Title PRACTICE OF MANAGEMENT

Instructor: ARMOR, VIVIAN

Institution, VI

Enrollment: 41
Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 513 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

District Commons Com				Fre	quer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
1. Did you gain new Insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor seeke clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 3. Did with revaluations reflect the expected goals 3. Did with revaluations reflect the expected goals 4. Did with revaluations reflect the expected goals 4. Did with revaluations (1. Did with reflect the expected goals 5. Did with reflect assignment readings contribute to that you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to that you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. Did written assignments contribute to that you learned 8. Did with reflect assignments contribute to that you learned 9. The state of the property of the pro	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1. Did you gain new Insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor seeke clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 3. Did with revaluations reflect the expected goals 3. Did with revaluations reflect the expected goals 4. Did with revaluations reflect the expected goals 4. Did with revaluations (1. Did with reflect the expected goals 5. Did with reflect assignment readings contribute to that you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to that you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. Did written assignments contribute to that you learned 8. Did with reflect assignments contribute to that you learned 9. The state of the property of the pro															
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 22 4.58 4.31 6.4 4.23 4.26 4.58 3.01 dthe exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 3 4 29 4.72 298/1423 4.33 4.36 4.27 4.36 4.72 4.50 4.72 4.50 dther evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 2 0 0 3 1 2 19 4.47 526/1609 3.95 4.23 4.22 4.23 4.47 5.51 dt assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 2 3 8 21 4.47 56/1609 3.95 4.13 4.03 4.06 4.03 4.03 4.03 4.05 4.05 4.07 4.00 4.00 4.03 4.03 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05	General														
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 3 2 9 4.72 298/1423 4.33 4.36 4.72 4.36 4.72 5. Did dassigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 2 3 8 21 4.31 50/1585 4.13 4.04 3.96 3.91 4.31 5. Did witton assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 2 3 8 21 4.31 50/1585 4.13 4.04 3.96 3.91 4.31 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 0 2 5 28 4.74 242/1651 4.05 4.06 4.08 4.03 4.04 8. Now many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 1 8 21 4.07 257/1655 4.06 4.05 4.04 4.00 4.08 8. Now many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 1 8 21 4.07 257/1655 4.06 4.05 4.06 4.07 4.00 9. How would you grade the overall teachins effectiveness 5 1 0 0 1 8 21 4.07 257/1655 4.08 4.06 4.07 4.01 4.05 1. Market the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course			-	0				4.44	703/1674	4.07	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 7. Did assigned reading system clearly explained 8. Was the granding system clearly explained 8. Was the instructor's lectures well prepared 8. Was the instructor granding system contribute to what you learned 8. Was clearly explained 8. Was clearly expl	2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	13	22	4.58	483/1674	4.23	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 2 3 8 21 4.31 502/1585 3.81 4.08 3.96 3.91 4.31 5. Did witten assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 2 5 28 4.74 242/1651 3.06 4.08 4.08 4.03 4.03 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 0 0 2 5 28 4.74 242/1651 4.06 4.20 4.18 4.20 4.74 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 0 1 8 21 4.67 257/1656 4.08 4.06 4.07 4.10 4.67 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 1 0 0 0 1 8 21 4.67 257/1656 4.08 4.06 4.07 4.10 4.67 1. Were the instructor's leatures well prepared 2 0 0 0 0 0 3 31 4.91 397/1566 4.08 4.04 4.04 4.08 4.06 1. Where the instructor's leatures well prepared 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	29	4.72	298/1423	4.33	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.72
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 3. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 4. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 5. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 7. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 8. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 8. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 9. Did least lectures well prepared least leas	4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	3	12	19	4.47	536/1609	3.95	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	3	8	21	4.31	502/1585	4.13	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 4 5.00 1/1673 4.63 4.65 4.69 4.67 5.00 **Description** **Lecture** 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 0 0 0 0 3 31 4.91 192/1586 4.39 4.43 4.48 4.91 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 0 0 3 31 4.91 192/1586 4.39 4.43 4.48 4.91 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 0 0 2 5 27 4.74 339/1582 4.28 4.30 4.26 4.35 4.74 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 0 0 1 6 5 2 7 4.74 339/1582 4.28 4.30 4.26 4.35 4.74 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 1 0 0 0 1 6 7 13 4.19 709/1520 3.77 4.14 4.01 4.03 4.19 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0 0 1 6 7 13 4.19 709/1520 3.77 4.14 4.01 4.03 4.19 2. Were special techniques successful 9 0 0 0 1 1 1 15 4.52 634/1511 4.31 4.37 4.27 4.28 4.52 3. Did the instructor encourage fish and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	9	13	12	4.03	861/1535	3.81	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.03
Now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness S T T T T T T T T T	7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	5	28	4.74	242/1651	4.06	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.74
Lecture Nere the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 0 0 0 3 31 4.91 192/1586 4.39 4.43 4.48 4.91 1.00 4.00	8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	34	5.00	1/1673	4.63	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00
1. Where the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 0 0 0 0 3 3 14 9.01 192/1586 4.39 4.43 4.48 4.94 4.95 2 0 0 0 0 0 3 45 5.00 1/1585 4.53 4.72 4.69 4.76 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 0 0 1 2 5 27 4.74 339/1582 4.28 4.20 4.26 4.35 4.74 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7 1 1 2 1 2 1 3 8 5 5 3.45 1065/1380 3.26 3.94 3.94 4.03 4.75 5 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 6 27 4.76 343/1575 4.14 4.32 4.27 4.39 4.76 5 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8 1 0 0 0 0 1 3 8 5.0 5 3.45 1065/1380 3.26 3.94 3.94 4.03 4.75 6 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 0 0 0 0 1 1 6 27 4.76 343/1575 4.12 4.27 4.27 4.39 4.76 5 Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 1 1 11 15 4.52 620/1515 4.29 4.37 4.24 4.28 4.52 8 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 0 1 1 11 15 4.52 620/1515 4.29 4.37 4.24 4.28 4.52 8 Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1 2 Were spou provided with adequate background information 1 3 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 205 *** 4.06 4.23 4.34 *** 1 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 5 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 205 *** 4.21 4.99 4.36 *** 2 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 203 *** 4.34 4.46 4.51 *** 2 Was the instructor provide assistance 1 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 203 *** 4.34 4.46 4.51 *** 3 Did research projects contribute to what you learned 3 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 203 *** 4.36 4.29 4.48 *** 4 Did the lab instructor provide assistance 2 Seminar 1 Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2 Was the instructor available for individual attention 3 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 203 *** 4.36 4.29 4.48 *** 4 Did the lab instructor provide assistance 3 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 203 *** 4.36 4.39 4.41 4.63 *** 4 Did diela experience contribute to what you learned 3 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 203 *** 4.36 4.39 4.41 4.63 *** 4 Did diela e	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	8	21	4.67	257/1656	4.08	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.67
