```
Course-Section: FYS  102D 0101            University of Maryland                      Page  857
Title       INVEST PROBS & IT SOLU        Baltimore County                           AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   EVANS, SUSAN A              Spring 2008                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    20
Questionnaires: 13                  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  2  1  5  5  4.00 1216/1670  4.00  4.40  4.31  4.23  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  1  2  5  5  4.08 1154/1666  4.08  4.07  4.27  4.30  4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  1  1  2  6  3  3.69 1228/1406  3.69  4.36  4.32  4.31  3.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  0  1  0  3  5  4  3.85 1270/1615  3.85  4.40  4.24  4.17  3.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  2  3  3  5  3.85 1068/1566  3.85  4.15  4.07  4.03  3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  1  3  5  4  3.92 1011/1528  3.92  4.06  4.12  4.00  3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0  0  0  0  2  3  8  4.46  630/1650  4.46  4.10  4.22  4.28  4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0  0  0  0  0  0 13  5.00    1/1667  5.00  4.72  4.67  4.61  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2  0  0  0  1  6  4  4.27  704/1626  4.27  4.26  4.11  4.07  4.27


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         5  0  0  0  0  3  5  4.63  739/1559  4.63  4.44  4.46  4.47  4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    5  0  0  0  0  2  6  4.75  948/1560  4.75  4.76  4.72  4.68  4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5  0  0  0  2  2  4  4.25  977/1549  4.25  4.11  4.31  4.32  4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      5  0  0  0  3  2  3  4.00 1139/1546  4.00  4.30  4.32  4.32  4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5  2  0  1  1  0  4  4.17  612/1323  4.17  4.37  4.00  3.91  4.17


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9  0  1  0  0  1  2  3.75  996/1384  3.75  4.31  4.10  3.92  3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9  0  0  0  1  0  3  4.50  603/1378  4.50  4.46  4.29  4.09  4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9  0  0  0  0  2  2  4.50  653/1378  4.50  4.62  4.31  4.08  4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                   9  1  0  1  0  1  1  3.67 ****/ 904  ****  4.14  4.03  3.94  ****


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 8  0  0  0  1  3  1  4.00   74/  87  4.00  4.41  4.65  4.67  4.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 8  0  0  1  1  1  2  3.80   73/  79  3.80  4.57  4.64  4.72  3.80
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 8  0  0  0  1  2  2  4.20   55/  75  4.20  4.32  4.57  4.46  4.20
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     8  0  0  0  2  0  3  4.20   58/  79  4.20  4.49  4.45  4.59  4.20
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 8  0  1  0  2  0  2  3.40   59/  80  3.40  3.95  3.97  3.99  3.40


                                   Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      5      0.00-0.99    0      A    8      Required for Majors  8    Graduate    0      Major       0
 28-55      3      1.00-1.99    0      B    3
 56-83      1      2.00-2.99    1      C    0      General              1    Under-grad 13      Non-major  13
 84-150     0      3.00-3.49    0      D    0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    6      F    0      Electives            1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                               responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other                2
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: FYS  102E 0101                University of Maryland                            Page  858
Title          WHAT SHOULD GOVRNMNT D          Baltimore County                                 AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:    BRENNAN, TIMOTH                 Spring 2008                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    17
Questionnaires: 12                     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  0  0  5  7  4.58   578/1670  4.58 4.40 4.31 4.23 4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  1  1  4  6  4.25   967/1666  4.25 4.07 4.27 4.30 4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   9  0  0  0  0  3  5.00     1/1406  5.00 4.36 4.32 4.31 5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1  0  0  1  6  4  4.27   849/1615  4.27 4.40 4.24 4.17 4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1  0  2  2  2  5  3.91  1010/1566  3.91 4.15 4.07 4.03 3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 2 3 7  4.42   546/1528  4.42 4.06 4.12 4.00 4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  1  5  2  4  3.75  1359/1650  3.75 4.10 4.22 4.28 3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  2 10  0  3.83  1620/1667  3.83 4.72 4.67 4.61 3.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1 0 0 0 3 5  4.63   308/1626  4.63 4.26 4.11 4.07 4.63


