hatcher
INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

PHIL
DEPARTMENT NAME

262.
COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to minimize your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

- What were this instructor's main strengths? extremely enthusiastic about the subject, very good at preparing for the discussions, very knowledgeable about the material, great at getting the class to participate in discussions

- How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? nothing that I can really think of

- Additional comments? amazing TA!

Hatcher

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

PHIL

DEPARTMENT NAME

262

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop-off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

- What were this instructor's main strengths? Very approachable.

- How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? Be a little more organized in topics to be discussed.

- Additional comments?

Michael Hatcher

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Phil

DEPARTMENT NAME

262

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths?

He was enthusiastic, accessible, and knowledgeable.

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness?

He could have explained more what he wanted from papers.

3. Additional comments?

Michael Hatcher
INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Philosophy
DEPARTMENT NAME

262S
COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (I.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths?

Knowledge, accessibility and interest about the topic.
He was more than able to raise and maintain discussion.

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness?

Stating the direct and pure main claims
could help in lowering confusion.

3. Additional comments?

The handouts were very helpful!

Michael Hatcher
INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Phi
DEPARTMENT NAME

262
COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths? Michael was extremely kind in discussion section. He was very organized - the sheets he made were great. He was very helpful when writing papers as well + was very easily accessible.
2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? I don't know he did a really great job, one of the better TAs I've had. More like discussion & conversation which was great.
3. Additional comments? It was great having you as a TA!
Thanks!

Michael Hatcher
INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Phil
DEPARTMENT NAME

262g
COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (I.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths? He has a wonderful enthusiasm for the subject and for our education.
 - Articulates the theories in a very clear manner! (Probably better than the professor)
 - Willing to help, created a safe and warm environment for discussion.

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness?
 - Goals for discussion.
 - Vocab list (that we build as a class).
 - Assignments that connect our ideas to that of the lecture content.
 - Time management in discussion

3. Additional comments?

A wonderful experience!

Thank you!

M. Harcher

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Philosophy

DEPARTMENT NAME

262

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to UH administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

- What were this instructor's main strengths? He was clear and enthusiastic.

- How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? Can't imagine.

- Additional comments?

DEPT: PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

EVALUATION SERVICES

INSTRUCTOR: HATCHER ,M

01/16/12

COURSE: 220

CLASS NUMBER: 49581

RESPONSES FROM TEACHING ASSISTANT FORM A - FALL 2011

NUMBER OF STUDENTS COMPLETING EVALUATIONS: 14
 PERCENTAGE OF ENROLLED STUDENTS COMPLETING EVALUATIONS: 64

THE FOLLOWING STATISTICS ARE BASED UPON THE ACTUAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS RESPONDING TO THE QUESTION.

FOR EACH QUESTION, THE PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS MAKING EACH RESPONSE (OR NOT RESPONDING), THE MEAN RESPONSE, AND THE STANDARD DEVIATION ARE PRESENTED.
 CAUTION SHOULD BE USED IN INTERPRETING RESULTS WHEN THE TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS COMPLETING EVALUATIONS IS SMALL, THE PERCENTAGE OF ENROLLED STUDENTS COMPLETING EVALUATIONS IS SMALL, OR THE PERCENTAGE OF "NON-RESPONSE" TO INDIVIDUAL ITEMS IS LARGE.

(SOME QUESTIONS HAVE BEEN ABBREVIATED)

SPECIFIC QUESTIONS	NO RESP	PERCENTAGE RESPONDING						STD DEV
		POOR (1)	BELLOW AVG (2)	Avg (3)	Above Avg (4)	EXCELLENT (5)	MEAN	
1. CLEARLY RELATED PURPOSE & MATERIAL IN DISCUSSION SECTION TO LECTURE COMPONENT OF THE COURSE.	0	0	0	0	29	71	4.71	0.47
2. WAS CONSISTENTLY PUNCTUAL.	0	0	0	0	0	100	5.00	.
3. ARTICULATED GOALS OF THE DISCUSSION SECTION CLEARLY.	7	0	0	7	0	86	4.85	0.55
4. ORGANIZED DISCUSSION SECTION TO ACHIEVE THOSE GOALS.	0	0	0	7	21	71	4.64	0.63
5. PRESENTED MATERIAL IN CLEAR, UNDERSTANDABLE LANGUAGE.	0	0	0	14	21	64	4.50	0.76
6. USED CHALKBOARD & OTHER VISUAL AIDS EFFECTIVELY.	0	0	0	14	36	50	4.36	0.74
7. WAS KNOWLEDGEABLE ABOUT THE SUBJECT MATTER.	0	0	0	0	29	71	4.71	0.47
8. EXPLAINED DIFFICULT CONCEPTS, METHODS, SUB. MATTER.	0	0	0	7	29	64	4.57	0.65
9. PROVIDED INSIGHTS INTO WAY RESEARCH IS DONE	7	0	14	0	36	43	4.15	1.07
10. WAS ENTHUSIASTIC ABOUT COMMUNICATING SUBJECT MATTER.	0	0	0	7	7	86	4.79	0.58
11. ENCOURAGED STUDENTS TO PARTICIPATE IN THEIR LEARNING.	0	0	0	14	21	64	4.50	0.76
12. WAS ACCESSIBLE TO STUDENTS.	0	0	0	7	0	93	4.86	0.53
13. EVALUATED STUDENT WORK IN FAIR & APPROPRIATE WAYS.	0	0	0	21	14	64	4.43	0.85
14. GAVE HELPFUL FEEDBACK ON ASSIGNMENTS.	0	0	0	14	7	79	4.64	0.74

