

GTU Course Evaluation
for non-doctoral courses

To the student: Please fill out this course evaluation form (using ink). Another designated student will collect it and put it in an envelope to go to the GTU Dean's Office (3rd floor of the GTU Library).

To the professor: This form is for non-doctoral-level courses. Please designate a student to: collect, put in envelope with new label, seal, and return to the GTU Dean's Office, 3rd Floor of GTU Library.

Name and number of course: LSST 4341 Development of Eucharistic Theology

Professor(s): Weil + Shaver

Semester: Sp. 15 Year: 2015

Student's school of affiliation: CDSP

Student's degree program: M.Div. Year Student entered program: Fall 2014

To the student: These course evaluations, designed for non-doctoral-level courses are used by the instructor to evaluate and improve his or her own effectiveness as a teacher; they also have an important role to play in tenure and promotion decisions. They are returned to the instructor after grades are submitted.

Teacher evaluation [Name of Teacher: Weil]

- | No, strongly
disagree | Yes, strongly
agree | |
|--------------------------|------------------------|--|
| ○ ○ ○ ○ ● | | 1. The teacher was knowledgeable about the subject. |
| ○ ○ ○ ○ ● | | 2. The teacher was well prepared, e.g., organized for class meetings. |
| ○ ○ ○ ○ ● | | 3. The teacher was respectful and fair to students regardless of race, color, religious affiliation, age, sex, gender, marital status, veteran status, national origin, sexual orientation, or disability. |
| ○ ○ ○ ○ ● | | 4. The teacher made productive use of the diversity represented within the class. |
| ○ ○ ○ ○ ● | | 5. The teacher was available for consultation. |
| ○ ○ ○ ○ ● | | 6. The teacher followed a clear and well-structured syllabus. |

If there is another instructor: [Name of Teacher: Shaver]

- | No, strongly
disagree | Yes, strongly
agree | |
|--------------------------|------------------------|--|
| ○ ○ ○ ○ ● | | 1. The teacher was knowledgeable about the subject. |
| ○ ○ ○ ○ ● | | 2. The teacher was well prepared, e.g., organized for class meetings. |
| ○ ○ ○ ○ ● | | 3. The teacher was respectful and fair to students regardless of race, color, religious affiliation, age, sex, gender, marital status, veteran status, national origin, sexual orientation, or disability. |
| ○ ○ ○ ○ ● | | 4. The teacher made productive use of the diversity represented within the class. |
| ○ ○ ○ ○ ● | | 5. The teacher was available for consultation. |
| ○ ○ ○ ○ ● | | 6. The teacher followed a clear and well-structured syllabus. |

Student Self-Evaluation

- | | |
|-----------|--|
| ○ ○ ○ ○ ● | 1. I came to class prepared and ready to engage the material. |
| ○ ○ ○ ○ ● | 2. I found myself thinking in more focused and complex ways. |
| ○ ○ ○ ○ ● | 3. I have made significant progress in developing specific skills, competencies, and points of view needed in the fields most closely related to this course. |
| ○ ○ ○ ○ ● | 4. I have acquired a better understanding of the discipline(s) relevant to this course |
| ○ ○ ○ ○ ● | 5. I was respectful of student diversity (e.g., race, color, religious affiliation, age, sex, gender, marital status, veteran status, national origin, sexual orientation, disability) in this course and made use of it in my own learning. |

Course Evaluation

No, strongly disagree

Yes, strongly agree

-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-

1. This course was well conceived.
2. The goals/objectives of this course were made clear at the beginning of the course, e.g., explained in the course syllabus.
3. The course requirements, e.g., readings and assignments, were relevant to course objectives.
4. This course was intellectually challenging.
5. This course required an appropriate workload.
6. Class discussions were lively and enlightening.
7. The course integrated issues of gender, race, ethnicity, class.
(if not applicable, leave blank)
8. This course adequately addressed any interreligious/ecumenical issues. (if not applicable, leave blank)
9. This course effectively brought interdisciplinary approaches to bear on the subject. (if not applicable, leave blank)

1. The strongest aspect of this course was: *Everything was excellent! I thoroughly enjoyed this class and I learned + grew so much. Thank you.*

2. Reflecting on your thinking and learning in this course, your considered advice to the professor is:

3. Would you make any suggestions regarding the course workload, e.g., readings and other assignments?

4. Are there any suggestions that you would make regarding the organization of the course on the semester level or the use of class time? Are there pedagogical suggestions you might make? Might technology have been used more effectively in the course?

