

09/17/15

ALL-COLLEGE COURSE EVALUATION RESULTS: FALL 2014

PART I: COURSE INFORMATION

Course:	PL151 A Logic and Argumentation	Enrollment:	70
Instructor:	John P Waterman	Forms Returned:	56

PART II: STUDENT INFORMATION (% based on number of answers to each question)

Reason Taking Course:

All-College Requirement	Major Requirement	Interest in Subject	Instructor Reputation	Time of Day	Other	[Responses]
29 (52%)	5 (9%)	12 (21%)	0 (0%)	5 (9%)	5 (9%)	56

Expected Grade:

A	B	C	D	F	Satisf.	Unsatisf.	[Responses]
21 (39%)	28 (52%)	2 (4%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	2 (4%)	0 (0%)	54

Class Standing:

First Year	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Other	[Responses]
34 (61%)	4 (7%)	10 (18%)	8 (14%)	0 (0%)	56

Student Sex:

Female	Male	[Responses]
27 (48%)	29 (52%)	56

PART III: STUDENT REACTION (% based on number of answers to question)

(1) I was involved in this course (for example, I attended class regularly, I worked hard, and I participated in class discussions and activities).

	Str. Agree	Agree	Neith. Ag/Dis	Disagree	Str. Disagr	[Responses]
INSTRUCTOR	18 (32%)	27 (48%)	9 (16%)	2 (4%)	0 (0%)	56
COURSE	18 (32%)	27 (48%)	9 (16%)	2 (4%)	0 (0%)	56
DEPARTMENT	92 (46%)	83 (41%)	24 (12%)	3 (1%)	0 (0%)	202
DIVISION	1380 (63%)	722 (33%)	71 (3%)	12 (1%)	2 (0%)	2187
COLLEGE	4705 (60%)	2776 (35%)	308 (4%)	43 (1%)	8 (0%)	7840

(2) I found this course challenging and intellectually stimulating, and I learned a considerable amount.

	Str. Agree	Agree	Neith. Ag/Dis	Disagree	Str. Disagr	[Responses]
INSTRUCTOR	17 (30%)	22 (39%)	9 (16%)	5 (9%)	3 (5%)	56
COURSE	17 (30%)	22 (39%)	9 (16%)	5 (9%)	3 (5%)	56
DEPARTMENT	115 (57%)	60 (30%)	15 (7%)	6 (3%)	5 (2%)	201
DIVISION	1268 (58%)	689 (32%)	163 (7%)	48 (2%)	14 (1%)	2182
COLLEGE	4424 (56%)	2690 (34%)	514 (7%)	163 (2%)	44 (1%)	7835

(3) The workload and pace of this course seemed appropriate.

	Str. Agree	Agree	Neith. Ag/Dis	Disagree	Str. Disagr	[Responses]
INSTRUCTOR	17 (31%)	30 (55%)	6 (11%)	2 (4%)	0 (0%)	55
COURSE	17 (31%)	30 (55%)	6 (11%)	2 (4%)	0 (0%)	55
DEPARTMENT	89 (44%)	95 (47%)	12 (6%)	5 (2%)	0 (0%)	201
DIVISION	1121 (51%)	832 (38%)	151 (7%)	68 (3%)	13 (1%)	2185
COLLEGE	3694 (47%)	3207 (41%)	582 (7%)	299 (4%)	55 (1%)	7837

(4) The instructor's organizational skills (including planning, preparation, and productive use of class time) were effective.

	Str.Agree	Agree	Neith.Ag/Dis	Disagree	Str.Disagr	[Responses]
INSTRUCTOR	15 (27%)	23 (41%)	10 (18%)	6 (11%)	2 (4%)	56
COURSE	15 (27%)	23 (41%)	10 (18%)	6 (11%)	2 (4%)	56
DEPARTMENT	103 (52%)	67 (34%)	17 (9%)	8 (4%)	3 (2%)	198
DIVISION	1249 (57%)	694 (32%)	156 (7%)	62 (3%)	16 (1%)	2177
COLLEGE	4368 (56%)	2609 (33%)	540 (7%)	242 (3%)	66 (1%)	7825

(5) The instructor's communication skills (e.g., presentation of material, facilitation of discussion, and clarity of expectations) were effective.

	Str.Agree	Agree	Neith.Ag/Dis	Disagree	Str.Disagr	[Responses]
INSTRUCTOR	20 (36%)	18 (32%)	14 (25%)	3 (5%)	1 (2%)	56
COURSE	20 (36%)	18 (32%)	14 (25%)	3 (5%)	1 (2%)	56
DEPARTMENT	115 (57%)	56 (28%)	21 (10%)	8 (4%)	1 (0%)	201
DIVISION	1300 (60%)	628 (29%)	151 (7%)	74 (3%)	23 (1%)	2176
COLLEGE	4338 (55%)	2501 (32%)	591 (8%)	300 (4%)	89 (1%)	7819

(6) The instructor was open to questions and willing to help outside of class time.

