```
Course-Section: HONR 100  0101          University of Maryland                                    Page 1009
Title       HONORS FORUM                Baltimore County                                         FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   SHIELDS, ANNA   (Instr. A)      Fall   2008                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     119
Questionnaires: 113                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Instructor Mean | Rank | Course Mean | Dept Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 2 | 0 | 9 | 16 | 35 | 23 | 28 | 3.41 | 1524/1649 | 3.41 | 4.12 | 4.28 | 4.11 | 3.41 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 3 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 29 | 41 | 27 | 3.72 | 1375/1648 | 3.72 | 3.98 | 4.23 | 4.16 | 3.72 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 4 | 95 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 3.86 | ****/1375 | **** | 4.46 | 4.27 | 4.10 | **** |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 6 | 27 | 1 | 6 | 14 | 31 | 28 | 3.99 | 1094/1595 | 3.99 | 4.35 | 4.20 | 4.03 | 3.99 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 6 | 13 | 25 | 36 | 29 | 3.63 | 1159/1533 | 3.63 | 4.32 | 4.04 | 3.87 | 3.63 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 5 | 3 | 8 | 13 | 33 | 29 | 22 | 3.42 | 1314/1512 | 3.42 | 3.96 | 4.10 | 3.86 | 3.42 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 4 | 21 | 0 | 1 | 16 | 20 | 51 | 4.38 | 671/1623 | 4.38 | 4.23 | 4.16 | 4.08 | 4.38 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 107 | 4.98 | 133/1646 | 4.98 | 4.71 | 4.69 | 4.67 | 4.98 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 22 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 56 | 27 | 4.24 | 709/1621 | 4.25 | 4.30 | 4.06 | 3.96 | 4.25 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 18 | 83 | 4.75 | 480/1568 | 4.73 | 4.62 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.73 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 92 | 4.84 | 765/1572 | 4.83 | 4.93 | 4.70 | 4.64 | 4.83 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 23 | 74 | 4.64 | 498/1564 | 4.61 | 4.54 | 4.28 | 4.20 | 4.61 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 35 | 55 | 4.30 | 931/1559 | 4.33 | 4.45 | 4.29 | 4.20 | 4.33 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 9 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 20 | 30 | 42 | 4.10 | 633/1352 | 4.10 | 4.03 | 3.98 | 3.86 | 4.10 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 21 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 11 | 27 | 45 | 4.12 | 755/1384 | 4.12 | 4.46 | 4.08 | 3.86 | 4.12 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 21 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 16 | 18 | 54 | 4.30 | 799/1382 | 4.30 | 4.54 | 4.29 | 4.03 | 4.30 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 21 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 19 | 64 | 4.57 | 609/1368 | 4.57 | 4.60 | 4.30 | 4.01 | 4.57 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 22 | 12 | 3 | 5 | 10 | 19 | 42 | 4.16 | 380/ 948 | 4.16 | 4.49 | 3.95 | 3.75 | 4.16 |
| **Laboratory** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 109 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2.75 | ****/ 243 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 4.08 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 109 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 212 | **** | **** | 4.40 | 4.43 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 109 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 209 | **** | **** | 4.35 | 4.38 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 104 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3.83 | ****/ 555 | **** | 4.00 | 4.29 | 4.14 | **** |
| **Seminar** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 84 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 10 | 9 | 3.85 | ****/ 88 | **** | 4.90 | 4.54 | 4.31 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 87 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 4 | 3.94 | ****/ 85 | **** | 3.80 | 4.47 | 4.30 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 86 | 11 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 2 | 3.56 | ****/ 81 | **** | 4.70 | 4.43 | 4.39 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 86 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 10 | 11 | 4.12 | ****/ 92 | **** | 4.90 | 4.35 | 4.01 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 79 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 14 | 10 | 4.00 | 83/ 288 | 4.00 | 3.90 | 3.68 | 3.54 | 4.00 |
| **Field Work** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 110 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.33 | ****/ 52 | **** | **** | 4.06 | 3.72 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 110 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 48 | **** | **** | 4.09 | 3.65 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 110 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 39 | **** | **** | 4.47 | 4.36 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 109 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/ 39 | **** | **** | 4.38 | 4.37 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 107 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/ 312 | **** | **** | 3.68 | 3.51 | **** |
| **Self  Paced** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 109 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3.25 | ****/ 53 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 4.17 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 109 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 30 | **** | **** | 4.16 | 4.06 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 109 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 41 | **** | **** | 4.43 | 4.27 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 109 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 24 | **** | **** | 4.42 | 4.24 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 107 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4.25 | ****/ 110 | **** | **** | 3.99 | 3.83 | **** |

Enrollment:   119
Questionnaires: 113                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned            Cum. GPA          Expected Grades              Reasons                    Type                      Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27    32        0.00-0.99    3          A    18        Required for Majors   0        Graduate      0        Major        0
 28-55    24        1.00-1.99    0          B     0                                       Under-grad  113        Non-major  113
 56-83     1        2.00-2.99    0          C     0        General               1
 84-150    0        3.00-3.49    1          D     0                                       #### - Means there are not enough
 Grad.     0        3.50-4.00   12          F     0        Electives             2        responses to be significant
                                            P    72
                                            I     0        Other                85
                                            ?     0