5. Are there ways in which the professor's comments on written work were particularly helpful, or could be more helpful?

Particularly appreciated suggestions for further reading.

revised Jan 2010

GTU Course Evaluation
for non-doctoral courses

To the student: Please fill out this course evaluation form (using ink). Another designated student will collect it and put it in an envelope to go to the GTU Dean's Office (3rd floor of the GTU Library).

To the professor: This form is for non-doctoral-level courses. Please designate a student to: collect, put in envelope with new label, seal, and return to the GTU Dean's Office, 3rd Floor of GTU Library.

Name and number of course: LSST 4341 - Development of Eucharistic Theology

Professor(s): Shaver + Weil

Semester: Spring Year: 2015

Student's school of affiliation: _____

Student's degree program: _____ Year Student entered program: _____

To the student: These course evaluations, designed for non-doctoral-level courses are used by the instructor to evaluate and improve his or her own effectiveness as a teacher; they also have an important role to play in tenure and promotion decisions. They are returned to the instructor after grades are submitted.

Teacher evaluation [Name of Teacher: Shaver]

- | No, strongly
disagree | Yes, strongly
agree | |
|--------------------------|------------------------|--|
| ○ ○ ○ ○ ● | | 1. The teacher was knowledgeable about the subject. |
| ○ ○ ○ ○ ● | | 2. The teacher was well prepared, e.g., organized for class meetings. |
| ○ ○ ○ ○ ● | | 3. The teacher was respectful and fair to students regardless of race, color, religious affiliation, age, sex, gender, marital status, veteran status, national origin, sexual orientation, or disability. |
| ○ ○ ○ ○ ● | | 4. The teacher made productive use of the diversity represented within the class. |
| ○ ○ ○ ○ ● | | 5. The teacher was available for consultation. |
| ○ ○ ○ ○ ● | | 6. The teacher followed a clear and well-structured syllabus. |

If there is another instructor: [Name of Teacher: Weil]

- | No, strongly
disagree | Yes, strongly
agree | |
|--------------------------|------------------------|--|
| ○ ○ ○ ○ ● | | 1. The teacher was knowledgeable about the subject. |
| ○ ○ ○ ○ ● | | 2. The teacher was well prepared, e.g., organized for class meetings. |
| ○ ○ ○ ○ ● | | 3. The teacher was respectful and fair to students regardless of race, color, religious affiliation, age, sex, gender, marital status, veteran status, national origin, sexual orientation, or disability. |
| ○ ○ ○ ○ ● | | 4. The teacher made productive use of the diversity represented within the class. |
| ○ ○ ○ ○ ● | | 5. The teacher was available for consultation. |
| ○ ○ ○ ○ ● | | 6. The teacher followed a clear and well-structured syllabus. |

Student Self-Evaluation

- | | |
|-----------|--|
| ○ ○ ○ ● ○ | 1. I came to class prepared and ready to engage the material. |
| ○ ○ ○ ○ ● | 2. I found myself thinking in more focused and complex ways. |
| ○ ○ ○ ○ ● | 3. I have made significant progress in developing specific skills, competencies, and points of view needed in the fields most closely related to this course. |
| ○ ○ ○ ○ ● | 4. I have acquired a better understanding of the discipline(s) relevant to this course |
| ○ ○ ○ ○ ● | 5. I was respectful of student diversity (e.g., race, color, religious affiliation, age, sex, gender, marital status, veteran status, national origin, sexual orientation, disability) in this course and made use of it in my own learning. |

Course Evaluation

No, strongly
disagree

Yes, strongly
agree

-

1. This course was well conceived.
2. The goals/objectives of this course were made clear at the beginning of the course, e.g., explained in the course syllabus.
3. The course requirements, e.g., readings and assignments, were relevant to course objectives.
4. This course was intellectually challenging.
5. This course required an appropriate workload.
6. Class discussions were lively and enlightening.
7. The course integrated issues of gender, race, ethnicity, class. (if not applicable, leave blank)
8. This course adequately addressed any interreligious/ecumenical issues. (if not applicable, leave blank)
9. This course effectively brought interdisciplinary approaches to bear on the subject. (if not applicable, leave blank)

1. The strongest aspect of this course was:

Structure, readings, lectures - Entire course

2. Reflecting on your thinking and learning in this course, your considered advice to the professor is:

Stephen: Keep teaching! Louis, thank you for all you've given + shared with the class!

