Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FYS 101R 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 18
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
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	0	3	9	4.07	1071/1449	4.07	4.32	4.33	4.14	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	4	8	4.20	918/1446	4.20	4.02	4.29	4.20	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1081/1256	3.75	3.97	4.34	4.21	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	2	8	4.13	927/1402	4.13	4.13	4.27	4.10	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	3	10	4.50	371/1358	4.50	4.23	4.13	4.04	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	500/1327	4.43	4.24	4.16	3.92	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	2	8	4.21	808/1435	4.21	4.01	4.20	4.11	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	4	10	4.47	1049/1446	4.47	4.84	4.67	4.57	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	0	7	3	4.09	809/1437	4.09	4.12	4.12	4.04	4.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.38	4.48	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1390	5.00	4.82	4.74	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	101/1379	4.92	4.41	4.34	4.28	4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	567/1379	4.62	4.41	4.36	4.26	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	331/1236	4.50	4.33	4.08	3.93	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	139/1121	4.86	4.52	4.18	3.89	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	360/1122	4.71	4.50	4.36	4.09	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1121	5.00	4.71	4.40	4.08	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	187/790	4.54	4.29	4.06	3.89	4.54

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FYS 101R 01
Title:	Sustainability in Amer C
Instructor:	Turner,Rita J.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	15

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	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.52	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.39	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	4.04	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	4.18	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	4.10	4.00	3.44	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	15	Non-major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	3						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FYS 102D 01	Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment:	20
Title:	Invest Problems & IT Sol			Questionnaires:	16
Instructor:	Evans,Susan A				

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	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	553/1449	4.53	4.32	4.33	4.14	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	624/1446	4.47	4.02	4.29	4.20	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	717/1256	4.33	3.97	4.34	4.21	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	584/1402	4.47	4.13	4.27	4.10	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	345/1358	4.53	4.23	4.13	4.04	4.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	5	9	4.47	452/1327	4.47	4.24	4.16	3.92	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	1	12	4.60	382/1435	4.60	4.01	4.20	4.11	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1446	5.00	4.84	4.67	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	338/1437	4.54	4.12	4.12	4.04	4.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	3	0	9	4.50	803/1386	4.50	4.38	4.48	4.40	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	1002/1390	4.67	4.82	4.74	4.67	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	588/1379	4.55	4.41	4.34	4.28	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	776/1379	4.42	4.41	4.36	4.26	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	179/1236	4.73	4.33	4.08	3.93	4.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	396/1121	4.50	4.52	4.18	3.89	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	537/1122	4.50	4.50	4.36	4.09	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	770/1121	4.25	4.71	4.40	4.08	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	102/790	4.75	4.29	4.06	3.89	4.75

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FYS 102D 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment:	20
Title:	Invest Problems & IT Sol		Questionnaires:	16
Instructor:	Evans,Susan A			

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	8	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	29/67	4.88	4.52	4.58	4.48	4.88
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	24/66	4.75	4.39	4.36	4.35	4.75
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	20/64	4.75	4.04	4.25	4.01	4.75
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	32/75	4.63	4.18	4.32	3.95	4.63
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	17/73	4.75	4.10	4.00	3.44	4.75

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	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	1	C	0	General	9	Under-grad	16	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	3				
				P	0			**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				I	0	Other	1	to be significant			
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FYS 102G 01		Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment: 20
Title:	Sexuality, Health & Hum				Questionnaires: 17
Instructor:	Lottes,Ilsa 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	0	0	3	14	4.82	201/1449	4.82	4.32	4.33	4.14	4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	167/1446	4.82	4.02	4.29	4.20	4.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	198/1256	4.82	3.97	4.34	4.21	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	136/1402	4.87	4.13	4.27	4.10	4.87
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.23	4.13	4.04	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1327	5.00	4.24	4.16	3.92	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	518/1435	4.47	4.01	4.20	4.11	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	316/1446	4.94	4.84	4.67	4.57	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	155/1437	4.75	4.12	4.12	4.04	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	8	9	4.53	783/1386	4.53	4.38	4.48	4.40	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1390	5.00	4.82	4.74	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	223/1379	4.82	4.41	4.34	4.28	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	197/1379	4.88	4.41	4.36	4.26	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	2	4	9	4.25	553/1236	4.25	4.33	4.08	3.93	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	91/1121	4.92	4.52	4.18	3.89	4.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	233/1122	4.85	4.50	4.36	4.09	4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	169/1121	4.92	4.71	4.40	4.08	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	369/790	4.18	4.29	4.06	3.89	4.18

