

Course-Section: HONR 200 01
 Title Interdisc Honors Semin
 Instructor: Pincus, Fred L
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 866
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	222/1447	4.32	4.40	4.31	4.31	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	5	6	4.33	766/1447	3.83	3.95	4.27	4.23	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1241	4.04	4.16	4.33	4.35	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	555/1402	3.91	4.28	4.24	4.24	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1358	4.28	4.34	4.11	4.12	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	312/1316	4.11	4.22	4.14	4.08	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	459/1427	3.69	3.84	4.19	4.14	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	436/1447	4.84	4.52	4.69	4.70	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	454/1434	4.13	4.38	4.10	3.97	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	521/1387	4.33	4.51	4.46	4.42	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1387	4.80	4.85	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	510/1386	4.21	4.38	4.32	4.24	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	420/1380	4.18	4.44	4.32	4.30	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1087/1193	3.95	4.11	4.02	4.04	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1172	4.40	4.53	4.15	4.12	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	219/1182	4.67	4.72	4.35	4.30	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	243/1170	4.59	4.68	4.38	4.32	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	630/ 800	2.67	3.77	4.06	4.01	3.60
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 66	4.66	4.63	4.58	4.43	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	42/ 62	4.08	4.28	4.56	4.28	4.64
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	39/ 58	3.57	3.75	4.41	3.79	4.36
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	22/ 65	4.25	4.33	4.42	4.36	4.82
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	25/ 64	3.67	3.55	4.09	3.70	4.45

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	12	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	13	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HONR 200 02
 Title Interdisc Honors Semin
 Instructor: Worden,Frederic
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 867
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	9	11	4.41	723/1447	4.32	4.40	4.31	4.31	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	6	9	6	3.91	1141/1447	3.83	3.95	4.27	4.23	3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	2	1	13	4	3.95	956/1241	4.04	4.16	4.33	4.35	3.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	10	7	4.00	976/1402	3.91	4.28	4.24	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	4	8	9	4.09	751/1358	4.28	4.34	4.11	4.12	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	6	12	4	3.91	910/1316	4.11	4.22	4.14	4.08	3.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	5	11	4	3.86	1110/1427	3.69	3.84	4.19	4.14	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	243/1447	4.84	4.52	4.69	4.70	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	15	4	4.10	802/1434	4.13	4.38	4.10	3.97	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	798/1387	4.33	4.51	4.46	4.42	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1387	4.80	4.85	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	8	12	4.60	510/1386	4.21	4.38	4.32	4.24	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	604/1380	4.18	4.44	4.32	4.30	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	68/1193	3.95	4.11	4.02	4.04	4.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	710/1172	4.40	4.53	4.15	4.12	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	271/1182	4.67	4.72	4.35	4.30	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1170	4.59	4.68	4.38	4.32	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	12	6	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	****/ 800	2.67	3.77	4.06	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	33/ 66	4.66	4.63	4.58	4.43	4.78
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	4	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 62	4.08	4.28	4.56	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	6	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 58	3.57	3.75	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	35/ 65	4.25	4.33	4.42	4.36	4.56
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	4	4	1	3.67	46/ 64	3.67	3.55	4.09	3.70	3.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	19
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 8	Graduate	0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	23
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0		
			? 2	Other	0

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	408/1447	4.32	4.40	4.31	4.31	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	1	5	9	4.00	1053/1447	3.83	3.95	4.27	4.23	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	866/1241	4.04	4.16	4.33	4.35	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	0	2	2	10	4.33	685/1402	3.91	4.28	4.24	4.24	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	158/1358	4.28	4.34	4.11	4.12	4.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	5	12	4.50	392/1316	4.11	4.22	4.14	4.08	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	398/1427	3.69	3.84	4.19	4.14	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	978/1447	4.84	4.52	4.69	4.70	4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	190/1434	4.13	4.38	4.10	3.97	4.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	1000/1387	4.33	4.51	4.46	4.42	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1387	4.80	4.85	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	691/1386	4.21	4.38	4.32	4.24	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	463/1380	4.18	4.44	4.32	4.30	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	8	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1193	3.95	4.11	4.02	4.04	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1172	4.40	4.53	4.15	4.12	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	198/1182	4.67	4.72	4.35	4.30	4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	327/1170	4.59	4.68	4.38	4.32	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	9	6	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 800	2.67	3.77	4.06	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/ 66	4.66	4.63	4.58	4.43	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	6	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 62	4.08	4.28	4.56	4.28	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	12	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	3.57	3.75	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	3	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	23/ 65	4.25	4.33	4.42	4.36	4.80
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	5	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	16/ 64	3.67	3.55	4.09	3.70	4.75

