Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: FYS 101D 01	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 20
Title: Turning To One Another		Questionnaires: 20
Instructor: Lee,Diane M		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	4	7	7	4.17	1008/1520	4.17	3.97	4.31	4.14	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	3	9	4	3.83	1229/1520	3.83	3.90	4.27	4.20	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	11	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1055/1291	3.86	4.24	4.33	4.24	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	7	8	4.22	831/1483	4.22	3.97	4.23	4.09	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	3	4	9	4.06	773/1417	4.06	3.76	4.08	4.02	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	615/1405	4.29	4.01	4.12	3.96	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	3	6	7	3.94	1060/1504	3.94	3.92	4.16	4.13	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	355/1519	4.94	4.84	4.70	4.71	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	11	6	4.28	638/1495	4.26	4.00	4.11	4.01	4.26
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	584/1459	4.74	4.37	4.47	4.40	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	381/1460	4.97	4.77	4.74	4.68	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	637/1455	4.52	4.43	4.32	4.26	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	821/1456	4.39	4.12	4.34	4.26	4.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	1	1	3	4	3	3.58	1026/1316	3.56	4.09	4.03	3.91	3.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	385/1243	4.54	4.07	4.17	3.98	4.54
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	313/1241	4.77	4.34	4.33	4.14	4.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	554/1236	4.62	4.48	4.40	4.19	4.62
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	334/889	4.25	4.14	4.02	3.89	4.25

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FYS 101D 01	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment:	20
Title:	Turning To One Another		Questionnaires:	20
Instructor:	Lee,Diane M			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/67	****	4.67	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/66	****	4.67	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/62	****	4.23	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/68	****	4.76	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/66	****	4.83	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: FYS 101D 01	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 20
Title: Turning To One Another		Questionnaires: 20
Instructor: Lee,Diane M		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	5	Under-grad	20	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	6	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: FYS 101D 01		Term - Fall 2011								Enrollment: 20				
Title: Turning To One Another										Questionnaires: 20				
Instructor: Randles,C J														

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	4	7	7	4.17	1008/1520	4.17	3.97	4.31	4.14	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	3	9	4	3.83	1229/1520	3.83	3.90	4.27	4.20	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	11	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1055/1291	3.86	4.24	4.33	4.24	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	7	8	4.22	831/1483	4.22	3.97	4.23	4.09	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	3	4	9	4.06	773/1417	4.06	3.76	4.08	4.02	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	615/1405	4.29	4.01	4.12	3.96	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	3	6	7	3.94	1060/1504	3.94	3.92	4.16	4.13	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	355/1519	4.94	4.84	4.70	4.71	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	11	5	4.24	684/1495	4.26	4.00	4.11	4.01	4.26
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	374/1459	4.74	4.37	4.47	4.40	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1460	4.97	4.77	4.74	4.68	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	603/1455	4.52	4.43	4.32	4.26	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	788/1456	4.39	4.12	4.34	4.26	4.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	4	1	1	3	3	3	3.55	1041/1316	3.56	4.09	4.03	3.91	3.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	385/1243	4.54	4.07	4.17	3.98	4.54
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	313/1241	4.77	4.34	4.33	4.14	4.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	554/1236	4.62	4.48	4.40	4.19	4.62
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	334/889	4.25	4.14	4.02	3.89	4.25

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FYS 101D 01	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 20
Title:	Turning To One Another			Questionnaires: 20
Instructor:	Randles,C J			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/67	****	4.67	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/66	****	4.67	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/62	****	4.23	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/68	****	4.76	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/66	****	4.83	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FYS 101D 01	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment:	20
Title:	Turning To One Another			Questionnaires:	20
Instructor:	Randles,C J				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	5	Under-grad	20	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	6				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	3						

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: FYS 101Q 01	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 20
Title: Building a Culture of Pe		Questionnaires: 16
Instructor: Taylor,Joby B		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	2	1	0	3	9	4.07	1082/1520	4.07	3.97	4.31	4.14	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	723/1520	4.40	3.90	4.27	4.20	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	386/1291	4.67	4.24	4.33	4.24	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	607/1483	4.43	3.97	4.23	4.09	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	314/1417	4.56	3.76	4.08	4.02	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	267/1405	4.63	4.01	4.12	3.96	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	7	8	4.38	606/1504	4.38	3.92	4.16	4.13	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	652/1519	4.88	4.84	4.70	4.71	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	3	4	5	3.92	995/1495	3.92	4.00	4.11	4.01	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	953/1459	4.42	4.37	4.47	4.40	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	489/1460	4.92	4.77	4.74	4.68	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	450/1455	4.67	4.43	4.32	4.26	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	599/1456	4.58	4.12	4.34	4.26	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	587/1316	4.20	4.09	4.03	3.91	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	325/1243	4.63	4.07	4.17	3.98	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	198/1241	4.88	4.34	4.33	4.14	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	404/1236	4.75	4.48	4.40	4.19	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	150/889	4.63	4.14	4.02	3.89	4.63