1. Where the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 0 0 0 0 3 3 14 9.01 192/1586 4.39 4.43 4.48 4.94 4.95 2 0 0 0 0 0 3 45 5.00 1/1585 4.53 4.72 4.69 4.76 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 0 0 1 2 5 27 4.74 339/1582 4.28 4.20 4.26 4.35 4.74 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7 1 1 2 1 2 1 3 8 5 5 3.45 1065/1380 3.26 3.94 3.94 4.03 4.75 5 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 6 27 4.76 343/1575 4.14 4.32 4.27 4.39 4.76 5 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8 1 0 0 0 0 1 3 8 5.0 5 3.45 1065/1380 3.26 3.94 3.94 4.03 4.75 6 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 0 0 0 0 1 1 6 27 4.76 343/1575 4.12 4.27 4.27 4.39 4.76 5 Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 1 1 11 15 4.52 620/1515 4.29 4.37 4.24 4.28 4.52 8 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 0 1 1 11 15 4.52 620/1515 4.29 4.37 4.24 4.28 4.52 8 Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1 2 Were spou provided with adequate background information 1 3 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 205 *** 4.06 4.23 4.34 *** 1 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 5 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 205 *** 4.21 4.99 4.36 *** 2 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 203 *** 4.34 4.46 4.51 *** 2 Was the instructor provide assistance 1 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 203 *** 4.34 4.46 4.51 *** 3 Did research projects contribute to what you learned 3 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 203 *** 4.36 4.29 4.48 *** 4 Did the lab instructor provide assistance 2 Seminar 1 Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2 Was the instructor available for individual attention 3 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 203 *** 4.36 4.29 4.48 *** 4 Did the lab instructor provide assistance 3 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 203 *** 4.36 4.39 4.41 4.63 *** 4 Did diela experience contribute to what you learned 3 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 203 *** 4.36 4.39 4.41 4.63 *** 4 Did diela e	Logturo														
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 0 0 3 4 5.00 1.1585 4.53 4.72 4.68 9.76 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 0 0 1 6 27 4.76 339/1582 4.28 4.30 4.26 4.35 4.74 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 1 0 0 0 1 6 27 4.76 343/1575 4.14 4.32 4.27 4.39 4.76 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 1 2 1 0 0 0 0 1 6 27 4.76 343/1575 4.14 4.32 4.27 4.39 4.76 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 1 2 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 6 27 4.76 343/1575 4.14 4.32 4.27 4.39 4.76 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 3 7 17 4.52 620/1515 4.29 4.37 4.24 4.28 4.52 8. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 0 1 1 11 15 4.52 634/1511 4.31 4.37 4.27 4.28 4.52 8. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 0 1 1 11 15 5.00 ****/ 265 **** 4.06 4.33 4.38 *** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 32 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 5.00 ****/ 265 **** 4.06 4.23 4.34 **** 2. Mere you provided with adequate background information 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 5.00 ****/ 265 **** 4.06 4.23 4.34 **** 3. Nere necessary materials available for lab activities 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 5.00 ****/ 265 **** 4.06 4.23 4.48 **** 1. Was the instructor provide assistance 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 5.00 ****/ 265 **** 4.31 4.48 4.51 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 5.00 ****/ 275 **** 4.31 4.33 4.42 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 95 **** 4.36 4.39 4.22 **** 3. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 3.36 3.98 3.97 **** 3. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 77 **** 3.65 3.93 3.92 **** 3. Was the instructor available for individual attention 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** 3.65 3.93 3.92 **** 3. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** 3.66 3.93 3.92 ***		2	0	Λ	Λ	Λ	2	21	/ Q1	102/1506	1 20	1 12	1 12	1 10	/ Q1
1. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly															
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 2 0 0 0 0 1 6 27 4.76 343/1575 4.14 4.32 4.27 4.39 4.76 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 12 12 0 3 8 5 5 3.45 1065/1380 3.26 3.94 3.94 4.03 3.45 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7 0 12 12 0 3 8 5 5 5 3.45 1065/1380 3.26 3.94 3.94 4.03 3.45 Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 1 1 6 7 13 4.19 709/1520 3.77 4.14 4.01 4.03 4.19 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 15 4.52 634/1511 4.31 4.37 4.27 4.28 4.52 4.52 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 15 4.52 634/1511 4.31 4.37 4.27 4.28 4.52 4.52 Did the lab increase understanding of the material 32 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 15 4.52 634/1511 4.31 4.37 4.27 4.28 4.52 4.52 Did the lab increase understanding of the material 35 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/265 **** 4.06 4.23 4.34 **** 4.88 4.52 4.59 4.59 4.59 4.59 4.59 4.59 4.59 4.59	•		-		-		-								
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 12 1 1 3 8 8 5 5 8 3.45 1065/1380 3.26 3.94 3.94 4.03 3.45 Discussion Discussion Note that the provided with a sequence of the material and pen discussion of the m															
Discussion Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learned Did the lab increase clark processory make clear the expected goal Did the lab increase contribute to what you learned Did the lab instructor available for consultation Did class discussions contribute to what you learned Did the lab instructor available for consultation Did class discussions contribute to what you learned Did class discussions contribute to what you learned Did class c															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 1 6 7 13 4.19 709/1520 3.77 4.14 4.01 4.03 4.19 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0 0 0 1 1 11 15 4.52 620/1515 4.29 4.37 4.24 4.28 4.52 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 1 1 11 15 4.52 630/1511 4.31 4.37 4.27 4.28 4.52 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.0	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	۷	12	Τ	3	8	Э	5	3.45	1065/1380	3.20	3.94	3.94	4.03	3.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0 0 0 1 3 7 17 4.52 620/1515 4.29 4.37 4.24 4.28 4.52 4.00 the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 1 11 5 4.52 634/1511 4.31 4.37 4.27 4.28 4.52 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.0	Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 1 1 11 15 4.52 634/1511 4.31 4.37 4.27 4.28 4.52 4. Were special techniques successful 9 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 15 4.52 634/1511 4.31 4.37 4.27 4.28 4.52 4. Were special techniques successful 9 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 15 4.52 634/1511 4.31 4.37 4.27 4.28 4.52 4. Were special techniques successful 9 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 265 **** 4.06 4.23 4.34 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 278 **** 4.21 4.19 4.36 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 278 **** 4.21 4.19 4.36 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 259 **** 4.21 4.33 4.42 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 259 **** 4.36 4.20 4.48 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 103 **** 4.39 4.41 4.07 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 101 **** 4.33 4.48 4.45 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	6	7	13	4.19	709/1520	3.77	4.14	4.01	4.03	4.19
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 32 3 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 265 **** 4.06 4.23 4.34 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 265 **** 4.06 4.23 4.34 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 260 **** 4.21 4.19 4.36 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 260 **** 4.21 4.19 4.36 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 35 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 260 **** 4.21 4.19 4.36 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 35 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	3	7	17	4.52	620/1515	4.29	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.52
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 32 3 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 265 **** 4.06 4.23 4.34 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 278 **** 4.21 4.19 4.36 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 260 **** 4.43 4.46 4.51 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 260 **** 4.43 4.46 4.51 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 259 **** 4.21 4.33 4.42 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.36 4.20 4.48 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 35 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 103 **** 4.39 4.41 4.07 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 101 **** 4.33 4.48 4.45 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 101 **** 4.33 4.48 4.45 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 99 **** 4.15 4.31 4.33 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 77 *** 3.66 3.98 3.97 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 77 *** 3.65 3.98 3.97 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** 3.86 4.12 4.50 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	11	15	4.52	634/1511	4.31	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.52
