

Temple University Course and Teaching Evaluation - Fall 2003

CRN: 044675
 INSTR. NAME: POHL, FLORIAN
 DEPT. NAME: REL
 COURSE #: C051
 SECT. #: 002
 CAMPUS: BROAD AND MONTGOMERY
 COLLEGE: LIBERAL ARTS

TIMES TAUGHT: 2 - 4
 COURSE NAME: INTRO TO WESTERN REL
 DEPT. CODE: 02425
 INSTRUCTOR: 1 of 1

ENROLLMENT: 46
 COMPLETED EVALUATIONS: 24

		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=21	(5)	(8)	(8)	(3)			
	Section		24%	38%	38%		2.14	0.77	
	Department		13%	51%	36%		2.23	0.66	32
	College		19%	48%	32%		2.13	0.71	48
	Level		25%	50%	25%		2.00	0.71	65
	University		18%	45%	36%		2.18	0.71	41

		A = 4	B = 3	C = 2	D = 1	F = 0					
2.	Expected grade in this course	n=20	(8)	(12)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(4)			
	Section		40%	60%	0%	0%	0%		3.40	0.49	
	Department		46%	46%	7%	0%	0%		3.38	0.64	52
	College		39%	50%	11%	0%	0%		3.27	0.67	63
	Level		37%	48%	14%	1%	0%		3.21	0.72	69
	University		45%	44%	10%	1%	0%		3.33	0.69	53

		Required = 1	Elective = 2							
3.	Course was: Required or Elective	n=20	(8)	(12)			(4)			
	Section		40%	60%				1.60	0.49	
	Department		40%	60%				1.60	0.49	42
	College		64%	36%				1.36	0.48	71
	Level		79%	21%				1.21	0.41	88
	University		74%	26%				1.26	0.44	79

		Less than 1 = 1	1-3 = 2	4-6 = 3	7-9 = 4	More than 9 = 5					
4.	Hours per week spent preparing for course	n=21	(3)	(12)	(6)	(0)	(0)	(3)			
	Section		14%	57%	29%	0%	0%		2.14	0.64	
	Department		15%	58%	23%	3%	1%		2.17	0.76	46
	College		11%	54%	29%	5%	2%		2.33	0.80	27
	Level		14%	52%	27%	5%	2%		2.29	0.85	34
	University		11%	48%	29%	7%	5%		2.46	0.94	26

Temple University Course and Teaching Evaluation - Fall 2003

CRN: 044675
 INSTR. NAME: POHL, FLORIAN
 DEPT. NAME: REL
 COURSE #: C051
 SECT. #: 002
 CAMPUS: BROAD AND MONTGOMERY
 COLLEGE: LIBERAL ARTS

