

WUSTL Course Evaluations

10/8/2017

Title of Course: Biomedical Ethics

Course: L30 233F (same as L98 233, L84 233F) **Section:** 01
Semester: Spring 2016

Instructors: Charles Kurth (Instructor), Kathryn Shrumm (TA)

Completed Evaluations: 19 of 35 (54%)

Scoring Key

Bold - Score

(S) - System's Average Score For the Template

(D) - Department's Average Score For the Template

(M) - Median Score For the Question

Course Section Requirements:

Number of Quizzes	n/a
Number of Examinations	n/a
Number of short papers (1-5pgs)	n/a
Number of long papers (6 +pgs)	n/a
Number of homework assignments	n/a
Number of individual projects	n/a
Number of group projects	n/a
Number of oral presentations	n/a
Was attendance required?	No
Was class participation required?	No
Were take home exams given?	No

Lecture Class

Overall Evaluation (Charles Kurth - Instructor)

5.84 Give an overall rating for the course

(S) 5.54 of 12375	(blank)	1 - Poor	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Excellent
(D) 5.59 of 366	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	3 (15.79%)	4 (21.05%)	5 (26.32%)	7 (36.84%)
(M) 6.00								

6.32 Give an overall rating of the instructor's teaching

(S) 5.66 of 12375	(blank)	1 - Poor	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Excellent
(D) 5.96 of 366	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	3 (15.79%)	7 (36.84%)	9 (47.37%)
(M) 6.00								

6.00 Overall, how much did you learn in this course?

(S) 5.61 of 12375	(blank)	1 - Very Little	2	3	4	5	6	7 - A Great Deal
(D) 5.57 of 366	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	3 (15.79%)	3 (15.79%)	4 (21.05%)	9 (47.37%)
(M) 6.00								

5.84 Would you recommend this course to another student?

(S) 5.31 of 12375	(blank)	1 - No	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Certainly
(D) 5.35 of 366	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (10.53%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (5.26%)	3 (15.79%)	3 (15.79%)	10 (52.63%)
(M) 7.00								

WUSTL Course Evaluations

10/8/2017

4.37		How would you describe the workload in this course?						
(S) 4.39 of 12375	(blank)	1 - Very Light	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Very Heavy
(D) 4.22 of 366	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	4 (21.05%)	7 (36.84%)	5 (26.32%)	3 (15.79%)	0 (0.00%)
(M) 4.00								

4.58		How would you describe the content of this course?						
(S) 4.62 of 12374	(blank)	1 - Very Easy	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Very Difficult
(D) 4.69 of 366	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	3 (15.79%)	6 (31.58%)	6 (31.58%)	4 (21.05%)	0 (0.00%)
(M) 5.00								

Instruction (Charles Kurth - Instructor)

6.16		The instructor made the course interesting						
(S) 5.49 of 12374	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 5.74 of 366	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (10.53%)	3 (15.79%)	4 (21.05%)	10 (52.63%)
(M) 7.00								

6.53		Subject matter was explained clearly						
(S) 5.51 of 12374	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 5.77 of 366	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	3 (15.79%)	3 (15.79%)	13 (68.42%)
(M) 7.00								

6.37		Material was presented at an appropriate pace						
(S) 5.56 of 12374	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 5.82 of 366	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (10.53%)	1 (5.26%)	4 (21.05%)	12 (63.16%)
(M) 7.00								

6.74		The instructor was well prepared for class						
(S) 6.28 of 12374	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 6.48 of 366	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (5.26%)	3 (15.79%)	15 (78.95%)
(M) 7.00								

Organization (Charles Kurth - Instructor)

WUSTL Course Evaluations

10/8/2017

5.89 The course lived up to its description

(S) 6.00 of 12374	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 5.87 of 366	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (5.26%)	1 (5.26%)	1 (5.26%)	1 (5.26%)	7 (36.84%)	8 (42.11%)
(M) 6.00								

6.84 Assigned work (readings, etc.) complemented lectures

(S) 5.88 of 12374	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 6.51 of 366	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (5.26%)	1 (5.26%)	17 (89.47%)
(M) 7.00								

6.26 Class time was used well

(S) 5.78 of 12374	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 5.79 of 366	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (5.26%)	3 (15.79%)	5 (26.32%)	10 (52.63%)
(M) 7.00								

6.74 Topics were well organized

(S) 5.87 of 12374	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 6.03 of 366	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	5 (26.32%)	14 (73.68%)
(M) 7.00								

Interaction with students (Charles Kurth - Instructor)

6.00 Expectations were clearly explained

(S) 5.91 of 12374	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 5.85 of 366	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (10.53%)	4 (21.05%)	5 (26.32%)	8 (42.11%)
(M) 6.00								

