

Temple University Course and Teaching Evaluation - Spring 2004

CRN: 049094
 INSTR. NAME: POHL, FLORIAN
 DEPT. NAME: REL
 COURSE #: W200
 SECT. #: 001
 CAMPUS: BROAD AND MONTGOMERY
 COLLEGE: LIBERAL ARTS

TIMES TAUGHT: First Time
 COURSE NAME: INTRO TO ISLAM
 DEPT. CODE: 02425
 INSTRUCTOR: 1 of 1

ENROLLMENT: 26
 COMPLETED EVALUATIONS: 26

		Low = 1	Moderate = 2	High = 3	Not Answered	Mean	SD	Pct'l Rank
1.	Before enrolling, my level of interest in the subject matter of this course was	n=19 (2)	(7)	(10)	(7)			
	Section	11%	37%	50%		2.42	0.67	
	Department	13%	50%	36%		2.23	0.67	80
	College	19%	48%	33%		2.14	0.71	73
	Level	12%	43%	45%		2.33	0.68	54
	University	18%	46%	36%		2.18	0.71	66

		A = 4	B = 3	C = 2	D = 1	F = 0	Not Answered	Mean	SD	Pct'l Rank
2.	Expected grade in this course	n=19 (4)	(14)	(1)	(0)	(0)	(7)			
	Section	21%	74%	5%	0%	0%		3.16	0.49	
	Department	46%	46%	7%	0%	0%		3.38	0.64	16
	College	39%	50%	10%	0%	0%		3.28	0.67	30
	Level	46%	44%	9%	0%	0%		3.36	0.67	23
	University	45%	44%	10%	1%	0%		3.33	0.69	26

		Required = 1	Elective = 2	Not Answered	Mean	SD	Pct'l Rank
3.	Course was: Required or Elective	n=19 (12)	(7)	(7)			
	Section	63%	37%		1.37	0.48	
	Department	39%	61%		1.61	0.49	7
	College	62%	38%		1.38	0.48	49
	Level	68%	32%		1.32	0.47	58
	University	73%	27%		1.27	0.44	65

		Less than 1 = 1	1-3 = 2	4-6 = 3	7-9 = 4	More than 9 = 5	Not Answered	Mean	SD	Pct'l Rank
4.	Hours per week spent preparing for course	n=19 (1)	(4)	(11)	(2)	(1)	(7)			
	Section	5%	21%	58%	11%	5%		2.89	0.85	
	Department	15%	58%	23%	3%	1%		2.18	0.75	92
	College	11%	54%	29%	5%	2%		2.33	0.80	88
	Level	10%	47%	31%	8%	5%		2.53	0.96	73
	University	11%	48%	29%	7%	4%		2.46	0.94	78

Temple University Course and Teaching Evaluation - Spring 2004

CRN: 049094
 INSTR. NAME: POHL, FLORIAN
 DEPT. NAME: REL
 COURSE #: W200
 SECT. #: 001
 CAMPUS: BROAD AND MONTGOMERY
 COLLEGE: LIBERAL ARTS