TIMES TAUGHT: 2 - 4
 COURSE NAME: INTRO TO WESTERN REL
 DEPT. CODE: 02425
 INSTRUCTOR: 1 of 1

ENROLLMENT: 46
 COMPLETED EVALUATIONS: 24

		Strongly Agree = 5	Agree = 4	Neutral = 3	Disagree = 2	Strongly Disagree = 1	Not answered = 0	Mean	SD	Pct'l Rank
1. The instructor clearly explained the educational objectives of this course.	n=24	(21)	(3)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)			
	Section	88%	13%	0%	0%	0%		4.88	0.33	
	Department	43%	44%	9%	3%	2%		4.23	0.86	97
	College	44%	42%	9%	3%	1%		4.24	0.85	97
	Level	42%	42%	10%	4%	2%		4.18	0.91	97
	University	44%	41%	9%	4%	2%		4.22	0.90	95
2. The instructor was well organized and prepared for class.	n=24	(22)	(2)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)			
	Section	92%	8%	0%	0%	0%		4.92	0.28	
	Department	46%	39%	9%	4%	2%		4.23	0.90	97
	College	48%	39%	9%	3%	1%		4.29	0.85	97
	Level	46%	40%	9%	3%	2%		4.25	0.87	97
	University	48%	38%	9%	3%	2%		4.28	0.87	95
3. So far, the instructor has graded fairly.	n=24	(20)	(4)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)			
	Section	83%	17%	0%	0%	0%		4.83	0.37	
	Department	48%	39%	9%	3%	1%		4.29	0.86	95
	College	44%	39%	11%	4%	2%		4.19	0.93	95
	Level	43%	39%	12%	4%	2%		4.17	0.94	95
	University	44%	38%	11%	4%	2%		4.16	0.94	93
4. The instructor scheduled time and was available to students outside of class.	n=24	(18)	(5)	(1)	(0)	(0)	(0)			
	Section	75%	21%	4%	0%	0%		4.71	0.54	
	Department	39%	39%	18%	3%	1%		4.14	0.85	94
	College	41%	39%	17%	2%	1%		4.16	0.86	89
	Level	38%	38%	19%	3%	2%		4.07	0.92	93
	University	40%	38%	18%	3%	1%		4.12	0.90	90
5. The instructor provided prompt feedback about exams, projects, rehearsals, and performances.	n=24	(20)	(3)	(1)	(0)	(0)	(0)			
	Section	83%	13%	4%	0%	0%		4.79	0.50	
	Department	43%	41%	10%	4%	3%		4.16	0.95	93
	College	41%	41%	12%	5%	2%		4.13	0.93	94
	Level	39%	41%	13%	5%	2%		4.11	0.94	95
	University	42%	39%	12%	5%	2%		4.14	0.95	92
6. The instructor consistently started and ended class on time.	n=24	(22)	(2)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)			
	Section	92%	8%	0%	0%	0%		4.92	0.28	
	Department	47%	44%	6%	2%	1%		4.33	0.78	99
	College	46%	42%	7%	3%	1%		4.28	0.85	98
	Level	45%	42%	8%	3%	2%		4.26	0.86	98
	University	46%	41%	7%	3%	2%		4.27	0.87	97
7. The instructor promoted a classroom atmosphere in which I felt free to ask questions and express my opinions.	n=24	(22)	(2)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)			
	Section	92%	8%	0%	0%	0%		4.92	0.28	
	Department	53%	35%	7%	3%	2%		4.36	0.85	96
	College	51%	34%	9%	3%	2%		4.30	0.91	95
	Level	48%	35%	11%	4%	2%		4.22	0.95	96
	University	50%	34%	10%	3%	2%		4.27	0.93	94
8. The instructor taught this course well.	n=24	(21)	(3)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)			
	Section	88%	13%	0%	0%	0%		4.88	0.33	
	Department	47%	35%	11%	5%	3%		4.18	1.00	95
	College	47%	35%	11%	4%	3%		4.19	0.99	95
	Level	44%	35%	12%	5%	4%		4.10	1.05	95
	University	48%	34%	11%	5%	3%		4.15	1.03	93