```
Course-Section: HONR 100  0101              University of Maryland                        Page 1010
Title        HONORS FORUM                   Baltimore County                             FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  STACEY, SIMON   (Instr. B)     Fall  2008                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      119
Questionnaires: 113                    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   2   0   9  16  35  23  28  3.41 1524/1649  3.41  4.12  4.28 4.11  3.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    3   0   3  10  29  41  27  3.72 1375/1648  3.72  3.98  4.23 4.16  3.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   4  95   0   0   6   4   4  3.86 ****/1375  ****  4.46  4.27 4.10  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    6  27   1   6  14  31  28  3.99 1094/1595  3.99  4.35  4.20 4.03  3.99
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 4  0   6  13  25  36  29  3.63 1159/1533  3.63  4.32  4.04 3.87  3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 5  3  8  13  33  29  22  3.42 1314/1512  3.42  3.96  4.10 3.86  3.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            4  21   0   1  16  20  51  4.38  671/1623  4.38  4.23  4.16 4.08  4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled                  4   0   0   0   0   2 107  4.98  133/1646  4.98  4.71  4.69 4.67  4.98
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 33 5  0   1   4  44  26  4.27  676/1621  4.25  4.30  4.06 3.96  4.25


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        28   0   0   0   5  15  65  4.71  573/1568  4.73  4.62  4.43 4.39  4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   28   0   0   0   2  11  72  4.82  790/1572  4.83  4.93  4.70 4.64  4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 29  0   0   1   7  18  58  4.58  570/1564  4.61  4.54  4.28 4.20  4.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     28   0   1   3   6  29  46  4.36  871/1559  4.33  4.45  4.29 4.20  4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 31 8   1   3  16  22  32  4.09  638/1352  4.10  4.03  3.98 3.86  4.10


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 21  0   5   4  11  27  45  4.12  755/1384  4.12  4.46  4.08 3.86  4.12
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 21  0   2   2  16  18  54  4.30  799/1382  4.30  4.54  4.29 4.03  4.30
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 21 0   1   1   7  19  64  4.57  609/1368  4.57  4.60  4.30 4.01  4.57
4. Were special techniques successful                  22  12   3   5  10  19  42  4.16  380/ 948  4.16  4.49  3.95 3.75  4.16


            Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 109 0  2  0   0   1   1  2.75 ****/ 243  ****  ****  4.12 4.08  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 109 3  0  0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 212  ****  ****  4.40 4.43  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           109  3   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 209  ****  ****  4.35 4.38  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  104 3   0   1   1   2   2  3.83 ****/ 555  ****  4.00  4.29 4.14  ****


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 84  2   2   1   5  10   9  3.85 ****/  88  ****  4.90  4.54 4.31  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 87 10  1  0   2   9   4  3.94 ****/  85  ****  3.80  4.47 4.30  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 86 11   0   3   3   8   2  3.56 ****/  81  ****  4.70  4.43 4.39  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    86   1   1   1   3  10  11  4.12 ****/  92  ****  4.90  4.35 4.01  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                79   3   1   1   5  14  10  4.00   83/ 288  4.00  3.90  3.68 3.54  4.00


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 110  0   2   1   0   0   0  1.33 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.06 3.72  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 110  0   2   0   0   1   0  2.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.09 3.65  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       110  2   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.47 4.36  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   109  2   1   0   0   1   0  2.50 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.38 4.37  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 107  2   0   1   0   3   0  3.50 ****/ 312  ****  ****  3.68 3.51  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 109 0   1   0   1   1   1  3.25 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.30 4.17  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    109  2   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.16 4.06  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      109  2   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.43 4.27  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       109  2   0   0   0   2   0  4.00 ****/  24  ****  ****  4.42 4.24  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     107  2   0   0   0   3   1  4.25 ****/ 110  ****  ****  3.99 3.83  ****
```