3. Would you make any suggestions regarding the course workload, e.g., readings and other assignments?

Excellent.

4. Are there any suggestions that you would make regarding the organization of the course on the semester level or the use of class time? Are there pedagogical suggestions you might make? Might technology have been used more effectively in the course?

5. Are there ways in which the professor's comments on written work were particularly helpful, or could be more helpful?

All feedback on reflections + papers were extremely helpful

revised Jan 2010

GTU Course Evaluation
for non-doctoral courses

To the student: Please fill out this course evaluation form (using ink). Another designated student will collect it and put it in an envelope to go to the GTU Dean's Office (3rd floor of the GTU Library).

To the professor: This form is for non-doctoral-level courses. Please designate a student to: collect, put in envelope with new label, seal, and return to the GTU Dean's Office, 3rd Floor of GTU Library.

Name and number of course: LSST - 4241
 Professor(s): Louis Weil + Stephen Sherr
 Semester: Spring Year: 2015
 Student's school of affiliation: COSP
 Student's degree program: Master Year Student entered program: 1

To the student: These course evaluations, designed for non-doctoral-level courses are used by the instructor to evaluate and improve his or her own effectiveness as a teacher; they also have an important role to play in tenure and promotion decisions. They are returned to the instructor after grades are submitted.

Teacher evaluation [Name of Teacher: _____]

No, strongly disagree	Yes, strongly agree	
○ ○ ○ ○ ●	○ ○ ○ ○ ●	1. The teacher was knowledgeable about the subject.
○ ○ ○ ○ ●	○ ○ ○ ○ ●	2. The teacher was well prepared, e.g., organized for class meetings.
○ ○ ○ ○ ●	○ ○ ○ ○ ●	3. The teacher was respectful and fair to students regardless of race, color, religious affiliation, age, sex, gender, marital status, veteran status, national origin, sexual orientation, or disability.
○ ○ ○ ○ ●	○ ○ ○ ○ ●	4. The teacher made productive use of the diversity represented within the class.
○ ○ ○ ○ ●	○ ○ ○ ○ ●	5. The teacher was available for consultation.
○ ○ ○ ○ ●	○ ○ ○ ○ ●	6. The teacher followed a clear and well-structured syllabus.

If there is another instructor: [Name of Teacher: _____]

No, strongly disagree	Yes, strongly agree	
○ ○ ○ ○ ●	○ ○ ○ ○ ●	1. The teacher was knowledgeable about the subject.
○ ○ ○ ○ ●	○ ○ ○ ○ ●	2. The teacher was well prepared, e.g., organized for class meetings.
○ ○ ○ ○ ●	○ ○ ○ ○ ●	3. The teacher was respectful and fair to students regardless of race, color, religious affiliation, age, sex, gender, marital status, veteran status, national origin, sexual orientation, or disability.
○ ○ ○ ○ ●	○ ○ ○ ○ ●	4. The teacher made productive use of the diversity represented within the class.
○ ○ ○ ○ ●	○ ○ ○ ○ ●	5. The teacher was available for consultation.
○ ○ ○ ○ ●	○ ○ ○ ○ ●	6. The teacher followed a clear and well-structured syllabus.

Student Self-Evaluation

○ ○ ○ ○ ●	1. I came to class prepared and ready to engage the material.
○ ○ ○ ○ ●	2. I found myself thinking in more focused and complex ways.
○ ○ ○ ○ ●	3. I have made significant progress in developing specific skills, competencies, and points of view needed in the fields most closely related to this course.
○ ○ ○ ○ ●	4. I have acquired a better understanding of the discipline(s) relevant to this course
○ ○ ○ ○ ●	5. I was respectful of student diversity (e.g., race, color, religious affiliation, age, sex, gender, marital status, veteran status, national origin, sexual orientation, disability) in this course and made use of it in my own learning.

Course Evaluation

No, strongly
disagree

Yes, strongly
agree

1. This course was well conceived.

2. The goals/objectives of this course were made clear at the beginning of the course, e.g., explained in the course syllabus.

