

Course-Section: FYS 101 0101
 Title FIRST YEAR SEMINAR (AH)
 Instructor: BERMAN, JESSICA
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 893
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1	0	1	2	3.40	1545/1674	3.40	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1146/1674	4.00	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	2	4.20	894/1423	4.20	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	0	1	3.00	1557/1609	3.00	4.23	4.22	4.05	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	265/1585	4.60	4.04	3.96	3.88	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1332/1535	3.40	4.08	4.08	3.89	3.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1403/1651	3.60	4.20	4.18	4.10	3.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1135/1673	4.60	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1004/1586	4.40	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1309/1585	4.40	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	998/1582	4.20	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	819/1575	4.40	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1290/1380	2.75	3.94	3.94	3.78	2.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	191/1520	4.80	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1024/1515	4.00	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	563/1511	4.60	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	835/ 994	3.25	3.97	3.94	3.73	3.25	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	86/ 278	4.50	4.21	4.19	3.97	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	137/ 260	4.50	4.43	4.46	4.41	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 259	5.00	4.21	4.33	4.19	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 233	5.00	4.36	4.20	4.00	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 103	5.00	4.39	4.41	4.33	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	46/ 101	4.75	4.33	4.48	4.18	4.75	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	80/ 95	3.50	4.15	4.31	3.99	3.50	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	86/ 99	3.75	4.36	4.39	4.10	3.75	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	47/ 97	4.25	3.76	4.14	3.69	4.25	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	73/ 76	2.00	3.36	3.98	3.32	2.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	50/ 77	3.50	3.65	3.93	3.42	3.50	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	41/ 48	3.50	3.86	4.12	4.00	3.50	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	53/ 61	3.00	4.03	4.09	3.87	3.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	40/ 52	3.50	4.21	4.26	3.91	3.50	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	36/ 50	4.00	4.23	4.44	4.39	4.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	23/ 35	4.00	4.22	4.36	3.92	4.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	16/ 31	4.50	4.25	4.34	3.88	4.50	

Course-Section: FYS 101 0101
 Title FIRST YEAR SEMINAR (AH)
 Instructor: BERMAN, JESSICA
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 893
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: FYS 101B 0101
 Title LIVING/DYING ANC ATHEN
 Instructor: GOLDBERG, MARIL
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 894
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	4	6	5	3.88	1340/1674	3.88	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	3	7	3	3.50	1499/1674	3.50	4.26	4.23	4.16	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	5	7	4.06	980/1423	4.06	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.06	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	9	4	3.94	1185/1609	3.94	4.23	4.22	4.05	3.94	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	2	4	5	3.60	1164/1585	3.60	4.04	3.96	3.88	3.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	5	5	3.80	1110/1535	3.80	4.08	4.08	3.89	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	2	1	6	3	3.27	1522/1651	3.27	4.20	4.18	4.10	3.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	778/1673	4.87	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	2	6	2	3.67	1297/1656	3.67	4.06	4.07	3.96	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	3	9	3	3.81	1397/1586	3.81	4.43	4.43	4.37	3.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	1047/1585	4.69	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	4	8	2	3.56	1385/1582	3.56	4.30	4.26	4.17	3.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	6	6	3.88	1230/1575	3.88	4.32	4.27	4.17	3.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	4	8	3	3.75	902/1380	3.75	3.94	3.94	3.78	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	2	7	3	3.64	1104/1520	3.64	4.14	4.01	3.76	3.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	3	5	5	4.00	1024/1515	4.00	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	3	6	4	3.86	1166/1511	3.86	4.37	4.27	4.00	3.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	1	0	5	4	1	3.36	799/ 994	3.36	3.97	3.94	3.73	3.36	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	5	5	3	3.64	47/ 76	3.64	3.36	3.98	3.32	3.64	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	1	1	3	7	2	3.57	48/ 77	3.57	3.65	3.93	3.42	3.57	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	4	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	32/ 53	4.40	4.19	4.45	4.34	4.40	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	4	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	31/ 48	3.90	3.86	4.12	4.00	3.90	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	6	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	34/ 49	4.00	3.74	4.27	4.30	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: FYS 101C 0101
 Title BEETHOVEN'S MUSIC & CU
 Instructor: COX, FRANKLIN
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 895
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	6	4	4.27	928/1674	4.27	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	1	3.73	1388/1674	3.73	4.26	4.23	4.16	3.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	901/1423	4.18	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.18	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	3	3.91	1224/1609	3.91	4.23	4.22	4.05	3.91	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	2	3	3	3.27	1356/1585	3.27	4.04	3.96	3.88	3.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	4	2	3.27	1378/1535	3.27	4.08	4.08	3.89	3.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	4	2	3.64	1390/1651	3.64	4.20	4.18	4.10	3.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	1103/1673	4.64	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	794/1656	4.20	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	1198/1586	4.18	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.18	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	567/1585	4.91	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	5	3	3	3.82	1266/1582	3.82	4.30	4.26	4.17	3.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	537/1575	4.64	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	2	0	1	8	4.36	406/1380	4.36	3.94	3.94	3.78	4.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	2	4	3.55	1153/1520	3.55	4.14	4.01	3.76	3.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	4	2	3	3.70	1239/1515	3.70	4.37	4.24	3.97	3.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	3	2	4	3.80	1194/1511	3.80	4.37	4.27	4.00	3.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	2	1	3	1	0	2.43	972/ 994	2.43	3.97	3.94	3.73	2.43	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	71/ 103	4.25	4.39	4.41	4.33	4.25	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	72/ 101	4.00	4.33	4.48	4.18	4.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	78/ 95	3.60	4.15	4.31	3.99	3.60	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	85/ 99	3.80	4.36	4.39	4.10	3.80	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	76/ 97	3.60	3.76	4.14	3.69	3.60	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.87	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.39	****	