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  0  4  7  4.64   722/1559  4.64 4.44 4.46 4.47 4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  1 10  4.91   596/1560  4.91 4.76 4.72 4.68 4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  1  2  2  6  4.18  1036/1549  4.18 4.11 4.31 4.32 4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  1  1  3  6  4.27   971/1546  4.27 4.30 4.32 4.32 4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 7 0 0 0 0 3  5.00     1/1323  5.00 4.37 4.00 3.91 5.00


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0  0  1  0  2  5  4.38   570/1384  4.38 4.31 4.10 3.92 4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0  0  0  0  2  6  4.75   400/1378  4.75 4.46 4.29 4.09 4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 0 0 8  5.00     1/1378  5.00 4.62 4.31 4.08 5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  4   6  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 904  **** 4.14 4.03 3.94 ****


               Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 11 0 0 1 0 0 0  2.00 ****/  87  **** 4.41 4.65 4.67 ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 11 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  79  **** 4.57 4.64 4.72 ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 11 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 ****/  75  **** 4.32 4.57 4.46 ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    11  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  79  **** 4.49 4.45 4.59 ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                11  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  80  **** 3.95 3.97 3.99 ****


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     5      0.00-0.99    0       A   6       Required for Majors  4     Graduate    0      Major       0
  28-55     1      1.00-1.99    2       B   4
  56-83     0      2.00-2.99    1       C   0       General              5     Under-grad 12      Non-major  12
  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
                                        P   0                                 responses to be significant
                                        I   0       Other                2
                                        ?   1
```

```
Course-Section: FYS  102G 0101            University of Maryland                                    Page  859
Title        SEXLITY, HLTH & HUM RG        Baltimore County                                        AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   LOTTES, ILSA L.              Spring 2008                                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    20
Questionnaires:  17                 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   0   0   4  13  4.76  350/1670  4.76  4.40  4.31  4.23  4.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   0   0   0   7  10  4.59  516/1666  4.59  4.07  4.27  4.30  4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0   0   0   3   6   8  4.29  844/1406  4.29  4.36  4.32  4.31  4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   1   0   0   1   2  13  4.75  290/1615  4.75  4.40  4.24  4.17  4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   2   3  12  4.59  349/1566  4.59  4.15  4.07  4.03  4.59
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0   0   1   5  11  4.59  361/1528  4.59  4.06  4.12  4.00  4.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0   0   0   4   3  10  4.35  782/1650  4.35  4.10  4.22  4.28  4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0   0   0   0   0  17  5.00    1/1667  5.00  4.72  4.67  4.61  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0  0   0   5   9  4.64  293/1626  4.64  4.26  4.11  4.07  4.64


          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0   0   0   1   9   7  4.35 1072/1559  4.35  4.44  4.46  4.47  4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0   0   0   0   0  17  5.00    1/1560  5.00  4.76  4.72  4.68  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0   0   1   5  11  4.59  586/1549  4.59  4.11  4.31  4.32  4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0   0   0   1   3  13  4.71  470/1546  4.71  4.30  4.32  4.32  4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 2  1   1   3   2   8  4.00  692/1323  4.00  4.37  4.00  3.91  4.00


          Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0  0   0   1   2  14  4.76  249/1384  4.76  4.31  4.10  3.92  4.76
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0  0   0   0   3  14  4.82  327/1378  4.82  4.46  4.29  4.09  4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0  0   0   2   1  14  4.71  492/1378  4.71  4.62  4.31  4.08  4.71