5.79 Grading procedures were fair

(S) 5.82 of 12374	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 5.60 of 366	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (5.26%)	7 (36.84%)	6 (31.58%)	5 (26.32%)
(M) 6.00								

WUSTL Course Evaluations

10/8/2017

6.50 Instructor was concerned for students

(S) 5.94 of 12374	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 6.03 of 366	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (5.26%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (5.26%)	3 (15.79%)	13 (68.42%)
(M) 7.00								

6.58 Instructor was available for consultation outside of class

(S) 6.07 of 12374	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 6.28 of 366	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (5.26%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (5.26%)	2 (10.53%)	15 (78.95%)
(M) 7.00								

6.68 Instructor maintained positive environment in class

(S) 6.19 of 12374	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 6.46 of 366	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (10.53%)	2 (10.53%)	15 (78.95%)
(M) 7.00								

Short answers (Charles Kurth - Instructor)

What did you like most about this course?

- 00 As the first philosophy course I've taken, I found it incredibly interesting. I had no idea I liked philosophy this much!
- 01 Professor Kurth really makes the class extremely interesting. He is fantastic at engaging the class in turning it into much more of a discussion rather than a lecture course. Class time is genuinely enjoyable and informative.
- 02 Kurth is an amazing instructor!!! He made the material interesting and also very understandable. I liked when we covered different things that allowed us to use case studies to really make the whole subject matter more personal.
- 04 It was all new material and new questions on topics I either hardly ever thought about or that I had not thought about at all. This course literally opened my eyes to a new field and realm within it I wouldn't have known existed independent of the hard sciences. Open discussion with intelligent people and a comfortable, friendly classroom environment that welcomed questions because the professor was comfortable admitting he did not have all the answers. Fantastic!
- 05 It was very interesting and made me have to think deeply about topics that I had not necessarily considered before. I believe I improved my ability to analyze readings and critically think and question them and I am grateful for that
- 07 It covered a broad range of topics and allowed me to learn a great deal in areas I was not too familiar with before taking the course.
- 08 I most enjoyed our class discussions and really appreciated how Professor Kurth would give us a re-cap of our previous discussions, a brief summary of the articles we read for homework, and sometimes an interesting piece of related news to lead into the the topic.
- 09 Subject matter was interesting and clearly explained
- 11 The topic range.
- 12 topics
- 13 I really liked exploring philosophy and learning about biomedical ethics. I thought Dr. Kurth was a wonderful person and was engaging and interesting to listen to. He was also always happy to make appointments with students outside of class time.
- 14 Readings complimented the topics well. Also, having discussions with a partner was a good idea.
- 15 I really like the enthusiasm our professor brought for topics every class period. His openness and excitement really encouraged all of the students in the class to engage with the material and participate in class. I also really like that small group discussions were there to break up the class time.

- 16 The topics covered were very interesting. As a pre-med, I learned a lot of valuable information about various ethical issues in medicine.
- 18 The discussions were both engaging and enlightening. And I appreciate that you refrained from providing your own opinion until the end of the section. Also that you played devil's advocate by arguing back at us on behalf of the authors.

What did you like the least?