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 14	Required for Majors	12
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 3	Graduate	0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	Under-grad	19
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0	Non-major	19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1		
			Other		0

Course-Section: HONR 200 04
 Title Interdisc Honors Semin
 Instructor: Spitz, Ellen H (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 869
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	6	3	3.85	1206/1447	4.32	4.40	4.31	4.31	3.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	4	2	3.46	1333/1447	3.83	3.95	4.27	4.23	3.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	4	2	3.38	1292/1402	3.91	4.28	4.24	4.24	3.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	4	4	3.77	1015/1358	4.28	4.34	4.11	4.12	3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	4	4	3.77	991/1316	4.11	4.22	4.14	4.08	3.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	0	5	3	1	2.77	1377/1427	3.69	3.84	4.19	4.14	2.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	673/1447	4.84	4.52	4.69	4.70	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	2	5	2	3.55	1218/1434	4.13	4.38	4.10	3.97	3.72
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1105/1387	4.33	4.51	4.46	4.42	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1055/1387	4.80	4.85	4.73	4.71	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	1	0	4	0	3.60	1237/1386	4.21	4.38	4.32	4.24	3.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	1270/1380	4.18	4.44	4.32	4.30	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1193	3.95	4.11	4.02	4.04	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	4	3	4.00	710/1172	4.40	4.53	4.15	4.12	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	660/1182	4.67	4.72	4.35	4.30	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	839/1170	4.59	4.68	4.38	4.32	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	1	2	2	0	0	2.20	789/ 800	2.67	3.77	4.06	4.01	2.20
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	56/ 66	4.66	4.63	4.58	4.43	4.27
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	5	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	57/ 62	4.08	4.28	4.56	4.28	3.33
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	5	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	54/ 58	3.57	3.75	4.41	3.79	3.17
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	2	2	4	3.55	59/ 65	4.25	4.33	4.42	4.36	3.55
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	4	1	2	2	2	2.73	61/ 64	3.67	3.55	4.09	3.70	2.73

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: HONR 200 04
 Title Interdisc Honors Semin
 Instructor: Freyman, Jay M (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 870
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	6	3	3.85	1206/1447	4.32	4.40	4.31	4.31	3.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	4	2	3.46	1333/1447	3.83	3.95	4.27	4.23	3.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	4	2	3.38	1292/1402	3.91	4.28	4.24	4.24	3.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	4	4	3.77	1015/1358	4.28	4.34	4.11	4.12	3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	4	4	3.77	991/1316	4.11	4.22	4.14	4.08	3.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	0	5	3	1	2.77	1377/1427	3.69	3.84	4.19	4.14	2.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	673/1447	4.84	4.52	4.69	4.70	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	983/1434	4.13	4.38	4.10	3.97	3.72
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1176/1387	4.33	4.51	4.46	4.42	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1203/1387	4.80	4.85	4.73	4.71	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1174/1386	4.21	4.38	4.32	4.24	3.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1218/1380	4.18	4.44	4.32	4.30	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1193	3.95	4.11	4.02	4.04	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	4	3	4.00	710/1172	4.40	4.53	4.15	4.12	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	660/1182	4.67	4.72	4.35	4.30	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	839/1170	4.59	4.68	4.38	4.32	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	1	2	2	0	0	2.20	789/ 800	2.67	3.77	4.06	4.01	2.20
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	56/ 66	4.66	4.63	4.58	4.43	4.27
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	5	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	57/ 62	4.08	4.28	4.56	4.28	3.33
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	5	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	54/ 58	3.57	3.75	4.41	3.79	3.17
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	2	2	4	3.55	59/ 65	4.25	4.33	4.42	4.36	3.55
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	4	1	2	2	2	2.73	61/ 64	3.67	3.55	4.09	3.70	2.73