```
Course-Section: HONR 100  0101                    University of Maryland                              Page 1010
Title          HONORS FORUM                        Baltimore County                                   FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:    STACEY, SIMON   (Instr. B)              Fall   2008                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    119
Questionnaires: 113                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned            Cum. GPA         Expected Grades              Reasons                   Type                    Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    32         0.00-0.99    3        A   18        Required for Majors   0       Graduate      0         Major       0
  28-55    24         1.00-1.99    0        B    0
  56-83     1         2.00-2.99    0        C    0        General               1       Under-grad  113         Non-major 113
  84-150    0         3.00-3.49    1        D    0
  Grad.     0         3.50-4.00   12        F    0        Electives             2       #### - Means there are not enough
                                            P   72                                      responses to be significant
                                            I    0        Other                85
                                            ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: HONR 200A 0101            University of Maryland                            Page 1011
Title      TRAD CHINESE WRITERS            Baltimore County                                 FEB 11, 2009
Instructor: SHIELDS, ANNA                  Fall  2008                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      12
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   1  0  0  0  1  1  9  4.73  361/1649  4.73  4.12  4.28  4.29  4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1  0  0  1  0  2  8  4.55  510/1648  4.55  3.98  4.23  4.25  4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1  0  0  1  0  0 10  4.73  334/1375  4.73  4.46  4.27  4.37  4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  0  0  0  1  1  9  4.73  263/1595  4.73  4.35  4.20  4.22  4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  0  1 10  4.91  106/1533  4.91  4.32  4.04  4.04  4.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  2  0  0  9  4.45  451/1512  4.45  3.96  4.10  4.14  4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1  0  0  1  0  1  9  4.64  358/1623  4.64  4.23  4.16  4.21  4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1  0  0  0  0  6  5  4.45 1240/1646  4.45  4.71  4.69  4.63  4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  0  1  0  0  2  8  4.45  442/1621  4.45  4.30  4.06  4.01  4.45


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2  0  0  1  0  1  8  4.60  731/1568  4.60  4.62  4.43  4.39  4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2  0  0  0  0  0 10  5.00    1/1572  5.00  4.93  4.70  4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  1  0  0  9  4.70  434/1564  4.70  4.54  4.28  4.27  4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2  0  0  0  1  0  9  4.80  318/1559  4.80  4.45  4.29  4.33  4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3  5  0  1  1  1  1  3.50 1049/1352  3.50  4.03  3.98  4.07  3.50


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5  0  0  1  0  1  5  4.43  520/1384  4.43  4.46  4.08  3.99  4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5  0  1  0  0  1  5  4.29  812/1382  4.29  4.54  4.29  4.19  4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5  0  1  0  0  0  6  4.43  732/1368  4.43  4.60  4.30  4.21  4.43
4. Were special techniques successful                  5  2  0  0  0  2  3  4.60  170/ 948  4.60  4.49  3.95  3.89  4.60


              Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 9  0  0  0  1  1  1  4.00  388/ 555  4.00  4.00  4.29  4.33  4.00


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 11  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  88  ****  4.90  4.54  3.75  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 11  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  85  ****  3.80  4.47  3.33  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 11  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  81  ****  4.70  4.43  3.67  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    11  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  92  ****  4.90  4.35  5.00  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                10  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 288  ****  3.90  3.68  3.65  ****


              Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 11  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/ 312  ****  ****  3.68  3.59  ****


              Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     11  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 110  ****  ****  3.99  3.72  ****

                               Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades           Reasons                 Type                 Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0       0.00-0.99   0      A   7          Required for Majors  1      Graduate     0        Major        0
  28-55      0       1.00-1.99   0      B   4
  56-83      5       2.00-2.99   0      C   0          General              1      Under-grad  12        Non-major   12
  84-150     1       3.00-3.49   1      D   0
  Grad.      0       3.50-4.00   5      F   0          Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0                                      responses to be significant
                                        I   0          Other                7
                                        ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: HONR 210  0101            University of Maryland                         Page 1012
Title      GREAT BOOKS SEMINAR I          Baltimore County                               FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  MASON, RICHARD               Fall  2008                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     19
Questionnaires:  19               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   5  0  0  1  2  4  7  4.21 1007/1649  4.21  4.12  4.28  4.29  4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    5  0  1  1  5  3  4  3.57 1457/1648  3.57  3.98  4.23  4.25  3.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   5  0  0  2  3  4  5  3.86 1060/1375  3.86  4.46  4.27  4.37  3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    5  0  0  0  3  6  5  4.14  956/1595  4.14  4.35  4.20  4.22  4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 5  0  0  0  4  0 10  4.43  454/1533  4.43  4.32  4.04  4.04  4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 5 0 0  3  4  3  4  3.57 1221/1512  3.57  3.96  4.10  4.14  3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            5  0  2  2  5  4  1  3.00 1533/1623  3.00  4.23  4.16  4.21  3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  5  0  0  0  0 13  1  4.07 1517/1646  4.07  4.71  4.69  4.63  4.07
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0 0 4  5  3  3.92 1045/1621  3.92  4.30  4.06  4.01  3.92