	Str.Agree	Agree	Neith.Ag/Dis	Disagree	Str.Disagr	[Responses]
INSTRUCTOR	28 (50%)	22 (39%)	5 (9%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	56
COURSE	28 (50%)	22 (39%)	5 (9%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	56
DEPARTMENT	127 (63%)	65 (32%)	8 (4%)	2 (1%)	0 (0%)	202
DIVISION	1494 (69%)	544 (25%)	116 (5%)	23 (1%)	4 (0%)	2181
COLLEGE	5283 (68%)	2052 (26%)	403 (5%)	66 (1%)	19 (0%)	7823

(7) The instructor's assessment of student work was prompt, consistent, useful, and substantive.

	Str.Agree	Agree	Neith.Ag/Dis	Disagree	Str.Disagr	[Responses]
INSTRUCTOR	14 (25%)	29 (52%)	7 (13%)	3 (5%)	3 (5%)	56
COURSE	14 (25%)	29 (52%)	7 (13%)	3 (5%)	3 (5%)	56
DEPARTMENT	94 (47%)	82 (41%)	16 (8%)	6 (3%)	3 (1%)	201
DIVISION	1286 (59%)	689 (32%)	144 (7%)	39 (2%)	17 (1%)	2175
COLLEGE	4321 (55%)	2680 (34%)	587 (8%)	164 (2%)	61 (1%)	7813

(8) Overall, the instructor's teaching in this course was effective.

	Str.Agree	Agree	Neith.Ag/Dis	Disagree	Str.Disagr	[Responses]
INSTRUCTOR	20 (36%)	19 (34%)	12 (21%)	4 (7%)	1 (2%)	56
COURSE	20 (36%)	19 (34%)	12 (21%)	4 (7%)	1 (2%)	56
DEPARTMENT	115 (57%)	59 (29%)	21 (10%)	5 (2%)	1 (0%)	201
DIVISION	1375 (63%)	639 (29%)	111 (5%)	45 (2%)	12 (1%)	2182
COLLEGE	4571 (58%)	2549 (33%)	454 (6%)	195 (2%)	67 (1%)	7836

PART IV: DEPARTMENT CHAIR'S COMMENTS

PART V: INSTRUCTOR'S COMMENTS

Course Evaluation - By Evaluation Questions
Waterman, John P
PL151 A Logic and Argumentation
FA 2014

8. Overall, the instructor's teaching in this course was effective.

74714 Neither agree nor disagree:

74898 Agree:

75028 Agree:

75162 Disagree:

75167 Disagree:

75346 Strongly agree:

75447 Strongly agree:

75488 Neither agree nor disagree:

75570 Agree:

75720 Strongly agree:

Professor Waterman taught Logic in a clear, understandable way, for which I am very grateful, because I do not generally possess quantitative reasoning and I was very worried about this class. He was incredibly enjoyable and engaging, even though I am sure there are things he would rather teach.

75971 Strongly agree:

Professor Waterman is a very good teacher. I know that he has not been here very long, which puts him in a dubious spot, but he should be kept by the college at all costs. His class was my favorite of the semester and was almost always interesting, and the effectiveness of this man's teaching should be gifted to several many more years" worth of students.

76011 Strongly agree:

76100 Strongly agree:

76311 Neither agree nor disagree:

76330 Strongly agree:

76431 Neither agree nor disagree:

The classes were all pretty boring and the examples in class were not particularly challenging. I think that if you made the class a bit harder, people would take it more seriously.

76605 Strongly agree:

76742 Agree:

76850 Agree:

76872 Strongly agree:

77051 Strongly agree:

77141 Strongly agree:

I felt that his teaching was effective.

77467 Agree:

77566 Agree:

77663 Agree:

78211 Agree:

78775 Neither agree nor disagree:

78900 Strongly agree:
78927 Agree:
79102 Agree:
79186 Agree:
79277 Neither agree nor disagree:
79788 Strongly agree: As a new professor at Colby, professor Waterman did a wonderful job with logic 151.
79797 Strongly agree:
79845 Strongly agree:
80148 Neither agree nor disagree:
80167 Agree:
80226 Neither agree nor disagree:
80237 Agree:
80248 Strongly agree:
80395 Strongly agree:
80450 Neither agree nor disagree:
80465 Strongly agree:
80702 Neither agree nor disagree:
80979 Disagree:
80999 Agree:
81005 Neither agree nor disagree:
81258 Strongly disagree:
81512 Disagree:
81706 Neither agree nor disagree:
81830 Agree:
81934 Agree:
82039 Agree:
82204 Strongly agree:
82244 Agree:
82248 Strongly agree:

Course Evaluation - By Evaluation Questions
Waterman, John P
PL151 A Logic and Argumentation
FA 2014

You are encouraged to use the space below to make any additional relevant comments concerning the course or the instructor.

