| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | 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	0	0	1	1	2	14	6	3.96	1280/1670	3.86	3.93	4.31	4.23	3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	11	7	4.00	1199/1666	3.95	4.07	4.27	4.30	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	4	9	7	3.75	1206/1406	3.72	3.83	4.32	4.31	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	8	9	5	3.71	1356/1615	3.80	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	4	6	6	3	3.30	1385/1566	3.38	3.49	4.07	4.03	3.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	1	3	10	5	3.85	1080/1528	3.51	3.67	4.12	4.00	3.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	9	10	4.22	950/1650	4.15	4.21	4.22	4.28	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	823/1667	4.88	4.90	4.67	4.61	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	2	4	8	4	3.63	1329/1626	3.84	3.96	4.11	4.07	3.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	2	10	8	4.19	1199/1559	4.34	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	3	5	14	4.39	1333/1560	4.52	4.55	4.72	4.68	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	6	8	7	3.87	1256/1549	3.97	4.08	4.31	4.32	3.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	3	8	7	3.61	1354/1546	3.79	3.91	4.32	4.32	3.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	1	4	7	8	3.95	756/1323	3.91	4.00	4.00	3.91	3.95
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	5	8	6	3.68	1025/1384	3.81	3.95	4.10	3.92	3.68
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	1	5	7	7	3.73	1121/1378	3.65	3.88	4.29	4.09	3.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	3	6	6	7	3.77	1100/1378	3.69	3.88	4.31	4.08	3.77
4. Were special techniques successful	2	10	3	1	1	2	5	3.42	756/ 904	3.61	3.84	4.03	3.94	3.42
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	2	0	1	1	3	3.43	208/ 232	3.43	3.43	4.19	4.25	3.43
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	180/ 239	3.83	3.83	4.21	4.35	3.83
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	188/ 230	4.00	4.00	4.44	4.58	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	182/ 231	3.83	3.83	4.31	4.45	3.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

                                                   Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
00-27   9   0.00-0.99   1   A   9   Required for Majors   0   Graduate   0   Major   0
28-55   5   1.00-1.99   0   B   9
56-83   2   2.00-2.99   5   C   3   General   0   Under-grad   24   Non-major   24
84-150   1   3.00-3.49   2   D   0
Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   7   F   0   Electives   0   #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P   0   responses to be significant
                                           I   0   Other   22
                                           ?   0

```
Course-Section: ENES 101  0101              University of Maryland                                    Page  695
Title         INTRO ENGINEERING SCI         Baltimore County                                         AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   BAYLES, TARYN   (Instr. B)    Spring 2008                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   30
Questionnaires: 24                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                  Frequencies      Instructor    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  0   0  1  1  2 14   6  3.96 1280/1670  3.86  3.93  4.31 4.23  3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  1  5 11   7  4.00 1199/1666  3.95  4.07  4.27 4.30  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  1  3  4  9   7  3.75 1206/1406  3.72  3.83  4.32 4.31  3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  2  8  9   5  3.71 1356/1615  3.80  3.91  4.24 4.17  3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  2  1  4  6  6   3  3.30 1385/1566  3.38  3.49  4.07 4.03  3.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 3  1  1  3 10   5  3.85 1080/1528  3.51  3.67  4.12 4.00  3.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1   0  0  1  3  9  10  4.22  950/1650  4.15  4.21  4.22 4.28  4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1   0  0  0  1  2  20  4.83  823/1667  4.88  4.90  4.67 4.61  4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 14 1 0 1  2  2   4  4.00  953/1626  3.84  3.96  4.11 4.07  3.82


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared      15   0  0  0  1  4   4  4.33 1092/1559  4.34  4.38  4.46 4.47  4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 15   0  0  0  1  2   6  4.56 1205/1560  4.52  4.55  4.72 4.68  4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 15 0 1  0  1  3   4  4.00 1146/1549  3.97  4.08  4.31 4.32  3.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned   15   0  1  0  1  2   5  4.11 1095/1546  3.79  3.91  4.32 4.32  3.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 15 4 1 0 0  1   3  4.00 ****/1323  3.91  4.00  4.00 3.91  3.95


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0  2  1  5  8   6  3.68 1025/1384  3.81  3.95  4.10 3.92  3.68
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0  2  1  5  7   7  3.73 1121/1378  3.65  3.88  4.29 4.09  3.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0  3  6  6   7  3.77 1100/1378  3.69  3.88  4.31 4.08  3.77
4. Were special techniques successful                 2  10  3  1  1  2   5  3.42  756/ 904  3.61  3.84  4.03 3.94  3.42


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 17  0  2  0  1  1   3  3.43  208/ 232  3.43  3.43  4.19 4.25  3.43
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 18 0 0 0 2  3   1  3.83  180/ 239  3.83  3.83  4.21 4.35  3.83
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 18 0 0 1  0  3   2  4.00  188/ 230  4.00  4.00  4.44 4.58  4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance         18   0  0  0  3  1   2  3.83  182/ 231  3.83  3.83  4.31 4.45  3.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 18 1 0  0  0  2   3  4.60 ****/ 218  ****  ****  4.18 4.47  ****


