



**Course:** 11104.1261: PHI.192.M001.FALL25.Introduction to Moral Theory  
**Instructor:** Minseok Kim \*  
**Response Rate:** 16/25 (64.00 %)

**1 - My key reasons for taking this course were: (Select all that apply.)**

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	
Interested in the subject	(1)	11	68.75%		
Required for major, minor, or program	(2)	2	12.50%		
Fulfilled Liberal Arts requirement/distribution (undergraduate only)	(3)	10	62.50%		
Reputation of instructor	(4)	1	6.25%		
Fit into my schedule	(5)	5	31.25%		
Advisor recommended course	(6)	1	6.25%		
Friend(s) recommended course	(7)	2	12.50%		
Other	(8)	0	0.00%		
<b>Response Rate</b>		16/25 (64%)			

**2 - If you selected 'other' as a key reason, please comment.**

<b>Response Rate</b>	0/25 (0%)
----------------------	-----------

**3 - For this course, on average, I spent the following time, outside of synchronous or in-person class sessions, on course work:**

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
0 hours per week	(1)	0	0.00%		
1-3 hours per week	(2)	13	81.25%		
4-6 hours per week	(3)	2	12.50%		
7-10 hours per week	(4)	1	6.25%		
11-15 hours per week	(5)	0	0.00%		
More than 15 hours per week	(6)	0	0.00%		
				0 25 50 100	Question
<b>Response Rate</b>				<b>Mean</b>	<b>STD</b>
16/25 (64.00%)				2.25	0.58
					<b>Median</b>
					2.00

**4 - I feel that I performed to my potential in this course.**

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0.00%		
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%		
Somewhat Disagree	(3)	1	6.25%		
Somewhat Agree	(4)	3	18.75%		
Agree	(5)	8	50.00%		
Strongly Agree	(6)	4	25.00%		
				0 25 50 100	Question
<b>Response Rate</b>				<b>Mean</b>	<b>STD</b>
16/25 (64.00%)				4.94	0.85
					<b>Median</b>
					5.00

**5 - The syllabus was an accurate guide to course requirements.**

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0.00%		
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%		
Somewhat Disagree	(3)	0	0.00%		
Somewhat Agree	(4)	1	6.25%		
Agree	(5)	6	37.50%		
Strongly Agree	(6)	9	56.25%		
				0 25 50 100	Question
<b>Response Rate</b>				<b>Mean</b>	<b>STD</b>
16/25 (64.00%)				5.50	0.63
					<b>Median</b>
					6.00



**Course:** 11104.1261: PHI.192.M001.FALL25.Introduction to Moral Theory  
**Instructor:** Minseok Kim \*  
**Response Rate:** 16/25 (64.00 %)

**6 - Student participation and the contribution of ideas, comments, and questions were encouraged.**

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means			
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0.00%					
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%					
Somewhat Disagree	(3)	0	0.00%					
Somewhat Agree	(4)	1	6.25%					
Agree	(5)	4	25.00%					
Strongly Agree	(6)	11	68.75%					
				02550100	Question			
Response Rate				Mean		STD		Median
16/25 (64.00%)				5.63		0.62		6.00

**7 - I felt a sense of belonging and community in the class.**

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means				
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0.00%		<div>5.44</div>				
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%						
Somewhat Disagree	(3)	0	0.00%						
Somewhat Agree	(4)	2	12.50%						
Agree	(5)	5	31.25%						
Strongly Agree	(6)	9	56.25%						
				02550100	Question				
Response Rate				Mean		STD		Median	
16/25 (64.00%)				5.44		0.73		6.00	

**8 - Course assessments (e.g., exams/quizzes, papers, presentations, projects, performances, etc.) allowed me to demonstrate what I learned.**

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means				
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0.00%		<div>5.38</div>				
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%						
Somewhat Disagree	(3)	0	0.00%						
Somewhat Agree	(4)	1	6.25%						
Agree	(5)	8	50.00%						
Strongly Agree	(6)	7	43.75%						
				02550100	Question				
Response Rate				Mean		STD		Median	
16/25 (64.00%)				5.38		0.62		5.00	

**9 - I received helpful feedback from the instructor to guide my progress in this course.**

Minseok Kim

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means			
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0.00%					
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%					
Somewhat Disagree	(3)	0	0.00%					
Somewhat Agree	(4)	2	12.50%					
Agree	(5)	7	43.75%					
Strongly Agree	(6)	7	43.75%					
				02550100	Question			
Response Rate				Mean	STD		Median	
16/25 (64.00%)				5.31	0.70		5.00	