- 74714 : There was a disconnect between the homework that we did, the material on the tests and how Professor Waterman presented concepts in class. It was also difficult to talk to the tutors about logic because they didn't understand what we were doing either. Overall I felt confused a lot of the time.
- 74898 : Professor Waterman made a pretty boring subject more interesting, and helped to break it down a lot. The computer program we used definitely made comprehension more difficult though. The subject was a lot easier in class, but the software was really picky with citation rules, and it sometimes felt like a guessing game. I also wish we had been able to do more like what we did at the end of the semester, talking about religion and other real world issues and formatting them in the logic language.
- 75028 :
- 75162 : Overall it was very difficult to get motivated to learn during this class. Most of the information was presented seemed haphazard and concepts were either overexplained or not explained well. The expectations for the class were never made clear. It was almost impossible to prepare for tests. I also never had any clue where I stood in the class grade wise and still do not know.
- 75167 : Unclear expectations, disorganized/poor use of class time. No idea what my grade will be because we took a test about a month ago and still don't have it back. Our homework is graded by a computer and it marks the whole problem wrong when it isn't exactly what it's looking for even if it is still correct. I also have no idea how that affects my grade.
- 75346 : I really liked this course and I think Professor Waterman did a great job teaching the course.
- 75447 :
- 75488 : I would have liked to spend a little more time on how the principles of logic that we learned could be applied to real world arguments. We only spent a week on it, and while I understand the basics, that was the part of the class I found most engaging and widely applicable, and I would have enjoyed going deeper into it.
- 75570 : I found this course very interesting and I learned a lot. The exams were a bit difficult to study for since most of the work we had done was online. I think study guides for the exam would be helpful, as well as some concrete definitions for terms that would be on the exam.
- 75720 : Professor Waterman did a great job. I never would have guessed that he was a new professor at all. He deserves the highest commendations as he carries on into the academic world.
- 75971 :
- 76011 :
- 76100 :
- 76311 :
- 76330 :

76431 :
76605 : John is an amazing teacher. the course is just so very abstract, it's difficult to grasp without getting very creative. I can see how passionate he is about it, always open to questions and different ways to solve a problem set. I'm not good at this class, but he's very supportive, has no problem answering dumb questions. Sweetest professor ever, really wants to know more about you.

76742 : I would suggest teaching the logical structure of actual arguments like the ones we evaluated in the papers rather than using Tarski's World.

76850 :
76872 :
77051 :
77141 : Interesting course, must be savvy with computers to succeed though.

77467 : The one critique I have of the course was using the computer software to practice/do homework and then having the tests written out. Certainly the software is helpful and tests need to be written, but I would have done better on the tests if some/more of our required work followed the format of the test. It's a lot harder to do a proof without the computer prompting you or letting you know that the step you took is wrong.

77566 :
77663 :
78211 :
78775 :
78900 : Great class, but where do I go from here if I'm still interested?

78927 : I took this course for the math requirement so I didn't expect to get much from the class and I was not interested in the material. I am not a math person. However, Professor Waterman was a devoted teacher who is clearly a good teacher of the materials. he explained complicated subjects and concepts with passion and many hand gestures.

79102 :
79186 :
79277 :
79788 :
79797 : I took this class to fulfill my quantitative reasoning requirement. It was an appropriate course for me, and I appreciated Professor Waterman's teaching style and approach to the material. Thanks!!

79845 : Mr. Waterman was really enthusiastic when teaching logic and made what could have become a boring class, into something I looked forward to. As a new teacher he was right in the swing of things from day one and was always prepared.

80148 :
80167 : This class was very enjoyable and Professor Waterman did a great job teaching the course.

80226 :

- 80237 : Professor clearly has a grasp of the material, but while I never felt as though he did not know or understand something himself, I often felt as though his explanation was impaired by disorganization and the textbook. He managed to significantly alleviate the disorganization, as I have said, toward the end of the semester, and I suspect it may have been the result of simple nervousness. I found the textbook, however, to be ineffective. The software was difficult and confusing to use and I think that often times, it confused me further. In fact, I found the book so confusing that I found myself relying almost solely on the professor's explanations, which were much more effective. for clarification and ignoring it almost entirely. Overall, I think the professor is a conscientious, intelligent and kind instructor, and it is frustrating to see his instruction limited by someone else's shortcomings.
- 80248 : I came into this class thinking that I would dread it and find it uninteresting, yet I thought Professor Waterman's teaching of this class was effective and he made the class interesting.
- 80395 :
- 80450 :
- 80465 : In the future, I will definitely be taking a philosophy course solely because Prof. Waterman is the teacher. Thanks for a great semester.
- 80702 : Going forward I would recommend that Professor Waterman creates a study guide with practice problems (and an answer key) for students before an exam. Given that our homework is for the most part all online, writing proofs by hand would have been great practice. Also, having the ability to see what kinds of questions the professor will ask is always helpful when studying.
- 80979 :
- 80999 :
- 81005 :
- 81258 :
- 81512 :
- 81706 : It would have been nice to have a longer class because we kept running over. Also, the tests contained way too much material for me to be able to complete in the allotted 50 minutes.
- 81830 :
- 81934 :
- 82039 :
- 82204 :
- 82244 : your tests were way too long for a 50 minute period. I'm normally a speedy test taker often one of the first ones done and i struggled.
- 82248 : Great professor who makes a seemingly very boring subject interesting and realizes that life happens, and is therefore very forgiving of students which is great, but definitely not too lenient. Couldn't find a better professor for this subject