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 20 0 0 1  1  0   2  3.75 ****/  87  ****  ****  4.65 4.67  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 20 0 0 0 1  1   2  4.25 ****/  79  ****  ****  4.64 4.72  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 20 0 1 1  0  1   1  3.00 ****/  75  ****  ****  4.57 4.46  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned  20   0  1  0  1  0   2  3.50 ****/  79  ****  ****  4.45 4.59  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear              20   0  0  0  1  1   2  4.25 ****/  80  ****  ****  3.97 3.99  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 20 0 1 1  1  1   0  2.50 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.50 3.91  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 20 0 1 0  2  1   0  2.75 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.19 4.07  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation     20   0  0  1  1  0   2  3.75 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.62 4.63  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 20   0  0  1  0  2   1  3.75 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.27 4.42  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 20 2 0 1  0  0   1  3.50 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.47 4.28  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 1  0  1   1  3.67 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.64 4.59  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal  21   0  0  1  0  1   1  3.67 ****/  16  ****  ****  4.67 4.83  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful    21   0  0  1  0  0   2  4.00 ****/  27  ****  ****  4.54 4.46  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful     21   1  0  1  0  0   1  3.50 ****/  10  ****  ****  4.84 4.75  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students   21   1  1  0  0  0   1  3.00 ****/   6  ****  ****  4.92 4.83  ****
```

                                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
00-27   9   0.00-0.99   1   A   9   Required for Majors   0   Graduate   0   Major   0
28-55   5   1.00-1.99   0   B   9
56-83   2   2.00-2.99   5   C   3   General   0   Under-grad   24   Non-major   24
84-150   1   3.00-3.49   2   D   0
Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   7   F   0   Electives   0   #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P   0   responses to be significant
                                       I   0   Other   22
                                       ?   0

```
Course-Section: ENES 101  0102                 University of Maryland                              Page 696
Title      INTRO ENGINEERING SCI                  Baltimore County                              AUG 6, 2008
Instructor:   BAYLES, TARYN                         Spring 2008                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   28
Questionnaires: 27                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                  Frequencies        Instructor   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    0  0  0  3  8  6 10  3.85 1379/1670   3.86 3.93   4.31 4.23   3.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  1  1  7  8 10  3.93 1294/1666   3.95 4.07   4.27 4.30   3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  4  6  7 10  3.85 1158/1406   3.72 3.83   4.32 4.31   3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  0  0  2  8  8  9  3.89 1246/1615   3.80 3.91   4.24 4.17   3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  2  4  6  2  6  6  3.17 1440/1566   3.38 3.49   4.07 4.03   3.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 3 4 5 4 3 7  3.17 1421/1528   3.51 3.67   4.12 4.00   3.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1  0  2  1  4 11  8  3.85 1309/1650   4.15 4.21   4.22 4.28   3.85
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1  0  0  0  0  1 25  4.96  270/1667   4.88 4.90   4.67 4.61   4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 1 0 1 4 9 5  3.95 1055/1626   3.84 3.96   4.11 4.07   3.95


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0  0  0  1  3  8 15  4.37 1052/1559   4.34 4.38   4.46 4.47   4.37
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0  0  0  0  1  9 17  4.59 1171/1560   4.52 4.55   4.72 4.68   4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  1  3  1 14  8  3.93 1218/1549   3.97 4.08   4.31 4.32   3.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0  0  3  0  4  9 11  3.93 1213/1546   3.79 3.91   4.32 4.32   3.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 3 2 1 6 5 9  3.78  903/1323   3.91 4.00   4.00 3.91   3.78


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0  1  1  6  7 11  4.00  820/1384   3.81 3.95   4.10 3.92   4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0  2  0 11  4  9  3.69 1131/1378   3.65 3.88   4.29 4.09   3.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 2 4 5 7 8  3.58 1172/1378   3.69 3.88   4.31 4.08   3.58
4. Were special techniques successful                   1 19  1  2  1  1  2  3.14  812/ 904   3.61 3.84   4.03 3.94   3.14


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  25  0  1  1  0  0  0  1.50 ****/ 232   3.43 3.43   4.19 4.25   ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 26 0 0 0 1 0 0  3.00 ****/ 239   3.83 3.83   4.21 4.35   ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 25 0 0 1 1 0 0  2.50 ****/ 230   4.00 4.00   4.44 4.58   ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           26  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 231   3.83 3.83   4.31 4.45   ****


                         Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA       Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27   14      0.00-0.99   0      A  11       Required for Majors  0     Graduate    0       Major        0
  28-55    5      1.00-1.99   0      B  11
  56-83    0      2.00-2.99   4      C   2       General              1     Under-grad  27      Non-major   27
  84-150   0      3.00-3.49   7      D   0
  Grad.    0      3.50-4.00   7      F   0       Electives            1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                     P   0                                 responses to be significant
                                     I   0       Other               22
                                     ?   1
```

```
Course-Section: ENES 101  0103              University of Maryland                         Page  697
Title       INTRO ENGINEERING SCI           Baltimore County                              AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  BAYLES, TARYN                  Spring 2008                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   30