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 32 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 265 **** 4.06 4.23 4.34 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 278 **** 4.21 4.19 4.36 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 260 **** 4.21 4.19 4.36 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 259 **** 4.21 4.33 4.42 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.36 4.20 4.48 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 35 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 103 **** 4.39 4.41 4.07 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 101 **** 4.33 4.48 4.45 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	1	2	5	9	6	3.74	647/ 994	3.85	3.97	3.94	3.98	3.74
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 32 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 265 **** 4.06 4.23 4.34 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 278 **** 4.21 4.19 4.36 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 260 **** 4.21 4.19 4.36 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 259 **** 4.21 4.33 4.42 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.36 4.20 4.48 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 35 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 103 **** 4.39 4.41 4.07 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 101 **** 4.33 4.48 4.45 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 278 **** 4.21 4.19 4.36 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 260 **** 4.43 4.46 4.51 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 35 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 259 **** 4.21 4.33 4.42 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 35 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.36 4.20 4.48 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 35 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 103 **** 4.39 4.41 4.07 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 103 **** 4.39 4.41 4.07 **** 4. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 95 **** 4.15 4.31 4.33 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** 3.76 4.14 4.63 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 77 **** 3.65 3.93 4.20 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 77 **** 3.65 3.93 4.20 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** 3.86 4.12 4.50 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** 3.86 4.12 4.50 **** 2. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 49 **** 3.74 4.27 4.82 **** 3. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 49 **** 3.74 4.27 4.82 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 50 **** 4.21 4.26 4.53 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.00 ****/ 50 **** 4.21 4.26 4.53 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	-	32	3	Ω	Λ	Λ	Λ	1	5 00	****/ 265	****	4 06	4 23	4 34	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 35 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 260 **** 4.43 4.46 4.51 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 35 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 259 **** 4.21 4.33 4.42 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 35 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.21 4.33 4.42 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 35 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.20 4.48 **** 7. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 35 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 101 **** 4.39 4.41 4.07 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 35 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 101 **** 4.33 4.48 4.45 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 95 **** 4.15 4.31 4.33 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** 3.76 4.14 4.63 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** 3.76 4.14 4.63 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 35 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 77 **** 3.65 3.93 4.20 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 35 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** 3.86 4.12 4.50 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0					-		-	_			****				****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 35 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 259 **** 4.21 4.33 4.42 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 103 **** 4.39 4.41 4.07 **** 35 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 103 **** 4.39 4.41 4.07 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 95 **** 4.15 4.31 4.33 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 99 **** 4.15 4.31 4.33 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 99 **** 3.76 4.14 4.63 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** 3.76 4.14 4.63 **** Field Work 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 35 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 77 **** 3.65 3.98 3.97 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 35 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 77 **** 3.65 3.93 4.20 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 35 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** 3.86 4.12 4.50 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ***/ 49 **** 3.74 4.27 4.82 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ***/ 52 **** 4.21 4.26 4.53 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ***/ 52 **** 4.21 4.26 4.53 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ***/ 52 **** 4.21 4.26 4.53 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ***/ 52 **** 4.21 4.26 4.63 ****											****				****
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 25 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.36 4.20 4.48 **** 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 103 **** 4.39 4.41 4.07 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 35 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 101 **** 4.33 4.48 4.45 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 95 **** 4.15 4.31 4.33 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** 3.76 4.14 4.63 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 97 **** 3.76 4.14 4.63 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 77 **** 3.65 3.93 4.20 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 77 **** 3.65 3.93 4.20 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 78 **** 3.36 3.98 3.97 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 48 **** 3.86 4.12 4.50 **** 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 48 **** 3.74 4.27 4.82 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	-									,					****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 **** 4.39 4.41 4.07 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 35 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 101 **** 4.33 4.48 4.45 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** 95 *** 4.15 4.31 4.33 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 97 *** 4.36 4.39 4.22 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 97 *** 3.76 4.14 4.63 **** 2. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 3.36 3.98 3.97 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 77 *** 3.36 3.98 3.97 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 *** 77 *** 3.65 3.93 4.20 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 *** 78 *** 4.19 4.45 4.50 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 *** 49 *** 3.74 4.27 4.82 **** 5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 *** 75 2 *** 4.21 4.26 4.53 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 *** 75 5 *** 4.22 4.36 4.63 ****											****				****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 **** 4.39 4.41 4.07 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 35 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 101 **** 4.33 4.48 4.45 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** 95 *** 4.15 4.31 4.33 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 97 *** 4.36 4.39 4.22 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 97 *** 3.76 4.14 4.63 **** 2. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 3.36 3.98 3.97 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 77 *** 3.36 3.98 3.97 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 *** 77 *** 3.65 3.93 4.20 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 *** 78 *** 4.19 4.45 4.50 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 *** 49 *** 3.74 4.27 4.82 **** 5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 *** 75 2 *** 4.21 4.26 4.53 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 *** 75 5 *** 4.22 4.36 4.63 ****															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 101 **** 4.33 4.48 4.45 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 95 **** 4.15 4.31 4.33 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 99 **** 4.36 4.39 4.22 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 35 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 97 **** 3.76 4.14 4.63 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 3.36 3.98 3.97 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 77 **** 3.65 3.93 4.20 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 53 **** 4.19 4.45 4.50 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** 3.86 4.12 4.50 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 49 **** 3.74 4.27 4.82 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 49 **** 3.74 4.27 4.82 **** Self Paced 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.21 4.26 4.53 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 50 **** 4.23 4.44 4.42 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 50 **** 4.23 4.44 4.42 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 50 **** 4.23 4.46 4.63 ****		2.5		0	0	-	•	0	2 00	/ 100	als als als als	4 20	4 41	4 00	ale ale ale ale
