UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO

UCSD

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO

SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

9500 GILMAN DRIVE
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92093-0348

Course and Instructor Evaluation Summary
Department of Philosophy

Weltman, Daniel Benjamin
PHIL 164 - Technology and Human Values (A)
Summer Session I 2015

Number of Students Enrolled: 24
Number of Evaluations Submitted: 17

PLEASE COMMENT ON THE FOLLOWING:

1. Your class level is

0 (0.0%):	Freshman
0 (0.0%):	Sophomore
6 (37.5%):	Junior
10 (62.5%):	Senior
0 (0.0%):	Graduate
0 (0.0%):	Extension
1:	[No Response]

2. Your reason for taking this class is

4 (26.7%):	Major
2 (13.3%):	Minor
5 (33.3%):	Gen. Ed.
3 (20.0%):	Elective
1 (6.7%):	Interest
2:	[No Response]

3. What grade do you expect in this class?

6 (37.5%):	A
5 (31.3%):	B
2 (12.5%):	C
0 (0.0%):	D
0 (0.0%):	F
3 (18.8%):	P
0 (0.0%):	NP
1:	[No Response]

4. I learned a great deal from this course.

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
1 (7.1%):	Disagree
1 (7.1%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
2 (14.3%):	Agree
9 (64.3%):	Strongly Agree
1 (7.1%):	Not Applicable
3:	[No Response]

5. How many hours a week do you spend studying outside of class on average?

1 (6.7%):	0-1
4 (26.7%):	2-3
3 (20.0%):	4-5
4 (26.7%):	6-7
1 (6.7%):	8-9
0 (0.0%):	10-11
1 (6.7%):	12-13
1 (6.7%):	14-15
0 (0.0%):	16-17
0 (0.0%):	18-19
0 (0.0%):	20 or more
2:	[No Response]

6. How often do you attend this course?

0 (0.0%):	Very Rarely
1 (6.7%):	Some of the Time
14 (93.3%):	Most of the Time
2:	[No Response]

7. The course material is intellectually stimulating.

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
1 (6.3%):	Disagree
3 (18.8%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
3 (18.8%):	Agree
9 (56.3%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable
1:	[No Response]

8. Assignments promote learning.

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
1 (6.7%):	Disagree
2 (13.3%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
4 (26.7%):	Agree
8 (53.3%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable
2:	[No Response]

9. Required reading is useful.

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
1 (6.3%):	Disagree
2 (12.5%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
3 (18.8%):	Agree
10 (62.5%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable
1:	[No Response]

10. This course is difficult relative to others.

1 (6.7%):	Strongly Disagree
3 (20.0%):	Disagree
4 (26.7%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
2 (13.3%):	Agree
5 (33.3%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable
2:	[No Response]

11. Exams are representative of the course material.

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
1 (6.7%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
2 (13.3%):	Agree
7 (46.7%):	Strongly Agree
5 (33.3%):	Not Applicable
2:	[No Response]

12. Do you recommend this course overall?

15 (100.0%):	Yes
0 (0.0%):	No
2:	[No Response]

13. Course PHIL 164:

- PHIL 164 was a class unlike any other I have taken so far. It is basically a forum in which we talk about topics from articles we've been assigned. We covered the good, the bad, and the ugly of technological advancement in human society and, although I personally struggled with speaking in class or conveying my ideas clearly (in class and on the TED website), I was thoroughly intrigued by the range of subjects we went over. This class requires a sharp eye for flawed arguments and an open mind for allowing others' opinions to shape yours. I'm glad I took this class; it has undoubtedly made me more keen on surveying arguments, responding logically, and other useful skills.

- Overall I find the course to be difficult. The readings are sometime hard to interpret until everything is cleared up in lecture.

- I did not really enjoy this class that much because the subject material in my opinion was trivial and kinda bland. I believe it would be a lot easier to have valid opinion worth listening to if we were experts in the subjects that we were talking about but seeing that none of us are experts in any of the fields that we talked about we are just sharing our own opinions on subjects that

we really know nothing about. However interesting it is to talk about these subjects it feels kinda pointless. But like i said, that is only my opinion.