Course-Section: FYS 101C 0101
 Title BEETHOVEN'S MUSIC & CU
 Instructor: COX, FRANKLIN
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 895
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	11	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FYS 101D 0101
 Title TURNING TO ONE ANOTHER
 Instructor: LEE, DIANE
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 896
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1	11	4.77	287/1674	4.77	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	259/1674	4.77	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1423	****	4.36	4.27	4.16	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	490/1609	4.50	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	1	8	4.15	652/1585	4.15	4.04	3.96	3.88	4.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	578/1535	4.33	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	768/1651	4.33	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	814/1673	4.85	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	144/1656	4.82	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	474/1586	4.77	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.60	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	208/1582	4.85	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	658/1575	4.54	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	114/1380	4.80	3.94	3.94	3.78	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	107/1520	4.92	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	277/1515	4.85	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.00	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	111/ 994	4.77	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.77	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	3.97	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	1	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	34/ 103	4.91	4.39	4.41	4.33	4.91	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	34/ 101	4.92	4.33	4.48	4.18	4.92	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	58/ 95	4.25	4.15	4.31	3.99	4.25	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	38/ 99	4.75	4.36	4.39	4.10	4.75	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	44/ 97	4.33	3.76	4.14	3.69	4.33	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.87	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: FYS 101D 0101
 Title TURNING TO ONE ANOTHER
 Instructor: LEE, DIANE
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 896
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	4	Under-grad	13	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: FYS 101E 0101
 Title SEPTEMBER 11TH
 Instructor: LOVIGLIO, JASON
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 897
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	176/1674	4.88	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	1009/1674	4.19	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.19	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	459/1423	4.60	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	3	9	4.25	852/1609	4.25	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	198/1585	4.71	4.04	3.96	3.88	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	355/1535	4.53	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	4	3	2	5	3.25	1525/1651	3.25	4.20	4.18	4.10	3.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	359/1656	4.53	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	2	6	6	3.94	1349/1586	3.94	4.43	4.43	4.37	3.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	397/1585	4.94	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	6	6	4.06	1099/1582	4.06	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.06	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	467/1575	4.69	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	622/1380	4.10	3.94	3.94	3.78	4.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	94/1520	4.94	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.94	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	0	2	13	4.69	463/1515	4.69	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.69	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	0	15	4.81	346/1511	4.81	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.81	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	167/ 994	4.60	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.60	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	3.97	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 103	5.00	4.39	4.41	4.33	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 101	5.00	4.33	4.48	4.18	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	32/ 95	4.86	4.15	4.31	3.99	4.86	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 99	5.00	4.36	4.39	4.10	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	65/ 97	3.86	3.76	4.14	3.69	3.86	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.91	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A 3	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 12			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 7	Under-grad 17	Non-major 8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			

