Course-Section: HONR 100 0101 University of Maryland Title HONORS FORUM Instructor:

SHIELDS, ANNA

Enrollment: 108 Questionnaires: 98

Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Baltimore County

Page 981 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

| Captable | 27 4.08 3.2 22 4.17 3.6 28 4.18 *** 19 4.01 3.8 20 3.78 3.3 16 4.10 4.5 55 4.56 4.9 20 3.95 3.9 43 4.38 4.6 70 4.61 4.7 71 4.20 4.1 72 4.20 4.1 72 4.20 4.1 73 3.84 4.0 74 3.84 4.0 |
|--|---|
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 15 12 27 22 22 3.24 1568/1639 3.24 4.23 4.2 Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 8 7 30 21 31 3.62 1438/1639 3.62 4.09 4.3 Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 87 0 1 1 3 5 4.20 ****/1397 **** 4.57 4.5 4.0 Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 40 4 2 11 23 17 3.82 1212/1583 3.82 4.37 4.5 Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3 4 11 13 28 22 17 3.23 1367/1532 3.23 4.28 4.5 Did assigned reading system clearly explained 1 4 12 11 21 34 15 3.31 1316/1504 3.31 4.23 4.7 4.8 How many times was class cancelled 2 2 6 2 2 5 9 52 4.53 469/1612 4.53 4.00 4.8 How many times was class cancelled 2 0 1 0 0 2 93 4.94 463/1635 4.94 4.63 4.9 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 24 7 1 0 7 50 9 3.99 922/1579 3.99 4.19 4.2 Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9 0 1 0 2 13 73 4.76 872/1520 4.76 4.91 4.2 Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 9 1 3 3 1 4 29 39 4.11 1019/1550 4.11 4.31 4.31 4.31 Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 8 0 10 7 15 23 25 3.58 1083/1398 3.58 4.44 4.2 Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17 0 5 7 8 16 45 4.10 940/1391 4.10 4.73 4.3 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16 0 1 0 4 20 57 4.61 571/1388 4.61 4.54 4.3 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16 0 1 0 4 20 57 4.61 571/1388 4.61 4.54 4.3 A.3 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16 0 1 0 4 20 57 4.61 571/1388 4.61 4.54 4.3 A.3 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16 0 1 0 4 20 57 4.61 571/1388 4.61 4.54 4.3 A.3 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16 0 1 0 4 20 57 4.61 571/1388 4.61 4.54 4.3 A.3 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16 0 1 0 4 20 57 4.61 571/1388 4.61 4.54 4.3 A.3 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16 0 1 0 4 20 57 4.61 571/1388 4.61 4.54 4.3 A.3 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16 0 1 0 4 20 57 4.61 571/1388 | 22 4.17 3.6 28 4.18 *** 19 4.01 3.8 20 3.78 3.3 20 4.10 4.5 20 4.56 4.9 20 3.95 3.9 43 4.38 4.6 70 4.61 4.7 27 4.20 4.1 22 4.17 4.1 24 3.84 4.0 27 3.85 3.5 30 4.07 4.1 28 4.01 4.6 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 8 7 30 21 31 3.62 1438/1639 3.62 4.09 4.3 Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 87 0 1 1 3 5 4.20 ****/1397 **** 4.57 4.4 Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 40 4 2 11 23 17 3.82 1212/1583 3.82 4.37 4.5 Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3 4 11 13 28 22 17 3.23 1367/1532 3.23 4.28 4.6 Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 4 12 11 21 34 15 3.31 1316/1504 3.31 4.23 4.7 Was the grading system clearly explained 2 26 2 2 5 9 52 4.53 469/1612 4.53 4.00 4.8 How many times was class cancelled 2 0 1 0 0 2 93 4.94 463/1635 4.94 4.63 4.9 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 24 7 1 0 7 50 9 3.99 922/1579 3.99 4.19 4.5 Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 8 0 1 1 2 24 62 4.61 670/1518 4.61 4.36 4.2 Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9 0 1 0 2 13 73 4.76 872/1520 4.76 4.91 4.5 A.Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 9 1 3 3 14 29 39 4.11 1019/1550 4.11 4.31 4.5 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 10 14 2 5 13 23 31 4.03 613/1295 4.03 4.18 3.1 Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0 10 7 15 23 25 3.58 1083/1398 3.58 4.44 4.2 Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17 0 5 7 8 16 45 4.10 940/1391 4.10 4.73 4.3 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16 0 1 0 4 20 57 4.61 571/1388 4.61 4.54 4.3 4.4 Were special techniques successful | 22 4.17 3.6 28 4.18 *** 19 4.01 3.8 20 3.78 3.3 20 4.10 4.5 20 4.56 4.9 20 3.95 3.9 43 4.38 4.6 70 4.61 4.7 27 4.20 4.1 22 4.17 4.1 24 3.84 4.0 27 3.85 3.5 30 4.07 4.1 28 4.01 4.6 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 87 0 1 1 3 5 4.20 ****/1397 **** 4.57 4. 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 40 4 2 11 23 17 3.82 1212/1583 3.82 4.37 4. 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3 4 11 13 28 22 17 3.23 1367/1532 3.23 4.28 4.7 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 4 12 11 21 34 15 3.31 1316/1504 3.31 4.23 4. 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 26 2 2 5 9 52 4.53 469/1612 4.53 4.00 4. 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 1 0 0 2 93 4.94 463/1635 4.94 4.63 4. 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 24 7 1 0 7 50 9 3.99 922/1579 3.99 4.19 4. Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 8 0 1 1 2 24 62 4.61 670/1518 4.61 4.36 4. 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9 0 1 0 2 13 73 4.76 872/1520 4.76 4.91 4. 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 9 1 3 3 14 29 39 4.11 1019/1550 4.11 4.31 4. 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 9 1 3 3 14 29 39 4.11 1019/1550 4.11 4.31 4. 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 10 14 2 5 13 23 31 4.03 613/1295 4.03 4.18 3. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0 10 7 15 23 25 3.58 1083/1398 3.58 4.44 4. 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17 0 5 7 8 16 45 4.10 940/1391 4.10 4.73 4. 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16 0 1 0 4 20 57 4.61 571/1388 4.61 4.54 4. 4. Were special techniques successful 19 13 3 6 8 18 31 4.03 450/ 958 4.03 4.18 3. | 28 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 40 4 2 11 23 17 3.82 1212/1583 3.82 4.37 4.5 Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3 4 11 13 28 22 17 3.23 1367/1532 3.23 4.28 4.6 | 19 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3 4 11 13 28 22 17 3.23 1367/1532 3.23 4.28 4.6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 4 12 11 21 34 15 3.31 1316/1504 3.31 4.23 4.7 Was the grading system clearly explained 2 26 2 2 5 9 52 4.53 469/1612 4.53 4.00 4.8 How many times was class cancelled 2 0 1 0 0 2 93 4.94 463/1635 4.94 4.63 4.9 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 24 7 1 0 7 50 9 3.99 922/1579 3.99 4.19 4.5 | 01 3.88 3.2 05 3.78 3.3 16 4.10 4.5 65 4.56 4.9 08 3.95 3.9 43 4.38 4.6 70 4.61 4.7 27 4.20 4.1 22 4.17 4.1 94 3.84 4.0 07 3.85 3.5 30 4.07 4.1 28 4.01 4.6 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 4 12 11 21 34 15 3.31 1316/1504 3.31 4.23 4.7 Was the grading system clearly explained 2 26 2 2 5 9 52 4.53 469/1612 4.53 4.00 4.8 How many times was class cancelled 2 0 1 0 0 2 93 4.94 463/1635 4.94 4.63 4.9 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 24 7 1 0 7 50 9 3.99 922/1579 3.99 4.19 4.5 Lecture Lecture Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 8 0 1 1 2 24 62 4.61 670/1518 4.61 4.36 4.2 Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9 0 1 0 2 13 73 4.76 872/1520 4.76 4.91 4.3 Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 10 0 2 2 11 37 36 4.17 964/1517 4.17 4.38 4.4 Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 9 1 3 3 14 29 39 4.11 1019/1550 4.11 4.31 4.5 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 10 14 2 5 13 23 31 4.03 613/1295 4.03 4.18 3.5 Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0 10 7 15 23 25 3.58 1083/1398 3.58 4.44 4.2 Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17 0 5 7 8 16 45 4.10 940/1391 4.10 4.73 4.3 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16 0 1 0 4 20 57 4.61 571/1388 4.61 4.54 4.4 4.5 Were special techniques successful | 05 3.78 3.3 16 4.10 4.5 15 4.56 4.9 10 8 3.95 3.9 11 4.38 4.6 12 4.17 4.1 12 4.17 4.1 12 4.17 4.1 13 84 4.0 14 3.85 3.5 15 3.5 16 4.07 4.1 17 4.1 18 4.01 4.6 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 26 2 2 5 9 52 4.53 469/1612 4.53 4.00 4.8 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 1 0 0 2 93 4.94 463/1635 4.94 4.63 4.9 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 24 7 1 0 7 50 9 3.99 922/1579 3.99 4.19 4.0 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 8 0 1 1 2 24 62 4.61 670/1518 4.61 4.36 4.2 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9 0 1 0 2 13 73 4.76 872/1520 4.76 4.91 4.3 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 10 0 2 2 11 37 36 4.17 964/1517 4.17 4.38 4.4 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 9 1 3 3 14 29 39 4.11 1019/1550 4.11 4.31 4.3 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 10 14 2 5 13 23 31 4.03 613/1295 4.03 4.18 3.1 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0 10 7 15 23 25 3.58 1083/1398 3.58 4.44 4.2 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17 0 5 7 8 16 45 4.10 940/1391 4.10 4.73 4.3 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16 0 1 0 4 20 57 4.61 571/1388 4.61 4.54 4.4 4. Were special techniques successful | 16 4.10 4.5 55 4.56 4.9 08 3.95 3.9 43 4.38 4.6 70 4.61 4.7 27 4.20 4.1 22 4.17 4.1 94 3.84 4.0 07 3.85 3.5 30 4.07 4.1 28 4.01 4.6 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 1 0 0 2 93 4.94 463/1635 4.94 4.63 4.99. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 24 7 1 0 7 50 9 3.99 922/1579 3.99 4.19 4.00 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 8 0 1 1 2 24 62 4.61 670/1518 4.61 4.36 4.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9 0 1 0 2 13 73 4.76 872/1520 4.76 4.91 4.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 10 0 2 2 11 37 36 4.17 964/1517 4.17 4.38 4.00 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 9 1 3 3 14 29 39 4.11 1019/1550 4.11 4.31 4.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 10 14 2 5 13 23 31 4.03 613/1295 4.03 4.18 3.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0 10 7 15 23 25 3.58 1083/1398 3.58 4.44 4.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17 0 5 7 8 16 45 4.10 940/1391 4.10 4.73 4.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16 0 1 0 4 20 57 4.61 571/1388 4.61 4.54 4.00 4. Were special techniques successful 19 13 3 6 8 18 31 4.03 450/ 958 4.03 4.18 3.00 | 4.56 4.96 3.95 3.96 4.38 4.66 70 4.61 4.7 27 4.20 4.1 22 4.17 4.1 94 3.84 4.0 07 3.85 3.5 30 4.07 4.1 28 4.01 4.6 |
| Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8. O 1 1 2 24 62 4.61 670/1518 4.61 4.36 4.20 9. O 1 0 2 2 11 37 36 4.17 964/1517 4.17 4.38 4.30 9. Discussion 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18. O 10 7 15 23 25 3.58 1083/1398 3.58 4.44 4.20 9. Did the instructor encouraged to participate 17. O 5 7 8 16 45 4.10 940/1391 4.10 4.73 4.30 18. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion fair fair fair fair fair fair fair fair | 3.95 3.9 43 4.38 4.6 70 4.61 4.7 4.20 4.1 22 4.17 4.1 94 3.84 4.0 77 3.85 3.5 30 4.07 4.1 28 4.01 4.6 |
| Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 43 4.38 4.6 70 4.61 4.7 27 4.20 4.1 22 4.17 4.1 94 3.84 4.0 07 3.85 3.5 30 4.07 4.1 28 4.01 4.6 |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 8 0 1 1 2 24 62 4.61 670/1518 4.61 4.36 4.2 Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9 0 1 0 2 13 73 4.76 872/1520 4.76 4.91 4.3 3.4 Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 9 1 3 3 14 29 39 4.11 1019/1550 4.11 4.31 4.5 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 10 14 2 5 13 23 31 4.03 613/1295 4.03 4.18 3.3 Did the instructor encouraged to participate 17 0 5 7 8 16 45 4.10 940/1391 4.10 4.73 4.3 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19 13 3 6 8 18 31 4.03 450/958 4.03 4.18 3.3 4.5 Were special techniques successful 19 13 3 6 8 18 31 4.03 450/958 4.03 4.18 3.5 4.04 4.2 4.3 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 | 70 4.61 4.7 27 4.20 4.1 22 4.17 4.1 94 3.84 4.0 07 3.85 3.5 30 4.07 4.1 28 4.01 4.6 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9 0 1 0 2 13 73 4.76 872/1520 4.76 4.91 4.3 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 10 0 2 2 11 37 36 4.17 964/1517 4.17 4.38 4.4 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 9 1 3 3 14 29 39 4.11 1019/1550 4.11 4.31 4.5 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 10 14 2 5 13 23 31 4.03 613/1295 4.03 4.18 3.4 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0 10 7 15 23 25 3.58 1083/1398 3.58 4.44 4.2 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17 0 5 7 8 16 45 4.10 940/1391 4.10 4.73 4.3 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16 0 1 0 4 20 57 4.61 571/1388 4.61 4.54 4.4 4. Were special techniques successful 19 13 3 6 8 18 31 4.03 450/958 4.03 4.18 3.5 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0 10 7 15 23 25 3.58 1083/1398 3.58 4.44 4.2 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16 0 1 0 4 20 57 4.61 571/1388 4.61 4.54 4.3 4. Were special techniques successful | 70 4.61 4.7 27 4.20 4.1 22 4.17 4.1 94 3.84 4.0 07 3.85 3.5 30 4.07 4.1 28 4.01 4.6 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 10 0 2 2 11 37 36 4.17 964/1517 4.17 4.38 4.4 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 9 1 3 3 14 29 39 4.11 1019/1550 4.11 4.31 4.5 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 10 14 2 5 13 23 31 4.03 613/1295 4.03 4.18 3.5 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0 10 7 15 23 25 3.58 1083/1398 3.58 4.44 4.2 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17 0 5 7 8 16 45 4.10 940/1391 4.10 4.73 4.3 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16 0 1 0 4 20 57 4.61 571/1388 4.61 4.54 4.4 4. Were special techniques successful 19 13 3 6 8 18 31 4.03 450/958 4.03 4.18 3.5 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19 13 3 6 8 18 31 4.03 450/958 4.03 4.18 3.5 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19 13 3 6 8 18 31 4.03 450/958 4.03 4.18 3.5 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19 13 3 6 8 18 31 4.03 450/958 4.03 4.18 3.5 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19 13 3 6 8 18 31 4.03 450/958 4.03 4.18 3.5 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19 13 3 6 8 18 31 4.03 450/958 4.03 4.18 3.5 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19 13 3 6 8 18 31 4.03 450/958 4.03 4.18 3.5 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19 13 3 6 8 18 31 4.03 450/958 4.03 4.18 3.5 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19 13 3 6 8 18 31 4.03 450/958 4.03 4.18 3.5 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19 13 3 6 8 18 31 4.03 450/958 4.03 4.18 3.5 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19 13 3 6 8 18 31 4.03 450/958 4.03 4.18 3.5 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19 13 3 6 8 18 31 4.03 450/958 4.03 4.18 3.5 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19 13 3 6 8 18 31 4.03 450/958 4.03 4.18 3.5 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19 10 4 20 57 4.61 57 | 27 4.20 4.1 22 4.17 4.1 94 3.84 4.0 07 3.85 3.5 30 4.07 4.1 28 4.01 4.6 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 9 1 3 3 14 29 39 4.11 1019/1550 4.11 4.31 4.5 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 10 14 2 5 13 23 31 4.03 613/1295 4.03 4.18 3.3 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0 10 7 15 23 25 3.58 1083/1398 3.58 4.44 4.2 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17 0 5 7 8 16 45 4.10 940/1391 4.10 4.73 4.3 3.0 2.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3 | 22 4.17 4.1 94 3.84 4.0 07 3.85 3.5 30 4.07 4.1 28 4.01 4.6 |