**Course:** 11104.1261: PHI.192.M001.FALL25.Introduction to Moral Theory  
**Instructor:** Minseok Kim \*  
**Response Rate:** 16/25 (64.00 %)

**10 - The instructor's voice was easily audible and his or her diction was distinct.**

**Minseok Kim**

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means			
Strongly disagree	(1)	0	0.00%			3.56		
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%					
Agree	(3)	7	43.75%	■				
Strongly agree	(4)	9	56.25%	■				
				0 25 50 100	Question			
Response Rate				Mean		STD		Median
16/25 (64.00%)				3.56		0.51		4.00

**11 - Attentive and prepared students find the instructor's lectures and remarks clear.**

**Minseok Kim**

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means			
Strongly disagree	(1)	0	0.00%			3.69		
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%					
Agree	(3)	5	31.25%	■				
Strongly agree	(4)	11	68.75%	■				
				0 25 50 100	Question			
Response Rate				Mean		STD		Median
16/25 (64.00%)				3.69		0.48		4.00

**12 - The instructor knows the subject matter.**

**Minseok Kim**

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means			
Strongly disagree	(1)	0	0.00%			3.69		
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%					
Agree	(3)	5	31.25%	■				
Strongly agree	(4)	11	68.75%	■				
				0 25 50 100	Question			
Response Rate				Mean		STD		Median
16/25 (64.00%)				3.69		0.48		4.00

**13 - The instructor was well prepared for each class.**

**Minseok Kim**

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means			
Strongly disagree	(1)	0	0.00%			3.63		
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%					
Agree	(3)	6	37.50%	■				
Strongly agree	(4)	10	62.50%	■				
				0 25 50 100	Question			
Response Rate				Mean		STD		Median
16/25 (64.00%)				3.63		0.50		4.00



**Course:** 11104.1261: PHI.192.M001.FALL25.Introduction to Moral Theory  
**Instructor:** Minseok Kim \*  
**Response Rate:** 16/25 (64.00 %)

**14 - This course challenged me to do my best work.**

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means			
Strongly disagree	(1)	0	0.00%					
Disagree	(2)	1	6.25%					
Agree	(3)	10	62.50%					
Strongly agree	(4)	5	31.25%					
				0 25 50 100	Question			
<b>Response Rate</b>				<b>Mean</b>		<b>STD</b>		<b>Median</b>
16/25 (64.00%)				3.25		0.58		3.00

**15 - The grading is reasonably fair.**

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means			
Strongly disagree	(1)	0	0.00%					
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%					
Agree	(3)	8	50.00%					
Strongly agree	(4)	8	50.00%					
				0 25 50 100	Question			
<b>Response Rate</b>				<b>Mean</b>		<b>STD</b>		<b>Median</b>
16/25 (64.00%)				3.50		0.52		3.50

**16 - Students are able to get an appropriate amount of individual help from the instructor.**

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means			
Strongly disagree	(1)	0	0.00%					
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%					
Agree	(3)	8	50.00%					
Strongly agree	(4)	8	50.00%					
				0 25 50 100	Question			
<b>Response Rate</b>				<b>Mean</b>		<b>STD</b>		<b>Median</b>
16/25 (64.00%)				3.50		0.52		3.50

**17 - I learned to think critically about issues in philosophy.**

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means			
Strongly disagree	(1)	0	0.00%					
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%					
Agree	(3)	7	43.75%					
Strongly agree	(4)	9	56.25%					
				0 25 50 100	Question			
<b>Response Rate</b>				<b>Mean</b>		<b>STD</b>		<b>Median</b>
16/25 (64.00%)				3.56		0.51		4.00

**18 - The instructor treats students with respect.**

Minseok Kim

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means			
Strongly disagree	(1)	0	0.00%					
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%					
Agree	(3)	5	31.25%					
Strongly agree	(4)	11	68.75%					
				0 25 50 100	Question			
<b>Response Rate</b>				<b>Mean</b>		<b>STD</b>		<b>Median</b>
16/25 (64.00%)				3.69		0.48		4.00



**Course:** 11104.1261: PHI.192.M001.FALL25.Introduction to Moral Theory  
**Instructor:** Minseok Kim \*  
**Response Rate:** 16/25 (64.00 %)