TIMES TAUGHT: First Time
 COURSE NAME: INTRO TO ISLAM
 DEPT. CODE: 02425
 INSTRUCTOR: 1 of 1

ENROLLMENT: 26
 COMPLETED EVALUATIONS: 26

		Strongly Agree = 5	Agree = 4	Neutral = 3	Disagree = 2	Strongly Disagree = 1	Not measured = 0	Mu	SD	Pct'l Rank
1. The instructor clearly explained the educational objectives of this course.	n=19	(14)	(5)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(7)			
	Section	74%	26%	0%	0%	0%		4.74	0.44	
	Department	44%	43%	8%	3%	1%		4.25	0.85	92
	College	44%	42%	9%	3%	1%		4.24	0.85	90
	Level	47%	40%	8%	3%	2%		4.26	0.88	87
	University	44%	41%	9%	4%	2%		4.22	0.89	87
2. The instructor was well organized and prepared for class.	n=19	(16)	(3)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(7)			
	Section	84%	16%	0%	0%	0%		4.84	0.36	
	Department	46%	40%	9%	3%	2%		4.26	0.87	94
	College	48%	39%	9%	3%	1%		4.29	0.85	93
	Level	50%	37%	8%	3%	1%		4.31	0.86	91
	University	48%	38%	9%	3%	2%		4.28	0.87	91
3. So far, the instructor has graded fairly.	n=19	(12)	(7)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(7)			
	Section	63%	37%	0%	0%	0%		4.63	0.48	
	Department	48%	39%	9%	3%	1%		4.28	0.86	79
	College	44%	39%	11%	4%	2%		4.19	0.92	82
	Level	45%	37%	11%	4%	2%		4.19	0.94	80
	University	44%	38%	11%	4%	2%		4.19	0.94	80
4. The instructor scheduled time and was available to students outside of class.	n=17	(10)	(7)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(9)			
	Section	59%	41%	0%	0%	0%		4.59	0.49	
	Department	40%	39%	18%	2%	1%		4.15	0.85	87
	College	41%	39%	17%	2%	1%		4.16	0.86	81
	Level	42%	37%	16%	3%	1%		4.16	0.89	81
	University	41%	38%	17%	3%	1%		4.13	0.90	82
5. The instructor provided prompt feedback about exams, projects, rehearsals, and performances.	n=19	(12)	(7)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(7)			
	Section	63%	37%	0%	0%	0%		4.63	0.48	
	Department	43%	40%	10%	4%	2%		4.17	0.94	83
	College	41%	41%	12%	5%	2%		4.13	0.94	83
	Level	44%	39%	11%	5%	2%		4.17	0.94	80
	University	42%	39%	12%	4%	2%		4.15	0.94	81
6. The instructor consistently started and ended class on time.	n=19	(15)	(4)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(7)			
	Section	79%	21%	0%	0%	0%		4.79	0.41	
	Department	47%	44%	6%	2%	1%		4.34	0.77	91
	College	46%	42%	7%	3%	1%		4.28	0.85	93
	Level	47%	41%	7%	3%	1%		4.29	0.85	91
	University	46%	41%	7%	3%	2%		4.28	0.86	92
7. The instructor promoted a classroom atmosphere in which I felt free to ask questions and express my opinions.	n=19	(16)	(3)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(7)			
	Section	84%	16%	0%	0%	0%		4.84	0.36	
	Department	54%	36%	8%	2%	1%		4.37	0.84	91
	College	51%	34%	9%	3%	2%		4.29	0.92	91
	Level	52%	34%	8%	3%	2%		4.31	0.91	89
	University	50%	34%	9%	3%	2%		4.27	0.93	89
8. The instructor taught this course well.	n=19	(16)	(3)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(7)			
	Section	84%	16%	0%	0%	0%		4.84	0.36	
	Department	48%	35%	10%	4%	3%		4.21	0.98	92
	College	47%	35%	11%	4%	3%		4.18	0.99	92
	Level	48%	33%	11%	5%	3%		4.19	1.01	91
	University	46%	34%	11%	5%	3%		4.15	1.02	91