| Discussion 10 14 2 5 13 23 31 4.03 613/1295 4.03 4.18 3.14 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0 10 7 15 23 25 3.58 1083/1398 3.58 4.44 4.2 Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17 0 5 7 8 16 45 4.10 940/1391 4.10 4.73 4.3 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16 0 1 0 4 20 57 4.61 571/1388 4.61 4.54 4.4 Were special techniques successful 19 13 3 6 8 18 31 4.03 450/ 958 4.03 4.18 3.5 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 10 14 2 5 13 23 31 4.03 613/1295 4.03 4.18 3.5 10 14 2 5 13 23 31 4.03 613/1295 4.03 4.18 3.5 Discussion 18 0 10 7 15 23 25 3.58 1083/1398 3.58 4.44 4.5 | 94 3.84 4.0 07 3.85 3.5 30 4.07 4.1 28 4.01 4.6 |
| Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0 10 7 15 23 25 3.58 1083/1398 3.58 4.44 4.2 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17 0 5 7 8 16 45 4.10 940/1391 4.10 4.73 4.3 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16 0 1 0 4 20 57 4.61 571/1388 4.61 4.54 4.4 4. Were special techniques successful 19 13 3 6 8 18 31 4.03 450/ 958 4.03 4.18 3.58 | 07 3.85 3.5 30 4.07 4.1 28 4.01 4.6 |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0 10 7 15 23 25 3.58 1083/1398 3.58 4.44 4.2 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17 0 5 7 8 16 45 4.10 940/1391 4.10 4.73 4.3 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16 0 1 0 4 20 57 4.61 571/1388 4.61 4.54 4.4 4.4 4.4 4.4 4.5 4.5 4.5 4.5 4. | 30 4.07 4.1 28 4.01 4.6 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17 0 5 7 8 16 45 4.10 940/1391 4.10 4.73 4. 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16 0 1 0 4 20 57 4.61 571/1388 4.61 4.54 4. 4. 4. Were special techniques successful 19 13 3 6 8 18 31 4.03 450/958 4.03 4.18 3. | 30 4.07 4.1 28 4.01 4.6 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16 0 1 0 4 20 57 4.61 571/1388 4.61 4.54 4. 4. Were special techniques successful 19 13 3 6 8 18 31 4.03 450/958 4.03 4.18 3.55 | 28 4.01 4.6 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful 19 13 3 6 8 18 31 4.03 450/ 958 4.03 4.18 3. | |
| | 12 2 71 1 0 |
| Laboratory | 93 3.71 4.0 |
| Edbordoory | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 96 0 1 0 0 1 0 $2.50 **** / 240 **** **** 4.50$ | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 96 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** / 219 **** **** 4. | |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 95 1 0 0 1 1 0 $3.50 ****/ 215 **** **** 4.$ | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 96 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 198 **** **** 4. | 18 4.25 *** |
| Seminar | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 81 2 0 0 4 6 5 4.07 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4 | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 83 14 0 0 0 0 1 $5.00****/ 82**** **** 4.00$ | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 83 1 1 1 4 4 3.64 ****/ 80 **** 4.33 4. | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 84 1 1 1 0 4 7 4.15 ****/ 82 **** 4.50 4.5 | 16 3.90 *** |
| Field Work | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 96 0 2 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.0 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 97 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 53 **** **** 4.0 | |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 97 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 7 55 4. | 75 3.51 |
| Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 97 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 50 **** **** 4. | 45 4.54 *** |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 97 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 50 **** **** 4. | 10 4.54 ^^^ |
| Frequency Distribution | |
| Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type | Majors |
| 00-27 37 0.00-0.99 16 A 8 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Ma | ajor 0 |
| 28-55 23 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 | -5 |
| 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 98 N | on-major 98 |
| 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 | |
| Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 10 F 0 Electives 2 $\#\#\#$ - Means there are | not enough |
| P 80 responses to be signific | cant |