3. The course requirements, e.g., readings and assignments, were relevant to course objectives.

4. This course was intellectually challenging.

5. This course required an appropriate workload.

6. Class discussions were lively and enlightening.

7. The course integrated issues of gender, race, ethnicity, class.
(if not applicable, leave blank)

8. This course adequately addressed any interreligious/ecumenical issues. (if not applicable, leave blank)

9. This course effectively brought interdisciplinary approaches to bear on the subject. (if not applicable, leave blank)

1. The strongest aspect of this course was:

The class had both heart and head. I loved the studies, as well

2. Reflecting on your thinking and learning in this course, your considered advice to the professor is:

as the helpful explanations

3. Would you make any suggestions regarding the course workload, e.g., readings and other assignments?

4. Are there any suggestions that you would make regarding the organization of the course on the semester level or the use of class time? Are there pedagogical suggestions you might make? Might technology have been used more effectively in the course?

5. Are there ways in which the professor's comments on written work were particularly helpful, or could be more helpful?

I appreciated the comments and reflections on
the papers

revised Jan 2010

GTU Course Evaluation
for non-doctoral courses

To the student: Please fill out this course evaluation form (using ink). Another designated student will collect it and put it in an envelope to go to the GTU Dean's Office (3rd floor of the GTU Library).

To the professor: This form is for non-doctoral-level courses. Please designate a student to: collect, put in envelope with new label, seal, and return to the GTU Dean's Office, 3rd Floor of GTU Library.

Name and number of course: LSST - 4341
 Professor(s): Stephen Shaver
 Semester: Spring Year: 2015
 Student's school of affiliation: _____
 Student's degree program: _____ Year Student entered program: Auditor

To the student: These course evaluations, designed for non-doctoral-level courses are used by the instructor to evaluate and improve his or her own effectiveness as a teacher; they also have an important role to play in tenure and promotion decisions. They are returned to the instructor after grades are submitted.

Teacher evaluation [Name of Teacher: Stephen Shaver]

- | No, strongly
disagree | Yes, strongly
agree | |
|--------------------------|------------------------|--|
| ○ ○ ○ ○ ● | ● | 1. The teacher was knowledgeable about the subject. |
| ○ ○ ○ ○ ● | ● | 2. The teacher was well prepared, e.g., organized for class meetings. |
| ○ ○ ○ ○ ● | ● | 3. The teacher was respectful and fair to students regardless of race, color, religious affiliation, age, sex, gender, marital status, veteran status, national origin, sexual orientation, or disability. |
| ○ ○ ○ ○ ● | ● | 4. The teacher made productive use of the diversity represented within the class. |
| ○ ○ ○ ○ ● | ● | 5. The teacher was available for consultation. |
| ○ ○ ○ ○ ● | ● | 6. The teacher followed a clear and well-structured syllabus. |

If there is another instructor: [Name of Teacher: Louis Wail]

- | No, strongly
disagree | Yes, strongly
agree | |
|--------------------------|------------------------|--|
| ○ ○ ○ ○ ● | ● | 1. The teacher was knowledgeable about the subject. |
| ○ ○ ○ ○ ● | ● | 2. The teacher was well prepared, e.g., organized for class meetings. |
| ○ ○ ○ ○ ● | ● | 3. The teacher was respectful and fair to students regardless of race, color, religious affiliation, age, sex, gender, marital status, veteran status, national origin, sexual orientation, or disability. |
| ○ ○ ○ ○ ● | ● | 4. The teacher made productive use of the diversity represented within the class. |
| ○ ○ ○ ○ ● | ● | 5. The teacher was available for consultation. |
| ○ ○ ○ ○ ● | ● | 6. The teacher followed a clear and well-structured syllabus. |

Student Self-Evaluation

- | | |
|-----------|--|
| ○ ○ ○ ○ ● | 1. I came to class prepared and ready to engage the material. |
| ○ ○ ○ ○ ● | 2. I found myself thinking in more focused and complex ways. |
| ○ ○ ○ ○ ● | 3. I have made significant progress in developing specific skills, competencies, and points of view needed in the fields most closely related to this course. |
| ○ ○ ○ ○ ● | 4. I have acquired a better understanding of the discipline(s) relevant to this course |
| ○ ○ ○ ○ ● | 5. I was respectful of student diversity (e.g., race, color, religious affiliation, age, sex, gender, marital status, veteran status, national origin, sexual orientation, disability) in this course and made use of it in my own learning. |

Course Evaluation

No, strongly
disagree

Yes, strongly
agree

1. This course was well conceived.

2. The goals/objectives of this course were made clear at the beginning of the course, e.g., explained in the course syllabus.