Temple University Course and Teaching Evaluation - Fall 2003

CRN: 044675
 INSTR. NAME: POHL, FLORIAN
 DEPT. NAME: REL
 COURSE #: C051
 SECT. #: 002
 CAMPUS: BROAD AND MONTGOMERY

COLLEGE: LIBERAL ARTS
 TIMES TAUGHT: 2 - 4
 COURSE NAME: INTRO TO WESTERN REL
 DEPT. CODE: 02425
 INSTRUCTOR: 1 of 1

ENROLLMENT: 46
 COMPLETED EVALUATIONS: 24

		Strongly Agree = 5	Agree = 4	Neutral = 3	Disagree = 2	Strongly Disagree = 1	Not Answered	Mean	SD	Pct'l Rank
1. The course materials (textbook, handouts, etc.) and course activities were useful and of high quality.	n=24	(13)	(9)	(1)	(1)	(0)	(0)			
Section		54%	38%	4%	4%	0%		4.42	0.76	
Department		31%	45%	17%	6%	2%		3.97	0.94	82
College		32%	44%	16%	6%	2%		3.98	0.96	82
Level		28%	44%	18%	7%	3%		3.87	1.00	90
University		31%	43%	16%	6%	3%		3.92	1.00	83
2. I learned a great deal in this course.	n=24	(15)	(9)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)			
Section		63%	38%	0%	0%	0%		4.63	0.48	
Department		38%	42%	13%	4%	2%		4.09	0.94	91
College		36%	42%	15%	5%	2%		4.04	0.95	89
Level		31%	42%	18%	6%	3%		3.92	1.00	94
University		36%	42%	15%	5%	3%		4.03	0.97	88
3. I increased my ability to analyze and critically evaluate ideas, arguments, and points of view.	n=24	(10)	(6)	(8)	(0)	(0)	(0)			
Section		42%	25%	33%	0%	0%		4.08	0.86	
Department		28%	39%	25%	6%	3%		3.85	0.98	64
College		30%	40%	22%	6%	2%		3.90	0.96	58
Level		25%	39%	26%	7%	3%		3.77	1.00	71
University		30%	40%	22%	6%	2%		3.89	0.96	56
4. Information technology (Internet, e-mail, courseware, etc.) was used effectively in the course.	n=24	(11)	(11)	(2)	(0)	(0)	(0)			
Section		46%	46%	8%	0%	0%		4.38	0.63	
Department		28%	38%	26%	5%	3%		3.82	0.99	84
College		30%	38%	24%	6%	3%		3.87	0.99	86
Level		28%	38%	24%	7%	3%		3.81	1.02	88
University		32%	39%	21%	6%	3%		3.91	1.00	81
5. I gained an interest in learning more about the material covered in this course.	n=24	(10)	(11)	(3)	(0)	(0)	(0)			
Section		42%	46%	13%	0%	0%		4.29	0.68	
Department		32%	41%	17%	7%	3%		3.93	1.02	75
College		30%	37%	20%	9%	4%		3.80	1.09	77
Level		25%	35%	23%	11%	6%		3.62	1.15	86
University		31%	37%	19%	8%	4%		3.83	1.09	73
6. This course had value to me.	n=24	(11)	(9)	(4)	(0)	(0)	(0)			
Section		46%	38%	17%	0%	0%		4.29	0.73	
Department		34%	42%	16%	5%	3%		4.00	0.98	67
College		33%	40%	17%	6%	4%		3.92	1.04	70
Level		28%	40%	20%	7%	5%		3.79	1.08	79
University		35%	40%	15%	5%	4%		3.98	1.03	64
7. The workload for this course was	n=24	(1)	(3)	(20)	(0)	(0)	(0)			
Section		4%	13%	83%	0%	0%		3.21	0.50	
Department		4%	18%	65%	12%	1%		3.13	0.69	64
College		5%	26%	61%	8%	0%		3.27	0.69	44
Level		5%	24%	60%	10%	1%		3.22	0.72	49
University		5%	28%	57%	8%	1%		3.31	0.73	43

Part 6. Comments

Please comment on the quality of the course and instruction.

1. The strengths of the teaching were:

used powerpoint so it was easy to take notes

2. The strengths of the course were:

Gave perspective to people who are different

3. The weaknesses of the teaching were:

Did not always know answers to questions

4. The weaknesses of the course were:

Book did not cover all religions equally

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

Count the little papers we do more

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 used diversity to his advantage b/c ppl gave perspective on their religion

Part 6. Comments

Please comment on the quality of the course and instruction.

1. The strengths of the teaching were:

clearly & concise explanation

2. The strengths of the course were:

in depth look into the religion

3. The weaknesses of the teaching were:

4. The weaknesses of the course were:

the text book was too complex & detailed to understand

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.

very sensitive & accommodating

Part 6. Comments

Please comment on the quality of the course and instruction.

1. The strengths of the teaching were:

Excellent

2. The strengths of the course were:

Very informative

3. The weaknesses of the teaching were:

N/A

4. The weaknesses of the course were:

Some of the informations were not available.

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

to do more group works

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 excellent. He gave time to each of the students equally.

Part 6. Comments

Please comment on the quality of the course and instruction.

1. The strengths of the teaching were:

Very informative... I learned a lot! Good mix between lecture and discussion.

2. The strengths of the course were:

Informative! and interesting

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:

- good preparation
- highlighting of the key informational aspects

2. The strengths of the course were:

3. The weaknesses of the teaching were:

4. The weaknesses of the course were:

Too little time to cover all 3 traditions

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

Add more detail portraying the traditions

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 good

Part 6. Comments

Please comment on the quality of the course and instruction.