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: HONR 211 1
 Title Great Books Seminar II
 Instructor: Spitz, Ellen H
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 871
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	309/1447	4.75	4.40	4.31	4.31	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	662/1447	4.42	3.95	4.27	4.23	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.16	4.33	4.35	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	448/1402	4.55	4.28	4.24	4.24	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.34	4.11	4.12	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	4	6	4.17	700/1316	4.17	4.22	4.14	4.08	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	1	3	5	4.00	971/1427	4.00	3.84	4.19	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	1079/1447	4.50	4.52	4.69	4.70	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	206/1434	4.70	4.38	4.10	3.97	4.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	200/1387	4.90	4.51	4.46	4.42	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.85	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.38	4.32	4.24	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.44	4.32	4.30	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	2	0	0	1	3	3.50	960/1193	3.50	4.11	4.02	4.04	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.53	4.15	4.12	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.72	4.35	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	364/1170	4.78	4.68	4.38	4.32	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	169/ 800	4.57	3.77	4.06	4.01	4.57
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	29/ 66	4.82	4.63	4.58	4.43	4.82
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	2	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	44/ 62	4.56	4.28	4.56	4.28	4.56
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	35/ 58	4.44	3.75	4.41	3.79	4.44
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	30/ 65	4.73	4.33	4.42	4.36	4.73
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	1	1	3	3	3	3.55	51/ 64	3.55	3.55	4.09	3.70	3.55

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 1						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	3	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	640/1447	4.46	4.40	4.31	4.31	4.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	6	4	3.85	1182/1447	3.85	3.95	4.27	4.23	3.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	2	3.85	1028/1241	3.85	4.16	4.33	4.35	3.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	459/1402	4.54	4.28	4.24	4.24	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	563/1358	4.31	4.34	4.11	4.12	4.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	512/1316	4.38	4.22	4.14	4.08	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	5	5	4.00	971/1427	4.00	3.84	4.19	4.14	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	4	4.31	1223/1447	4.31	4.52	4.69	4.70	4.31	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	341/1434	4.63	4.38	4.10	3.97	4.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	641/1387	4.64	4.51	4.46	4.42	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	844/1387	4.73	4.85	4.73	4.71	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	839/1386	4.36	4.38	4.32	4.24	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	463/1380	4.65	4.44	4.32	4.30	4.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	262/1193	4.55	4.11	4.02	4.04	4.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1172	****	4.53	4.15	4.12	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1182	****	4.72	4.35	4.30	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1170	****	4.68	4.38	4.32	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	2	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 189	5.00	5.00	4.34	4.47	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	26/ 192	4.86	4.86	4.34	4.38	4.86	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	90/ 186	4.57	4.57	4.48	4.57	4.57	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	91/ 187	4.57	4.57	4.33	4.46	4.57	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	107/ 168	4.00	4.00	4.20	4.15	4.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 13	Non-major 13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 1			

Course-Section: HONR 216 01
 Title Phage Hunters II
 Instructor: Caruso, Steven M (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 873
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	640/1447	4.46	4.40	4.31	4.31	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	6	4	3.85	1182/1447	3.85	3.95	4.27	4.23	3.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	2	3.85	1028/1241	3.85	4.16	4.33	4.35	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	459/1402	4.54	4.28	4.24	4.24	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	563/1358	4.31	4.34	4.11	4.12	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	512/1316	4.38	4.22	4.14	4.08	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	5	5	4.00	971/1427	4.00	3.84	4.19	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	4	4.31	1223/1447	4.31	4.52	4.69	4.70	4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	290/1434	4.63	4.38	4.10	3.97	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	566/1387	4.64	4.51	4.46	4.42	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	946/1387	4.73	4.85	4.73	4.71	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	733/1386	4.36	4.38	4.32	4.24	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	506/1380	4.65	4.44	4.32	4.30	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	262/1193	4.55	4.11	4.02	4.04	4.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1172	****	4.53	4.15	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1182	****	4.72	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1170	****	4.68	4.38	4.32	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	2	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 189	5.00	5.00	4.34	4.47	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	26/ 192	4.86	4.86	4.34	4.38	4.86
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	90/ 186	4.57	4.57	4.48	4.57	4.57
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	91/ 187	4.57	4.57	4.33	4.46	4.57
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	107/ 168	4.00	4.00	4.20	4.15	4.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 13	Non-major 13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 1			

