```
Course-Section: INDS 330  0101                  University of Maryland                                      Page  913
Title      WAYS OF KNOWING                       Baltimore County                                          JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:   GWIAZDA, PIOTR  (Instr. A)              Spring 2006                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     31
Questionnaires:  17                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

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

```
                                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0    0    0    0    0    1   16   4.94    95/1481   4.94  4.63  4.29  4.29  4.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0    0    0    0    0    3   14   4.82   169/1481   4.82  4.61  4.23  4.23  4.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   13    0    0    0    1    3   4.75 ****/1249   ****  5.00  4.27  4.28  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0    0    0    0    3    2   12   4.53   416/1424   4.53  4.38  4.21  4.27  4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0    0    0    0    1    2   14   4.76   131/1396   4.76  4.39  3.98  4.00  4.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0    1    0    1    3   12   4.47   333/1342   4.47  4.23  4.07  4.12  4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0    0    0    0    3    4   10   4.41   595/1459   4.41  3.74  4.16  4.17  4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0    0    0    0    0   11    6   4.35  1146/1480   4.35  4.51  4.68  4.65  4.35
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  0    0    0    2    8    6   4.25   630/1450   4.29  4.33  4.09  4.10  4.29

                                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2    0    0    0    1    3   11   4.67   559/1409   4.67  4.61  4.42  4.43  4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2    0    0    0    0    1   14   4.93   350/1407   4.97  4.92  4.69  4.67  4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2    0    0    0    1    1   13   4.80   212/1399   4.90  4.70  4.26  4.27  4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2    0    0    0    2    3   10   4.53   561/1400   4.60  4.53  4.27  4.28  4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2   1    0    0    1    3   10   4.64   187/1179   4.69  4.46  3.96  4.02  4.69

                                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3    0    0    0    1    0   13   4.86   146/1262   4.86  4.93  4.05  4.14  4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3    0    0    0    0    1   13   4.93   169/1259   4.93  4.96  4.29  4.34  4.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3   0    0    0    1    1   12   4.79   320/1256   4.79  4.89  4.30  4.34  4.79
4. Were special techniques successful                   4    5    1    0    0    4    3   4.00   394/ 788   4.00  4.13  4.00  4.07  4.00

                                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 16   0    0    0    0    0    1   5.00 ****/  68   ****  4.71  4.49  4.70  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16  0    0    0    0    0    1   5.00 ****/  69   ****  4.71  4.53  4.66  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 16   0    0    0    0    0    1   5.00 ****/  63   ****  4.50  4.44  4.56  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     16   0    0    0    0    0    1   5.00 ****/  69   ****  4.57  4.35  4.48  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 16   0    0    0    0    1    0   4.00 ****/  68   ****  4.43  3.92  4.43  ****

                                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  15   0    0    0    0    0    2   5.00 ****/  59   ****  ****  4.30  4.48  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  15   0    0    0    0    1    1   4.50 ****/  51   ****  ****  4.00  4.13  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        15   0    0    0    0    0    2   5.00 ****/  36   ****  ****  4.60  4.33  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    16   0    0    0    0    0    1   5.00 ****/  41   ****  ****  4.26  3.90  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  16   0    0    0    0    0    1   5.00 ****/  31   ****  ****  4.42  4.00  ****