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 95 **** 4.15 4.31 4.33 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 99 **** 4.36 4.39 4.22 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 35 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 97 **** 3.76 4.14 4.63 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 3.36 3.98 3.97 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 77 **** 3.65 3.93 4.20 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 53 **** 4.19 4.45 4.50 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 3.00 ****/ 48 **** 3.86 4.12 4.50 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 49 **** 3.74 4.27 4.82 **** 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 49 **** 3.74 4.27 4.82 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 50 **** 4.23 4.44 4.42 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 50 **** 4.22 4.36 4.63 ****					-		-	-		,					
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 99 **** 4.36 4.39 4.22 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 35 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 97 **** 3.76 4.14 4.63 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 3.36 3.98 3.97 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 77 **** 3.65 3.93 4.20 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 53 **** 4.19 4.45 4.50 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 35 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 48 **** 3.86 4.12 4.50 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 49 **** 3.74 4.27 4.82 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 61 **** 4.03 4.09 4.23 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.21 4.26 4.53 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 50 **** 4.23 4.44 4.2 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 35 **** 4.22 4.36 4.63 ****															
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1 7							-		,					
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 3.36 3.98 3.97 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 77 **** 3.65 3.93 4.20 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 53 **** 4.19 4.45 4.50 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 35 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 48 **** 3.86 4.12 4.50 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 49 **** 3.74 4.27 4.82 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 61 **** 4.03 4.09 4.23 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.21 4.26 4.53 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 50 **** 4.23 4.44 4.42 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 50 **** 4.22 4.36 4.63 ****				-			-	_		, , ,					
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 3.36 3.98 3.97 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 77 **** 3.65 3.93 4.20 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 53 **** 4.19 4.45 4.50 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 3.00 ****/ 48 **** 3.86 4.12 4.50 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 49 **** 3.74 4.27 4.82 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 61 **** 4.03 4.09 4.23 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.21 4.26 4.53 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 50 **** 4.23 4.44 4.42 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 35 **** 4.22 4.36 4.63 ****	5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	0	0	Τ	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 77 **** 3.65 3.93 4.20 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 53 **** 4.19 4.45 4.50 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 35 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 48 **** 3.86 4.12 4.50 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 49 **** 3.74 4.27 4.82 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 61 **** 4.03 4.09 4.23 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.21 4.26 4.53 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 50 **** 4.23 4.44 4.42 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 35 **** 4.22 4.36 4.63 ****	Field Work														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation 35 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 53 **** 4.19 4.45 4.50 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 35 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 48 **** 3.86 4.12 4.50 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 49 **** 3.74 4.27 4.82 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 61 **** 4.03 4.09 4.23 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.21 4.26 4.53 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 50 **** 4.23 4.44 4.42 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 35 **** 4.22 4.36 4.63 ****	1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.97	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation 35 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 53 **** 4.19 4.45 4.50 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 35 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 48 **** 3.86 4.12 4.50 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 49 **** 3.74 4.27 4.82 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 61 **** 4.03 4.09 4.23 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.21 4.26 4.53 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 50 **** 4.23 4.44 4.42 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 35 **** 4.22 4.36 4.63 ****	2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.20	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 35 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 48 **** 3.86 4.12 4.50 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 49 **** 3.74 4.27 4.82 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 61 **** 4.03 4.09 4.23 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.21 4.26 4.53 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 50 **** 4.23 4.44 4.42 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 35 **** 4.22 4.36 4.63 ****							0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****				****
Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 49 **** 4.03 4.09 4.23 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.21 4.26 4.53 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 35 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 50 **** 4.23 4.44 4.42 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 35 **** 4.22 4.36 4.63 ****							0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****				***
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 61 **** 4.03 4.09 4.23 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.21 4.26 4.53 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 50 **** 4.23 4.44 4.42 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 35 **** 4.22 4.36 4.63 ****		35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	***			4.82	***
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 61 **** 4.03 4.09 4.23 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.21 4.26 4.53 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 50 **** 4.23 4.44 4.42 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 35 **** 4.22 4.36 4.63 ****	Oals David														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.21 4.26 4.53 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 35 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 50 **** 4.23 4.44 4.42 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 35 **** 4.22 4.36 4.63 ****		2.5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	++++/ (1	++++	4 02	4 00	4 02	++++
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 35 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 50 **** 4.23 4.44 4.42 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 35 **** 4.22 4.36 4.63 ****								-		,					
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 35 **** 4.22 4.36 4.63 ****								-							
1. Was the recaster, tatoring by proceeds herpful 35 0 0 0 1 0 1.00 / 35 1.22 1.30 1.05	-									,					
5. were there enough proctors for all the students 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ^^^/ 31 **** 4.25 4.34 4.50 ****								-		, 55					
	o. were there enough proctors for all the students	35	U	U	U	U	Т	U	4.00	^^/ 31		4.25	4.34	4.50	