Course-Section: HONR 216 01
 Title Phage Hunters II
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 874
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	640/1447	4.46	4.40	4.31	4.31	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	6	4	3.85	1182/1447	3.85	3.95	4.27	4.23	3.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	2	3.85	1028/1241	3.85	4.16	4.33	4.35	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	459/1402	4.54	4.28	4.24	4.24	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	563/1358	4.31	4.34	4.11	4.12	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	512/1316	4.38	4.22	4.14	4.08	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	5	5	4.00	971/1427	4.00	3.84	4.19	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	4	4.31	1223/1447	4.31	4.52	4.69	4.70	4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	117/1434	4.63	4.38	4.10	3.97	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1387	4.64	4.51	4.46	4.42	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1387	4.73	4.85	4.73	4.71	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1386	4.36	4.38	4.32	4.24	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1380	4.65	4.44	4.32	4.30	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1193	4.55	4.11	4.02	4.04	4.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1172	****	4.53	4.15	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1182	****	4.72	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1170	****	4.68	4.38	4.32	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	2	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 189	5.00	5.00	4.34	4.47	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	26/ 192	4.86	4.86	4.34	4.38	4.86
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	90/ 186	4.57	4.57	4.48	4.57	4.57
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	91/ 187	4.57	4.57	4.33	4.46	4.57
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	107/ 168	4.00	4.00	4.20	4.15	4.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 13	Non-major 13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 1			

Course-Section: HONR 300 01
 Title General Honors Seminar
 Instructor: Radtke,Katherin
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 875
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	408/1447	4.36	4.40	4.31	4.32	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	532/1447	4.03	3.95	4.27	4.23	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	8	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1241	4.35	4.16	4.33	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	314/1402	4.43	4.28	4.24	4.24	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	299/1358	4.30	4.34	4.11	4.10	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	166/1316	4.25	4.22	4.14	4.13	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	866/1427	3.87	3.84	4.19	4.15	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	2	8	1	3.91	1405/1447	4.35	4.52	4.69	4.65	3.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	93/1434	4.41	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	566/1387	4.56	4.51	4.46	4.44	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1387	4.92	4.85	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1386	4.43	4.38	4.32	4.30	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	463/1380	4.50	4.44	4.32	4.32	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1193	4.12	4.11	4.02	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1172	4.57	4.53	4.15	4.24	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	198/1182	4.71	4.72	4.35	4.42	4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1170	4.76	4.68	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	169/ 800	4.61	3.77	4.06	4.12	4.57
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 66	4.44	4.63	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 62	4.54	4.28	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	3.63	3.75	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	4.33	4.33	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 64	3.25	3.55	4.09	3.38	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 12	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 0						

Course-Section: HONR 300 02
 Title General Honors Seminar
 Instructor: Provencher,Deni
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 876
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	190/1447	4.36	4.40	4.31	4.32	4.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	352/1447	4.03	3.95	4.27	4.23	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	282/1241	4.35	4.16	4.33	4.33	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	121/1402	4.43	4.28	4.24	4.24	4.87
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	387/1358	4.30	4.34	4.11	4.10	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	292/1316	4.25	4.22	4.14	4.13	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	596/1427	3.87	3.84	4.19	4.15	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	4	4.27	1246/1447	4.35	4.52	4.69	4.65	4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	149/1434	4.41	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.77
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	566/1387	4.56	4.51	4.46	4.44	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1387	4.92	4.85	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	431/1386	4.43	4.38	4.32	4.30	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	143/1380	4.50	4.44	4.32	4.32	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	65/1193	4.12	4.11	4.02	4.05	4.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	181/1172	4.57	4.53	4.15	4.24	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1182	4.71	4.72	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1170	4.76	4.68	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	159/ 800	4.61	3.77	4.06	4.12	4.60
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 66	4.44	4.63	4.58	4.17	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	5	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	26/ 62	4.54	4.28	4.56	4.21	4.83
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	2	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	25/ 65	4.33	4.33	4.42	4.01	4.78
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	3	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	42/ 64	3.25	3.55	4.09	3.38	3.88