GENERAL QUESTIONS

15. OVERALL, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THIS TEACHING ASSISTANT?	0	0	0	7	7	86	4.79	0.58
16. OVERALL, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THIS DISCUSSION SECTION?	0	0	0	7	21	71	4.64	0.63

QUESTIONS PROVIDED BY INSTRUCTOR

18. INSTRUCTOR PROVIDED QUESTION # 18	0	0	0	0	0	0	.	.
19. INSTRUCTOR PROVIDED QUESTION # 19	0	0	0	0	0	0	.	.
20. INSTRUCTOR PROVIDED QUESTION # 20	0	0	0	0	0	0	.	.
21. INSTRUCTOR PROVIDED QUESTION # 21	0	0	0	0	0	0	.	.
22. INSTRUCTOR PROVIDED QUESTION # 22	0	0	0	0	0	0	.	.

DUE TO ROUNDING, PERCENTAGES MAY NOT ADD TO 100.

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

DEPARTMENT NAME

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

- What were this instructor's main strengths? *Fantastic TA! Enthusiastic and informative!*

Couldn't ask for a better one. Best TA of my whole semester.

- How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? _____

- Additional comments? _____

HATCHER
INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

PHIL
DEPARTMENT NAME

220
COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths? He made himself very available to the class always,

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? He could be more concise.

3. Additional comments? _____

MICHAEL HATCHER

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

POLC

DEPARTMENT NAME

220

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths? _____

He Had A Lot Of Knowledge Of The Subject
And He Was Very Kind. He Explained The
Material Very Well.

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? _____

Speak A
Little Slower.

3. Additional comments? _____

Hatcher
INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Phil
DEPARTMENT NAME

220 g
COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths? made the difficult material

really easy to understand, good outlines and notes

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? _____

3. Additional comments? best TA I had this semester

Michael Hatcher
INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Philosophy
DEPARTMENT NAME

220g
COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths? Very enthusiastic about teaching class. Tried extremely hard to draw out class participation. Approachable and very helpful. Explained well.

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? _____

3. Additional comments? Very good TA.

Micheal Hatcher
INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

PHIL
DEPARTMENT NAME

220
COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths? He was very helpful, informative, and a very fair grader. Never once did I feel like discussion was a waste of time and I actually learned more from him than the professor.

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? Can't think of much to improve, so I don't really know what to say.

3. Additional comments? Really great T.A. my best so far.

MICHAEL HATCHER

PHIL 210

220

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

DEPARTMENT NAME

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths? Carefully explained different concepts

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? More

3. Additional comments?

Michael Fletcher

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

PHIL

DEPARTMENT NAME

220

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths? *V knowledgeable about the material and always keeps students in the loop regarding discussion structure.*

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? *I think he should project more confidence during section, considering he knows the material and, for this class, is an important guide for students.*

3. Additional comments? _____

Michael Hatcher
INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Phil
DEPARTMENT NAME

220
COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

- What were this instructor's main strengths? He was very good at explaining things in ways that are easy to understand. I also liked that he checked to make sure we understood the material he was covering.

- How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness?

- Additional comments? I enjoyed this discussion section, and having Michael as a TA!

Michael Hatcher
INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Philosophy
DEPARTMENT NAME

220
COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths? Organizing discussions, stating goals of each section, availability for office hours, helpful commentary on assignments + tests, sending emails to students with discussion questions

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? _____

3. Additional comments? Overall, Michael has been very helpful + useful for me this semester. I felt comfortable going into office hours to ask questions.

