

Course-Section: FYS 101A 0101
 Title THE DIVINE COMEDY
 Instructor: ROSENTHAL, ALAN
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 863
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 4.57 | 540/1639 | 4.57 | 4.27 | 4.27 | 4.08 | 4.57 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 4.43 | 650/1639 | 4.43 | 4.02 | 4.22 | 4.17 | 4.43 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 5.00 | 1/1397 | 5.00 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.18 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 4.82 | 181/1583 | 4.82 | 4.12 | 4.19 | 4.01 | 4.82 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 5.00 | 1/1532 | 5.00 | 4.50 | 4.01 | 3.88 | 5.00 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 4.36 | 529/1504 | 4.36 | 4.12 | 4.05 | 3.78 | 4.36 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 4.57 | 418/1612 | 4.57 | 3.71 | 4.16 | 4.10 | 4.57 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 3 | 4.21 | 1382/1635 | 4.21 | 4.62 | 4.65 | 4.56 | 4.21 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 11 | 4.71 | 205/1579 | 4.71 | 4.01 | 4.08 | 3.95 | 4.71 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 4.86 | 286/1518 | 4.86 | 4.44 | 4.43 | 4.38 | 4.86 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 5.00 | 1/1520 | 5.00 | 4.85 | 4.70 | 4.61 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 4.79 | 263/1517 | 4.79 | 4.31 | 4.27 | 4.20 | 4.79 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 4.86 | 231/1550 | 4.86 | 4.38 | 4.22 | 4.17 | 4.86 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 5 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4.00 | 623/1295 | 4.00 | 3.65 | 3.94 | 3.84 | 4.00 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 4.78 | 242/1398 | 4.78 | 4.64 | 4.07 | 3.85 | 4.78 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 4.78 | 368/1391 | 4.78 | 4.60 | 4.30 | 4.07 | 4.78 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 4.78 | 363/1388 | 4.78 | 4.63 | 4.28 | 4.01 | 4.78 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 10 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3.80 | 577/ 958 | 3.80 | 3.86 | 3.93 | 3.71 | 3.80 | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4.89 | 38/ 85 | 4.89 | 4.50 | 4.58 | 4.50 | 4.89 | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 9 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3.67 | ****/ 82 | **** | 4.47 | 4.52 | 4.12 | **** | |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 9 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/ 78 | **** | 4.28 | 4.47 | 4.25 | **** | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 4.90 | 36/ 80 | 4.90 | 4.44 | 4.47 | 4.39 | 4.90 | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 4.56 | 32/ 82 | 4.56 | 3.75 | 4.16 | 3.90 | 4.56 | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 6 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 10 | Required for Majors | 5 |
| 28-55 | 6 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 4 | | Graduate 0 |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 1 | C 0 | General | 10 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 0 | D 0 | | Under-grad 19 |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 4 | F 0 | Electives | 1 |
| | | | P 0 | | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 1 |
| | | | ? 0 | | |

Course-Section: FYS 101D 0101
 Title TURNING TO ONE ANOTHER
 Instructor: LEE, DIANE (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 864
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 1 | 6 | 9 | 4.50 | 615/1639 | 4.50 | 4.27 | 4.27 | 4.08 | 4.50 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 4.56 | 455/1639 | 4.56 | 4.02 | 4.22 | 4.17 | 4.56 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4.57 | 447/1397 | 4.57 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.18 | 4.57 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 11 | 4.53 | 444/1583 | 4.53 | 4.12 | 4.19 | 4.01 | 4.53 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 4.44 | 409/1532 | 4.44 | 4.50 | 4.01 | 3.88 | 4.44 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 12 | 4.50 | 367/1504 | 4.50 | 4.12 | 4.05 | 3.78 | 4.50 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 10 | 4.13 | 955/1612 | 4.13 | 3.71 | 4.16 | 4.10 | 4.13 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 5.00 | 1/1635 | 5.00 | 4.62 | 4.65 | 4.56 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 4.40 | 496/1579 | 4.40 | 4.01 | 4.08 | 3.95 | 4.40 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 13 | 4.75 | 454/1518 | 4.75 | 4.44 | 4.43 | 4.38 | 4.79 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 4.94 | 382/1520 | 4.87 | 4.85 | 4.70 | 4.61 | 4.87 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 13 | 4.75 | 299/1517 | 4.68 | 4.31 | 4.27 | 4.20 | 4.68 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 12 | 4.69 | 435/1550 | 4.59 | 4.38 | 4.22 | 4.17 | 4.59 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3.77 | 832/1295 | 3.77 | 3.65 | 3.94 | 3.84 | 3.77 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 5.00 | 1/1398 | 5.00 | 4.64 | 4.07 | 3.85 | 5.00 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 4.93 | 159/1391 | 4.93 | 4.60 | 4.30 | 4.07 | 4.93 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 5.00 | 1/1388 | 5.00 | 4.63 | 4.28 | 4.01 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 4.71 | 135/ 958 | 4.71 | 3.86 | 3.93 | 3.71 | 4.71 | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 224 | **** | **** | 4.10 | 3.90 | **** | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 240 | **** | 4.50 | 4.11 | 4.01 | **** | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 14 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 219 | **** | **** | 4.44 | 4.44 | **** | |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 15 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 215 | **** | **** | 4.35 | 4.43 | **** | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 15 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 198 | **** | **** | 4.18 | 4.25 | **** | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 4.82 | 43/ 85 | 4.82 | 4.50 | 4.58 | 4.50 | 4.82 | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 4.45 | 54/ 82 | 4.45 | 4.47 | 4.52 | 4.12 | 4.45 | |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 4.45 | 48/ 78 | 4.45 | 4.28 | 4.47 | 4.25 | 4.45 | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 4.82 | 38/ 80 | 4.82 | 4.44 | 4.47 | 4.39 | 4.82 | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 6 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4.27 | 45/ 82 | 4.27 | 3.75 | 4.16 | 3.90 | 4.27 | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/ 52 | **** | 4.00 | 4.04 | 3.61 | **** | |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/ 53 | **** | 3.00 | 4.05 | 3.51 | **** | |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 42 | **** | 5.00 | 4.75 | 4.79 | **** | |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 37 | **** | 5.00 | 4.58 | 5.00 | **** | |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.56 | 4.60 | **** | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 50 | **** | 3.00 | 4.45 | 4.54 | **** | |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.51 | 4.67 | **** | |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 43 | **** | **** | 4.69 | 4.69 | **** | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.37 | 4.67 | **** | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 21 | **** | **** | 4.52 | 5.00 | **** | |

Course-Section: FYS 101D 0101
 Title TURNING TO ONE ANOTHER
 Instructor: LEE, DIANE (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 864
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|---|---------------------|------|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 9 | 0.00-0.99 | 5 | A | 9 | Required for Majors | 4 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 2 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 2 | General | 7 | Under-grad | 17 | Non-major | 17 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 0 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 1 | F | 0 | Electives | 2 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 2 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: FYS 101D 0101
 Title TURNING TO ONE ANOTHER
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 865
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 1 | 6 | 9 | 4.50 | 615/1639 | 4.50 | 4.27 | 4.27 | 4.08 | 4.50 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 4.56 | 455/1639 | 4.56 | 4.02 | 4.22 | 4.17 | 4.56 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4.57 | 447/1397 | 4.57 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.18 | 4.57 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 11 | 4.53 | 444/1583 | 4.53 | 4.12 | 4.19 | 4.01 | 4.53 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 4.44 | 409/1532 | 4.44 | 4.50 | 4.01 | 3.88 | 4.44 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 12 | 4.50 | 367/1504 | 4.50 | 4.12 | 4.05 | 3.78 | 4.50 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 10 | 4.13 | 955/1612 | 4.13 | 3.71 | 4.16 | 4.10 | 4.13 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 5.00 | 1/1635 | 5.00 | 4.62 | 4.65 | 4.56 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/1579 | 4.40 | 4.01 | 4.08 | 3.95 | 4.40 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 315/1518 | 4.79 | 4.44 | 4.43 | 4.38 | 4.79 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 802/1520 | 4.87 | 4.85 | 4.70 | 4.61 | 4.87 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 474/1517 | 4.68 | 4.31 | 4.27 | 4.20 | 4.68 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 11 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4.50 | 638/1550 | 4.59 | 4.38 | 4.22 | 4.17 | 4.59 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | ****/1295 | 3.77 | 3.65 | 3.94 | 3.84 | 3.77 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 5.00 | 1/1398 | 5.00 | 4.64 | 4.07 | 3.85 | 5.00 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 4.93 | 159/1391 | 4.93 | 4.60 | 4.30 | 4.07 | 4.93 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 5.00 | 1/1388 | 5.00 | 4.63 | 4.28 | 4.01 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 4.71 | 135/ 958 | 4.71 | 3.86 | 3.93 | 3.71 | 4.71 | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 224 | **** | **** | 4.10 | 3.90 | **** | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 240 | **** | 4.50 | 4.11 | 4.01 | **** | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 14 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 219 | **** | **** | 4.44 | 4.44 | **** | |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 15 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 215 | **** | **** | 4.35 | 4.43 | **** | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 15 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 198 | **** | **** | 4.18 | 4.25 | **** | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 4.82 | 43/ 85 | 4.82 | 4.50 | 4.58 | 4.50 | 4.82 | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 4.45 | 54/ 82 | 4.45 | 4.47 | 4.52 | 4.12 | 4.45 | |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 4.45 | 48/ 78 | 4.45 | 4.28 | 4.47 | 4.25 | 4.45 | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 4.82 | 38/ 80 | 4.82 | 4.44 | 4.47 | 4.39 | 4.82 | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 6 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4.27 | 45/ 82 | 4.27 | 3.75 | 4.16 | 3.90 | 4.27 | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/ 52 | **** | 4.00 | 4.04 | 3.61 | **** | |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/ 53 | **** | 3.00 | 4.05 | 3.51 | **** | |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 42 | **** | 5.00 | 4.75 | 4.79 | **** | |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 37 | **** | 5.00 | 4.58 | 5.00 | **** | |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.56 | 4.60 | **** | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 50 | **** | 3.00 | 4.45 | 4.54 | **** | |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.51 | 4.67 | **** | |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 43 | **** | **** | 4.69 | 4.69 | **** | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.37 | 4.67 | **** | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 21 | **** | **** | 4.52 | 5.00 | **** | |

Course-Section: FYS 101D 0101
 Title TURNING TO ONE ANOTHER
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 865
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|---|---------------------|------|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 9 | 0.00-0.99 | 5 | A | 9 | Required for Majors | 4 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 2 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 2 | General | 7 | Under-grad | 17 | Non-major | 17 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 0 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 1 | F | 0 | Electives | 2 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 2 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: FYS 102A 0101
 Title IMAGES OF MADNESS
 Instructor: TICE, CAROLYN
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 866
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 4 | 9 | 4.57 | 540/1639 | 4.57 | 4.27 | 4.27 | 4.08 | 4.57 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 4.21 | 895/1639 | 4.21 | 4.02 | 4.22 | 4.17 | 4.21 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 4.56 | 467/1397 | 4.56 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.18 | 4.56 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 4.67 | 323/1583 | 4.67 | 4.12 | 4.19 | 4.01 | 4.67 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 10 | 4.54 | 317/1532 | 4.54 | 4.50 | 4.01 | 3.88 | 4.54 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 11 | 4.71 | 208/1504 | 4.71 | 4.12 | 4.05 | 3.78 | 4.71 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 4.23 | 837/1612 | 4.23 | 3.71 | 4.16 | 4.10 | 4.23 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 5.00 | 1/1635 | 5.00 | 4.62 | 4.65 | 4.56 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4.09 | 835/1579 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.08 | 3.95 | 4.09 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 4.71 | 529/1518 | 4.71 | 4.44 | 4.43 | 4.38 | 4.71 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 5.00 | 1/1520 | 5.00 | 4.85 | 4.70 | 4.61 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 10 | 4.64 | 428/1517 | 4.64 | 4.31 | 4.27 | 4.20 | 4.64 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 4.64 | 478/1550 | 4.64 | 4.38 | 4.22 | 4.17 | 4.64 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 4.92 | 65/1295 | 4.92 | 3.65 | 3.94 | 3.84 | 4.92 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 11 | 4.71 | 294/1398 | 4.71 | 4.64 | 4.07 | 3.85 | 4.71 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 5.00 | 1/1391 | 5.00 | 4.60 | 4.30 | 4.07 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 5.00 | 1/1388 | 5.00 | 4.63 | 4.28 | 4.01 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 4.09 | 438/ 958 | 4.09 | 3.86 | 3.93 | 3.71 | 4.09 | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 85 | **** | 4.50 | 4.58 | 4.50 | **** | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 82 | **** | 4.47 | 4.52 | 4.12 | **** | |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 78 | **** | 4.28 | 4.47 | 4.25 | **** | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 80 | **** | 4.44 | 4.47 | 4.39 | **** | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 82 | **** | 3.75 | 4.16 | 3.90 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 5 | 0.00-0.99 | A 9 | Required for Majors | 7 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | B 4 | | Graduate 0 |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | C 0 | General | 4 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | D 0 | | Under-grad 14 |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | F 0 | Electives | 1 |