- 00 I think we could have moved quicker through the material in class. A lot of time was just spent summarizing and explaining the readings, instead of actually arguing about what we agreed/disagreed with in each piece. Many students don't do the readings, so I know summarizing everything ensures everyone can participate, but then it's more boring for the students that do read.
- 01 As someone with an admittedly weak writing background, I think more can be done to instruct the class on how to write in the correct style required by philosophy papers. While this may be much less interesting, it is vital to do well in the class.
- 02 I didn't like that the class was so much of Kurth talking. I really think he could utilize more case studies, videos, and just technology in general. The subject matter is so interesting, and sometimes it just felt a little boring.
- 04 The TA graded everything and I didn't understand why since she only taught like one lecture.
- 05 I felt like the grading at times was a bit harsh in that it seemed like points deducted were arbitrary
- 07 I kind of wish we had more room for debating our own opinions of the matters discussed instead of focusing heavily on the authors' points.
- 08 At times I wished the class were a bit smaller.
- 12 It is more of a "evaluate this argument" class and less of a "argue your views on this issue we have talked about" class. i.e. it focused too much on the argument structure and points and not enough on the implications of such arguments.
- 13 I found that the papers were graded very harshly. The grading was focused strongly on the way that are arguments were developed and connections between things. This was frustrating as this would be my expectation for writing or English courses, rather than philosophy courses. (I was also frustrated by my lack of improvement on papers. Despite going to office hours after my second paper, my grades declined a few points. Over the course of the semester, my paper grades were all within 5 points of each other.) I wish that there were other major components of the final grade than papers. (This especially disadvantages the weaker writers.) I entered the class expecting more formal discussions on the topics of the course and debates, rather than smaller group discussions which we then reviewed as a class, and wish we had such topics. I felt that we focused too much on the readings and arguments developed in readings rather than just the topics more broadly. Lastly, I would have liked for the course to cover a much wider range of topics and spend less time on some topics (like organ donation). I would have liked to learn about the ethics of stem cell research for example.
- 14
 - 1) I wish that the class was smaller and that the class was structured more like a round-table discussion. Having the class face each other in a circle will make discussions more fluid and less structured.
 - 2) I think that it would be nice to have one of the SW grades dropped as this is a first philosophy class for many students and the nature of the assignments are different than other classes at Wash U.
 - 3) Less reliance on summarizing reading during class. I felt that a lot of times the majority of class time was spent summarizing the points from the reading. It is important to learn how to dissect arguments and i think that Professor Kurth did a fantastic job teaching this. Perhaps the beginning of the semester should continue to focus on dissecting the arguments of the reading but that this can be transitioned out of towards the end of the semester once people begin to get the hang of this.
 - 4) Occasionally (rarely though), there was a fact stated in class that was wrong so just making sure that all information conveyed is accurate.
- 16 The papers - I feel like we could have gone over better how to organize and expand enough on each section.
- 18 Unfortunately this class came after a day of being up since 8am and 2 hours of work, and 3 hours of class. Otherwise I'd have been more awake!

Is there something important about the course not covered by these questions?

- 02 N/A
- 04 I think a possible improvement that could be made would be to have a 1-page reflection due each day that's just stream-of-consciousness writing as a response to readings as we go. I had that in an East Asian Studies course and discussion was always great because people had to read for class and couldn't escape it.
- 05 No
- 07 n/a
- 13 Sometimes the writing prompts were not as specific and explicit as I would have liked.
- 16 no

WUSTL Course Evaluations

10/8/2017

6.88 Topics were effectively related to the lectures

(S)	6.10 of 11115	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D)	6.08 of 247	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (5.26%)	7 (36.84%)
(M)	7.00								

6.73 Communicated at a level appropriate for the class

(S)	6.06 of 11115	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D)	5.99 of 247	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	3 (15.79%)	8 (42.11%)
(M)	7.00								

Interaction with students (Kathryn Shrumm - TA)

6.38 Expectations were clearly explained

(S)	5.85 of 11115	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D)	5.60 of 247	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	3 (15.79%)	2 (10.53%)	8 (42.11%)
(M)	7.00								

5.93 Grading procedures were fair

(S)	5.86 of 11115	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D)	5.39 of 247	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (5.26%)	4 (21.05%)	4 (21.05%)	5 (26.32%)
(M)	6.00								

6.27 TA was concerned for students

(S)	5.98 of 11115	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D)	5.53 of 247	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (10.53%)	1 (5.26%)	3 (15.79%)	9 (47.37%)
(M)	7.00								

6.80 TA was available for consultation outside of class

(S)	6.08 of 11115	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D)	6.10 of 247	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (5.26%)	1 (5.26%)	13 (68.42%)
(M)	7.00								

WUSTL Course Evaluations

10/8/2017

7.00		TA maintained positive environment in class							
(S)	6.14 of 11115	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D)	6.02 of 247	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	14 (73.68%)
(M)	7.00								

Short Answers (Kathryn Shrumm - TA)

Is there something important about the section not covered by these questions?

02	N/A
05	No
13	There was not a discussion section of the course. I based my answers on the one lecture that Kate led in class and my interactions with Kate during office hours.
16	no
18	Had limited interaction with Kathryn so cannot accurately answer questions about her teaching.

Instructor Short Answers (Kathryn Shrumm - TA)

What did you like most about the teaching of this section by the TA?

00	I usually groan when TA's give guest lectures because it is clear they're not used to teaching, and we're the guinea pigs they're learning on as they stumble through the material. Kate's guest lecture on the other hand was amazing! She was well prepared, managed the classroom gracefully, and it was interesting, informative, and clearly explained. I am impressed! Kate, you should start as a philosophy prof now.
01	Extremely helpful during office hours.
05	I liked that she made her self available as much as possible outside of class, which was really helpful
11	Her availability.
12	good critiques
13	Kate was one of the most helpful TAs that I have had in a humanities class. I was originally skeptical of how helpful office hours would be in a writing based course, but I found Kate extremely helpful. She was also always happy to help students.
16	Kate was so helpful when meeting one-on-one.