Other

84

I 0

? 1

Course-Section: HONR 200B 0101
Title HONORS SEMINAR
Instructor: SENG, PHILLIP

16

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 982 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

| Student | Course | Evaluation | Questionnaire |
|---------|--------|------------|---------------|
|---------|--------|------------|---------------|

| | | | | | Fre | equei | ncies | 5 | | Ins | tructor | Course | e Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect | | |
|-----------|------------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------|-----|---------|--------|-------------|---------|--------|--------|--------|------|
| | | Question | S | | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| | | Genera | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did vo | ou gain n | ew insights,ski | | om this course | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 4.14 | 1016/1639 | 4.14 | 4.23 | 4.27 | 4.35 | 4.14 |
| _ | _ | ctor make clear | | | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 3 | | 1455/1639 | | 4.09 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 3.57 |
| | | uestions reflec | | | 2 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | ****/1397 | **** | 4.57 | 4.28 | 4.39 | **** |
| 4. Did ot | her eval | uations reflect | the ex | spected goals | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 4 | 3.93 | 1128/1583 | 3.93 | 4.37 | 4.19 | 4.28 | 3.93 |
| 5. Did as | ssigned re | eadings contrib | ute to | what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 4.29 | 553/1532 | 4.29 | 4.28 | 4.01 | 4.09 | 4.29 |
| 6. Did wr | ritten as | signments contr | ibute t | to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 4.00 | 824/1504 | 4.00 | 4.23 | 4.05 | 4.09 | 4.00 |
| 7. Was th | ne gradin | g system clearl | y expla | ained | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3.14 | 1501/1612 | 3.14 | 4.00 | 4.16 | 4.21 | 3.14 |
| | | was class canc | | | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 3 | 4.00 | 1497/1635 | 4.00 | 4.63 | 4.65 | 4.63 | 4.00 |
| 9. How wo | ould you | grade the overa | ll teac | ching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 4.15 | 772/1579 | 4.15 | 4.19 | 4.08 | 4.14 | 4.15 |
| | | Lectur | e | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were t | the instr | uctor's lecture | s well | prepared | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 3 | 3.69 | 1386/1518 | 3.69 | 4.36 | 4.43 | 4.48 | 3.69 |
| 2. Did th | ne instru | ctor seem inter | ested i | n the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 4.92 | 437/1520 | 4.92 | 4.91 | 4.70 | 4.78 | 4.92 |
| 3. Was le | ecture ma | terial presente | d and e | explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 2 | 3.77 | 1256/1517 | 3.77 | 4.38 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 3.77 |
| | | es contribute t | | - | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 4.00 | 1077/1550 | 4.00 | 4.31 | 4.22 | 4.33 | 4.00 |
| 5. Did au | udiovisua | l techniques en | hance y | our understanding | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 12 | 4.85 | 98/1295 | 4.85 | 4.18 | 3.94 | 4.07 | 4.85 |
| | | Discus | sion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | what you learned | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.33 | 560/1398 | | 4.44 | 4.07 | 4.14 | 4.33 |
| | | | | ed to participate | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.50 | 616/1391 | | 4.73 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.50 |
| | | | | nd open discussion | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 4.56 | 609/1388 | | 4.54 | 4.28 | 4.37 | 4.56 |
| 4. Were s | special to | echniques succe | ssful | | 10 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/ 958 | **** | 4.18 | 3.93 | 4.00 | **** |
| | | Semina | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | _ | - | | announced theme | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | | ****/ 85 | | 5.00 | 4.58 | 4.00 | **** |
| | | | | lividual attention | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | | ****/ 82 | | **** | 4.52 | 3.00 | **** |
| | _ | - | | what you learned | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | ****/ 78 | | **** | 4.47 | **** | **** |
| _ | | ons contribute | | - | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | | ****/ 80 | | 4.33 | 4.47 | 2.00 | **** |
| 5. Were d | criteria : | for grading mad | e clear | Î | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 82 | **** | 4.50 | 4.16 | 4.00 | **** |
| | | | | Frequ | ıency | Dis | trib | utio | n | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits E | Earned | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | | | Rea | asons | 3 | | | Ту | pe | | | Majors | \$ |
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A 9 | | Re | านา่า | ed f | or Ma | | | 1 | Graduat | | 0 | Majo | or | 0 |
| 28-55 | 3 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В 3 | | 100 | 2411 | - A I | J_ 1710 | | 2 | _ | Gradad | | • | 1100) | - | J |
| 56-83 | 4 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C 0 | | Ger | nera | 1 | | | | 3 | Under-c | rad | L6 | Non- | -major | 16 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | 5 | D 0 | | | | | | | | - | | | - | | , | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 6 | F 0 | | El | ecti | ves | | | | 0 | #### - | Means t | here a | re not | enoug | jh |
| | | | | D 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | • |

Other

8

Ρ

I

?