Michael Hatcher

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Phil 220

DEPARTMENT NAME

49581

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths?

Punctuality, Organization, Discussion Notes, Clarity,
Willingness to help students, Fairness.

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness?

~~Speaks~~ could try to speak slower.

Use of chalkboard sometimes ineffective, because he
erased noteworthy stuff immediately

3. Additional comments?

Keep up the good work. He's a great
TA - and fair.

DEPT: PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

EVALUATION SERVICES

INSTRUCTOR: HATCHER ,M

01/16/12

COURSE: 220

RESPONSES FROM TEACHING ASSISTANT FORM A - FALL 2011

CLASS NUMBER: 49582

NUMBER OF STUDENTS COMPLETING EVALUATIONS: 12
 PERCENTAGE OF ENROLLED STUDENTS COMPLETING EVALUATIONS: 57

THE FOLLOWING STATISTICS ARE BASED UPON THE ACTUAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS RESPONDING TO THE QUESTION.

FOR EACH QUESTION, THE PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS MAKING EACH RESPONSE (OR NOT RESPONDING), THE MEAN RESPONSE, AND THE STANDARD DEVIATION ARE PRESENTED. CAUTION SHOULD BE USED IN INTERPRETING RESULTS WHEN THE TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS COMPLETING EVALUATIONS IS SMALL, THE PERCENTAGE OF ENROLLED STUDENTS COMPLETING EVALUATIONS IS SMALL, OR THE PERCENTAGE OF "NON-RESPONSE" TO INDIVIDUAL ITEMS IS LARGE.

(SOME QUESTIONS HAVE BEEN ABBREVIATED)

SPECIFIC QUESTIONS	NO RESP	PERCENTAGE RESPONDING					STD DEV
		POOR (1)	BELLOW AVG (2)	Avg (3)	ABOVE AVG (4)	EXCELLENT (5)	
1. CLEARLY RELATED PURPOSE & MATERIAL IN DISCUSSION SECTION TO LECTURE COMPONENT OF THE COURSE.	0	0	0	0	0	100	5.00
2. WAS CONSISTENTLY PUNCTUAL.	0	0	0	0	0	100	.
3. ARTICULATED GOALS OF THE DISCUSSION SECTION CLEARLY.	0	0	0	0	0	100	5.00
4. ORGANIZED DISCUSSION SECTION TO ACHIEVE THOSE GOALS.	0	0	0	0	17	83	4.83 0.39
5. PRESENTED MATERIAL IN CLEAR, UNDERSTANDABLE LANGUAGE.	0	0	0	0	0	100	5.00
6. USED CHALKBOARD & OTHER VISUAL AIDS EFFECTIVELY.	0	0	0	0	17	83	4.83 0.39
7. WAS KNOWLEDGEABLE ABOUT THE SUBJECT MATTER.	0	0	0	8	8	83	4.75 0.62
8. EXPLAINED DIFFICULT CONCEPTS, METHODS, SUB. MATTER.	0	0	0	8	0	92	4.83 0.58
9. PROVIDED INSIGHTS INTO WAY RESEARCH IS DONE	0	0	0	8	8	83	4.75 0.62
10. WAS ENTHUSIASTIC ABOUT COMMUNICATING SUBJECT MATTER.	0	0	0	0	0	100	5.00
11. ENCOURAGED STUDENTS TO PARTICIPATE IN THEIR LEARNING.	8	0	0	0	17	75	4.82 0.40
12. WAS ACCESSIBLE TO STUDENTS.	0	0	0	0	0	100	5.00
13. EVALUATED STUDENT WORK IN FAIR & APPROPRIATE WAYS.	0	0	0	0	17	83	4.83 0.39
14. GAVE HELPFUL FEEDBACK ON ASSIGNMENTS.	0	0	0	8	8	83	4.75 0.62

GENERAL QUESTIONS

15. OVERALL, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THIS TEACHING ASSISTANT?	0	0	0	0	0	100	5.00	.
16. OVERALL, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THIS DISCUSSION SECTION?	8	0	0	8	25	58	4.55	0.69

QUESTIONS PROVIDED BY INSTRUCTOR

18. INSTRUCTOR PROVIDED QUESTION # 18	0	0	0	0	0	0	.	.
19. INSTRUCTOR PROVIDED QUESTION # 19	0	0	0	0	0	0	.	.
20. INSTRUCTOR PROVIDED QUESTION # 20	0	0	0	0	0	0	.	.
21. INSTRUCTOR PROVIDED QUESTION # 21	0	0	0	0	0	0	.	.
22. INSTRUCTOR PROVIDED QUESTION # 22	0	0	0	0	0	0	.	.