CRN: 049094
 INSTR. NAME: POHL, FLORIAN
 DEPT. NAME: REL
 COURSE #: W200
 SECT. #: 001
 CAMPUS: BROAD AND MONTGOMERY

COLLEGE: LIBERAL ARTS
 TIMES TAUGHT: First Time
 COURSE NAME: INTRO TO ISLAM
 DEPT. CODE: 02425
 INSTRUCTOR: 1 of 1

ENROLLMENT: 26
 COMPLETED EVALUATIONS: 26

		Strongly Agree = 5	Agree = 4	Neutral = 3	Disagree = 2	Strongly Disagree = 1	Not Answered	Mean	SD	Pct Rank
1. The course materials (textbook, handouts, etc.) and course activities were useful and of high quality.	n=19	(10)	(9)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(7)			
	Section	53%	47%	0%	0%	0%		4.53	0.50	
	Department	31%	45%	17%	5%	2%		3.97	0.84	91
	College	32%	44%	16%	6%	2%		3.98	0.96	89
	Level	33%	42%	16%	6%	3%		3.95	1.01	88
	University	31%	43%	16%	6%	3%		3.93	1.00	89
2. I learned a great deal in this course.	n=19	(14)	(5)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(7)			
	Section	74%	26%	0%	0%	0%		4.74	0.44	
	Department	38%	43%	13%	4%	2%		4.11	0.92	95
	College	36%	42%	15%	5%	2%		4.04	0.96	94
	Level	40%	41%	13%	4%	2%		4.11	0.95	92
	University	36%	42%	15%	5%	3%		4.03	0.97	93
3. I increased my ability to analyze and critically evaluate ideas, arguments, and points of view.	n=19	(11)	(7)	(1)	(0)	(0)	(7)			
	Section	58%	37%	5%	0%	0%		4.53	0.60	
	Department	29%	39%	24%	5%	2%		3.87	0.97	92
	College	30%	40%	22%	6%	2%		3.91	0.97	90
	Level	33%	40%	20%	5%	2%		3.97	0.96	88
	University	30%	40%	21%	6%	2%		3.90	0.98	89
4. Information technology (Internet, e-mail, courseware, etc.) was used effectively in the course.	n=18	(12)	(6)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(6)			
	Section	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%		4.67	0.47	
	Department	28%	38%	25%	5%	3%		3.84	0.99	98
	College	30%	38%	23%	6%	2%		3.87	0.99	96
	Level	35%	38%	20%	5%	2%		3.98	0.98	93
	University	32%	39%	21%	6%	3%		3.92	0.99	94
5. I gained an interest in learning more about the material covered in this course.	n=19	(9)	(10)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(7)			
	Section	47%	53%	0%	0%	0%		4.47	0.50	
	Department	33%	40%	18%	6%	3%		3.94	1.01	87
	College	31%	37%	20%	9%	4%		3.82	1.09	87
	Level	36%	38%	16%	6%	3%		3.98	1.03	80
	University	32%	37%	19%	8%	4%		3.84	1.09	84
6. This course had value to me.	n=19	(11)	(7)	(1)	(0)	(0)	(7)			
	Section	58%	37%	5%	0%	0%		4.53	0.60	
	Department	35%	42%	15%	4%	3%		4.02	0.97	83
	College	33%	40%	17%	6%	4%		3.93	1.04	85
	Level	40%	40%	13%	4%	3%		4.11	0.97	76
	University	36%	40%	15%	5%	4%		3.99	1.03	80
7. The workload for this course was	n=19	(2)	(15)	(2)	(0)	(0)	(7)			
	Section	11%	79%	11%	0%	0%		4.00	0.45	
	Department	4%	18%	66%	12%	0%		3.14	0.68	97
	College	5%	26%	61%	7%	0%		3.27	0.69	95
	Level	7%	31%	55%	7%	1%		3.38	0.73	90
	University	6%	28%	57%	8%	1%		3.31	0.73	93

Too Heavy = 5
 Heavy = 4
 Average = 3
 Light = 2
 Too Light = 1
 Not Answered

Temple University Course and Teaching Evaluation - Spring 2004

CRN: 049094
 INSTR. NAME: POHL, FLORIAN

INSTRUCTOR: 1 of 1

Question	Responses	High = 5	4	3	2	Low = 1	NA	Mean	SD
01.	0	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(26)		
02.	0	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(26)		
03.	0	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(26)		
04.	0	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(26)		
05.	0	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(26)		
06.	0	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(26)		
07.	0	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(26)		
08.	0	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(26)		
09.	0	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(26)		
10.	0	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(26)		
11.	0	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(26)		
12.	0	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(26)		
13.	0	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(26)		
14.	0	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(26)		
15.	0	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(26)		
16.	0	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(26)		
17.	0	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(26)		
18.	0	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(26)		
19.	0	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(26)		
20.	0	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(26)		
21.	0	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(26)		
22.	0	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(26)		
23.	0	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(26)		
24.	0	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(26)		
25.	0	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(26)		

Question	Responses	High = 5	4	3	2	Low = 1	NA	Mean	SD
26.	0	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(26)		
27.	0	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(26)		
28.	0	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(26)		
29.	0	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(26)		
30.	0	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(26)		
31.	0	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(26)		
32.	0	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(26)		
33.	0	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(26)		
34.	0	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(26)		
35.	0	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(26)		
36.	0	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(26)		
37.	0	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(26)		
38.	0	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(26)		
39.	0	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(26)		
40.	0	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(26)		
41.	0	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(26)		
42.	0	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(26)		
43.	0	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(26)		
44.	0	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(26)		
45.	0	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(26)		
46.	0	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(26)		
47.	0	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(26)		
48.	0	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(26)		
49.	0	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(26)		
50.	0	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(26)		

Part 6. Comments

Please comment on the quality of the course and instruction.