0

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: HONR 200C 0101

15

HONORS SEMINAR

WILSON, RICHARD

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 15

Page 983 FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | | | NR | NA | Fr 1 | eque: 2 | ncies 3 | 4 | 5 | Inst Mean | tructor Rank | | e Dept Mean | | Level Mean | Sect Mean | |
|------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------------------|-------|---------|------------|------------|-----------|---------|--------------|-----------------|-------------|----------------|--------|---------------|--------------|------|
| | | General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Did you | u dain n | | ls from this course | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 4 14 | 1016/1639 | 4.14 | 4.23 | 4.27 | 4.35 | 4.14 |
| _ | _ | - | the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 6 | | 1036/1639 | | 4.09 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.07 |
| | | | the expected goals | 2 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/1397 | | 4.57 | 4.28 | 4.39 | **** |
| | _ | | the expected goals | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 4.46 | | | 4.37 | 4.19 | 4.28 | 4.46 |
| 5. Did as | signed re | eadings contribut | te to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 4.21 | 616/1532 | 4.21 | 4.28 | 4.01 | 4.09 | 4.21 |
| 6. Did wr | itten as: | signments contril | oute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 10 | 4.64 | 260/1504 | 4.64 | 4.23 | 4.05 | 4.09 | 4.64 |
| | | g system clearly | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3.85 | 1221/1612 | 3.85 | 4.00 | 4.16 | 4.21 | 3.85 |
| | | was class cance | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 2 | 3.85 | 1578/1635 | 3.85 | 4.63 | 4.65 | 4.63 | 3.85 |
| 9. How wo | uld you | grade the overal: | l teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 2 | 4.00 | 889/1579 | 4.00 | 4.19 | 4.08 | 4.14 | 4.00 |
| | | Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were th | he instr | uctor's lectures | well prepared | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3.67 | 1392/1518 | 3.67 | 4.36 | 4.43 | 4.48 | 3.67 |
| | | | sted in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 4.92 | 491/1520 | 4.92 | 4.91 | 4.70 | 4.78 | 4.92 |
| | | | and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4.17 | 973/1517 | | 4.38 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.17 |
| 4. Did the | e lectur | es contribute to | what you learned | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 3.83 | 1198/1550 | 3.83 | 4.31 | 4.22 | 4.33 | 3.83 |
| 5. Did au | diovisua | l techniques enha | ance your understanding | 3 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | 978/1295 | 3.50 | 4.18 | 3.94 | 4.07 | 3.50 |
| | | Discuss | ion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did cla | ass disc | ussions contribut | te to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4.14 | 708/1398 | 4.14 | 4.44 | 4.07 | 4.14 | 4.14 |
| 2. Were a | ll stude | nts actively enc | ouraged to participate | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1391 | 5.00 | 4.73 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 5.00 |
| | | _ | air and open discussion | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4.63 | 546/1388 | 4.63 | 4.54 | 4.28 | 4.37 | 4.63 |
| 4. Were s | pecial te | echniques success | sful | 8 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4.00 | 456/ 958 | 4.00 | 4.18 | 3.93 | 4.00 | 4.00 |
| | | Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were a | ssigned t | topics relevant t | to the announced theme | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/ 85 | **** | 5.00 | 4.58 | 4.00 | **** |
| | | | or individual attention | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | | ****/ 82 | | **** | 4.52 | 3.00 | **** |
| | _ | | te to what you learned | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | | ****/ 78 | | **** | 4.47 | **** | **** |
| _ | | | o what you learned | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | | ****/ 80 | | 4.33 | 4.47 | 2.00 | **** |
| 5. Were c | riteria : | for grading made | clear | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/ 82 | **** | 4.50 | 4.16 | 4.00 | **** |
| | | | Freq | uency | / Dis | strib | utio: | n | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits E | arned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | | | | Re | asons | | | | Ту | pe | | | Majors | 3 |
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 A 11 | | De | anir | ed f | or Ma | ior | | 0 | Graduat | | 0 | Majo | | 0 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 B 0 | | 166 | -durr | cu I | OI Ma | בט כ | D | U | Graduat | | J | Ma J |) <u>+</u> | U |
| 56-83 | 5 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 C 1 | | Ge | nera | 1 | | | | 0 | Under-q | rad 1 | L5 | Non- | -major | 15 |
| 84-150 | | | | | 30 | c. a | - | | | | • | onder 9 | | | 1,011 | | 13 |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 5 F 0 | | E:1 | ecti | ves | | | | 2 | #### - | Means t | here a | re not | enous | ιh |
| 32 44. | ŭ | 3.50 1.00 | P 0 | | | | | | | | _ | respons | | | | _ | ,== |
| | | | I O | | Ot | her | | | | 1 | 2 | 10050110 | 1 | | | | |
| | | | ? 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Course-Section: HONR 300A 0101