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FYS 101Q 01		Term - Fall 2011				Enrollment: 20
Title:	Building a Culture of Pe						Questionnaires: 16
Instructor:	Taylor,Joby B						

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/67	5.00	4.67	4.60	4.51	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/66	5.00	4.67	4.55	4.36	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	24/62	4.86	4.23	4.54	4.01	4.86
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	35/68	4.71	4.76	4.59	4.43	4.71
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	15/66	4.86	4.83	4.20	3.90	4.86

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	14	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	16	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	6	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FYS 101R 01		Term - Fall 2011			Enrollment:	20			
Title:	Sustainability in Amer C					Questionnaires:	15			
Instructor:	Turner,Rita J.									

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	607/1520	4.50	3.97	4.31	4.14	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	1041/1520	4.07	3.90	4.27	4.20	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	696/1291	4.40	4.24	4.33	4.24	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	4	5	3.93	1101/1483	3.93	3.97	4.23	4.09	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	134/1417	4.79	3.76	4.08	4.02	4.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	750/1405	4.15	4.01	4.12	3.96	4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	694/1504	4.31	3.92	4.16	4.13	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	8	3	4.17	759/1495	4.17	4.00	4.11	4.01	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	796/1459	4.53	4.37	4.47	4.40	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	0	14	4.80	806/1460	4.80	4.77	4.74	4.68	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	294/1455	4.79	4.43	4.32	4.26	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	767/1456	4.43	4.12	4.34	4.26	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	0	12	4.71	169/1316	4.71	4.09	4.03	3.91	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	385/1243	4.54	4.07	4.17	3.98	4.54
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	313/1241	4.77	4.34	4.33	4.14	4.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	171/1236	4.92	4.48	4.40	4.19	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	433/889	4.08	4.14	4.02	3.89	4.08

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FYS 101R 01		Term - Fall 2011			Enrollment: 20
Title:	Sustainability in Amer C					Questionnaires: 15
Instructor:	Turner,Rita J.					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/67	****	4.67	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	4.67	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/62	****	4.23	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/68	****	4.76	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/66	****	4.83	4.20	3.90	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	9	Under-grad	15	Non-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FYS 101S 01						Term - Fall 2011						Enrollment: 20
Title:	Creating Stories about T												Questionnaires: 15
Instructor:	Ronch,Judah L.												

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			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	2	5	5	3	3.60	1363/1520	3.60	3.97	4.31	4.14	3.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	4	7	4.07	1047/1520	4.07	3.90	4.27	4.20	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1291	5.00	4.24	4.33	4.24	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	906/1483	4.15	3.97	4.23	4.09	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1285/1417	3.25	3.76	4.08	4.02	3.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1018/1405	3.83	4.01	4.12	3.96	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	1	1	2	4	5	3.85	1150/1504	3.85	3.92	4.16	4.13	3.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	875/1519	4.73	4.84	4.70	4.71	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	5	5	1	3.50	1288/1495	3.64	4.00	4.11	4.01	3.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	2	3	6	3.79	1329/1459	4.09	4.37	4.47	4.40	4.09
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	1319/1460	4.49	4.77	4.74	4.68	4.49
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	2	2	6	3.77	1236/1455	4.05	4.43	4.32	4.26	4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	3	0	6	3.46	1322/1456	3.86	4.12	4.34	4.26	3.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	3	1	8	4.15	627/1316	4.35	4.09	4.03	3.91	4.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	2	0	0	2	3.00	1187/1243	3.00	4.07	4.17	3.98	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	1178/1241	3.25	4.34	4.33	4.14	3.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1141/1236	3.50	4.48	4.40	4.19	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/889	****	4.14	4.02	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FYS 101S 01		Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment:	20
Title:	Creating Stories about T				Questionnaires:	15
Instructor:	Ronch,Judah L.					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/67	****	4.67	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/66	****	4.67	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/62	****	4.23	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/68	****	4.76	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/66	****	4.83	4.20	3.90	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	15	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: FYS 101S 01		Term - Fall 2011			Enrollment: 20
Title: Creating Stories about T					Questionnaires: 15
Instructor: Lunt,Elizabeth					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	2	5	5	3	3.60	1363/1520	3.60	3.97	4.31	4.14	3.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	4	7	4.07	1047/1520	4.07	3.90	4.27	4.20	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1291	5.00	4.24	4.33	4.24	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	906/1483	4.15	3.97	4.23	4.09	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1285/1417	3.25	3.76	4.08	4.02	3.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1018/1405	3.83	4.01	4.12	3.96	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	1	1	2	4	5	3.85	1150/1504	3.85	3.92	4.16	4.13	3.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	875/1519	4.73	4.84	4.70	4.71	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	0	3	5	1	3.78	1121/1495	3.64	4.00	4.11	4.01	3.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	967/1459	4.09	4.37	4.47	4.40	4.09
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	1048/1460	4.49	4.77	4.74	4.68	4.49
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	842/1455	4.05	4.43	4.32	4.26	4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	945/1456	3.86	4.12	4.34	4.26	3.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	272/1316	4.35	4.09	4.03	3.91	4.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	2	0	0	2	3.00	1187/1243	3.00	4.07	4.17	3.98	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	1178/1241	3.25	4.34	4.33	4.14	3.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1141/1236	3.50	4.48	4.40	4.19	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/889	****	4.14	4.02	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FYS 101S 01	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 20
Title:	Creating Stories about T		Questionnaires: 15
Instructor:	Lunt,Elizabeth		