3. The course requirements, e.g., readings and assignments, were relevant to course objectives.

4. This course was intellectually challenging.

5. This course required an appropriate workload.

6. Class discussions were lively and enlightening.

7. The course integrated issues of gender, race, ethnicity, class.
(if not applicable, leave blank)

8. This course adequately addressed any interreligious/ecumenical issues. (if not applicable, leave blank)

9. This course effectively brought interdisciplinary approaches to bear on the subject. (if not applicable, leave blank)

1. The strongest aspect of this course was:

The excellent teaching by Stephen Shaver

2. Reflecting on your thinking and learning in this course, your considered advice to the professor is:

Continue to teach

3. Would you make any suggestions regarding the course workload, e.g., readings and other assignments?

no, excellent

4. Are there any suggestions that you would make regarding the organization of the course on the semester level or the use of class time? Are there pedagogical suggestions you might make? Might technology have been used more effectively in the course?

5. Are there ways in which the professor's comments on written work were particularly helpful, or could be more helpful?

revised Jan 2010

GTU Course Evaluation

for non-doctoral courses

To the student: Please fill out this course evaluation form (using ink). Another designated student will collect it and put it in an envelope to go to the GTU Dean's Office (3rd floor of the GTU Library).

To the professor: This form is for non-doctoral-level courses. Please designate a student to: collect, put in envelope with new label, seal, and return to the GTU Dean's Office, 3rd Floor of GTU Library.

Name and number of course: LST 4341

Professor(s): LOUIS WEIL / STEPHEN SHAWER

Semester: SPRING Year: 1995

Student's school of affiliation: AUDITOR

Student's degree program: _____ Year Student entered program: _____

To the student: These course evaluations, designed for non-doctoral-level courses are used by the instructor to evaluate and improve his or her own effectiveness as a teacher; they also have an important role to play in tenure and promotion decisions. They are returned to the instructor after grades are submitted.

Teacher evaluation [Name of Teacher: WEIL]

- | No, strongly disagree | Yes, strongly agree | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | 1. The teacher was knowledgeable about the subject. |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | 2. The teacher was well prepared, e.g., organized for class meetings. |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | 3. The teacher was respectful and fair to students regardless of race, color, religious affiliation, age, sex, gender, marital status, veteran status, national origin, sexual orientation, or disability. |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | 4. The teacher made productive use of the diversity represented within the class. |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | 5. The teacher was available for consultation. |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | 6. The teacher followed a clear and well-structured syllabus. |

If there is another instructor: [Name of Teacher: _____]

- | No, strongly disagree | Yes, strongly agree | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | 1. The teacher was knowledgeable about the subject. |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | 2. The teacher was well prepared, e.g., organized for class meetings. |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | 3. The teacher was respectful and fair to students regardless of race, color, religious affiliation, age, sex, gender, marital status, veteran status, national origin, sexual orientation, or disability. |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | 4. The teacher made productive use of the diversity represented within the class. |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | 5. The teacher was available for consultation. |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | 6. The teacher followed a clear and well-structured syllabus. |

Student Self-Evaluation

- | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | 1. I came to class prepared and ready to engage the material. |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | 2. I found myself thinking in more focused and complex ways. |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | 3. I have made significant progress in developing specific skills, competencies, and points of view needed in the fields most closely related to this course. |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | 4. I have acquired a better understanding of the discipline(s) relevant to this course |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | 5. I was respectful of student diversity (e.g., race, color, religious affiliation, age, sex, gender, marital status, veteran status, national origin, sexual orientation, disability) in this course and made use of it in my own learning. |

Course Evaluation

No, strongly
disagree

Yes, strongly
agree

1. This course was well conceived.

2. The goals/objectives of this course were made clear at the beginning of the course, e.g., explained in the course syllabus.