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        7  0  0  0  1  4  7  4.50  852/1568  4.50  4.62  4.43  4.39  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   7  0  0  0  0  0 12  5.00    1/1572  5.00  4.93  4.70  4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 7 0  0  1  1  6  4  4.08 1091/1564  4.08  4.54  4.28  4.27  4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     7  0  0  2  3  1  6  3.92 1189/1559  3.92  4.45  4.29  4.33  3.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7 11 1 0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/1352  ****  4.03  3.98  4.07  ****


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0 0  0  2  1  5  4.38  571/1384  4.38  4.46  4.08  3.99  4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0 0  0  2  0  6  4.50  616/1382  4.50  4.54  4.29  4.19  4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 0 0  2  2  4  4.25  844/1368  4.25  4.60  4.30  4.21  4.25
4. Were special techniques successful                  11  5  0  1  0  1  1  3.67 ****/ 948  ****  4.49  3.95  3.89  ****


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  18  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 221  ****  ****  4.16  4.45  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 18 0 0 0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 243  ****  ****  4.12  4.47  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 16  0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33 ****/ 555  ****  4.00  4.29  4.33  ****


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 15 0 0  0  1  0  3  4.50 ****/  88  ****  4.90  4.54  3.75  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 15 3 0 0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  85  ****  3.80  4.47  3.33  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 15 3 0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  81  ****  4.70  4.43  3.67  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    15  0  0  0  1  1  2  4.25 ****/  92  ****  4.90  4.35  5.00  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                14  1  1  0  1  1  1  3.25 ****/ 288  ****  3.90  3.68  3.65  ****

                                  Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27       0      0.00-0.99    0      A  9      Required for Majors  1     Graduate      0      Major        0
 28-55       2      1.00-1.99    0      B  3
 56-83       2      2.00-2.99    0      C  0      General              0     Under-grad   19      Non-major   19
 84-150      5      3.00-3.49    2      D  0
 Grad.       0      3.50-4.00    7      F  0      Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P  0                                 responses to be significant
                                       I  0      Other               12
                                       ?  1
```

```
Course-Section: HONR 300A 0101                University of Maryland                              Page 1013
Title          ART MUSEUM: HIST/THEOR          Baltimore County                                  FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:    JACOB, PREMINDA                 Fall  2008                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    21
Questionnaires: 20                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                               Frequencies      Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                     NR NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0  0  0  0  0  7 13 4.65  446/1649 4.65 4.12 4.28 4.27 4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  0  0  4  9  7 4.15 1010/1648 4.15 3.98 4.23 4.18 4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0 11  0  0  1  1  7 4.67  401/1375 4.67 4.46 4.27 4.22 4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1  0  0  1  0  5 13 4.58  417/1595 4.58 4.35 4.20 4.21 4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0  0  3  4 13 4.50  366/1533 4.50 4.32 4.04 4.05 4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 0 2 7 9 4.21  735/1512 4.21 3.96 4.10 4.11 4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  0  1  4  5 10 4.20  883/1623 4.20 4.23 4.16 4.08 4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1  0  0  0  0  0 19 5.00    1/1646 5.00 4.71 4.69 4.67 5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 4 5 10 4.32  619/1621 4.32 4.30 4.06 4.02 4.32


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       3  0  0  1  0  8  8 4.35 1031/1568 4.35 4.62 4.43 4.39 4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  3  0  0  0  0  0 17 5.00    1/1572 5.00 4.93 4.70 4.64 5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 0 1 1 4 11 4.47  689/1564 4.47 4.54 4.28 4.25 4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    3  0  0  0  1  4 12 4.65  536/1559 4.65 4.45 4.29 4.23 4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 0 0 0 0 2 15 4.88  107/1352 4.88 4.03 3.98 3.97 4.88