Title PRACTICE OF MANAGEMENT

Instructor: ARMOR, VIVIAN

Enrollment: 41

Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 513 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	14	Required for Majors	0	 Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В	14						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	6	General	8	Under-grad	36	Non-major	2
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	12	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	23				
				?	0						

Title PRACTICE OF MANAGEMENT

Instructor: ARMOR, VIVIAN

Enrollment: 38
Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 514 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	Ω	0	Λ	1	6	2.4	4.74	309/1674	4.07	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	8	23	4.74	281/1674	4.23	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.74
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	23	4.71	322/1423	4.33	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	13	18	4.58	397/1609	3.95	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	1	9	18	4.35	462/1585	4.13	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	11	16	4.35	558/1535	3.81	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	9	21	4.65	351/1651	4.06	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	1	0	0	1	28	4.83	832/1673	4.63	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	6	20	4.70	222/1656	4.08	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	26	4.84	336/1586	4.39	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	227/1585	4.53	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	8	23	4.74	326/1582	4.28	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	6	25	4.81	279/1575	4.14	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	3	3	6	1	9	3.45	1065/1380	3.26	3.94	3.94	4.03	3.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	4	9	13	4.22	673/1520	3.77	4.14	4.01	4.03	4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	2	5	19	4.52	620/1515	4.29	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.52
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	10	16	4.52	634/1511	4.31	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.52
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	2	2	2	-6	11	3.96	521/ 994		3.97	3.94	3.98	3.96
1. Here special commiques successful	J	•	-	_	-	Ü		3.70	321/ 331	3.03	3.57	3.71	3.70	3.70
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	4.23	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	4.53	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.42	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	 А	14	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	9	C	4	General	5	Under-grad	32	Non-major	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	20	_			
				2	0						

PRACTICE OF MANAGEMENT

Title SKLAMM, STEWART

Instructor: Enrollment: Questionnaires: 25

35

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 515 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	aner	ncies	!		Tnst	ructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	MP	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	6	13	4.24	979/1674	4.07	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	20	4.68	365/1674	4.23	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	1	22	4.72	310/1423	4.33	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	4	5		4.17	952/1609	3.95	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	3	4		4.17	642/1585	4.13		3.96	3.91	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	8	3		3.96	930/1535	3.81	4.08	4.08	4.03	3.96
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1		19	4.64		4.06	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1		4.88	742/1673	4.63	4.65	4.18	4.67	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	2	7		4.26	706/1656	4.08		4.09	4.10	4.26
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	O	U	U	Τ	4	/	9	4.20	/00/1030	4.00	4.00	4.07	4.10	4.20
T a whoma														
Lecture	0	0		_	1	-	0.0	4 00	040/1506	4 20	4 42	4 42	4 40	4 00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	23	4.88	249/1586	4.39	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	2	21	4.76	896/1585	4.53	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	1	22	4.80	246/1582	4.28	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3		17	4.48	717/1575	4.14		4.27	4.39	4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	4	4	16	4.40	379/1380	3.26	3.94	3.94	4.03	4.40
Discussion		_	_		_	_	_							
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	5	3	6	3.93	889/1520	3.77	4.14	4.01	4.03	3.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	603/1515	4.29	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	563/1511	4.31	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	11	9	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	****/ 994	3.85	3.97	3.94	3.98	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	1	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 265	****		4.23	4.34	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	1	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.51	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	1	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.42	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.48	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.07	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.45	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.63	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.20	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.82	****
-														
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	4.23	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	4.53	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.42	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	4.50	****

Title PRACTICE OF MANAGEMENT

Instructor:

SKLAMM, STEWART

Enrollment: 35 Questionnaires: 25 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 515 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	25	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	1						