Title ARISTOTLE & THE VERB A

Instructor: GLASSER, JOEL

Enrollment: 8
Questionnaires: 7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2007

Page 984 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

| Ouestions | | 373 | - | | | ructor | Course Dept Mean Mean | | | | 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 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 231/1639 | 4.83 | 4.23 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.83 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.67 | 349/1639 | 4.67 | 4.09 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.67 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 230/1397 | 4.80 | 4.57 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 4.80 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 164/1583 | 4.86 | 4.37 | 4.19 | 4.24 | 4.86 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 203/1532 | | 4.28 | 4.01 | 4.05 | 4.71 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | | 4.71 | 208/1504 | | 4.23 | 4.05 | 4.12 | 4.71 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | | 4.33 | 718/1612 | | 4.00 | 4.16 | 4.12 | 4.33 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | | 1/1635 | | | 4.65 | 4.66 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 4.43 | 473/1579 | 4.43 | 4.19 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.43 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1518 | 5.00 | 4.36 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 5.00 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1520 | | 4.91 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 347/1517 | | 4.38 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 4.71 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 231/1550 | 4.86 | 4.31 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.86 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1295 | **** | 4.18 | 3.94 | 3.95 | **** | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Ω | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1398 | 5.00 | 4 44 | 4.07 | 4.13 | 5.00 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 1 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 5.00 | 1/1391 | | | 4.30 | 4.35 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | | 4.00 | 944/1388 | | 4.54 | | 4.34 | 4.00 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | | 201/ 958 | | | 3.93 | 3.97 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Seminar | | | • | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | F 00 | 1 / 05 | F 00 | F 00 | 4 50 | 4 50 | F 00 | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 4 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/ 85 ****/ 82 | | 5.00 *** | 4.58 4.52 | 4.50 4.59 | 5.00 *** | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 4 | _ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 78 | | **** | 4.52 | | **** | |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | _ | 4.33 | 52/ 80 | | 4.33 | 4.47 | | 4.33 | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | T | 1 | 1 | | 33/ 82 | | | | 4.05 | 4.50 | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made crear | 4 | Τ | U | U | U | 1 | | 4.50 | 33/ 02 | 4.50 | 4.50 | 4.10 | 4.00 | 4.50 | |
| Freq | uency | Dis | trib | utio | n | | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades | | | | | Reasons | | | | | Туре | | | | Majors | |

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: HONR 300B 0101

7

HONORS SEMINAR

MACAULAY, JANIC

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 7

Fall 2007

Page 985

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

| G . 1 . | ~ | | |
|---------|--------|------------|---------------|
| Student | Course | Evaluation | Ouestionnaire |

| | | | | | Frequencies | | | Inst | Instructor | | Dept | ept UMBC Level | | Sect | | | | |
|-------|--|-------------------|---------|--------------------|-------------|-----|-------|-------|------------|--------|-------|----------------------|-----------|---------|--------|--------|--------|------|
| | | Questions | 3 | | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| | | Genera | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Di | d vou gain i | new insights,skil | = | m this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 4.29 | 860/1639 | 4.29 | 4.23 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.29 |
| | | uctor make clear | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4.43 | 650/1639 | 4.43 | 4.09 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.43 |
| | | questions reflect | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 323/1397 | 4.71 | 4.57 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 4.71 |
| | | luations reflect | | _ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 164/1583 | 4.86 | 4.37 | 4.19 | 4.24 | 4.86 |
| | | readings contrib | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 133/1532 | | 4.28 | 4.01 | 4.05 | 4.83 |
| | _ | _ | | o what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4.50 | 367/1504 | 4.50 | 4.23 | 4.05 | 4.12 | 4.50 |
| | | ng system clearly | | - | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4.17 | 913/1612 | 4.17 | 4.00 | 4.16 | 4.12 | 4.17 |
| | | s was class cance | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1635 | 5.00 | 4.63 | 4.65 | 4.66 | 5.00 |
| | | | | hing effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4.00 | 889/1579 | 4.00 | 4.19 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.00 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 77- | | Lecture | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4 57 | 700/1510 | 4 57 | 4 26 | 4 42 | 4 20 | 4 57 |
| | | ructor's lectures | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4.57 | 720/1518 | 4.57 | 4.36 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.57 |
| | | uctor seem intere | | _ | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 674/1520 | 4.86 | 4.91 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 4.86 |
| | 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | | | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 4 | 6 | 4.86 | 198/1517 | 4.86 | 4.38 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 4.86 |
| | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4.43 | 742/1550 329/1295 | 4.43 | 4.31 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.43 | |
| 5. DI | 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | | | our understanding | U | U | U | U | Т | 2 | 4 | 4.43 | 329/1295 | 4.43 | 4.18 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 4.43 |
| | | Discus | sion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Di | d class dis | cussions contribu | ite to | what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1398 | 5.00 | 4.44 | 4.07 | 4.13 | 5.00 |
| 2. We | re all stude | ents actively end | courage | d to participate | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 332/1391 | 4.80 | 4.73 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.80 |
| 3. Di | d the instr | uctor encourage i | fair an | d open discussion | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4.60 | 571/1388 | 4.60 | 4.54 | 4.28 | 4.34 | 4.60 |
| 4. We | re special | techniques succes | ssful | | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 958 | **** | 4.18 | 3.93 | 3.97 | **** |
| | | | | _ | | | , | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | Frequ | iency | Dis | tribi | lt101 | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| Credi | ts Earned | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | | | Rea | asons | 3 | | | Туј | pe | | | Majors | } |
| 00-2 | 7 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A 7 | | Red | auire | ed fo | or Ma | aiors | 5 | 0 | Graduat | e | 0 | Majo | r r | 0 |
| 28-5 | | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В 0 | | | | | | | - | - | | - | - |) • | | - |
| 56-8 | | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C 0 | | Gei | nera: | 1 | | | | 2 | Under-g | rad | 7 | Non- | major | 7 |
| 84-1 | | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D 0 | | | | | | | | | - 2- 5- | | | | 3 | • |
| Grad | | 3.50-4.00 | 6 | F 0 | | Ele | ecti | ves | | | | 0 | #### - 1 | Means t | here a | re not | enoug | ıh |
| | | | | P 0 | | | | | | | | | respons | | | | _ | |
| | | | | I 0 | | Ot1 | her | | | | | 5 | _ | | 3 | | | |
| | | | | ? 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Course-Section: HONR 300C 0101
Title HONORS SEMINAR
Instructor: STACEY, SIMON