3. The course requirements, e.g., readings and assignments, were relevant to course objectives.

4. This course was intellectually challenging.

5. This course required an appropriate workload.

6. Class discussions were lively and enlightening.

7. The course integrated issues of gender, race, ethnicity, class.
(if not applicable, leave blank)

8. This course adequately addressed any interreligious/ecumenical issues. (if not applicable, leave blank)

9. This course effectively brought interdisciplinary approaches to bear on the subject. (if not applicable, leave blank)

1. The strongest aspect of this course was:

2. Reflecting on your thinking and learning in this course, your considered advice to the professor is:

3. Would you make any suggestions regarding the course workload, e.g., readings and other assignments?

4. Are there any suggestions that you would make regarding the organization of the course on the semester level or the use of class time? Are there pedagogical suggestions you might make? Might technology have been used more effectively in the course?

5. Are there ways in which the professor's comments on written work were particularly helpful, or could be more helpful?

revised Jan 2010

GTU Course Evaluation

for non-doctoral courses

To the student: Please fill out this course evaluation form (using ink). Another designated student will collect it and put it in an envelope to go to the GTU Dean's Office (3rd floor of the GTU Library).

To the professor: This form is for non-doctoral-level courses. Please designate a student to: collect, put in envelope with new label, seal, and return to the GTU Dean's Office, 3rd Floor of GTU Library.

Name and number of course: LSST- 4341
 Professor(s): Weil / Shaver
 Semester: SP 2015 Year: 2015
 Student's school of affiliation: CDSP
 Student's degree program: Mdiv Year Student entered program: 2013

To the student: These course evaluations, designed for non-doctoral-level courses are used by the instructor to evaluate and improve his or her own effectiveness as a teacher; they also have an important role to play in tenure and promotion decisions. They are returned to the instructor after grades are submitted.

Teacher evaluation [Name of Teacher: Weil]

No, strongly disagree Yes, strongly agree

-
-
-
-
-
-

1. The teacher was knowledgeable about the subject.
2. The teacher was well prepared, e.g., organized for class meetings.
3. The teacher was respectful and fair to students regardless of race, color, religious affiliation, age, sex, gender, marital status, veteran status, national origin, sexual orientation, or disability.
4. The teacher made productive use of the diversity represented within the class.
5. The teacher was available for consultation.
6. The teacher followed a clear and well-structured syllabus.

If there is another instructor: [Name of Teacher: Shaver]

No, strongly disagree Yes, strongly agree

-
-
-
-
-
-

1. The teacher was knowledgeable about the subject.
2. The teacher was well prepared, e.g., organized for class meetings.
3. The teacher was respectful and fair to students regardless of race, color, religious affiliation, age, sex, gender, marital status, veteran status, national origin, sexual orientation, or disability.
4. The teacher made productive use of the diversity represented within the class.
5. The teacher was available for consultation.
6. The teacher followed a clear and well-structured syllabus.

Student Self-Evaluation

-
-
-
-
-

1. I came to class prepared and ready to engage the material.
2. I found myself thinking in more focused and complex ways.
3. I have made significant progress in developing specific skills, competencies, and points of view needed in the fields most closely related to this course.
4. I have acquired a better understanding of the discipline(s) relevant to this course.
5. I was respectful of student diversity (e.g., race, color, religious affiliation, age, sex, gender, marital status, veteran status, national origin, sexual orientation, disability) in this course and made use of it in my own learning.

Course Evaluation

No, strongly
disagree

Yes, strongly
agree

1. This course was well conceived.

2. The goals/objectives of this course were made clear at the beginning of the course, e.g., explained in the course syllabus.

3. The course requirements, e.g., readings and assignments, were relevant to course objectives.

4. This course was intellectually challenging.

5. This course required an appropriate workload.

6. Class discussions were lively and enlightening.

7. The course integrated issues of gender, race, ethnicity, class.
(if not applicable, leave blank)

8. This course adequately addressed any interreligious/ecumenical issues. (if not applicable, leave blank)

9. This course effectively brought interdisciplinary approaches to bear on the subject. (if not applicable, leave blank)

1. The strongest aspect of this course was:

Seminar format

2. Reflecting on your thinking and learning in this course, your considered advice to the professor is:

Keep teaching! Don't retire yet!

3. Would you make any suggestions regarding the course workload, e.g., readings and other assignments?

Probably just about right

4. Are there any suggestions that you would make regarding the organization of the course on the semester level or the use of class time? Are there pedagogical suggestions you might make? Might technology have been used more effectively in the course?

5. Are there ways in which the professor's comments on written work were particularly helpful, or could be more helpful?

revised Jan 2010