- Fun, relevant, thought-provoking -- it's what I signed up for.

- Fun class, with topics that make you think differently.

- Conceptually, this course was perfect. Sci-fi and futuristic philosophical questions brought to reality. The readings themselves were only alright and I think could have been better. However, thanks to the instructor, we got to debate the fun and interesting moral grey areas of these topics in a meaningful way, something that I believe the readings missed out on.

14. Exams/Quizzes/Papers:

- The papers are pretty hard to get a good grade on in my opinion.

- Fairly administered.

- The various forms of grading were straight forward, simple, easy, and could be done in a timely fashion. They did their job and did their job well.

- We had to write many 'miniature' posts on the online TED forums for this class. I, personally, struggled with my assignments because I always strayed from the point or did not explain myself clearly enough. I am unfamiliar with this style of analysis, I suppose, and I want to become stronger at it. Therefore, I accept all constructive criticism that was given to me about my writings. We also had reading quizzes that pertained to the (mostly difficult) articles, but those were simple enough. I felt like I was challenged just enough with this class.

- Exams and quizzes were tough, but fair. The feedback really made this system work for me. Since all the work was done outside of class, the online feedback on our assignments made learning possible.

- the exams are super straight forward and even helpful.

15. Reading [title(s) and comments]:

- In my opinion, the readings for the class are interesting and makes me focus more on the ethics of technology.

- Reading was often tough and missed the potentially fun aspects of the class. The arguments in the reading seemed liked they often argued around the actual point of these topics, rather than the key moral questions at the heart of these issues. The instructor was nice and didn't ever give an unreasonable amount of reading though. Very thoughtful on his part.

- Good stuff!

- I didn't really like the readings that much. Yes they provided information on the subjects we were talking about but a lot of the time it was just a person commenting on another persons work through opinions. There was no science to back up anything they were saying so it was just logical comments on someone else's work with no real science to backup what they claimed. I just wish the readings had more scientific data to back them up. I do understand, however, that is not necessarily the point of the class so i guess the readings did what they were supposed to do, get us to think about different subjects in different ways.

- The articles we were assigned for this class were very interesting and definitely more philosophical than your average newspaper article. It was like reading pages from the scientific

book of philosophy! I liked, appreciated, and found interest in everything we read, however, and I still would like to know more on this topic (this class has helped sparked that urge). I also appreciated that we were able to choose from a variety of secondary supplementary readings because that allowed for some nice freedom.

16. Instructor displays a proficient command of the material.

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
1 (6.3%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
4 (25.0%):	Agree
11 (68.8%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable
1:	[No Response]

17. Instructor is well prepared for classes.

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
1 (6.3%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
3 (18.8%):	Agree
12 (75.0%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable
1:	[No Response]

18. Instructor's speech is clear and audible.

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
2 (12.5%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
3 (18.8%):	Agree
11 (68.8%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable
1:	[No Response]

19. Instructor explains the course material well.

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
2 (12.5%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
3 (18.8%):	Agree
11 (68.8%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable
1:	[No Response]

20. Lectures hold your attention.

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
1 (6.3%):	Disagree
1 (6.3%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
6 (37.5%):	Agree
8 (50.0%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable
1:	[No Response]

21. Instructor's lecture style facilitates note-taking.

0 (0.0%):   Strongly Disagree
2 (12.5%):   Disagree
5 (31.3%):   Neither Agree nor Disagree
2 (12.5%):   Agree
5 (31.3%):   Strongly Agree
2 (12.5%):   Not Applicable
1:             [No Response]

22. Instructor shows concern for students' learning.

0 (0.0%):   Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):   Disagree
2 (12.5%):   Neither Agree nor Disagree
4 (25.0%):   Agree
10 (62.5%):   Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):   Not Applicable
1:             [No Response]