What did you like least about the teaching of this section by the TA?

01	Nothing. She was great!
05	Even though we discussed the papers and the writing, it still felt at times like points were arbitrarily deducted on papers without much explanation
13	Kate was a tough grader. While this is good for learning, it was tough given that 90 percent of our grade is based on our grades on the papers.
16	Grading was sometimes very tough.

Other Considerations

Other Considerations (NOT Instructor Specific)

Early in the semester, did your professor explain the expectations for academic integrity?

(blank)	Yes	No
0 (0.00%)	14 (73.68%)	2 (10.53%)

When was your last exam held?

(blank)	The last week of classes	Reading period	Finals period	A take-home final	No final exam
0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (10.53%)	4 (21.05%)	9 (47.37%)

Was the date and/or time of your last exam changed during the semester?

(blank)	Yes	No
0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	11 (57.89%)

WUSTL Course Evaluations

10/8/2017

Title of Course: Biomedical Ethics

Course: L30 233F (same as L98 233, L84 233F) **Section:** 02
Semester: Spring 2016

Instructors: Charles Kurth (Instructor), Ian Tully (TA)

Completed Evaluations: 25 of 39 (64%)

Scoring Key

Bold - Score

(S) - System's Average Score For the Template

(D) - Department's Average Score For the Template

(M) - Median Score For the Question

Course Section Requirements:

Number of Quizzes	n/a
Number of Examinations	n/a
Number of short papers (1-5pgs)	n/a
Number of long papers (6 +pgs)	n/a
Number of homework assignments	n/a
Number of individual projects	n/a
Number of group projects	n/a
Number of oral presentations	n/a
Was attendance required?	No
Was class participation required?	No
Were take home exams given?	No

Lecture Class

Overall Evaluation (Charles Kurth - Instructor)

6.00	Give an overall rating for the course							
(S) 5.54 of 12375	(blank)	1 - Poor	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Excellent
(D) 5.59 of 366	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (4.00%)	2 (8.00%)	3 (12.00%)	9 (36.00%)	10 (40.00%)
(M) 6.00								
6.48	Give an overall rating of the instructor's teaching							
(S) 5.66 of 12375	(blank)	1 - Poor	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Excellent
(D) 5.96 of 366	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (8.00%)	9 (36.00%)	14 (56.00%)
(M) 7.00								
6.20	Overall, how much did you learn in this course?							
(S) 5.61 of 12375	(blank)	1 - Very Little	2	3	4	5	6	7 - A Great Deal
(D) 5.57 of 366	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (8.00%)	1 (4.00%)	12 (48.00%)	10 (40.00%)
(M) 6.00								
6.20	Would you recommend this course to another student?							
(S) 5.31 of 12375	(blank)	1 - No	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Certainly
(D) 5.35 of 366	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (4.00%)	0 (0.00%)	3 (12.00%)	0 (0.00%)	6 (24.00%)	15 (60.00%)
(M) 7.00								

WUSTL Course Evaluations

10/8/2017

3.96		How would you describe the workload in this course?						
(S) 4.39 of 12375	(blank)	1 - Very Light	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Very Heavy
(D) 4.22 of 366	0 (0.00%)	1 (4.00%)	2 (8.00%)	3 (12.00%)	12 (48.00%)	5 (20.00%)	2 (8.00%)	0 (0.00%)
(M) 4.00								

4.24		How would you describe the content of this course?						
(S) 4.62 of 12374	(blank)	1 - Very Easy	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Very Difficult
(D) 4.69 of 366	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	6 (24.00%)	10 (40.00%)	6 (24.00%)	3 (12.00%)	0 (0.00%)
(M) 4.00								

Instruction (Charles Kurth - Instructor)

6.32		The instructor made the course interesting						
(S) 5.49 of 12374	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 5.74 of 366	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (4.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (8.00%)	2 (8.00%)	2 (8.00%)	18 (72.00%)
(M) 7.00								

6.44		Subject matter was explained clearly						
(S) 5.51 of 12374	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 5.77 of 366	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (4.00%)	2 (8.00%)	7 (28.00%)	15 (60.00%)
(M) 7.00								

6.40		Material was presented at an appropriate pace						
(S) 5.56 of 12374	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 5.82 of 366	0 (0.00%)	1 (4.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (4.00%)	1 (4.00%)	4 (16.00%)	18 (72.00%)
(M) 7.00								

6.76		The instructor was well prepared for class						
(S) 6.28 of 12374	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 6.48 of 366	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (8.00%)	2 (8.00%)	21 (84.00%)
(M) 7.00								

Organization (Charles Kurth - Instructor)