1. The strengths of the teaching were:

Universal strength & weakness with
all religions

2. The strengths of the course were:

The textbook read very well

3. The weaknesses of the teaching were:

Too little time.

4. The weaknesses of the course were:

Too little time

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

Add a few more weeks of class

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 sensitive to all religions but also
made us look at all religions with open
eyes.

Part 6. Comments

Please comment on the quality of the course and instruction.

1. The strengths of the teaching were:

Very knowledgeable in subject

2. The strengths of the course were:

equally
~~adequately~~ covered
 three faiths

3. The weaknesses of the teaching were:

too many notes at times

4. The weaknesses of the course were:

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

Less Reading!

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.

~~Did so~~
 Treated everyone
 fairly/ equally

Part 6. Comments

Please comment on the quality of the course and instruction.

1. The strengths of the teaching were:

Good ability to explain terms as well as ideas constructed.

2. The strengths of the course were:

I learned alot about religions that I'm interested in to begin with.

3. The weaknesses of the teaching were:

4. The weaknesses of the course were:

The textbook was very difficult to read for any amount of time

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.

Wonderful use of diversity & acceptance to all ideas from every person.

Part 6. Comments

Please comment on the quality of the course and instruction.

1. The strengths of the teaching were:

Very organized & had a lot of well known knowledge.

2. The strengths of the course were:

Very Informative

3. The weaknesses of the teaching were:

Sometimes a little boring

4. The weaknesses of the course were:

The text was boring in some parts & would jump around

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

Nothing I liked this 3 test and worship service, a lot better than what he had previous.

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 very nice

Part 6. Comments

Please comment on the quality of the course and instruction.

1. The strengths of the teaching were:

Everything was clearly explained. Expectations for assignments were clear as well.

2. The strengths of the course were:

Variety of material

3. The weaknesses of the teaching were:

None

4. The weaknesses of the course were:

Text book was hard to follow at times

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.

Excellent

Part 6. Comments

Please comment on the quality of the course and instruction.

1. The strengths of the teaching were:

Text + in class assignments

2. The strengths of the course were:

quick pace

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 in class videos

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:

• kept it interesting, varied approaches

2. The strengths of the course were:

Pace, content

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.

Very good

Part 6. Comments

Please comment on the quality of the course and instruction.

1. The strengths of the teaching were: The use of Powerpoint, blackboard and getting student's thoughts as well as answering all questions

2. The strengths of the course were:

N/A

3. The weaknesses of the teaching were:

Too much group work

4. The weaknesses of the course were:

The book was dry and always left me w/ alot of questions

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

Get a different book

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:

2. The strengths of the course were:

Diverse group of students w/ different perspectives

3. The weaknesses of the teaching were:

4. The weaknesses of the course were:

The book.

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:

Humor; he was funny & incorporated jokes into the learning process

2. The strengths of the course were:

interesting material

3. The weaknesses of the teaching were:

Worked out too many assignments

4. The weaknesses of the course were:

Too much text to read

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

give out less papers & more tests

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.

Florian responded well to other races.

**Part 5. Comments**

Please comment on the quality of the course and instructor.

1. The strengths of the teaching were:

Very knowledgeable. Covered ideas well.

2. The strengths of the course were:

Covered a broad range of material.

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?

Less group work.

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 fair.

Part 6. Comments

Please comment on the quality of the course and instruction.

1. The strengths of the teaching were:

He really broke everything down.

2. The strengths of the course were:

Book was useful.

3. The weaknesses of the teaching were:

4. The weaknesses of the course were:

There was so much information.

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 instruction.

1. The strengths of the teaching were:

He is very objective + knowledgeable.

2. The strengths of the course were:

Good use of technology. Easy to understand material.

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.

Very sensitive

Part 6. Comments

Please comment on the quality of the course and instruction.

1. The strengths of the teaching were:

Lectures were fun and very informational, not boring. He made it interesting for me to want to learn the material.

2. The strengths of the course were:

N/A

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?

less reading at one time, maybe more instructional videos.

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.

The teacher was great!

Part 6. Comments

Please comment on the quality of the course and instruction.

1. The strengths of the teaching were:

Very informative

explained material (very) well

open to any questions

2. The strengths of the course were:

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?

about writing

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.

Open to everyone's needs