23. Instructor promotes appropriate questions/discussion.

0 (0.0%):   Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):   Disagree
1 (6.3%):   Neither Agree nor Disagree
3 (18.8%):   Agree
12 (75.0%):   Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):   Not Applicable
1:             [No Response]

24. Instructor is accessible outside of class.

0 (0.0%):   Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):   Disagree
2 (12.5%):   Neither Agree nor Disagree
2 (12.5%):   Agree
9 (56.3%):   Strongly Agree
3 (18.8%):   Not Applicable
1:             [No Response]

25. Instructor starts and finishes class on time.

0 (0.0%):   Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):   Disagree
1 (6.3%):   Neither Agree nor Disagree
3 (18.8%):   Agree
12 (75.0%):   Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):   Not Applicable
1:             [No Response]

26. Instructor is effective in promoting academic integrity.

0 (0.0%):   Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):   Disagree
1 (6.3%):   Neither Agree nor Disagree
4 (25.0%):   Agree
11 (68.8%):   Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):   Not Applicable
1:               [No Response]

27. The instructor practiced effective teaching strategies that acknowledged and valued differences among students, including differences of race and gender identity.

0:               Strongly Disagree
0:               Disagree
0:               Neither Agree nor Disagree
0:               Agree
0:               Strongly Agree
0:               Not Applicable
17:              [No Response]

28. Do you recommend this professor overall?

15 (100.0%):   Yes
0 (0.0%):   No
2:               [No Response]

Custom Question 5

29. Instructor Daniel Weltman:

- Danny is very enthusiastic about the course material and works hard to stimulate class discussion. I liked how open ended the classes were, he really let the students dictate the direction of the discussions for the most part.

- Encourages thoughtful discussions and is maintains a positive environment despite what was oftentimes lackluster participation on the part of the rest of the class.

- I enjoyed Danny's teaching style which promoted a lot of discussion.

- Instructor Daniel Weltman is a good instructor and gets the material across well through various styles: group work, lectures, class discussion. Over all its a good way to present the material we are covering and he makes it clear what we need to know.

- Danny goes above and beyond to help his students understand the material.

- While the class was often based around peer discussions, Professor Weltman was always willing to contribute interesting angles into conversation for students to elaborate on something new. He always provided a lot of energy for the class and made sure each long class session stayed engaging.

- Really thoughtful and approachable. Tried his best to make the class time effective for the students. Encouraged fun and engaging discussions and continually left the debating to the students (as opposed to him), meaning he was great at facilitating discussion. Best discussion-based class I've had, largely thanks to his great job at creating and encouraging exciting and thoughtful discussions. This is the example for which every philosophy class should follow.

- Weltman is one of the best philosophy professors I've ever had. His lecture style really helps you understand the material and breaks the readings down for you. His assignments are also not busy work. They help with understanding the material as well. If you were thinking of taking a phil class, choose any class with him.

- Down to earth type of professor who simulates learning through cooperation with other students in the class. I learned more of the materials through other students' responses in class. At first I thought that 3 hours of lecture will probably bored me halfway, however his teaching style is simulating which prevent this.

- Daniel was one of the most engaged, student-focussed teachers I've ever had!

- Danny is a very enthusiastic and kind instructor. He is very patient with us even when our class conversations are quiet or we are unsure of what to say. He asks very interesting questions that prompt us to further discuss our topics and never pressures anyone to answer if that student feels uncomfortable. He has come up with some great topics for this class and is skilled at providing clarification for concepts we don't understand.

30. Please provide examples of the ways the instructor did or did not create a learning environment that welcomed, challenged, and supported all students.

[No Responses]

Please note that any responses or comments submitted by evaluators do not necessarily reflect the opinions of instructors, Philosophy, Academic Affairs, or UC San Diego. Responses and comments are made available without auditing or editing, and they may not be modified or deleted, to ensure that each evaluator has an opportunity to express his or her opinion.