Questionnaires:  20                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies      Instructor   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   0  1  4  3  6  5  3.53 1531/1670  3.86  3.93  4.31  4.23  3.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0  1  0  5  9  4  3.79 1393/1666  3.95  4.07  4.27  4.30  3.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0  2  2  3  9  3  3.47 1284/1406  3.72  3.83  4.32  4.31  3.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   0  1  2  5  8  3  3.53 1442/1615  3.80  3.91  4.24  4.17  3.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2   0  1  2  6  5  4  3.50 1285/1566  3.38  3.49  4.07  4.03  3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 2  2  1  6  6  1  3.19 1418/1528  3.51  3.67  4.12  4.00  3.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             2   1  0  0  1 10  6  4.29  855/1650  4.15  4.21  4.22  4.28  4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled                   3   1  0  0  0  0 16  5.00    1/1667  4.88  4.90  4.67  4.61  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9 0  0  0  4  5  2  3.82 1210/1626  3.84  3.96  4.11  4.07  3.82


           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0  0  0  2  6 10  4.44  971/1559  4.34  4.38  4.46  4.47  4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0  0  0  2  2 14  4.67 1090/1560  4.52  4.55  4.72  4.68  4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0  0  2  4  2 10  4.11 1095/1549  3.97  4.08  4.31  4.32  4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   1  4  1  1  4  7  3.53 1374/1546  3.79  3.91  4.32  4.32  3.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4  2  1  1  3  4  5  3.79  903/1323  3.91  4.00  4.00  3.91  3.79


           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4   0  0  0  5  4  7  4.13  777/1384  3.81  3.95  4.10  3.92  4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5   0  0  2  7  2  4  3.53 1181/1378  3.65  3.88  4.29  4.09  3.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5  0  0  2  5  3  5  3.73 1120/1378  3.69  3.88  4.31  4.08  3.73
4. Were special techniques successful                   5   6  1  0  2  3  3  3.78  619/ 904  3.61  3.84  4.03  3.94  3.78


           Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  17   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/ 232  3.43  3.43  4.19  4.25  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 17 0 0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/ 239  3.83  3.83  4.21  4.35  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 17 0 0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/ 230  4.00  4.00  4.44  4.58  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           17   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/ 231  3.83  3.83  4.31  4.45  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 17   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/ 218  **** ****  4.18  4.47  ****


           Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 17  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/  87  **** ****  4.65  4.67  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 17 0 0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/  79  **** ****  4.64  4.72  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 17  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/  75  **** ****  4.57  4.46  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    17   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/  79  **** ****  4.45  4.59  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                17   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/  80  **** ****  3.97  3.99  ****


           Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 17   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/  41  **** ****  4.50  3.91  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 17   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/  38  **** ****  4.19  4.07  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       17   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/  38  **** ****  4.62  4.63  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   17   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/  39  **** ****  4.27  4.42  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 18   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  31  **** ****  4.47  4.28  ****


           Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 18  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  28  **** ****  4.64  4.59  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    17   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/  16  **** ****  4.67  4.83  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      17   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/  27  **** ****  4.54  4.46  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       17   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/  10  **** ****  4.84  4.75  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     17   1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/   6  **** ****  4.92  4.83  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	2	A	2	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: ENES 101  0104              University of Maryland                        Page  698
Title       INTRO ENGINEERING SCI             Baltimore County                        AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   BAYLES, TARYN                     Spring 2008                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    28
Questionnaires:  24                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                           Frequencies      Instructor   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   0   0  1  0  7  6 10  4.00 1216/1670  3.86  3.93  4.31  4.23  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  1  2  2  9 10  4.04 1173/1666  3.95  4.07  4.27  4.30  4.04
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  2  1  4 10  7  3.79 1190/1406  3.72  3.83  4.32  4.31  3.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  1  3 11  9  4.17  972/1615  3.80  3.91  4.24  4.17  4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  2  3  1  4  6  7  3.62 1225/1566  3.38  3.49  4.07  4.03  3.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1 2 2 7 5  6  3.50 1274/1528  3.51  3.67  4.12  4.00  3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  0  2  2  9 10  4.17  997/1650  4.15  4.21  4.22  4.28  4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  1  3 19  4.78  885/1667  4.88  4.90  4.67  4.61  4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 1 7 8 5 3.81 1220/1626  3.84  3.96  4.11  4.07  3.81


          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  1  3  6 13  4.35 1082/1559  4.34  4.38  4.46  4.47  4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  3  0  5 15  4.39 1333/1560  4.52  4.55  4.72  4.68  4.39