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 2 9 4.82  195/1384 4.82 4.46 4.08 4.11 4.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0 0 0 1 10 4.91  243/1382 4.91 4.54 4.29 4.37 4.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 1 0 10 4.82  358/1368 4.82 4.60 4.30 4.39 4.82
4. Were special techniques successful                 9  1  0  0  0  3  7 4.70  143/ 948 4.70 4.49 3.95 4.00 4.70


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 10 0 0 0 0 2 8 4.80  34/  88 4.80 4.90 4.54 4.63 4.80
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 10 0 1 1 1 3 4 3.80  75/  85 3.80 3.80 4.47 4.55 3.80
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 3 7 4.70  34/  81 4.70 4.70 4.43 4.30 4.70
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   10  0  0  0  0  2  8 4.80   25/  92 4.80 4.90 4.35 4.46 4.80
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               10  0  2  0  1  3  4 3.70  179/ 288 3.70 3.90 3.68 3.58 3.70

              Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 19 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 312 **** **** 3.68 3.60 ****
```

```
                                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0         0.00-0.99   0     A  14            Required for Majors   2    Graduate      1        Major       0
 28-55      0         1.00-1.99   0     B   6
 56-83      3         2.00-2.99   0     C   0            General               1    Under-grad   19        Non-major  20
 84-150     6         3.00-3.49   1     D   0
 Grad.      1         3.50-4.00  11     F   0            Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0                                       responses to be significant
                                        I   0            Other                16
                                        ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: HONR 300C 0101          University of Maryland                              Page 1014
Title      POLITICS AND LITERATUR        Baltimore County                                  FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  STACEY, SIMON               Fall   2008                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    23
Questionnaires:  20              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions               NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  4  6 10  4.30  912/1649  4.30  4.12  4.28  4.27  4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0  0  1  4  5  9  4.16 1010/1648  4.16  3.98  4.23  4.18  4.16
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1  12  0  0  1  1  5  4.57  488/1375  4.57  4.46  4.27  4.22  4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   2  0  0  0  6 11  4.65  342/1595  4.65  4.35  4.20  4.21  4.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   0  0  0  0  3 16  4.84  133/1533  4.84  4.32  4.04  4.05  4.84
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1  0  0  1  4 13  4.67  263/1512  4.67  3.96  4.10  4.11  4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   2  0  0  0  3 14  4.82  159/1623  4.82  4.23  4.16  4.08  4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0  0  0  0  4 15  4.79  865/1646  4.79  4.71  4.69  4.67  4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0  0  1  5 12  4.61  279/1621  4.61  4.30  4.06  4.02  4.61


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         6   0  0  0  0  3 11  4.79  424/1568  4.79  4.62  4.43  4.39  4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    6   0  0  0  0  1 13  4.93  473/1572  4.93  4.93  4.70  4.64  4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 6   0  0  0  1  1 12  4.79  294/1564  4.79  4.54  4.28  4.25  4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      6   0  0  1  0  2 11  4.64  536/1559  4.64  4.45  4.29  4.23  4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8  5  0  2  1  2  2  3.57 1016/1352  3.57  4.03  3.98  3.97  3.57


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6   0  0  0  0  1 13  4.93  120/1384  4.93  4.46  4.08  4.11  4.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6   0  0  0  0  1 13  4.93  194/1382  4.93  4.54  4.29  4.37  4.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6  0  0  0  0  0 14  5.00    1/1368  5.00  4.60  4.30  4.39  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   6   8  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  100/ 948  4.83  4.49  3.95  4.00  4.83


              Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  17  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/ 555  ****  4.00  4.29  4.22  ****


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 15  0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/  88  5.00  4.90  4.54  4.63  5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 15 1  0  0  0  0  4  5.00 ****/  85  ****  3.80  4.47  4.55  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 15  2  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/  81  ****  4.70  4.43  4.30  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     15  0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/  92  5.00  4.90  4.35  4.46  5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 16  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00 ****/ 288  ****  3.90  3.68  3.58  ****


                                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned       Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons                Type                  Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     2      0.00-0.99   0       A   15     Required for Majors  1     Graduate    0       Major       0
 28-55     0      1.00-1.99   0       B    2
 56-83     7      2.00-2.99   0       C    0     General              3     Under-grad  20      Non-major   20
 84-150    5      3.00-3.49   3       D    0
 Grad.     0      3.50-4.00  10       F    0     Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                                responses to be significant
                                      I    0     Other               12
                                      ?    1
```