                                Frequency Distribution
```

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	16	Non-major	4
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: INDS 330  0101                   University of Maryland                              Page  914
Title         WAYS OF KNOWING                    Baltimore County                                   JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:   KELBER-KAYE, JO (Instr. B)         Spring 2006                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      31
Questionnaires:  17                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                     Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                    NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  0  1 16  4.94    95/1481  4.94  4.63  4.29 4.29  4.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  3 14  4.82   169/1481  4.82  4.61  4.23 4.23  4.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  13  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  ****/1249  ****  5.00  4.27 4.28  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  3  2 12  4.53   416/1424  4.53  4.38  4.21 4.27  4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  1  2 14  4.76   131/1396  4.76  4.39  3.98 4.00  4.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  1  0  1  3 12  4.47   333/1342  4.47  4.23  4.07 4.12  4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  3  4 10  4.41   595/1459  4.41  3.74  4.16 4.17  4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0 11  6  4.35  1146/1480  4.35  4.51  4.68 4.65  4.35
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2  0  0  0  2  6  7  4.33   546/1450  4.29  4.33  4.09 4.10  4.29

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         5   0  0  0  1  2  9  4.67   559/1409  4.67  4.61  4.42 4.43  4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    5   0  0  0  0  0 12  5.00     1/1407  4.97  4.92  4.69 4.67  4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5   0  0  0  0  0 12  5.00     1/1399  4.90  4.70  4.26 4.27  4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      5   0  0  0  1  2  9  4.67   421/1400  4.60  4.53  4.27 4.28  4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6  0  0  0  0  3  8  4.73   147/1179  4.69  4.46  3.96 4.02  4.69

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3   0  0  0  1  0 13  4.86   146/1262  4.86  4.93  4.05 4.14  4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3   0  0  0  0  1 13  4.93   169/1259  4.93  4.96  4.29 4.34  4.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3  0  0  0  1  1 12  4.79   320/1256  4.79  4.89  4.30 4.34  4.79
4. Were special techniques successful                   4   5  1  0  0  4  3  4.00   394/ 788  4.00  4.13  4.00 4.07  4.00

                 Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 16  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  68  ****  4.71  4.49 4.70  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  69  ****  4.71  4.53 4.66  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 16  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  63  ****  4.50  4.44 4.56  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     16  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  69  ****  4.57  4.35 4.48  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 16  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  68  ****  4.43  3.92 4.43  ****

                 Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  15  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  ****/  59  ****  ****  4.30 4.48  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  15  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/  51  ****  ****  4.00 4.13  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        15  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  ****/  36  ****  ****  4.60 4.33  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    16  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  41  ****  ****  4.26 3.90  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  16  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  31  ****  ****  4.42 4.00  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	16	Non-major	4
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: INDS 480  0101                University of Maryland                              Page  915
Title         INDS: CAPSTONE PRJCT S             Baltimore County                                JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:   LEONARD, JEANNI                    Spring 2006                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:        9
Questionnaires:    9                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


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

              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   1   2   6  4.56  505/1481  4.43  4.63  4.29  4.45  4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   1   7  4.67  324/1481  4.46  4.61  4.23  4.32  4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   6   0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/1249  5.00  5.00  4.27  4.44  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   1   1   2   5  4.22  773/1424  4.27  4.38  4.21  4.35  4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   0   0   2   3   4  4.22  527/1396  4.13  4.39  3.98  4.09  4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   3   3   3  4.00  755/1342  4.07  4.23  4.07  4.21  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   1   2   6  4.56  402/1459  3.30  3.74  4.16  4.25  4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0   0   0   3   5  4.63  981/1480  4.61  4.51  4.68  4.74  4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  1   0   0   0   5   2  4.29  599/1450  4.35  4.33  4.09  4.28  4.29


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        5   0   0   0   1   0   3  4.50  762/1409  4.58  4.61  4.42  4.51  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   5   0   0   0   0   1   3  4.75  823/1407  4.88  4.92  4.69  4.79  4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5  0   0   0   1   0   3  4.50  567/1399  4.50  4.70  4.26  4.36  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     5   0   0   0   1   0   3  4.50  591/1400  4.45  4.53  4.27  4.38  4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5  1   0   1   0   0   2  4.00  590/1179  4.00  4.46  3.96  4.07  4.00


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  7  0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/1262  5.00  4.93  4.05  4.33  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  7  0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/1259  5.00  4.96  4.29  4.57  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7  0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/1256  5.00  4.89  4.30  4.60  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                    7  0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/ 788  4.25  4.13  4.00  4.26  ****


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material    8  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 246  ****  ****  4.20  4.45  ****