4. Were special techniques successful                 0   0   0   0   3   4  10  4.41  284/ 904  4.41  4.14  4.03  3.94  4.41


          Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 15 0 1  0   0   0   1  3.00 ****/ 239  ****  ****  4.21  4.35  ****


          Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 8  0  0   0   0   2   7  4.78   55/  87  4.78  4.41  4.65  4.67  4.78
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 9 4  0   0   0   0   4  5.00 ****/  79  ****  4.57  4.64  4.72  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 8  8  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  75  ****  4.32  4.57  4.46  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   8   0   0   0   0   0   9  5.00    1/  79  5.00  4.49  4.45  4.59  5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               8   0   0   0   0   1   8  4.89   19/  80  4.89  3.95  3.97  3.99  4.89


          Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 15 0  1   0   0   1   0  2.50 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.50  3.91  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 15 0  0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.19  4.07  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      15  1   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.62  4.63  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  15  1   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.27  4.42  ****


          Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 15 0 0  0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.64  4.59  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   15  0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/  16  ****  ****  4.67  4.83  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     15  1   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  27  ****  ****  4.54  4.46  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      15  1   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  10  ****  ****  4.84  4.75  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: FYS  103I 0101                University of Maryland                            Page  860
Title      DYNAMICS OF PROBLEM SO                 Baltimore County                             AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   CARMI, SHLOMO                       Spring 2008                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     6
Questionnaires:  4               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  0  1  3  0  3.75 1442/1670  3.75  4.40  4.31  4.23  3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  1  0  3  0  0  2.50 1645/1666  2.50  4.07  4.27  4.30  2.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  1  0  2  1  3.75 1206/1406  3.75  4.36  4.32  4.31  3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1  0  1  0  0  2  4.00 1083/1615  4.00  4.40  4.24  4.17  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0  0  0  0  3  0  1  3.50 1285/1566  3.50  4.15  4.07  4.03  3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  2  1  0  0  1  2.50 1506/1528  2.50  4.06  4.12  4.00  2.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  1  0  1  1  1  3.25 1541/1650  3.25  4.10  4.22  4.28  3.25
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  2  2  4.50 1157/1667  4.50  4.72  4.67  4.61  4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0  0  1  0  1  2  0  3.00 1534/1626  3.00  4.26  4.11  4.07  3.00

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  1  0  1  0  2  3.50 1461/1559  3.50  4.44  4.46  4.47  3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  1  1  2  4.25 1411/1560  4.25  4.76  4.72  4.68  4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  1  0  2  0  1  3.00 1489/1549  3.00  4.11  4.31  4.32  3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  0  1  2  1  4.00 1139/1546  4.00  4.30  4.32  4.32  4.00

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1  0  0  0  0  3  0  4.00  820/1384  4.00  4.31  4.10  3.92  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  1  0  0  0  2  1  0  3.33 1247/1378  3.33  4.46  4.29  4.09  3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1  0  0  0  1  1  1  4.00  977/1378  4.00  4.62  4.31  4.08  4.00

                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme  0  0  1  0  1  1  1  3.25   83/  87  3.25  4.41  4.65  4.67  3.25
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 0  0  0  0  1  0  3  4.50   53/  79  4.50  4.57  4.64  4.72  4.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned  0  0  1  0  0  1  2  3.75   69/  75  3.75  4.32  4.57  4.46  3.75
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned      0  0  0  1  0  2  1  3.75   69/  79  3.75  4.49  4.45  4.59  3.75
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                  0  0  1  0  2  0  1  3.00   67/  80  3.00  3.95  3.97  3.99  3.00
```