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/67	****	4.67	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/66	****	4.67	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/62	****	4.23	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/68	****	4.76	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/66	****	4.83	4.20	3.90	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	15	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FYS 102A 01	Term - Fall 2011									Enrollment:	15			
Title:	Images of Madness										Questionnaires:	15			
Instructor:	Tice,Carolyn J														

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	3	0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	838/1520	4.33	3.97	4.31	4.14	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	809/1520	4.33	3.90	4.27	4.20	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	2	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	851/1291	4.20	4.24	4.33	4.24	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	2	2	2	4	3.80	1183/1483	3.80	3.97	4.23	4.09	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	1	3	5	3.91	932/1417	3.91	3.76	4.08	4.02	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	1	1	7	4.18	725/1405	4.18	4.01	4.12	3.96	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	619/1504	4.36	3.92	4.16	4.13	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	1166/1495	3.71	4.00	4.11	4.01	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	772/1459	4.56	4.37	4.47	4.40	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	596/1460	4.89	4.77	4.74	4.68	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	450/1455	4.67	4.43	4.32	4.26	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	746/1456	4.44	4.12	4.34	4.26	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	90/1316	4.88	4.09	4.03	3.91	4.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1243	****	4.07	4.17	3.98	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1241	****	4.34	4.33	4.14	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1236	****	4.48	4.40	4.19	****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/889	****	4.14	4.02	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FYS 102A 01			Term - Fall 2011						Enrollment:	15			
Title:	Images of Madness									Questionnaires:	15			
Instructor:	Tice,Carolyn J													

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/164	****	****	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/160	****	****	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/158	****	****	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/150	****	****	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	54/67	4.33	4.67	4.60	4.51	4.33
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	50/66	4.33	4.67	4.55	4.36	4.33
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	1	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	57/62	3.60	4.23	4.54	4.01	3.60
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	27/68	4.80	4.76	4.59	4.43	4.80
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	16/66	4.80	4.83	4.20	3.90	4.80
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FYS 102A 01	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment:	15
Title:	Images of Madness		Questionnaires:	15
Instructor:	Tice,Carolyn J			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	15	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FYS 102C 01	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 21
Title:	Dvrsty,Ethics & Social J			Questionnaires: 11
Instructor:	Williams,Vickie			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	6	1	3.45	1424/1520	3.45	3.97	4.31	4.14	3.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	3	2	3.45	1391/1520	3.45	3.90	4.27	4.20	3.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1159/1291	3.60	4.24	4.33	4.24	3.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	2	2	3	3.56	1307/1483	3.56	3.97	4.23	4.09	3.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	3	2	4	3.55	1167/1417	3.55	3.76	4.08	4.02	3.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	2	3	3.55	1177/1405	3.55	4.01	4.12	3.96	3.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	3	3	3.73	1232/1504	3.73	3.92	4.16	4.13	3.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	605/1495	4.26	4.00	4.11	4.01	4.26
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	1055/1459	4.28	4.37	4.47	4.40	4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	779/1460	4.77	4.77	4.74	4.68	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	699/1455	4.44	4.43	4.32	4.26	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	945/1456	3.79	4.12	4.34	4.26	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	830/1316	3.78	4.09	4.03	3.91	3.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	766/1243	4.00	4.07	4.17	3.98	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	748/1241	4.29	4.34	4.33	4.14	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	277/1236	4.86	4.48	4.40	4.19	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	653/889	3.67	4.14	4.02	3.89	3.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FYS 102C 01		Term - Fall 2011				Enrollment: 21
Title:	Dvrsty,Ethics & Social J						Questionnaires: 11
Instructor:	Williams,Vickie						