DUE TO ROUNDING, PERCENTAGES MAY NOT ADD TO 100.

Michael Hatcher

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

PHI 1220

DEPARTMENT NAME

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths?

He is very positive and makes everything easy to understand because he will repeat the same thing a few times in different ways so we can understand it. He makes discussion fun to be at. He made notes to give us before to go off of.

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness?

Manage time better so we can get through everything.

3. Additional comments?

Very nice guy - great TA, very personable.

Michael Hatcher
INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Philosophy
DEPARTMENT NAME

220
COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths?

He explained things thoroughly and was very helpful. He truly seemed to care about the progress of the students! Very knowledgeable and gave explanations that were interesting and easy to understand!
2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness?

I honestly do not have any suggestions! Michael was the best TA I have ever had.
3. Additional comments?

Thank you sooo much for all of your help!! I don't know what I would have done without your help!

Michael Hatcher

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

PHIL

DEPARTMENT NAME

220

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths? _____

very willing to help, nice, enthusiastic.

He explains confusing concepts well

He is the best of all the TAs in this class

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? _____

grade easier please.

3. Additional comments? _____

MICHAEL HATCHER
INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

PHIL
DEPARTMENT NAME

220
COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths? Michael is extremely good at explaining what we , his students, see as complex philosophical concepts. He is very helpful when you ask him a question, as he provides thorough answers and is very nice about explaining something again if you don't get it.

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? Honestly there's not much else you can expect out of someone. He goes beyond other TAs I've had .

3. Additional comments?

Hatcher
INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Philosophy
DEPARTMENT NAME

220
COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths? Clearly explains all lecture topics. Very patient, explain until we understood.

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? _____

3. Additional comments? I've been to another of the TA's session and Michael is the best. I think I would have failed this class if not for his help.

Michael Hatcher

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Phil

DEPARTMENT NAME

2201

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths? He always make sure to explain difficult concepts (and there were many of them) in real world terms and made them less abstract. He was very friendly and always spent his time to make sure we comprehended the material.

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? Maybe he could have sentences preplanned that would encapsulate an idea in simple terms. He did this as he was talking but coming in with them as headers would be nice.

3. Additional comments? Best part of the class was Michael!

Michael Hatcher

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

PHIL

DEPARTMENT NAME

220

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

- What were this instructor's main strengths? Very helpful explaining difficult concepts in detail.

- How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? Could offer more feedback on exams.

- Additional comments?

Michael Hatcher

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Phil

DEPARTMENT NAME

220

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths? enthusiastic, incredibly knowledgeable, coherent

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? he's great as he is

3. Additional comments? great T.A.! I just wish I was more interested in the course

Michael Hatch
INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Phil
DEPARTMENT NAME

220g
COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths? Best TA. He articulates the

material in a way that is understandable

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? _____

3. Additional comments? _____

Michael Hatcher
INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Phil
DEPARTMENT NAME

220
COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths? Miznall was a wonderful TA. He was enthusiastic, always helpful + available to students, and made an effort to get to know each student. He explained the lectures so clearly + was always in a good mood in class - What a great guy! He is the reason I did well in the class. He made complex lectures seem easy to understand! He also always brought a sense of humor to the discussions!

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? NONE

3. Additional comments? He always emailed me back right away when I had a question + held AMAZING exam review sessions w/ the other TAs

Hatcher
INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Phil
DEPARTMENT NAME

2209
COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths? Very enthusiastic and kind:
while the professor gave long lectures,
he broke down the information into
easily digestible parts. Lenient grader and
very helpful.

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? _____

3. Additional comments? All-in-all great TA. Very helpful.

Hatcher, Michael

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME

Phil

DEPARTMENT NAME

220

COURSE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to USC administrators to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have salary and promotion implications so please take them very seriously. When you have finished, a designated student will pick up the evaluations and take them to a drop off point for processing. Your responses will remain anonymous and summaries will not be given to the instructor until after grades have been assigned.

Put Instructor's Name, Department Name, and Course Number at top (i.e., Smith, Psychology, 200)

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

1. What were this instructor's main strengths? Enthusiastic. Clearly presented all topics in a way that actually made sense. Took time to make sure we understood each concept.

2. How might this instructor improve his or her teaching effectiveness? None.

3. Additional comments? Great TA. Is the reason I did well in the class.