14

Enrollment:

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 986 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

| Questionnaires: | 13 | Student Co | ourse I | Evaluation | Questionnaire |
|-----------------|----|------------|---------|------------|---------------|
|-----------------|----|------------|---------|------------|---------------|

| Questions | | | NR | NA | Fre | _ | ncies 3 | 4 | 5 | Inst Mean | ructor Rank | Course Mean | Dept Mean | | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|--|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | | | | | 0 0 1 0 1 0 1 | 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 | 1 1 0 1 1 2 2 | 1 5 0 3 1 2 2 | 10 5 4 6 9 6 5 | 5.00 | 318/1639 948/1639 850/1397 771/1583 430/1532 678/1504 1044/1612 1/1635 | 4.75 4.17 4.20 4.27 4.42 4.18 4.00 5.00 | 4.23 4.09 4.57 4.37 4.28 4.23 4.00 4.63 | 4.27 4.22 4.28 4.19 4.01 4.05 4.16 4.65 | 4.28 4.20 4.26 4.24 4.05 4.12 4.12 4.66 | 4.75 4.17 4.20 4.27 4.42 4.18 4.00 5.00 |
| 1. Were the instru 2. Did the instru 3. Was lecture ma 4. Did the lectur | Lecture Lectures well cotor seem interested and terial presented and tes contribute to what all techniques enhance | prepared in the subject explained clearly you learned | 3 3 2 3 | 0 0 0 0 1 1 | 0 0 0 0 | 0 0 0 0 1 | 0 1 0 1 0 2 | 2 0 2 1 4 | 7 10 7 8 3 | 4.55 4.60 5.00 4.60 4.11 | 342/1579 684/1518 1/1520 474/1517 522/1550 569/1295 | 4.55 4.60 5.00 4.60 4.60 4.11 | 4.19 4.36 4.91 4.38 4.31 4.18 | 4.43 4.70 4.27 4.22 3.94 | 4.39 4.68 4.23 4.20 3.95 | 4.55 4.60 5.00 4.60 4.60 4.11 |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful | | | | 0 0 0 5 | 0 0 0 | 0 0 0 | 1 0 0 0 | 1 0 1 0 | 5 7 6 2 | 4.57 5.00 4.86 5.00 | 386/1398 1/1391 276/1388 ****/ 958 | 4.57 5.00 4.86 *** | 4.44 4.73 4.54 4.18 | 4.07 4.30 4.28 3.93 | 4.13 4.35 4.34 3.97 | 4.57 5.00 4.86 **** |
| Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | | | 12 12 12 12 12 | 0 0 0 0 | 0 0 0 0 | 0 0 0 0 | 0 0 0 0 | 0 0 0 0 | 1 1 1 1 | 5.00 5.00 5.00 | ****/ 85 ****/ 82 ****/ 88 ****/ 80 ****/ 82 | * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * | 5.00 **** **** 4.33 4.50 | 4.58 4.52 4.47 4.47 4.16 | 4.50 4.59 4.60 4.65 4.08 | *** *** *** *** |
| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Frequ Expected Grades | ıency | Dis [.] | tribu | | n asons | | | | Tyj | pe | | | Majors | |
| 00-27 0 28-55 2 56-83 3 84-150 4 Grad. 0 | 0.00-0.99 0 1.00-1.99 0 2.00-2.99 0 3.00-3.49 1 3.50-4.00 8 | A 10 B 1 C 0 D 0 F 0 P 0 I 0 | | Ge: El: | quire neral ectiv | 1 | or Ma | jor | | 0 1 0 | Graduat Under-g: #### - 1 response | rad 1 | | re not | major enoug | 0 13 |