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FYS 102G 01													

Term - Spring 2011   Enrollment: 20   Questionnaires: 17

Title:	Sexuality, Health & Hum
Instructor:	Lottes,Ilsa L

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	3	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	22/67	4.93	4.52	4.58	4.48	4.93
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	9	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	22/66	4.80	4.39	4.36	4.35	4.80
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	11	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/64	****	4.04	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	18/75	4.75	4.18	4.32	3.95	4.75
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	3	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/73	5.00	4.10	4.00	3.44	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FYS 102G 01
Title:	Sexuality, Health & Hum
Instructor:	Lottes,IIsa L

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														

56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	8	Under-grad	17	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FYS 102M 01
Title:	Handling Conflict Constr
Instructor:	Small,Sue E

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 13

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	2	2	9	4.54	553/1449	4.54	4.32	4.33	4.14	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	531/1446	4.54	4.02	4.29	4.20	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1256	****	3.97	4.34	4.21	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	492/1402	4.54	4.13	4.27	4.10	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	827/1358	4.00	4.23	4.13	4.04	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	621/1327	4.31	4.24	4.16	3.92	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	279/1435	4.69	4.01	4.20	4.11	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	858/1446	4.69	4.84	4.67	4.57	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	550/1437	4.33	4.12	4.12	4.04	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	774/1386	4.54	4.38	4.48	4.40	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1390	5.00	4.82	4.74	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	397/1379	4.69	4.41	4.34	4.28	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	567/1379	4.62	4.41	4.36	4.26	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	516/1236	4.31	4.33	4.08	3.93	4.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	309/1121	4.64	4.52	4.18	3.89	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	429/1122	4.64	4.50	4.36	4.09	4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	316/1121	4.82	4.71	4.40	4.08	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	111/790	4.73	4.29	4.06	3.89	4.73

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FYS 102M 01
Title:	Handling Conflict Constr
Instructor:	Small,Sue E

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	13

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	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/205	****	****	4.29	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	41/67	4.57	4.52	4.58	4.48	4.57
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	20/66	4.83	4.39	4.36	4.35	4.83
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	39/64	4.17	4.04	4.25	4.01	4.17
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	55/75	4.00	4.18	4.32	3.95	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	23/73	4.57	4.10	4.00	3.44	4.57
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	5	Under-grad	13	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FYS 102M 01	
Title:	Handling Conflict Constr	
Instructor:	Small,Sue E	

Term - Spring 2011	

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														

Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses
				P	0			to be significant
				I	0	Other	3	
				?	1			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FYS 103C 01	Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment:	17
Title:	Issues In Biotechnology			Questionnaires:	14
Instructor:	Craig,Nessly C				

				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	0	0	2	2	5	2	3	3.14	1410/1449	3.14	4.32	4.33	4.14	3.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	3	5	2	0	2.36	1440/1446	2.36	4.02	4.29	4.20	2.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	5	3	5	1	0	2.14	1256/1256	2.14	3.97	4.34	4.21	2.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	2	5	3	0	2.50	1391/1402	2.50	4.13	4.27	4.10	2.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	5	1	2	1	1	2.20	1351/1358	2.20	4.23	4.13	4.04	2.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	3	6	2	0	2.62	1309/1327	2.62	4.24	4.16	3.92	2.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	4	2	1	2	1	2.40	1419/1435	2.40	4.01	4.20	4.11	2.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1446	5.00	4.84	4.67	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	4	2	3	3	0	2.42	1425/1437	2.42	4.12	4.12	4.04	2.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	3	1	4	1	3	3.00	1362/1386	3.00	4.38	4.48	4.40	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	1262/1390	4.31	4.82	4.74	4.67	4.31
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	2	1	5	1	2.92	1349/1379	2.92	4.41	4.34	4.28	2.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	3	2	4	1	2.77	1354/1379	2.77	4.41	4.36	4.26	2.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1012/1236	3.50	4.33	4.08	3.93	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	4	3	2	3.50	931/1121	3.50	4.52	4.18	3.89	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	1	1	2	5	3.90	923/1122	3.90	4.50	4.36	4.09	3.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	855/1121	4.00	4.71	4.40	4.08	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	681/790	3.33	4.29	4.06	3.89	3.33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: FYS 103C 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 17
Title: Issues In Biotechnology		Questionnaires: 14
Instructor: Craig,Nessly C		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/200	****	****	4.28	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/205	****	****	4.29	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/201	****	****	4.51	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/202	****	****	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/196	****	****	4.25	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	1	1	1	2	2	4	3.70	62/67	3.70	4.52	4.58	4.48	3.70
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	2	1	3	3	2	3.18	60/66	3.18	4.39	4.36	4.35	3.18
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	1	2	0	3	4	1	3.20	57/64	3.20	4.04	4.25	4.01	3.20
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	3	2	3	3.36	66/75	3.36	4.18	4.32	3.95	3.36
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	7	0	2	0	2	2.09	73/73	2.09	4.10	4.00	3.44	2.09
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: FYS 103C 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 17
Title: Issues In Biotechnology		Questionnaires: 14
Instructor: Craig,Nessly C		