University of Maryland PRACTICE OF MANAGEMENT

Title Instructor: Shady Grove

Enrollment: 27 Questionnaires: 20

Fall 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 516 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	miler	ncies	2		Tnat	ructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	T.evre.1	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	5	3	4	4	3	2 04	1645/1674	4.07	1 22	4.27	4.32	2.84
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	5 4	3	7	3	3		1633/1674	4.07	4.23	4.27	4.32	2.84
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	5	1	3	8	3		1348/1423	4.33	4.36	4.27	4.36	3.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	7	2	0	5	2		1600/1609	3.95	4.23	4.22	4.23	2.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	1	3	3	8		1121/1585	4.13	4.04	3.96	3.91	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	6	2	4	2	5	2.89	1471/1535	3.81	4.08	4.08	4.03	2.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	10	1	3	1	3	2.22	1629/1651	4.06	4.20	4.18	4.20	2.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	5	13	1		1637/1673		4.65	4.69	4.67	3.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	4	3	5	2	2	2.69	1608/1656	4.08	4.06	4.07	4.10	2.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	4	4	4	3	4		1549/1586	4.39	4.43	4.43	4.48	2.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	4	2	3	4	7		1559/1585	4.53	4.72	4.69	4.76	3.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	5	4	3	3	4		1537/1582	4.28	4.30	4.26	4.35	2.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	8	2	3	3	3		1546/1575	4.14	4.32	4.27	4.39	2.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	12	5	1	0	0	1	1.71	1371/1380	3.26	3.94	3.94	4.03	1.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	2	6	4	0		1438/1520	3.77	4.14	4.01	4.03	2.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	2	2	3	6		1274/1515	4.29	4.37	4.24	4.28	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5 5	0 11	2 1	0	4 0	5 2	4		1291/1511	4.31	4.37	4.27	4.28	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	5	11	Τ	U	U	4	1	3.50	****/ 994	3.85	3.97	3.94	3.98	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.34	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	1	0	0	0	2		****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	3	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.51	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	2	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.42	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.48	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	2	0	0	0	2	0		****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.07	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.45	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 95 ****/ 99	****	4.15	4.31	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16 16	2	0	0	1	1 1	0		****/ 97	****	4.36 3.76	4.39 4.14	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	10	2	U	U	1	1	U	3.30			3.70	4.14	4.03	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.20	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	1	0	0	0	2	0		****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	0	0	1	1	1.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.82	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	4.23	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	1	0	2		****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	4.53	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.42	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	1	0	0	1	0	1	1.00	****/ 35 ****/ 21	****	4.22	4.36	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	1	U	U	Т	0	1	4.00	****/ 31	***	4.25	4.34	4.50	* * * * *

Baltimore County

Title PRACTICE OF MANAGEMENT

Instructor:

Shady Grove

Enrollment: 27 Questionnaires: 20 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 516 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	12	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	С	0	General	6	Under-grad	20	Non-major	7
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECAD 310 0101 University of Maryland Title HUMAN RESOURCE MGT Baltimore County Instructor: Sadler, Patrici Fall 2005

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2005

6

Page 517

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	30		
Questionnaires:	12	Student Course E	Evaluation Questionnaire

I 0

							Fre	equei	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	1131/1674	4.08	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.08
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	830/1674	4.33	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.33
3. Did tl	he exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	771/1423	4.33	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.33
4. Did of	ther eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	2	2	3	5	3.92	1211/1609	3.92	4.23	4.22	4.27	3.92
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	642/1585	4.17	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.17
6. Did w	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	4	5	4.00	870/1535	4.00	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.00
7. Was tl	he gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	2	2	2	1	5	3.42	1480/1651	3.42	4.20	4.18	4.16	3.42
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	1300/1673	4.42	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.42
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	1	5	3	3	3.67	1297/1656	3.67	4.06	4.07	4.07	3.67
		Lectur	e															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	0	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	1260/1586	4.08	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.08
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	1	1	1	9		1225/1585		4.72	4.69	4.66	4.50
				explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	4	3	3.91	1217/1582	3.91	4.30	4.26	4.26	3.91
		es contribute t			0	0	0	3	2	2	5	3.75	1289/1575	3.75	4.32	4.27	4.25	3.75
5. Did a	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	6	1	2	0	1	1	2.80	1280/1380	2.80	3.94	3.94	4.01	2.80
		Discus	sion															
1. Did c	lass disc			what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	700/1520	4.20	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.20
				d to participate	7	0	0	1	0	1	_	4.20	944/1515		4.37	4.24		4.20
				d open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	2		4.20	955/1511		4.37	4.27		4.20
		echniques succe			7	1	0	0	1	1	2		360/ 994			3.94		
		Labora	tory															
2. Were	you provi		-	ground information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.24	****
				Frequ	encv	. Dist	trib	ution	1									
				_	.01107	210	0112	u0101	-									
Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons				Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А б		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jors	5 5	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 4														
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C 1		Ger	nera	1				5	Under-g	rad 1	2	Non-	-major	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### -				_	ſh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	nt	
				- A		0+1						_						

Other

Course-Section: ECAD 360 0101 University of Maryland Page 518
Title BUSINESS LAW Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006
Instructor: COHEN, HYMAN K. Fall 2005
Enrollment: 26

	uestionnaires:	19	Student Co	ourse Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
--	----------------	----	------------	------------------	---------------