WUSTL Course Evaluations

10/8/2017

6.48 The course lived up to its description

(S) 6.00 of 12374	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 5.87 of 366	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (4.00%)	3 (12.00%)	4 (16.00%)	17 (68.00%)
(M) 7.00								

6.76 Assigned work (readings, etc.) complemented lectures

(S) 5.88 of 12374	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 6.51 of 366	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	6 (24.00%)	19 (76.00%)
(M) 7.00								

6.32 Class time was used well

(S) 5.78 of 12374	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 5.79 of 366	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (8.00%)	3 (12.00%)	5 (20.00%)	15 (60.00%)
(M) 7.00								

6.52 Topics were well organized

(S) 5.87 of 12374	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 6.03 of 366	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (4.00%)	2 (8.00%)	5 (20.00%)	17 (68.00%)
(M) 7.00								

Interaction with students (Charles Kurth - Instructor)

6.24 Expectations were clearly explained

(S) 5.91 of 12374	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 5.85 of 366	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (8.00%)	1 (4.00%)	1 (4.00%)	6 (24.00%)	15 (60.00%)
(M) 7.00								

5.28 Grading procedures were fair

(S) 5.82 of 12374	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 5.60 of 366	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	3 (12.00%)	4 (16.00%)	5 (20.00%)	9 (36.00%)	4 (16.00%)
(M) 6.00								

WUSTL Course Evaluations

10/8/2017

6.28 Instructor was concerned for students

(S) 5.94 of 12374	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 6.03 of 366	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (4.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (4.00%)	2 (8.00%)	6 (24.00%)	15 (60.00%)
(M) 7.00								

6.56 Instructor was available for consultation outside of class

(S) 6.07 of 12374	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 6.28 of 366	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (4.00%)	3 (12.00%)	2 (8.00%)	19 (76.00%)
(M) 7.00								

6.48 Instructor maintained positive environment in class

(S) 6.19 of 12374	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 6.46 of 366	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (4.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (4.00%)	7 (28.00%)	16 (64.00%)
(M) 7.00								

Short answers (Charles Kurth - Instructor)

What did you like most about this course?

- 00 I thought that Charlie did an excellent job explaining really complicated topics and arguments and made it really interesting and easy to understand. It really helped me understand the way arguments are structured and also understand where I stand on some of these issues.
- 01 I like how you really engaged the students in the course.
- 02 The topics that were discussed were very current issues, and I was able to develop my understanding of relevant bioethical issues significantly.
- 03 The ethical discussion brought up were very thought provoking and interesting
- 04 I have not taken a philosophy course before (or any humanities, for that matter), but I had this recommended to me by a friend, and it was a good choice. I think the Professor Kurth did a great job at making this course interesting and making the whole class think about many issues in modern and semi-modern medicine, and I could see how what we were learning was very important in the real world.
- 05 The actual content of the class made me think differently and the subject matter was taught incredibly well.
- 06 Interesting topics
- 07 I thought a lot of the topics were very interesting.
- 09 It was very interesting because I had never before thought about some of the issues that we discussed in class
- 10 Learning about the ethics of organ transplantation and end of life issues.

- 11 - The topics were presented in a really organized way that allowed us to apply previous arguments and methodologies to newer concepts.
 - I liked how we saw both negative and positive views for each topic we covered in succession, and I think it's really helpful to take 3 surveys for each topic (before anything, after positive view, after negative view). The surveys that are conducted on paper for topics are also quite informative and interesting.
 - I really like how Professor Kurth asks us discussion questions in a format similar to how arguments for the papers we write should work as it helps organize my thoughts better.
 - Professor Kurth is an engaging professor and knows how to lead discussions extremely well with a balance between writing on the board and conversations, and it's really incredible.
 - I really like how this course as presented in a series of logical arguments and that the professor pushes us to flesh our arguments and really find where we might have flaws in the argument and how we can either critique other arguments or strengthen our own.
 - I like the diversity of papers that we have to read with respect to type of media platform (newspaper, published journal, online report, etc.) and date of publication. I think relevant news articles to what we're reading really increase the interest level in those topics
 - Professor Kurth really cares about his students, which is something that I deeply appreciate, always offering to talk during office hours or after class and bringing in cookies that one time when we all seemed kind of stressed. Having a professor who learns each student's name in a 40-person class and is concerned about his students is really awesome
- 12 Essay structure of the class more conducive to learning the material. In a class where its entirety is made up by analyzing papers, it would make little sense to be tested via exams on tidbits of knowledge. The class structure made us consider the relevance of what we were learning better.
- 13 The material. The topics we discussed were very relevant and interesting.
- 14 Everything, class was awesome
- 15 Enthusiasm of the professor
- 16 I liked that I was able to learn about relevant ethical issues that will directly apply to my professional field after graduation.
- 17 The flow of the class (the conversation between the beginning and end of the semesters). Also, the readings were very interesting and I learned how to dissect the argument. Group work was great as well.
- 18 I felt that the course presented many interesting ideas that allowed students to fully formulate their opinions on the issue
- 19 It was very interesting and well organized.
- 20 The discussion of difficult topics broken down logically.
- 21 Interesting subject material, with reasonable workload.
- 22 I loved the group work. I think it really helped and provided a lot of perspective.
- 23 The instructor was engaging and made the content interesting
- 24 Professor Kurth's teaching style made an otherwise difficult course much easier. Clear explanations, engaging the class' opinions (making more group discussion was a good improvement mid-way), and maintaining energy and enthusiasm. Also, the way he talks - voice inflections, emphasis, hand gestures - makes it much easier to pay attention and follow along when I'm having a long day or really tired, especially for someone who has hearing issues.