| | | | P 0 | | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 3 |
| | | | ? 0 | | |

Course-Section: FYS 102F 0101
 Title CNTRSTNG VISIONS SOCIE
 Instructor: MITCH, DAVID F
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 867
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3.40 | 1530/1639 | 3.40 | 4.27 | 4.27 | 4.08 | 3.40 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3.00 | 1579/1639 | 3.00 | 4.02 | 4.22 | 4.17 | 3.00 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3.00 | 1363/1397 | 3.00 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.18 | 3.00 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3.20 | 1497/1583 | 3.20 | 4.12 | 4.19 | 4.01 | 3.20 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 4.40 | 441/1532 | 4.40 | 4.50 | 4.01 | 3.88 | 4.40 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3.50 | 1212/1504 | 3.50 | 4.12 | 4.05 | 3.78 | 3.50 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2.40 | 1582/1612 | 2.40 | 3.71 | 4.16 | 4.10 | 2.40 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 4.33 | 1288/1635 | 4.33 | 4.62 | 4.65 | 4.56 | 4.33 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 3.13 | 1458/1579 | 3.13 | 4.01 | 4.08 | 3.95 | 3.13 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3.11 | 1475/1518 | 3.11 | 4.44 | 4.43 | 4.38 | 3.11 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 4.44 | 1239/1520 | 4.44 | 4.85 | 4.70 | 4.61 | 4.44 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 3.33 | 1405/1517 | 3.33 | 4.31 | 4.27 | 4.20 | 3.33 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 3.44 | 1352/1550 | 3.44 | 4.38 | 4.22 | 4.17 | 3.44 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | 1273/1295 | 2.00 | 3.65 | 3.94 | 3.84 | 2.00 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4.11 | 728/1398 | 4.11 | 4.64 | 4.07 | 3.85 | 4.11 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3.44 | 1236/1391 | 3.44 | 4.60 | 4.30 | 4.07 | 3.44 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3.78 | 1088/1388 | 3.78 | 4.63 | 4.28 | 4.01 | 3.78 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 1 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2.67 | 904/ 958 | 2.67 | 3.86 | 3.93 | 3.71 | 2.67 | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 224 | **** | **** | 4.10 | 3.90 | **** | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 240 | **** | 4.50 | 4.11 | 4.01 | **** | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 219 | **** | **** | 4.44 | 4.44 | **** | |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 215 | **** | **** | 4.35 | 4.43 | **** | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 198 | **** | **** | 4.18 | 4.25 | **** | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 5 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3.75 | 79/ 85 | 3.75 | 4.50 | 4.58 | 4.50 | 3.75 | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | 62/ 82 | 4.33 | 4.47 | 4.52 | 4.12 | 4.33 | |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 78 | **** | 4.28 | 4.47 | 4.25 | **** | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3.67 | 70/ 80 | 3.67 | 4.44 | 4.47 | 4.39 | 3.67 | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3.33 | 67/ 82 | 3.33 | 3.75 | 4.16 | 3.90 | 3.33 | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 52 | **** | 4.00 | 4.04 | 3.61 | **** | |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 53 | **** | 3.00 | 4.05 | 3.51 | **** | |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 42 | **** | 5.00 | 4.75 | 4.79 | **** | |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 37 | **** | 5.00 | 4.58 | 5.00 | **** | |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.56 | 4.60 | **** | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 50 | **** | 3.00 | 4.45 | 4.54 | **** | |

Course-Section: FYS 102F 0101
 Title CNTRSTNG VISIONS SOCIE
 Instructor: MITCH, DAVID F
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 867
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|-----------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 7 | 0.00-0.99 2 | A 5 | Required for Majors 5 | Graduate 0 Major 0 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 3 | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 0 | C 0 | General 1 | Under-grad 10 Non-major 10 |
| 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 2 | |
| | | | ? 0 | | |

Course-Section: FYS 103A 0101
 Title: COMPTATION AS EXPER TO
 Instructor: SURI, MANIL
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 868