1. The strengths of the teaching were:

Very detailed, hard-work required teachings. It went into depths of Islam and history as well as contemporary Islam in America.

2. The strengths of the course were:

Very well taught and very organized and informative.

3. The weaknesses of the teaching were:

It was a bit confusing especially the history of Islam that excluded Christianity.

4. The weaknesses of the course were:

Heavy load

5. To improve this course, what would you have the instructor do differently?

Nothing - - He was great

6. Please comment on the instructor's sensitivity to the diversity (race or ethnicity, gender, sexual identity, and disability) of the students in the class.

He was great to everyone

Part 6. Comments

Please comment on the quality of the course and instruction.

1. The strengths of the teaching were:

Very knowledgeable on the subject,
Good speaker, Great Guy!

2. The strengths of the course were:

Islam!

3. The weaknesses of the teaching were:

W/A

4. The weaknesses of the course were:

W/A

5. To improve this course, what would you have the instructor do differently?

One less book view, but not
a big deal.

6. Please comment on the instructor's sensitivity to the diversity (race or ethnicity, gender, sexual identity, and disability) of the students in the class.

Very Sensitive

Part 6. Comments

Please comment on the quality of the course and instruction.

1. The strengths of the teaching were:

Fun, loose atmosphere, group work.

2. The strengths of the course were:

interesting topics

3. The weaknesses of the teaching were:

NONE

4. The weaknesses of the course were:

NONE

5. To improve this course, what would you have the instructor do differently?

He was perfect

6. Please comment on the instructor's sensitivity to the diversity (race or ethnicity, gender, sexual identity, and disability) of the students in the class.

Part 6. Comments

Please comment on the quality of the course and instruction.

1. The strengths of the teaching were:

the knowledge and ability to teach
course

2. The strengths of the course were:

the material covered

3. The weaknesses of the teaching were:

N/A

4. The weaknesses of the course were:

N/A

5. To improve this course, what would you have the instructor do differently?

N/A

6. Please comment on the instructor's sensitivity to the diversity (race or ethnicity, gender, sexual identity, and disability) of the students in the class.

He was nice and treated
everyone equal and with
respect.

Part 6. Comments

Please comment on the quality of the course and instruction.

1. The strengths of the teaching were:

- humorous teacher

2. The strengths of the course were:

- speakers

- videos

3. The weaknesses of the teaching were:

4. The weaknesses of the course were:

5. To improve this course, what would you have the instructor do differently?

Discuss more the issues in textbooks

6. Please comment on the instructor's sensitivity to the diversity (race or ethnicity, gender, sexual identity, and disability) of the students in the class.

no problem!

Part 6. Comments

Please comment on the quality of the course and instruction.

1. The strengths of the teaching were:

The Book Reviews were highly-informative and helped bridge gaps between the text books + assigned Reading

2. The strengths of the course were:

genuine islamic text

3. The weaknesses of the teaching were:

we should have watched that video the whole way thru

4. The weaknesses of the course were:

not enough islam thru world history

5. To improve this course, what would you have the instructor do differently?

See above

6. Please comment on the instructor's sensitivity to the diversity (race or ethnicity, gender, sexual identity, and disability) of the students in the class.

great class

Part 6. Comments

Please comment on the quality of the course and instruction.

1. The strengths of the teaching were:

videos / speakers
 knew the topic
 good book choices

2. The strengths of the course were:

interesting topic
 → actually writing intensive

3. The weaknesses of the teaching were:

∅

4. The weaknesses of the course were:

∅

5. To improve this course, what would you have the instructor do differently?

more time for the video clips
 + SPEAKERS

6. Please comment on the instructor's sensitivity to the diversity (race or ethnicity, gender, sexual identity, and disability) of the students in the class.