What did you like the least?

- 00 I thought that it sometimes it would be nice to have more discussion between the entire class, rather than just between our pairs and as a back and forth between Charlie.
- 01 I felt like grading was a little variable at times for the essays.
- 02 The weight of the long writing assignments are a bit large in my opinion.
- 03 At times, the topics seemed slight out of order, particularly towards the end of the semester
- 04 Some of the readings were a bit dense and less interesting than others
- 05 the length of time that is took to get the assignments back.
- 06 Hard to get engaged
- 07 The grading seemed rather arbitrary. Even if I answered every part of the assignment thoroughly, I would often lose points just because the grader did not agree with my opinion. I also thought that the reading assignments could be better spaced out.
- 09 Participation was difficult for me, only because I'm not exactly outgoing
- 10 writing the long assignments but it was worth it

11	<p>- I think calling on people who don't normally contribute to the conversation would be helpful as it's nice to hear more people's perspectives, and I think it keeps everyone more engaged during class discussions. I think Professor Kurth started to do this a little bit towards the second half of the semester when he got an idea for which people were more talkative, so I guess that's something he already recognizes.</p> <p>- I think using examples from modern-day events and maybe having the class discuss those more rather than as a news report in the beginning of the class would make the discussions we feel much more applicable</p> <p>- I think it'd be nice to talk about topics in groups of 3-4 rather in groups of 2 as it happens easily that two people share the same reasoning, so it's harder to maintain a diverse conversation with different ideas</p> <p>- I believe having some more respectful debate from students on certain points that are brought up would help flesh out some arguments even more and help see additional perspectives. I think disagreements would lead to more insights and asking if students have both things to add to the argument or oppositions to one of the points we have brought up would really enrich the arguments that we develop</p>
12	Because the essays covered only a few papers of the many discussed during the year, it often felt that a disproportionate amount of class time was spent on material that was simply there for our interest. I felt this had a negative effect on the classroom dynamic because of the discussion-based environment that required heavy participation.
13	N/A
14	Only met two days a week
15	Lot of time spent on teasing out the argument didn't leave much time for debate
16	I'm not sure that class time was always best utilized. I understand that drawing out the big pieces of the assigned reading is probably the best way to begin a discussion about the intended topic of the day, however, for those who did the reading thoroughly, the conversations in class offered little new insight. For those who did not find the conversation particularly stimulating, I think a more hands-on approach would have been appreciated and definitely more engaging, whether that was in mock debates or being put in a group and given a scenario and having to spend time with your group deciding how you will respond and what actions you would take given the prompt.
17	Unclear expectations on participation
18	I did not like how oftentimes I felt that the professor was not as neutral as he should have been in presenting his arguments. For example, from the way he presented sides to an argument, one could clearly tell that he looked down upon the views of utilitarianism and that of Singer
19	The grading by the TA seemed harsher than necessary with not super helpful instruction. Often being told to go more in depth but we only have a 2 page maximum.
20	Subjectiveness of grading
21	The subjectivity that comes from all grades being writing based.
23	The essay prompts seemed to be released without too much notice before the due dates
24	I didn't find all of the readings too engaging, which made it difficult to stay engaged during some sections of the course

Is there something important about the course not covered by these questions?