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	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	7	Under-grad	14	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FYS 103N 01
Title:	Monitoring Global Enviro
Instructor:	Prados,Ana

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	7
Questionnaires:	7

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	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	821/1449	4.33	4.32	4.33	4.14	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1327/1446	3.50	4.02	4.29	4.20	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	849/1256	4.17	3.97	4.34	4.21	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1022/1402	4.00	4.13	4.27	4.10	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	232/1358	4.67	4.23	4.13	4.04	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	739/1327	4.17	4.24	4.16	3.92	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1143/1435	3.80	4.01	4.20	4.11	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1446	5.00	4.84	4.67	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	735/1437	4.17	4.12	4.12	4.04	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	803/1386	4.50	4.38	4.48	4.40	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	710/1390	4.83	4.82	4.74	4.67	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	635/1379	4.50	4.41	4.34	4.28	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	267/1379	4.83	4.41	4.36	4.26	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	264/1236	4.60	4.33	4.08	3.93	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	396/1121	4.50	4.52	4.18	3.89	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	857/1122	4.00	4.50	4.36	4.09	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1121	5.00	4.71	4.40	4.08	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	2	1	0	3	3.67	590/790	3.67	4.29	4.06	3.89	3.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FYS 103N 01		Term - Spring 2011			Enrollment:	7
Title:	Monitoring Global Enviro					Questionnaires:	7
Instructor:	Prados,Ana						

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	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/205	****	****	4.29	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.52	4.58	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	4.18	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	4.10	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FYS 103N 01		Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment:	7
Title:	Monitoring Global Enviro				Questionnaires:	7
Instructor:	Prados,Ana					

					Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions				NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced																	

56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	7	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FYS 104C 01		Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment:	20
Title:	The Italians				Questionnaires:	13
Instructor:	Rosenthal,Alan					

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	0	1	1	11	4.77	258/1449	4.77	4.32	4.33	4.14	4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	3	8	4.23	885/1446	4.23	4.02	4.29	4.20	4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	450/1256	4.58	3.97	4.34	4.21	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	688/1402	4.38	4.13	4.27	4.10	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	206/1358	4.69	4.23	4.13	4.04	4.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	253/1327	4.67	4.24	4.16	3.92	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	2	6	3.92	1042/1435	3.92	4.01	4.20	4.11	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	776/1446	4.77	4.84	4.67	4.57	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	321/1437	4.56	4.12	4.12	4.04	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	0	10	4.58	726/1386	4.58	4.38	4.48	4.40	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	478/1390	4.92	4.82	4.74	4.67	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	635/1379	4.50	4.41	4.34	4.28	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	385/1379	4.75	4.41	4.36	4.26	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	425/1236	4.42	4.33	4.08	3.93	4.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	232/1121	4.73	4.52	4.18	3.89	4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	170/1122	4.91	4.50	4.36	4.09	4.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1121	5.00	4.71	4.40	4.08	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	77/790	4.86	4.29	4.06	3.89	4.86

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FYS 104C 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment:	20
Title:	The Italians		Questionnaires:	13
Instructor:	Rosenthal,Alan			

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	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/67	****	4.52	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	4.39	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/64	****	4.04	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/75	****	4.18	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/73	****	4.10	4.00	3.44	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	7	Under-grad	13	Non-major	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	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	0				
				?	1						