**19 - Graded work was usually returned within a reasonable time.**

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means			
Strongly disagree	(1)	0	0.00%					
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%					
Agree	(3)	5	31.25%					
Strongly agree	(4)	11	68.75%					
				0 25 50 100	Question			
<b>Response Rate</b>				<b>Mean</b>		<b>STD</b>		<b>Median</b>
16/25 (64.00%)				3.69		0.48		4.00

**20 - The instructor's style of conducting the course held my interest.**

Minseok Kim

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means			
Strongly disagree	(1)	0	0.00%					
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%					
Agree	(3)	6	37.50%					
Strongly agree	(4)	10	62.50%					
				0 25 50 100	Question			
<b>Response Rate</b>				<b>Mean</b>		<b>STD</b>		<b>Median</b>
16/25 (64.00%)				3.63		0.50		4.00

**21 - The academic goals of the course are sufficiently clear.**

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means			
Strongly disagree	(1)	0	0.00%					
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%					
Agree	(3)	7	43.75%					
Strongly agree	(4)	9	56.25%					
				0 25 50 100	Question			
<b>Response Rate</b>				<b>Mean</b>		<b>STD</b>		<b>Median</b>
16/25 (64.00%)				3.56		0.51		4.00

**22 - The instructor is effective in achieving the academic goals of the course.**

Minseok Kim

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means			
Strongly disagree	(1)	0	0.00%					
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%					
Agree	(3)	7	43.75%					
Strongly agree	(4)	9	56.25%					
				0 25 50 100	Question			
<b>Response Rate</b>				<b>Mean</b>		<b>STD</b>		<b>Median</b>
16/25 (64.00%)				3.56		0.51		4.00

**23 - I would recommend this class to others.**

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means			
Strongly disagree	(1)	0	0.00%					
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%					
Agree	(3)	8	50.00%					
Strongly agree	(4)	8	50.00%					
				0 25 50 100	Question			
<b>Response Rate</b>				<b>Mean</b>		<b>STD</b>		<b>Median</b>
16/25 (64.00%)				3.50		0.52		3.50



**Course:** 11104.1261: PHI.192.M001.FALL25.Introduction to Moral Theory  
**Instructor:** Minseok Kim \*  
**Response Rate:** 16/25 (64.00 %)

**24 - I would recommend this instructor to others.**

Minseok Kim

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means			
Strongly disagree	(1)	0	0.00%			3.69		
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%					
Agree	(3)	5	31.25%	■				
Strongly agree	(4)	11	68.75%	■				
				0 25 50 100	Question			
Response Rate				Mean		STD		Median
16/25 (64.00%)				3.69		0.48		4.00

**25 - The pace of the course was:**

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means			
Much too fast	(1)	0	0.00%					
A little bit too fast	(2)	0	0.00%					
About right	(3)	14	87.50%	■				
A little bit too slow	(4)	2	12.50%	■				
Much too slow	(5)	0	0.00%					
				0 25 50 100				
Response Rate				16/25 (64.00%)				

**26 - How would you rank the instructor's overall teaching performance against the performance of your other instructors at Syracuse University?**

Minseok Kim

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means			
Far below average	(1)	0	0.00%			4.13		
Somewhat below average	(2)	0	0.00%					
Average	(3)	4	25.00%	■				
Better than average	(4)	6	37.50%	■				
Outstanding	(5)	6	37.50%	■				
				0 25 50 100	Question			
Response Rate				Mean		STD		Median
16/25 (64.00%)				4.13		0.81		4.00

**27 - How would you rank the instructor's overall teaching performance?**

Minseok Kim

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means			
Very poor	(1)	0	0.00%			4.56		
Poor	(2)	0	0.00%					
Adequate	(3)	0	0.00%					
Good	(4)	7	43.75%	■				
Excellent	(5)	9	56.25%	■				
				0 25 50 100	Question			
Response Rate				Mean		STD		Median
16/25 (64.00%)				4.56		0.51		5.00



**Course:** 11104.1261: PHI.192.M001.FALL25.Introduction to Moral Theory  
**Instructor:** Minseok Kim \*  
**Response Rate:** 16/25 (64.00 %)