04	Nope
05	the class was great.
07	no.
09	N/A
10	no
11	Professor Kurth has really significantly changed my (incorrect) perceptions of philosophy and bioethics as I came in thinking that philosophy was very unstructured and that anyone could have any opinion they wanted without substantial backing. However, I soon learned the intricacies of very coherent logical flow and progression of arguments that challenges students to really defend their claims without unjustifiable personal opinions. It is a very eye-opening class into the plethora of ethical issues that our society faces in medicine, and I think Professor Kurth has done an excellent job of presenting the material in an organized, interesting way that makes me view these issues quite differently. As a person highly invested in STEM and not very adept or interested in the humanities, I generally do not enjoy my non-STEM classes much, but this has honestly been one of my favorite classes at WashU, and I've been recommending it to all of my friends and peers. I really hope to take some more philosophy classes before I graduate, and Professor Kurth is one of my all-time favorite professors!
13	N/A
14	N/A
18	No

WUSTL Course Evaluations

10/8/2017

19	No.
21	I just wish he had a better understanding of some of the medical procedures we discussed. Some of our discussions were limited by this lack of information.
24	Good class atmosphere

Classroom Environment

The instructor promoted an inclusive learning environment with regard to the diversity of student personal backgrounds and identities. Please enter just the number on a scale of 1 to 7 where 1 is strongly disagree and 7 is strongly agree.

00	7
01	7
02	7
03	7
04	7
05	7
06	N/A
07	6
09	7
10	5
11	7
12	7
13	6
14	Yes
15	7
16	7
17	6
18	6
19	6
20	7
21	6
22	7
23	7
24	7

Where relevant, please give specific examples to explain your answer above.

04	I never felt uncomfortable or unwelcome in the class, and I don't know of anyone who did
05	the entire class was a class discussion that was open.
06	Don't see how he could promote it.
09	n/a
13	There was always a place for people to voice there opinion on the matters we discussed in class. If someone was shy and did not want to voice their opinion on a topic in a large group, we talked in small groups to discuss our opinions on the material.
17	I think the inclusive environment is inherent to the nature of the class (encourage discussion or individual response)
18	The professor tried to include everyone in his discussions, calling on the quiet ones if necessary. Also, he tried to remain politically correct and proper which I appreciated.
19	Charlie was a great professor and very friendly.
21	Very inclusive

WUSTL Course Evaluations

10/8/2017

23	When instructor offered examples of doctors, patients, or people, he used the pronoun "she" rather than always "he"
24	Really grateful for his understanding of a personal issue that was getting in the way of my writing

Discussion Section (Teaching Assistant)

Overall Evaluation (Ian Tully - TA)

5.38 Give an overall rating for the section

(S) 5.83 of 11115	(blank)	1 - Poor	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Excellent
(D) 5.61 of 247	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	4 (16.00%)	3 (12.00%)	2 (8.00%)	5 (20.00%)	7 (28.00%)
(M) 6.00								

5.35 Give an overall rating of the teaching effectiveness

(S) 5.73 of 11115	(blank)	1 - Poor	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Excellent
(D) 5.64 of 247	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (8.00%)	5 (20.00%)	3 (12.00%)	4 (16.00%)	6 (24.00%)
(M) 5.50								

Instruction (Ian Tully - TA)

5.72 Material was presented clearly

(S) 5.88 of 11115	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 5.80 of 247	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (4.00%)	0 (0.00%)	3 (12.00%)	1 (4.00%)	7 (28.00%)	6 (24.00%)
(M) 6.00								

5.67 Questions were answered clearly and concisely

(S) 5.84 of 11115	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 5.80 of 247	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (4.00%)	4 (16.00%)	1 (4.00%)	6 (24.00%)	6 (24.00%)
(M) 6.00								

5.72 Material was presented at an appropriate pace

(S) 5.93 of 11115	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 5.82 of 247	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (4.00%)	0 (0.00%)	4 (16.00%)	0 (0.00%)	6 (24.00%)	7 (28.00%)
(M) 6.00								

WUSTL Course Evaluations

10/8/2017

5.89 The TA was well prepared for class

(S) 6.15 of 11115	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 6.09 of 247	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (4.00%)	0 (0.00%)	3 (12.00%)	2 (8.00%)	3 (12.00%)	10 (40.00%)
(M) 7.00								

5.78 Class time was used well

(S) 5.90 of 11115	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 5.87 of 247	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (4.00%)	4 (16.00%)	0 (0.00%)	6 (24.00%)	7 (28.00%)
(M) 6.00								

5.71 The TA effectively led the class

(S) 5.82 of 11115	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 5.71 of 247	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	4 (16.00%)	2 (8.00%)	6 (24.00%)	5 (20.00%)
(M) 6.00								

6.12 Topics were effectively related to the lectures

(S) 6.10 of 11115	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 6.08 of 247	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	4 (16.00%)	0 (0.00%)	3 (12.00%)	10 (40.00%)
(M) 7.00								

6.18 Communicated at a level appropriate for the class

(S) 6.06 of 11115	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 5.99 of 247	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	4 (16.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (8.00%)	11 (44.00%)
(M) 7.00								