I	0	Other	1
?	0		

Course-Section: FYS 102A 0101
 Title IMAGES OF MADNESS
 Instructor: TICE, CAROLYN
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 898
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1	1	4	10	4.44	719/1674	4.44	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	352/1674	4.69	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	648/1423	4.44	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	420/1609	4.56	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	557/1585	4.25	4.04	3.96	3.88	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	373/1535	4.50	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	795/1651	4.31	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	15	4.81	868/1673	4.81	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	0	5	6	4.33	615/1656	4.33	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	150/1586	4.93	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	397/1585	4.93	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	339/1582	4.73	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	279/1575	4.80	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	93/1380	4.87	3.94	3.94	3.78	4.87	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	309/1520	4.64	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	0	12	4.71	432/1515	4.71	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.00	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	1	0	1	5	4	4.00	474/ 994	4.00	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.69	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	16	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FYS 102B 0101
 Title CONTRASTING VIS SOCIET
 Instructor: MITCH, DAVID F
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 899
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1	1	7	3	4.00	1196/1674	4.00	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	4	2	3	3.25	1576/1674	3.25	4.26	4.23	4.16	3.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	1	0	3	3	3.75	1173/1423	3.75	4.36	4.27	4.16	3.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	941/1609	4.18	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	482/1585	4.33	4.04	3.96	3.88	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	2	6	3.92	1006/1535	3.92	4.08	4.08	3.89	3.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	1214/1651	3.92	4.20	4.18	4.10	3.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	2	4.17	1484/1673	4.17	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	1	5	4	0	3.30	1455/1656	3.30	4.06	4.07	3.96	3.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	3	6	1	3.42	1497/1586	3.42	4.43	4.43	4.37	3.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	567/1585	4.91	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	2	6	1	3.33	1457/1582	3.33	4.30	4.26	4.17	3.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	6	2	3.75	1289/1575	3.75	4.32	4.27	4.17	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	1217/1380	3.00	3.94	3.94	3.78	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	6	2	3.67	1092/1520	3.67	4.14	4.01	3.76	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	2	5	2	2	3.17	1401/1515	3.17	4.37	4.24	3.97	3.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	896/1511	4.25	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	7	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	474/ 994	4.00	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	42/ 103	4.75	4.39	4.41	4.33	4.75	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	4	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	94/ 101	3.43	4.33	4.48	4.18	3.43	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	78/ 95	3.60	4.15	4.31	3.99	3.60	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	7	1	3.67	88/ 99	3.67	4.36	4.39	4.10	3.67	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	3	3	4	2	3.42	82/ 97	3.42	3.76	4.14	3.69	3.42	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.91	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	3	A	5	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	12	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FYS 102C 0101
 Title SOC JUSTICE IN SCHOOLI
 Instructor: OLIVA, LINDA M. (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 900
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	5	2	4.00	1196/1674	4.00	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	4	1	3.63	1441/1674	3.63	4.26	4.23	4.16	3.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1423	****	4.36	4.27	4.16	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	1018/1609	4.11	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	2	2	1	2.88	1495/1585	2.88	4.04	3.96	3.88	2.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	870/1535	4.00	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	866/1651	4.25	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	1203/1673	4.50	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	5	0	3.71	1267/1656	3.86	4.06	4.07	3.96	3.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1442/1586	3.67	4.43	4.43	4.37	3.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	1275/1585	4.39	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.39	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	1129/1582	3.92	4.30	4.26	4.17	3.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	1090/1575	4.06	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.06	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	986/1380	3.51	3.94	3.94	3.78	3.51	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	743/1520	4.14	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	971/1515	4.14	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	865/1511	4.29	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	420/ 994	4.14	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.14	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	67/ 103	4.33	4.39	4.41	4.33	4.33	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	97/ 101	3.33	4.33	4.48	4.18	3.33	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	62/ 95	4.00	4.15	4.31	3.99	4.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	59/ 99	4.33	4.36	4.39	4.10	4.33	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	85/ 97	3.33	3.76	4.14	3.69	3.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: FYS 102C 0101
 Title SOC JUSTICE IN SCHOOLI
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 901
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	5	2	4.00	1196/1674	4.00	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	4	1	3.63	1441/1674	3.63	4.26	4.23	4.16	3.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1423	****	4.36	4.27	4.16	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	1018/1609	4.11	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	2	2	1	2.88	1495/1585	2.88	4.04	3.96	3.88	2.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	870/1535	4.00	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	866/1651	4.25	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	1203/1673	4.50	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	955/1656	3.86	4.06	4.07	3.96	3.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1442/1586	3.67	4.43	4.43	4.37	3.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1354/1585	4.39	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.39	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1255/1582	3.92	4.30	4.26	4.17	3.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1138/1575	4.06	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.06	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1094/1380	3.51	3.94	3.94	3.78	3.51	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	743/1520	4.14	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	971/1515	4.14	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	865/1511	4.29	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	420/ 994	4.14	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.14	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	67/ 103	4.33	4.39	4.41	4.33	4.33	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	97/ 101	3.33	4.33	4.48	4.18	3.33	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	62/ 95	4.00	4.15	4.31	3.99	4.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	59/ 99	4.33	4.36	4.39	4.10	4.33	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	85/ 97	3.33	3.76	4.14	3.69	3.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	1