**28 - What aspects of this course were most valuable to your overall learning experience?**

Response Rate	14/25 (56%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I think what was more valuable to me was how much the instructor was able to get the class to participate in discussions. At the beginning of the semester, the class never spoke, and he was able to fix that by curating lectures to be more focused on what the students had to say about philosophical topics. I also really liked that the slide shows were posted ahead of class time. I also really liked the way the reading responses were set up; it gave me a chance to talk about specific things on my mind from the readings, without having to adhere to a rubric or censor myself and my thinking.</li> <li>• Made me think about important things I didnt before</li> <li>• Anything regarding morality and how to question what's right and wrong.</li> <li>• Videos and presentations</li> <li>• I valued that Professor Kim encouraged in class participation.</li> <li>• Thought experiments and seminar-based discussion.</li> <li>• Learning the basics of philosophy and then expanding on that basic knowledge.</li> <li>• Having students participate and share their opinions</li> <li>• He included many interactive activities</li> <li>• The group discussions every class that were encouraged.</li> <li>• The pace was very reasonable.</li> <li>• The incorporation of videos to in the lecture</li> <li>• I found analyzing arguments extremely valuable in this class rather than just having opinions. Also working with concpets like Kantian ethics, utilitarianism etc.. aloud me to slow down, break down claims into clear premises, and really understand why a position is valid or not</li> <li>• I really enjoyed the class discussions and also the different games/exercises we did in class. We often discussed different topics/problems in small groups which was honestly very helpful in order to understand topics. We were able to get really into different scenarios in relation to different moral/philosophical theories, and I felt very connected to the coursework.</li> </ul>	

**29 - What aspects of this course were least valuable to your overall learning experience?**

Response Rate	11/25 (44%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> <li>• In-class writing</li> <li>• I feel like the lectures could have been more concise</li> <li>• Lectures, at times.</li> <li>• Keeping track of who spoke was not my favorite thing, some students are paying attention but may not be comfortable speaking and they should not be penalized for that as long as they are paying attention.</li> <li>• n/a</li> <li>• N/A</li> <li>• Some in class discussions would get a bit off track.</li> <li>• Nothing</li> <li>• I feel like the tracked participation was pretty unvaluable, as I think some students have a much harder time speaking in front of others, don't want their ideas to be shut down etc. so i think just silently keeping track - maybe at the end of the week would be better.</li> <li>• At least for me, I felt as though the reading could be difficult at times just because I have a hard time focusing, but I do think they were helpful nonetheless.</li> </ul>	



**Course:** 11104.1261: PHI.192.M001.FALL25.Introduction to Moral Theory  
**Instructor:** Minseok Kim \*  
**Response Rate:** 16/25 (64.00 %)

**30 - Which course readings did you find most helpful? Why were they helpful?**

Response Rate	13/25 (52%)
---------------	-------------

- I really liked the AI one and the abortion discussion. I actually liked most of the readings, but sometimes they were long and a little boring and repetitive. I am talking about the spinach-test one specifically, but I can't remember the name of the reading or the author.
- I learned something useful from each
- Any of the readings about philosophers. They gave me more insight on how we as a society are.
- The readings on abortion I found them interesting.
- Yes the course lectures were helpful at explaining topics.
- I liked the readings by Kant and the ones on utilitarianism, allowed me to change my pattern of thought.
- I thought they were all helpful, they helped me gain knowledge on each lecture following them.
- all
- the weekly ones that were needed for assignments really helped me understand the material we were going to discuss
- The course reading on the experience machine was particularly interesting to me.
- All of them were good
- I found the readings by Kant, Marquis, and Huemer the most helpful. Kant's work helped me understand how moral reasoning is built on universal principles and intentions, which made it easier to evaluate actions using a consistent moral standard. Marquis' presented very clear understandings, and Huemer was also useful as it connected philosophical concepts to real life societal issues
- I enjoyed when we learned about different views such as Utilitarianism, Kantian ethics, Rationalism, etc.

**31 - Which course readings did you find least helpful? Why were they not helpful?**

Response Rate	11/25 (44%)
---------------	-------------

- The readings about Kant, I don't like Kant very much, so I found it really boring and almost repetitive.
- None
- None
- I believe some of the articles for the reading assignments could have been better.
- NA
- n/a
- n/a
- Can't recall.
- none
- The least helpful readings were the ones that used a lot of highly technical philosophical language without offering many concrete examples. Some texts felt unnecessarily dense, which made it harder to pull out the main ideas without re-reading multiple times.
- NA