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  1  4  1  6 11  3.96 1191/1549  3.97  4.08  4.31  4.32  3.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  3  0  6  4 10  3.78 1281/1546  3.79  3.91  4.32  4.32  3.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 2 0 3 6 12  4.13  634/1323  3.91  4.00  4.00  3.91  4.13


          Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 3 2 3 3  8  3.58 1070/1384  3.81  3.95  4.10  3.92  3.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 3 0 5 5  6  3.58 1167/1378  3.65  3.88  4.29  4.09  3.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 3 0 6 3 7  3.58 1172/1378  3.69  3.88  4.31  4.08  3.58
4. Were special techniques successful                  5  12  0  0  2  1  4  4.29  356/ 904  3.61  3.84  4.03  3.94  4.29


          Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  20   1  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/ 232  3.43  3.43  4.19  4.25  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 20 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 ****/ 239  3.83  3.83  4.21  4.35  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 21 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 ****/ 230  4.00  4.00  4.44  4.58  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           20   0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75 ****/ 231  3.83  3.83  4.31  4.45  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 20   0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00 ****/ 218  ****  ****  4.18  4.47  ****


          Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 20  1  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/  87  ****  ****  4.65  4.67  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 20 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 ****/  79  ****  ****  4.64  4.72  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 20  0  0  0  1  0  3  4.50 ****/  75  ****  ****  4.57  4.46  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    21   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/  79  ****  ****  4.45  4.59  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                21   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/  80  ****  ****  3.97  3.99  ****


          Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 20  0  0  0  1  0  3  4.50 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.50  3.91  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 20  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.19  4.07  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       20   0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.62  4.63  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   20   0  0  0  1  1  2  4.25 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.27  4.42  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 20  0  0  0  0  2  2  4.50 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.47  4.28  ****


          Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 20  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.64  4.59  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    20   1  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/  16  ****  ****  4.67  4.83  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      20   0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75 ****/  27  ****  ****  4.54  4.46  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       20   0  0  0  1  0  3  4.50 ****/  10  ****  ****  4.84  4.75  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     20   0  0  0  1  0  3  4.50 ****/   6  ****  ****  4.92  4.83  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	1						

```
                                           Frequencies        Instructor   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   0   0   0   1   1   6   8  4.31   929/1670   4.31  3.93  4.31  4.32  4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   3  12  4.69   390/1666   4.69  4.07  4.27  4.27  4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   3   4   9  4.38   751/1406   4.38  3.83  4.32  4.39  4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   1   0   2   1  12  4.44   646/1615   4.44  3.91  4.24  4.29  4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  1   1   0   0   5   3   6  4.07   808/1566   4.07  3.49  4.07  4.00  4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1   2   1   0   1   1  10  4.46   476/1528   4.46  3.67  4.12  4.11  4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   0   0   2   3  10  4.53   527/1650   4.53  4.21  4.22  4.20  4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0   0   0   0  15  5.00     1/1667   5.00  4.90  4.67  4.64  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3   0   0   0   1   4   8  4.54   379/1626   4.54  3.96  4.11  4.06  4.54


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0   0   0   2   2  10  4.57   809/1559   4.57  4.38  4.46  4.40  4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0   0   0   2   0  12  4.71  1023/1560   4.71  4.55  4.72  4.73  4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0   0   0   2   1  11  4.64   512/1549   4.64  4.08  4.31  4.25  4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0   1   0   1   1  11  4.50   715/1546   4.50  3.91  4.32  4.30  4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2   0   0   2   1   1  10  4.36   465/1323   4.36  4.00  4.00  4.08  4.36


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  8   0   0   0   1   1   6  4.63   356/1384   4.63  3.95  4.10  4.07  4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  8   0   0   0   0   0   8  5.00     1/1378   5.00  3.88  4.29  4.25  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8   0   0   0   0   1   7  4.88   312/1378   4.88  3.88  4.31  4.26  4.88
4. Were special techniques successful                  8   0   0   0   0   0   8  5.00     1/ 904   5.00  3.84  4.03  4.01  5.00
```

                               Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades            Reasons                    Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0        0.00-0.99    0      A   11        Required for Majors   0      Graduate      0      Major         0
28-55      1        1.00-1.99    0      B    2
56-83      1        2.00-2.99    2      C    0        General              10      Under-grad   16      Non-major    16
84-150     9        3.00-3.49    1      D    0
Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    6      F    0        Electives             3      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                        I    0        Other                 0
                                        ?    0
```