Interaction with students (Ian Tully - TA)
--

5.61 Expectations were clearly explained

(S) 5.85 of 11115	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 5.60 of 247	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (4.00%)	1 (4.00%)	3 (12.00%)	2 (8.00%)	3 (12.00%)	8 (32.00%)
(M) 6.00								

WUSTL Course Evaluations

10/8/2017

4.95 Grading procedures were fair

(S) 5.86 of 11115	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 5.39 of 247	0 (0.00%)	1 (4.00%)	1 (4.00%)	3 (12.00%)	3 (12.00%)	3 (12.00%)	7 (28.00%)	4 (16.00%)
(M) 5.50								

5.60 TA was concerned for students

(S) 5.98 of 11115	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 5.53 of 247	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	3 (12.00%)	3 (12.00%)	1 (4.00%)	5 (20.00%)	8 (32.00%)
(M) 6.00								

6.35 TA was available for consultation outside of class

(S) 6.08 of 11115	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 6.10 of 247	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	3 (12.00%)	1 (4.00%)	2 (8.00%)	14 (56.00%)
(M) 7.00								

6.05 TA maintained positive environment in class

(S) 6.14 of 11115	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 6.02 of 247	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	4 (16.00%)	1 (4.00%)	5 (20.00%)	10 (40.00%)
(M) 6.50								

Short Answers (Ian Tully - TA)

Is there something important about the section not covered by these questions?

- 04 I didn't answer many of these, because there wasn't really a discussion section. Overall, good job Ian!
- 05 Ian was great in lending help when ever it was necessary.
- 09 The TA did not do too much other than lecture once and grade the papers. The comments on the graded papers were not clear sometimes
- 10 no
- 13 N/A
- 14 N/A
- 18 No
- 19 I didn't find the grading very fair for some of the writings, specifically with the rubric set-up which makes it easier for one to lose more points than necessary.
- 21 No
- 23 The TA did not seem to take too much of an active/engaged role other than grading the essays, being available for meetings, and teaching part of a class once.

Instructor Short Answers (Ian Tully - TA)

What did you like <u>most</u> about the teaching of this section by the TA?

02	I could tell that the TA spent a lot of time grading the writing assignments, and he put a lot of effort into it.
03	He provided relevant details to the discussion and could answer questions the professor could not
04	N/A
05	It was well organized and thought out
07	Honestly, I felt that Ian did not really do much for the course.
09	n/a
10	he tabulated class stats
11	While I didn't attend the TA hours, Ian offers really useful feedback on all of our essay assignments, and these really help me improve and think about what to change in future essays. He has helped me become a more effective writer, encouraging me to avoid using weak claims and unsubstantiated evidence in the papers, which really helps me strengthen my writing.
13	I don't have much comments on this because the role of the TA wasn't necessarily to teach. He did lead the class discussion one day, and I think he did a great job of relaying the information to the class.
14	His delivery
18	He taught one section, but managed to convey the topics
19	He only taught once and did a good job.
21	N/A
22	He gave good feedback
23	He seemed interested in the philosophical aspects of the subject matter
24	Very approachable, easy to talk to, responsive, friendly

What did you like least about the teaching of this section by the TA?

00	Did not really interact with the class that much
02	The grade returns took a bit long, but were still reasonable.
04	N/A
05	N/A
07	I thought Ian's grading was often unfair and unjustified. I also would have appreciated it if Ian participated occasionally in the class to ask more ethical questions to make us think.
09	n/a
11	For the time that Ian led the class, I think he could've focused a little more on challenging students to flesh out arguments more to make everything more logically sound, but he did a great job overall and is clearly knowledgeable about the topics we are discussing.
13	N/A
14	only happened once
18	He did not really offer any relevant examples to what he presented in class.
19	Grading is really tough.
21	N/A
23	Provided explanations for grading but I felt that sometimes the grading wasn't fair, such as once I submitted almost 3 pages for an ~2 page essay and the 3rd page wasn't read or graded, whereas nowhere in the instructions was it explicitly stated that beyond the 2nd page it wouldn't be read or graded, or how strictly a suggested page limit would be enforced

Other Considerations

Other Considerations (NOT Instructor Specific)

Early in the semester, did your professor explain the expectations for academic integrity?

(blank)	Yes	No
0 (0.00%)	24 (96.00%)	0 (0.00%)

When was your last exam held?

(blank)	The last week of classes	Reading period	Finals period	A take-home final	No final exam
0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (8.00%)	3 (12.00%)	18 (72.00%)

Was the date and/or time of your last exam changed during the semester?

(blank)	Yes	No
0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	22 (88.00%)