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.67 | 430/1639 | 4.67 | 4.27 | 4.27 | 4.08 | 4.67 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4.33 | 774/1639 | 4.33 | 4.02 | 4.22 | 4.17 | 4.33 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | 973/1397 | 4.00 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.18 | 4.00 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4.40 | 597/1583 | 4.40 | 4.12 | 4.19 | 4.01 | 4.40 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1532 | **** | 4.50 | 4.01 | 3.88 | **** | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3.67 | 1116/1504 | 3.67 | 4.12 | 4.05 | 3.78 | 3.67 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.67 | 317/1612 | 4.67 | 3.71 | 4.16 | 4.10 | 4.67 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4.50 | 1135/1635 | 4.50 | 4.62 | 4.65 | 4.56 | 4.50 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4.50 | 382/1579 | 4.50 | 4.01 | 4.08 | 3.95 | 4.50 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4.60 | 684/1518 | 4.60 | 4.44 | 4.43 | 4.38 | 4.60 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1520 | 5.00 | 4.85 | 4.70 | 4.61 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.40 | 726/1517 | 4.40 | 4.31 | 4.27 | 4.20 | 4.40 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4.60 | 522/1550 | 4.60 | 4.38 | 4.22 | 4.17 | 4.60 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 4.20 | 505/1295 | 4.20 | 3.65 | 3.94 | 3.84 | 4.20 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1398 | 5.00 | 4.64 | 4.07 | 3.85 | 5.00 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 616/1391 | 4.50 | 4.60 | 4.30 | 4.07 | 4.50 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 647/1388 | 4.50 | 4.63 | 4.28 | 4.01 | 4.50 | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 224 | **** | **** | 4.10 | 3.90 | **** | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 240 | **** | 4.50 | 4.11 | 4.01 | **** | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 219 | **** | **** | 4.44 | 4.44 | **** | |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 215 | **** | **** | 4.35 | 4.43 | **** | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 198 | **** | **** | 4.18 | 4.25 | **** | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | 67/ 85 | 4.25 | 4.50 | 4.58 | 4.50 | 4.25 | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 40/ 82 | 4.67 | 4.47 | 4.52 | 4.12 | 4.67 | |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | 53/ 78 | 4.00 | 4.28 | 4.47 | 4.25 | 4.00 | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | 55/ 80 | 4.25 | 4.44 | 4.47 | 4.39 | 4.25 | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | 46/ 82 | 4.25 | 3.75 | 4.16 | 3.90 | 4.25 | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 52 | **** | 4.00 | 4.04 | 3.61 | **** | |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 53 | **** | 3.00 | 4.05 | 3.51 | **** | |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 42 | **** | 5.00 | 4.75 | 4.79 | **** | |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 37 | **** | 5.00 | 4.58 | 5.00 | **** | |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.56 | 4.60 | **** | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 50 | **** | 3.00 | 4.45 | 4.54 | **** | |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.51 | 4.67 | **** | |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 43 | **** | **** | 4.69 | 4.69 | **** | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.37 | 4.67 | **** | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 21 | **** | **** | 4.52 | 5.00 | **** | |

Course-Section: FYS 103A 0101
 Title: COMPUTATION AS EXPER TO
 Instructor: SURI, MANIL
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 868
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 3 | Required for Majors | 2 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 2 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 0 | General | 3 | Under-grad | 6 | Non-major | 6 |
| 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 responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: FYS 103B 0101
 Title PARADIGMS & PARADOXES
 Instructor: LIEBMAN, JOEL F
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 869
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3.75 | 1358/1639 | 3.75 | 4.27 | 4.27 | 4.08 | 3.75 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3.88 | 1281/1639 | 3.88 | 4.02 | 4.22 | 4.17 | 3.88 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1397 | 5.00 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.18 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 3.14 | 1510/1583 | 3.14 | 4.12 | 4.19 | 4.01 | 3.14 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/1532 | **** | 4.50 | 4.01 | 3.88 | **** | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3.71 | 1083/1504 | 3.71 | 4.12 | 4.05 | 3.78 | 3.71 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3.00 | 1519/1612 | 3.00 | 3.71 | 4.16 | 4.10 | 3.00 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 4.75 | 884/1635 | 4.75 | 4.62 | 4.65 | 4.56 | 4.75 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3.50 | 1318/1579 | 3.50 | 4.01 | 4.08 | 3.95 | 3.50 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.17 | 1162/1518 | 4.17 | 4.44 | 4.43 | 4.38 | 4.17 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1520 | 5.00 | 4.85 | 4.70 | 4.61 