								equei			_		tructor	Course	_			
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	Τ	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Die	d you gain :	new insights,ski	.lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	3	7	9	4.32	878/1674	4.32	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.32
		uctor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	9	8	4.32	856/1674	4.32	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.32
		questions reflec			0	0	0	2	2	6	9	4.16	922/1423	4.16	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.16
4. Dio	d other eva	- luations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	5	2	1	3	3	5	3.57	1423/1609	3.57	4.23	4.22	4.27	3.57
5. Die	d assigned	readings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	244/1585	4.63	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.63
6. Die	d written a	ssignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	5	2	0	4	4	4	3.57	1256/1535	3.57	4.08	4.08	4.15	3.57
7. Was	s the gradi	ng system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	4	4		4.37	727/1651	4.37	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.37
8. Hov	w many time	s was class cand	elled		0	1	0	0	0	10	8	4.44	1267/1673	4.44	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.44
9. Hov	w would you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	5	0	0	0	4	8	2	3.86	1162/1656	3.86	4.06	4.07	4.07	3.86
		Lectur																
1 Was	re the inst	ructor's lecture		prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	12	4 50	784/1586	4.58	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.58
		uctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0		17		- ,		4.72	4.69	4.66	
				explained clearly	0		0	0	3	8	8		924/1582		4.30	4.26	4.26	4.26
		res contribute t			0	0	1	0	4	6	8		1119/1575		4.32	4.27	4.25	4.05
				our understanding	-	17	0	0	0	1	0		****/1380			3.94	4.01	****
J. DI	a addioviba	ar cccimingaes en	mance ,	our unactiveanating	_	- /	J	J	O	-	J	1.00	, 1300		3.71	3.71	1.01	
		Discus	sion															
1. Die	d class dis	cussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	6	0	1	2	1	3	6	3.85	961/1520	3.85	4.14	4.01	4.09	3.85
				ed to participate	6	0	0	1	0		10	4.62	533/1515	4.62	4.37	4.24	4.32	
		_		d open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	479/1511		4.37	4.27	4.34	4.69
4. Wei	re special	techniques succe	essful		6	12	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	3.96	****
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credit	ts Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Po:	ason	c			Ту	ne			Majors	
			·	Expected Grades														,
00-27		0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Re	quir	ed fo	or M	ajor	s	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55		1.00-1.99	0	в 10														
56-83		2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Ge:	nera	L				4	Under-g	rad 1	.9	Non-	major	4
84-15		3.00-3.49	5	D 0														
Grad	. 0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		El	ecti	<i>r</i> es				0	#### -				_	ŗh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot:	her				1	.3						
				? 0														

Course-Section: ECAD 385 0101 University of Maryland Title BUSINESS ETHICS & SOC Baltimore County Instructor: BRENNER, THOMAS Fall 2005

University of Maryland Page 519
Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006
Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	28	
Questionnaires:	21	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fr	equei	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	1	2	7	11	4.33	854/1674	4.33	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.33
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	554/1674	4.52	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.52
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	1	1	3	16	4.62	445/1423	4.62	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.62
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	536/1609	4.48	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.48
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	5	11	4.30	512/1585	4.30	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.30
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	1	1	1	4	4	9	4.00	870/1535	4.00	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.00
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	116/1651	4.90	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.90
8. How ma	ny times	was class cand	elled		1	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	1040/1673	4.70	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.70
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	hing effectiveness	0	1	0	0	1	13	6	4.25	719/1656	4.25	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.25
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	3	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	560/1586	4.72	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.72
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	853/1585	4.79	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.79
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presente	d and e	explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	481/1582	4.63	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.63
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	537/1575	4.63	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.63
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	10	1	1	2	2	3	3.56	1017/1380	3.56	3.94	3.94	4.01	3.56
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	572/1520	4.33	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.33
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	6	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	681/1515	4.47	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.47
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	d open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	289/1511	4.87	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.87
4. Were s	special to	echniques succe	ssful		6	2	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	237/ 994	4.46	3.97	3.94	3.96	4.46
				Frequ	.ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	 0.00-0.99		A 13									Cwadaat		0			
00-27 28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	A 13 B 5		Re	quir	ed fo	Or. M	a jor	S	U	Graduat	Е	0	Majo	ır.	0
28-55 56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	G 0		Co	nera	1				5	Under-q	rad o	:1	Mon	major	3
84-150	5 7	3.00-3.49	5 6	D 0		Ge.	пета	т				S	onder-g.	rau 2	1	NOII-	ına Jor	3
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		₽ 1.	ecti [.]					0	#### - 1	Meane +	horo a	re not	anouio	rh
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	J	P 0		المند	CCLI	vca				U	respons				_	111
				T 0		O+1	her				1	.2	T CPPOILE		c bigi	LLLCai		
				1 0		UL.	TICI				1	. 4						

Course-Section: ECAD 425 0101 University of Maryland Title MARKETING Baltimore County

Baltimore County
Fall 2005

Page 520

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: HOFHERR, WILLIA
Enrollment: 44
Questionnaires: 28

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	s 4	5		ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	2	9	15	4.25	954/1674	4.25	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	19	4.54	542/1674		4.26	4.23	4.31	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	22	4.68	363/1423	4.68	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	5	7	13	4.00	1094/1609	4.00	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	0	3	9	11	4.08	715/1585	4.08	4.04	3.96	4.01	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	1	3	11	8		1140/1535		4.08	4.08	4.18	3.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	4	21	4.54	484/1651		4.20	4.18	4.23	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1673		4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	13	6	4.25	719/1656	4.25	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	231/1586	4.89	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	615/1585	4.89	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	22	4.78	286/1582		4.30	4.26	4.31	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	5	20	4.54	658/1575		4.32	4.27	4.35	4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	3	0	2	5	16	4.19	540/1380	4.19	3.94	3.94	4.04	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	537/1520	4.38	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	629/1515	4.50	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	751/1511	4.40	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	13	11	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	****/ 994	***	3.97	3.94	4.19	***
Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.21	***
2. Note for the man decided subsignment into the con-		Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	3.00	, 2.0			,		
Seminar	0.7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00		****	4 22	4 40	4 65	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27 27	0	0	0	0	1	0	5.00	****/ 101 ****/ 95		4.33	4.48	4.65	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99		4.15	4.31	4.60 4.57	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 97		3.76	4.14		****
3. Were effected for grading made effect	۷,	O	O	O	Ü	Ü	_	3.00	, ,,		3.70	1.11	1.10	
Field Work														****
 Did field experience contribute to what you learned Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 	27 27	0	1 1	0	0	0	0		****/ 76 ****/ 77		3.36	3.98	4.86 4.24	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2/	U	Τ.	U	U	U	U	1.00	/ //		3.05	3.93	4.24	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 61		4.03	4.09	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	5.00	***
Frequ	ency	Dis	tribu	ıtioı	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 14 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 8		Re	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	S	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
56-83 3 2.00-2.99 3 C 2		Ge:	neral	L				1	Under-g	rad 2	8	Non-	-major	1
84-150 11 3.00-3.49 7 D 0								0			1			1-
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0 P 0		EL	ectiv	res				0	#### - respons				_	n
I 0		Ot:	her				2	1		~			-	