                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: FYS  103J 0101            University of Maryland                              Page  861
Title      MATHEMATICAL BIOLOGY               Baltimore County                              AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   HOFFMAN, KATHLE                    Spring 2008                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      2
Questionnaires:  2                 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  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/1670   5.00  4.40  4.31  4.23  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/1666   5.00  4.07  4.27  4.30  5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   1   0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1406   5.00  4.36  4.32  4.31  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/1615   5.00  4.40  4.24  4.17  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   0  0  0  1  1  4.50  389/1566  4.50  4.15  4.07  4.03  4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0   0  0  0  1  1  4.50  421/1528  4.50  4.06  4.12  4.00  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0  0  0  1  1  4.50  570/1650  4.50  4.10  4.22  4.28  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/1667   5.00  4.72  4.67  4.61  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/1626   5.00  4.26  4.11  4.07  5.00


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/1559   5.00  4.44  4.46  4.47  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/1560   5.00  4.76  4.72  4.68  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   0  0  0  1  1  4.50  683/1549  4.50  4.11  4.31  4.32  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/1546   5.00  4.30  4.32  4.32  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  1   0  0  0  1  0  4.00  692/1323  4.00  4.37  4.00  3.91  4.00


                 Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 0   1   0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/  87   5.00  4.41  4.65  4.67  5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 0  0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/  79   5.00  4.57  4.64  4.72  5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 0   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/  75   5.00  4.32  4.57  4.46  5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     0   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/  79   5.00  4.49  4.45  4.59  5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 0   0   0  0  0  1  1  4.50  30/  80   4.50  3.95  3.97  3.99  4.50


                              Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: FYS  104  0101            University of Maryland                           Page  862
Title        FIRST YEAR SEMINAR (C)           Baltimore County                           AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  BELL, ALAN S                     Spring 2008                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    17
Questionnaires:  11              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   0   2   4   5  4.27   974/1670  4.27  4.40  4.31  4.23  4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   1   0   2   3   5  4.00  1199/1666  4.00  4.07  4.27  4.30  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   1   0   1   0   3   6  4.40   715/1406  4.40  4.36  4.32  4.31  4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   1   0   2   8  4.55   509/1615  4.55  4.40  4.24  4.17  4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   0   1   0   2   8  4.55   369/1566  4.55  4.15  4.07  4.03  4.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   1   4   6  4.45   490/1528  4.45  4.06  4.12  4.00  4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   1   0   1   2   7  4.27   879/1650  4.27  4.10  4.22  4.28  4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0  11  5.00     1/1667  5.00  4.72  4.67  4.61  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1  0   0   1   4   1  4.00   953/1626  4.00  4.26  4.11  4.07  4.00


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        7   0   0   0   1   0   3  4.50   896/1559  4.50  4.44  4.46  4.47  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   5   0   0   0   1   0   5  4.67  1090/1560  4.67  4.76  4.72  4.68  4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5  0   0   1   1   0   4  4.17  1053/1549  4.17  4.11  4.31  4.32  4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     5   0   1   0   1   1   3  3.83  1260/1546  3.83  4.30  4.32  4.32  3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5  0   0   0   1   0   5  4.67   235/1323  4.67  4.37  4.00  3.91  4.67


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0   0   1   0   0   8  4.67   324/1384  4.67  4.31  4.10  3.92  4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0   0   0   0   1   8  4.89   264/1378  4.89  4.46  4.29  4.09  4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0   0   0   0   1   8  4.89   302/1378  4.89  4.62  4.31  4.08  4.89
4. Were special techniques successful                  2   1   1   0   2   1   4  3.88   580/ 904  3.88  4.14  4.03  3.94  3.88


               Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 8  0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00     1/  87  5.00  4.41  4.65  4.67  5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 8  0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00     1/  79  5.00  4.57  4.64  4.72  5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 8  1   0   0   0   0   2  5.00  ****/  75  ****  4.32  4.57  4.46  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    9   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00  ****/  79  ****  4.49  4.45  4.59  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                9   1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  80  ****  3.95  3.97  3.99  ****

                                     Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                 Type                    Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      1        0.00-0.99    1        A    6        Required for Majors   2        Graduate     0        Major        0
  28-55      4        1.00-1.99    0        B    2
  56-83      0        2.00-2.99    1        C    0        General               3        Under-grad  11        Non-major   11
  84-150     0        3.00-3.49    1        D    0
  Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    3        F    0        Electives             2        #### - Means there are not enough
                                            P    0                                       responses to be significant
                                            I    0        Other                 2
                                            ?    0
```