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HONR 300 03
 Title General Honors Seminar
 Instructor: Orgelfinger,Gai
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 877
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	287/1447	4.36	4.40	4.31	4.32	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	479/1447	4.03	3.95	4.27	4.23	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	107/1402	4.43	4.28	4.24	4.24	4.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	97/1358	4.30	4.34	4.11	4.10	4.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	239/1316	4.25	4.22	4.14	4.13	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	398/1427	3.87	3.84	4.19	4.15	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1447	4.35	4.52	4.69	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	190/1434	4.41	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1387	4.56	4.51	4.46	4.44	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1387	4.92	4.85	4.73	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	316/1386	4.43	4.38	4.32	4.30	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	193/1380	4.50	4.44	4.32	4.32	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	131/1193	4.12	4.11	4.02	4.05	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	203/1172	4.57	4.53	4.15	4.24	4.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	521/1182	4.71	4.72	4.35	4.42	4.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1170	4.76	4.68	4.38	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	133/ 800	4.61	3.77	4.06	4.12	4.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 66	4.44	4.63	4.58	4.17	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 62	4.54	4.28	4.56	4.21	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	3.63	3.75	4.41	2.87	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 65	4.33	4.33	4.42	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 64	3.25	3.55	4.09	3.38	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	9	Non-major	9
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HONR 300 04
 Title General Honors Seminar
 Instructor: Mason, Richard S
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 878
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	4	7	3.94	1118/1447	4.36	4.40	4.31	4.32	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	6	5	2	3.24	1374/1447	4.03	3.95	4.27	4.23	3.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	11	3	3.94	962/1241	4.35	4.16	4.33	4.33	3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	6	4.18	845/1402	4.43	4.28	4.24	4.24	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	5	5	3.75	1022/1358	4.30	4.34	4.11	4.10	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	9	3	3.88	927/1316	4.25	4.22	4.14	4.13	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	4	6	4	0	2.87	1370/1427	3.87	3.84	4.19	4.15	2.87
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	15	1	4.06	1343/1447	4.35	4.52	4.69	4.65	4.06
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	3	7	4	3.93	942/1434	4.41	4.38	4.10	4.09	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	8	6	4.18	1098/1387	4.56	4.51	4.46	4.44	4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	732/1387	4.92	4.85	4.73	4.71	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	8	5	4.00	1047/1386	4.43	4.38	4.32	4.30	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	8	6	4.18	952/1380	4.50	4.44	4.32	4.32	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	1	3	1	1	1	2.71	1141/1193	4.12	4.11	4.02	4.05	2.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	580/1172	4.57	4.53	4.15	4.24	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	470/1182	4.71	4.72	4.35	4.42	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	508/1170	4.76	4.68	4.38	4.49	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 800	4.61	3.77	4.06	4.12	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	4.44	4.63	4.58	4.17	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	4.33	4.33	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	3.25	3.55	4.09	3.38	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HONR 300 05
 Title General Honors Seminar
 Instructor: Messinger, Seth
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 879
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	3	7	5	6	3.55	1327/1447	4.36	4.40	4.31	4.32	3.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	11	2	4	3.18	1380/1447	4.03	3.95	4.27	4.23	3.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	6	7	5	3.55	1249/1402	4.43	4.28	4.24	4.24	3.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	4	1	8	8	3.82	980/1358	4.30	4.34	4.11	4.10	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	4	7	5	4	3.33	1200/1316	4.25	4.22	4.14	4.13	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	6	6	6	4	3.36	1303/1427	3.87	3.84	4.19	4.15	3.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	11	4.50	1079/1447	4.35	4.52	4.69	4.65	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	7	5	3	3.73	1103/1434	4.41	4.38	4.10	4.09	3.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	4	2	8	4.29	1015/1387	4.56	4.51	4.46	4.44	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	1	0	0	13	4.79	814/1387	4.92	4.85	4.73	4.71	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	2	3	6	3	3.71	1205/1386	4.43	4.38	4.32	4.30	3.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	2	2	6	4	3.86	1128/1380	4.50	4.44	4.32	4.32	3.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	12	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1193	4.12	4.11	4.02	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	1	5	4	4.00	710/1172	4.57	4.53	4.15	4.24	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	595/1182	4.71	4.72	4.35	4.42	4.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	804/1170	4.76	4.68	4.38	4.49	4.18
4. Were special techniques successful	11	10	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 800	4.61	3.77	4.06	4.12	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	60/ 66	4.44	4.63	4.58	4.17	3.88
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	3	0	5	4.25	51/ 62	4.54	4.28	4.56	4.21	4.25
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	53/ 58	3.63	3.75	4.41	2.87	3.63
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	55/ 65	4.33	4.33	4.42	4.01	3.88
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	2	2	2	1	1	2.63	62/ 64	3.25	3.55	4.09	3.38	2.63

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	18	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	1	Other	0				
				?	2						