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/67	****	4.67	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	4.67	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/62	****	4.23	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/68	****	4.76	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	4.83	4.20	3.90	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	11	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FYS 102C 01		Term - Fall 2011			Enrollment: 21				
Title:	Dvrsty,Ethics & Social J					Questionnaires: 11				
Instructor:	Small,Sue E									

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	6	1	3.45	1424/1520	3.45	3.97	4.31	4.14	3.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	3	2	3.45	1391/1520	3.45	3.90	4.27	4.20	3.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1159/1291	3.60	4.24	4.33	4.24	3.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	2	2	3	3.56	1307/1483	3.56	3.97	4.23	4.09	3.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	3	2	4	3.55	1167/1417	3.55	3.76	4.08	4.02	3.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	2	3	3.55	1177/1405	3.55	4.01	4.12	3.96	3.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	3	3	3.73	1232/1504	3.73	3.92	4.16	4.13	3.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	695/1495	4.26	4.00	4.11	4.01	4.26
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	1093/1459	4.28	4.37	4.47	4.40	4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	981/1460	4.77	4.77	4.74	4.68	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	736/1455	4.44	4.43	4.32	4.26	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	2	2	0	2	3.33	1353/1456	3.79	4.12	4.34	4.26	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	987/1316	3.78	4.09	4.03	3.91	3.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	766/1243	4.00	4.07	4.17	3.98	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	748/1241	4.29	4.34	4.33	4.14	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	277/1236	4.86	4.48	4.40	4.19	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	653/889	3.67	4.14	4.02	3.89	3.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: FYS 102C 01	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 21
Title: Dvrsty,Ethics & Social J		Questionnaires: 11
Instructor: Small,Sue E		

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/67	****	4.67	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	4.67	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/62	****	4.23	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/68	****	4.76	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	4.83	4.20	3.90	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	11	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FYS 102P 01		Term - Fall 2011			Enrollment: 21
Title:	Creativity, Innov & Inv					Questionnaires: 16
Instructor:	LaCourse,Willia					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	790/1520	4.38	3.97	4.31	4.14	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	4	2	6	3.44	1396/1520	3.44	3.90	4.27	4.20	3.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1291	****	4.24	4.33	4.24	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	5	5	3	3.71	1230/1483	3.71	3.97	4.23	4.09	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	2	5	2	0	2.64	1392/1417	2.64	3.76	4.08	4.02	2.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	4	5	3	3.77	1065/1405	3.77	4.01	4.12	3.96	3.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	3	2	3	0	5	3.15	1415/1504	3.15	3.92	4.16	4.13	3.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	3	4.19	1360/1519	4.19	4.84	4.70	4.71	4.19
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	0	0	4	7	2	3.85	1068/1495	3.85	4.00	4.11	4.01	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	6	3	5	3.93	1273/1459	3.93	4.37	4.47	4.40	3.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	1072/1460	4.64	4.77	4.74	4.68	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	7	5	4.14	1002/1455	4.14	4.43	4.32	4.26	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	5	4	4	3.71	1248/1456	3.71	4.12	4.34	4.26	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	1	1	1	4	3	3.70	966/1316	3.70	4.09	4.03	3.91	3.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	545/1243	4.36	4.07	4.17	3.98	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	262/1241	4.82	4.34	4.33	4.14	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	441/1236	4.73	4.48	4.40	4.19	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	227/889	4.44	4.14	4.02	3.89	4.44

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: FYS 102P 01	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 21
Title: Creativity, Innov & Inv		Questionnaires: 16
Instructor: LaCourse,Willia		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/67	****	4.67	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/66	****	4.67	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/62	****	4.23	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/68	****	4.76	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/66	****	4.83	4.20	3.90	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	16	Non-major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						