0

Course-Section: ECAD 489 0301 University of Maryland

MGMT & ADMIN SEMINAR Baltimore County
Boulay, William (Instr. A) Fall 2005

Instructor: Boulay, William (In Enrollment: 15

Ouestionnaires: 12

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 521

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Ouestions Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 3 1 1 7 4.00 1196/1674 4.00 4.23 4.27 4.42 4.00 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 0 1 2 8 4.64 419/1674 4.64 4.26 4.23 4.31 4.64 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 2 10 4.83 181/1423 4.83 4.36 4.27 4.34 4.83 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 3 2 7 4.33 743/1609 4.33 4.23 4.22 4.30 4.33 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 1 0 10 4.82 131/1585 4.82 4.04 3.96 4.01 4.82 0 2 2 7 4.45 440/1535 4.45 4.08 4.08 4.18 4.45 7. Was the grading system clearly explained
9. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 1 0 1 9 4.64 361/1651 4.64 4.20 4.18 4.23 4.64 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 1 0 0 0 0 10 5.00 1/1673 5.00 4.65 4.69 4.67 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 1 5 4 4.30 655/1656 4.35 4.06 4.07 4.19 4.35 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 1 Ω Ω 0 11 4.67 663/1586 4.79 4.43 4.43 4.46 4.79 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 1 0 11 4.83 737/1585 4.92 4.72 4.69 4.76 4.92 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 1 0 1 1 9 4.42 762/1582 4.53 4.30 4.26 4.31 4.53 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 3 3 6 4.25 958/1575 4.26 4.32 4.27 4.35 4.26 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 1 0 1 1 7 4.30 447/1380 4.45 3.94 3.94 4.04 4.45 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 9 5.00 1/1520 5.00 4.14 4.01 4.18 5.00 0 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 230/1515 4.89 4.37 4.24 4.40 4.89 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0 0 0 9 5.00 1/1511 5.00 4.37 4.27 4.45 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 3 1 1 0 0 7 4.63 160/994 4.63 3.97 3.94 4.19 4.63 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 11 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 103 **** 4.39 4.41 4.42 **** 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 101 **** 4.33 4.48 4.65 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 11 0 0 Ω 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 95 **** 4.15 4.31 4.60 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 11 0 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 11 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 99 **** 4.36 4.39 4.57 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 11 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** 3.76 4.14 4.46 ****

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	 6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	12	Non-major	4
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	Į.
				P	0			responses to	be sid	nificant	
				I	0	Other	7	-	_	,	
					1						

Course-Section: ECAD 489 0301 University of Maryland
Title MGMT & ADMIN SEMINAR Baltimore County

MGMT & ADMIN SEMINAR Baltimore County RAUDENBUSH, LIN (Instr. B) Fall 2005

Instructor: RAUDEN Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 12

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 522

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

		Questions	s		NR	NA	Fre	-	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	e Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General	=					_		_	_							
		ew insights, skil			0	0	0	3 0	1 1	1 2	·/ 8		1196/1674		4.23	4.27	4.42	4.00
		ctor make clear uestions reflect			1	0	0	0	U T	2	10	4.64	419/1674 181/1423		4.26	4.23	4.31	4.64 4.83
	_	uations reflect	_	-	0	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	743/1609		4.23	4.27	4.34	4.33
		eadings contribu	_	_	1	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	131/1585		4.23	3.96	4.01	4.82
	_	signments contri		-	1	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	440/1535		4.08	4.08	4.18	4.45
		g system clearly			1	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	361/1651		4.20	4.18	4.23	4.64
		was class cance		<u>.</u>	1	1	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1673		4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00
	-	grade the overal		g effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	522/1656		4.06	4.07	4.19	4.35
		Lecture	2															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lectures	well pre	pared	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	214/1586	4.79	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.79
2. Did the	e instru	ctor seem intere	sted in t	he subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1585	4.92	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.92
		terial presented			1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	481/1582	4.53	4.30	4.26	4.31	4.53
		es contribute to	_		1	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	940/1575	4.26	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.26
5. Did aud	diovisua	l techniques enh	ance your	understanding	1	1	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	241/1380	4.45	3.94	3.94	4.04	4.45
		Discuss																
		ussions contribu		-	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1520		4.14	4.01	4.18	5.00
		nts actively end			3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	230/1515		4.37	4.24	4.40	4.89
		ctor encourage f		pen discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1511		4.37	4.27	4.45	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial t	echniques succes	sstul		3	1	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	160/ 994	4.63	3.97	3.94	4.19	4.63
		Seminar																
1. Were as	ssigned	topics relevant	to the an	nounced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.42	****
		ctor available f			11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101		4.33	4.48	4.65	****
	_	rojects contribu		-	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 95		4.15	4.31	4.60	****
		ons contribute t		u learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99		4.36	4.39	4.57	****
5. Were ci	riteria	for grading made	e clear		11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.46	****
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	tribu	ution	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	;			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А б		Re	 quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	 `s	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1			-			-						,		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C 0		Ge:	nera:	1				2	Under-g	rad 1	L2	Non-	-major	4
84-150	84-150 8 3.00-3.49 3 D 0																	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		El	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	there a	are not	enoug	h
				P 0									respons	es to l	oe sign	nificar	nt	
				I 0		Ot:	her					7						
				? 1														