			Required for Majors	2	Graduate
			General	7	Under-grad
			Electives	0	### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			Other	0	

Course-Section: FYS 103A 0101
 Title PHYSICS THROUGH DECADE
 Instructor: ROUS, PHILIP
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 902
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	8	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	243/1674	4.80	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	737/1674	4.40	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	8	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1423	****	4.36	4.27	4.16	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	1	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	1018/1609	4.11	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	1	3	4	3.80	1006/1585	3.80	4.04	3.96	3.88	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	1	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	154/1535	4.78	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	1	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	613/1651	4.44	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	1267/1673	4.44	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.44	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	185/1656	4.75	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	389/1586	4.80	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	567/1585	4.90	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	394/1582	4.70	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	3	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	463/1380	4.29	3.94	3.94	3.78	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	0	0	0	4	3.67	1092/1520	3.67	4.14	4.01	3.76	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	2	0	2	0	3	3.29	1374/1515	3.29	4.37	4.24	3.97	3.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	563/1511	4.60	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	3.73	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	3.97	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.19	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	48/ 103	4.67	4.39	4.41	4.33	4.67	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.34	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	18	Non-major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	0	
?	0			

Course-Section: FYS 103B 0101
 Title ATTEMPT TO UNDISTND UNV
 Instructor: LIEBMAN, JOEL F
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 903
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	1	1	4	4	3.58	1486/1674	3.58	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	1	4	3.54	1484/1674	3.54	4.26	4.23	4.16	3.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1423	****	4.36	4.27	4.16	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	3	5	3.69	1360/1609	3.69	4.23	4.22	4.05	3.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	2	3	4	3.58	1175/1585	3.58	4.04	3.96	3.88	3.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	1074/1535	3.85	4.08	4.08	3.89	3.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	4	1	3	3	3.08	1557/1651	3.08	4.20	4.18	4.10	3.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	1246/1673	4.46	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.46	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	906/1656	4.08	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	4	3	3	3.58	1464/1586	3.58	4.43	4.43	4.37	3.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.60	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	4	3	2	3.33	1457/1582	3.33	4.30	4.26	4.17	3.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	692/1575	4.50	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	143/1380	4.75	3.94	3.94	3.78	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	572/1520	4.33	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	560/1515	4.58	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.58	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	219/1511	4.92	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	2	0	2	1	3	3.38	795/ 994	3.38	3.97	3.94	3.73	3.38	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	63/ 103	4.43	4.39	4.41	4.33	4.43	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	42/ 101	4.83	4.33	4.48	4.18	4.83	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	2	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	62/ 95	4.00	4.15	4.31	3.99	4.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	34/ 99	4.86	4.36	4.39	4.10	4.86	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	1	1	0	3	2	0	3.00	88/ 97	3.00	3.76	4.14	3.69	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: FYS 103C 0101
 Title ISSUES IN BIOTECHNOLOG
 Instructor: CRAIG, NESSLY C
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 904