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme  2  0   0   0   0   2   5  4.71   39/  68  4.71  4.71  4.49  4.68  4.71
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 2  0   0   0   1   0   6  4.71   33/  69  4.71  4.71  4.53  4.64  4.71
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned  2  1   0   0   0   3   3  4.50   31/  63  4.50  4.50  4.44  4.49  4.50
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned      2  0   0   0   0   3   4  4.57   35/  69  4.57  4.57  4.35  4.53  4.57
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                  2  0   0   0   2   0   5  4.43   29/  68  4.43  4.43  3.92  4.10  4.43

                                           Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0        0.00-0.99    0        A    6          Required for Majors   0     Graduate      0         Major       0
  28-55      0        1.00-1.99    0        B    3
  56-83      0        2.00-2.99    1        C    0          General               1     Under-grad    9         Non-major   0
  84-150     5        3.00-3.49    3        D    0
  Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    3        F    0          Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                            P    0                                      responses to be significant
                                            I    0          Other                 6
                                            ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: INDS 480  0102              University of Maryland                                    Page  916
Title           INDS: CAPSTONE PRJCT S       Baltimore County                                        JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:     LEONARD, JEANNI (Instr. A)   Spring 2006                                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     11
Questionnaires: 11                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                               Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions               NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
        --------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  1  0  1  1  8  4.36  718/1481  4.43  4.63  4.29  4.45  4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  1  5  5  4.36  704/1481  4.46  4.61  4.23  4.32  4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  10  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/1249  5.00  5.00  4.27  4.44  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   1  0  0  1  5  4  4.30  684/1424  4.27  4.38  4.21  4.35  4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0   0  1  0  2  2  6  4.09  649/1396  4.13  4.39  3.98  4.09  4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0   1  0  1  2  2  5  4.10  695/1342  4.07  4.23  4.07  4.21  4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   2  1  3  4  0  1  2.67 1419/1459  3.30  3.74  4.16  4.25  2.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1   0  0  0  0  4  6  4.60  997/1480  4.61  4.51  4.68  4.74  4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3  0  0  0  1  3  4  4.38  504/1450  4.35  4.33  4.09  4.28  4.39

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       4   0  0  0  0  3  4  4.57  682/1409  4.58  4.61  4.42  4.51  4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  5   0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1407  4.88  4.92  4.69  4.79  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5  0  0  0  0  3  3  4.50  567/1399  4.50  4.70  4.26  4.36  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    6   0  0  0  0  3  2  4.40  704/1400  4.45  4.53  4.27  4.38  4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5  4  1  0  0  0  1  3.00  ****/1179  4.00  4.46  3.96  4.07  ****

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  0   0  0  0  0  0  11  5.00    1/1262  5.00  4.93  4.05  4.33  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  0   0  0  0  0  0  11  5.00    1/1259  5.00  4.96  4.29  4.57  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0   0  0  0  0  0  11  5.00    1/1256  5.00  4.89  4.30  4.60  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                 0   3  0  0  1  4  3  4.25  291/ 788  4.25  4.13  4.00  4.26  4.25

                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 10  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  68  4.71  4.71  4.49  4.68  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   10   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  69  4.57  4.57  4.35  4.53  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               10   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/  68  4.43  4.43  3.92  4.10  ****

                               Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: INDS 480  0102          University of Maryland                              Page  917
Title          INDS: CAPSTONE PRJCT S    Baltimore County                                  JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:    LANOUE, PATRICI (Instr. B)   Spring 2006                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    11
Questionnaires: 11                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	1	8	4.36	718/1481	4.43	4.63	4.29	4.45	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	704/1481	4.46	4.61	4.23	4.32	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1249	5.00	5.00	4.27	4.44	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	684/1424	4.27	4.38	4.21	4.35	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	649/1396	4.13	4.39	3.98	4.09	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	695/1342	4.07	4.23	4.07	4.21	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	1	3	4	0	1	2.67	1419/1459	3.30	3.74	4.16	4.25	2.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	997/1480	4.61	4.51	4.68	4.74	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	473/1450	4.35	4.33	4.09	4.28	4.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	559/1409	4.58	4.61	4.42	4.51	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1407	4.88	4.92	4.69	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1399	4.50	4.70	4.26	4.36	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1400	4.45	4.53	4.27	4.38	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.93	4.05	4.33	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.96	4.29	4.57	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.89	4.30	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	291/ 788	4.25	4.13	4.00	4.26	4.25
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	4.71	4.71	4.49	4.68	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	4.57	4.57	4.35	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	4.43	4.43	3.92	4.10	****

```
                                    Frequency Distribution
```

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	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	2	Under-grad	11	Non-major	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	1			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						