Not an issue
 Always fair

Part 6. Comments

Please comment on the quality of the course and instruction.

1. The strengths of the teaching were:

Taught the course material well, made it interesting to learn, and made class enjoyable.

2. The strengths of the course were:

I gained much knowledge on Islam.

3. The weaknesses of the teaching were:

4. The weaknesses of the course were:

5. To improve this course, what would you have the instructor do differently?

6. Please comment on the instructor's sensitivity to the diversity (race or ethnicity, gender, sexual identity, and disability) of the students in the class.

Part 6. Comments

Please comment on the quality of the course and instruction.

Florian Dohl was:

1. The strengths of the teaching were: Very good at communicating. He was very affective in his methods to make the class see past stereotypes. Also, he related very foreign ideas in an understandable way.
2. The strengths of the course were: good literature, good teacher. I enjoyed all the writing because it forced me to analyze and comprehend.
3. The weaknesses of the teaching were: none - this was a great teacher
A++
4. The weaknesses of the course were: none I loved this class
5. To improve this course, what would you have the instructor do differently? Nothing
6. Please comment on the instructor's sensitivity to the diversity (race or ethnicity, gender, sexual identity, and disability) of the students in the class.
Very sensitive.

Part 6. Comments

Please comment on the quality of the course and instructor.

1. The strengths of the teaching were: Florian was very knowledgeable about all aspects of this subject
2. The strengths of the course were: He had many ways of explaining unclear concepts
3. The weaknesses of the teaching were: NONE
4. The weaknesses of the course were: NONE
5. To improve this course, what would you have the instructor do differently?
NO ← assign so many writing assignments 😊
6. Please comment on the instructor's sensitivity to the diversity (race or ethnicity, gender, sexual identity, and disability) of the students in the class.
There are no concerns to report

Part 6. Comments

Please comment on the quality of the course and instruction.

1. The strengths of the teaching were:

Very knowledgeable + organized + everything related well

2. The strengths of the course were:

3. The weaknesses of the teaching were:

4. The weaknesses of the course were:

5. To improve this course, what would you have the instructor do differently?

6. Please comment on the instructor's sensitivity to the diversity (race or ethnicity, gender, sexual identity, and disability) of the students in the class.

Part 6. Comments

Please comment on the quality of the course and instruction.

1. The strengths of the teaching were: variation of methods used in class: lecture, discussion, writing...
encouraged students to practice writing (revising).
2. The strengths of the course were: diverse range of literature, primary/secondary sources
good for developing writing.
3. The weaknesses of the teaching were: N/A
4. The weaknesses of the course were: maybe 1 too many books, I felt overwhelmed sometimes.
5. To improve this course, what would you have the instructor do differently?
N/A
6. Please comment on the instructor's sensitivity to the diversity (race or ethnicity, gender, sexual identity, and disability) of the students in the class.
A. OK

Part 6. Comments

Please comment on the quality of the course and instruction.

1. The strengths of the teaching were:

Lots of class discussion
Not too much lecturing

2. The strengths of the course were:

Provided new info about Islam

3. The weaknesses of the teaching were:

None

4. The weaknesses of the course were:

None

5. To improve this course, what would you have the instructor do differently?

Nothing

6. Please comment on the instructor's sensitivity to the diversity (race or ethnicity, gender, sexual identity, and disability) of the students in the class.

Good sensitivity for all races.

Part 6. Comments

Please comment on the quality of the course and instruction.

1. The strengths of the teaching were:
very energetic & enthusiastic. Felt like you wanted to be here & weren't forced to be here. You encouraged student participation which was very good. Very thought provoking.
2. The strengths of the course were:
gives non-muslims & muslims as well a diff. (a more positive) view on Islam
3. The weaknesses of the teaching were:
dont incorporate discussion questions into lecture that much.
4. The weaknesses of the course were:
5. To improve this course, what would you have the instructor do differently?
nothing except #3.
6. Please comment on the instructor's sensitivity to the diversity (race or ethnicity, gender, sexual identity, and disability) of the students in the class.