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	2	0	0	2	5	2	3	3.50	1511/1674	3.50	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	6	1	2	2.92	1628/1674	2.92	4.26	4.23	4.16	2.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	6	1	3.54	1262/1423	3.54	4.36	4.27	4.16	3.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	5	5	1	3.31	1507/1609	3.31	4.23	4.22	4.05	3.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	6	4	1	3.31	1344/1585	3.31	4.04	3.96	3.88	3.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	4	6	2	3.62	1234/1535	3.62	4.08	4.08	3.89	3.62	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	5	2	3	2	0	2.17	1633/1651	2.17	4.20	4.18	4.10	2.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	1	4	2	2	3.30	1455/1656	3.30	4.06	4.07	3.96	3.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	1	4	3	0	3.00	1539/1586	3.00	4.43	4.43	4.37	3.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	1354/1585	4.33	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	2	3	4	0	3.22	1476/1582	3.22	4.30	4.26	4.17	3.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	4	4	0	3.33	1423/1575	3.33	4.32	4.27	4.17	3.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	6	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1380	****	3.94	3.94	3.78	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	7	1	3.73	1051/1520	3.73	4.14	4.01	3.76	3.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	513/1515	4.64	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	875/1511	4.27	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.27	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	2	1	0	2	1	2.83	932/ 994	2.83	3.97	3.94	3.73	2.83	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	69/ 103	4.29	4.39	4.41	4.33	4.29	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	1	0	3	2	1	3.29	99/ 101	3.29	4.33	4.48	4.18	3.29	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	60/ 95	4.14	4.15	4.31	3.99	4.14	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	67/ 99	4.14	4.36	4.39	4.10	4.14	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	4	1	1	1	0	1.86	97/ 97	1.86	3.76	4.14	3.69	1.86	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	2	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	12	Under-grad	14	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	3						

Course-Section: FYS 107 0101
 Title: FIRST YEAR SEMINAR
 Instructor: SLOANE, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 905
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1	0	5	8	4.43	735/1674	4.43	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	3	4.07	1097/1674	4.07	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.07	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	672/1423	4.43	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	614/1609	4.43	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	69/1585	4.93	4.04	3.96	3.88	4.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	481/1535	4.43	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	1	5	3	3	3.67	1377/1651	3.67	4.20	4.18	4.10	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	4.00	1566/1673	4.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	230/1656	4.70	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	10	4	4.29	1120/1586	4.29	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.60	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	599/1582	4.54	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	612/1575	4.57	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	817/1380	3.88	3.94	3.94	3.78	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	221/1520	4.77	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.77	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	372/1515	4.77	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.77	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.00	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	2	0	1	5	3	3.64	687/ 994	3.64	3.97	3.94	3.73	3.64	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	3.97	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	48/ 103	4.67	4.39	4.41	4.33	4.67	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	2	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	65/ 101	4.40	4.33	4.48	4.18	4.40	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	50/ 95	4.40	4.15	4.31	3.99	4.40	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	54/ 99	4.42	4.36	4.39	4.10	4.42	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	2	3	3	4	3.75	69/ 97	3.75	3.76	4.14	3.69	3.75	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A 9	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 5	Under-grad 14	Non-major 3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 1			
				I 0	Other 4		
				? 0			