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 4.00 | 1083/1517 | 4.00 | 4.31 | 4.27 | 4.20 | 4.00 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.33 | 832/1550 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 4.22 | 4.17 | 4.33 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3.33 | 1067/1295 | 3.33 | 3.65 | 3.94 | 3.84 | 3.33 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.14 | 708/1398 | 4.14 | 4.64 | 4.07 | 3.85 | 4.14 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4.57 | 564/1391 | 4.57 | 4.60 | 4.30 | 4.07 | 4.57 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 4.71 | 435/1388 | 4.71 | 4.63 | 4.28 | 4.01 | 4.71 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3.00 | 841/ 958 | 3.00 | 3.86 | 3.93 | 3.71 | 3.00 | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 80/ 240 | 4.50 | 4.50 | 4.11 | 4.01 | 4.50 | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4.60 | 50/ 85 | 4.60 | 4.50 | 4.58 | 4.50 | 4.60 | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/ 82 | 5.00 | 4.47 | 4.52 | 4.12 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 45/ 78 | 4.50 | 4.28 | 4.47 | 4.25 | 4.50 | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4.25 | 55/ 80 | 4.25 | 4.44 | 4.47 | 4.39 | 4.25 | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | 71/ 82 | 3.00 | 3.75 | 4.16 | 3.90 | 3.00 | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | 32/ 52 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.04 | 3.61 | 4.00 | |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | 44/ 53 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 4.05 | 3.51 | 3.00 | |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/ 42 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.75 | 4.79 | 5.00 | |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/ 37 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.58 | 5.00 | 5.00 | |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.56 | 4.60 | **** | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3.00 | 46/ 50 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 4.45 | 4.54 | 3.00 | |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.51 | 4.67 | **** | |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 43 | **** | **** | 4.69 | 4.69 | **** | |

Course-Section: FYS 103B 0101
 Title PARADIGMS & PARADOXES
 Instructor: LIEBMAN, JOEL F
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 869
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|---|---------------------|------|---|---|-----------|---|
| 00-27 | 6 | 0.00-0.99 | 2 | A | 5 | Required for Majors | 4 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 1 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 0 | General | 2 | Under-grad | 8 | Non-major | 8 |
| 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 | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: FYS 103C 0101
 Title ISSUES IN BIOTECHNOLOG
 Instructor: CRAIG, NESSLY C
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 870
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 4.20 | 951/1639 | 4.20 | 4.27 | 4.27 | 4.08 | 4.20 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 3.20 | 1564/1639 | 3.20 | 4.02 | 4.22 | 4.17 | 3.20 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3.50 | 1268/1397 | 3.50 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.18 | 3.50 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3.70 | 1296/1583 | 3.70 | 4.12 | 4.19 | 4.01 | 3.70 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4.20 | 633/1532 | 4.20 | 4.50 | 4.01 | 3.88 | 4.20 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 4.00 | 824/1504 | 4.00 | 4.12 | 4.05 | 3.78 | 4.00 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 2.60 | 1572/1612 | 2.60 | 3.71 | 4.16 | 4.10 | 2.60 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 4.20 | 1396/1635 | 4.20 | 4.62 | 4.65 | 4.56 | 4.20 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 3.71 | 1200/1579 | 3.71 | 4.01 | 4.08 | 3.95 | 3.71 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.50 | 807/1518 | 4.50 | 4.44 | 4.43 | 4.38 | 4.50 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 1115/1520 | 4.60 | 4.85 | 4.70 | 4.61 | 4.60 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4.00 | 1083/1517 | 4.00 | 4.31 | 4.27 | 4.20 | 4.00 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4.00 | 1077/1550 | 4.00 | 4.38 | 4.22 | 4.17 | 4.00 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 5 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3.33 | 1067/1295 | 3.33 | 3.65 | 3.94 | 3.84 | 3.33 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 4.38 | 532/1398 | 4.38 | 4.64 | 4.07 | 3.85 | 4.38 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4.63 | 525/1391 | 4.63 | 4.60 | 4.30 | 4.07 | 4.63 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4.25 | 834/1388 | 4.25 | 4.63 | 4.28 | 4.01 | 4.25 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4.00 | 456/ 958 | 4.00 | 3.86 | 3.93 | 3.71 | 4.00 | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 240 | **** | 4.50 | 4.11 | 4.01 | **** | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4.40 | 64/ 85 | 4.40 | 4.50 | 4.58 | 4.50 | 4.40 | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3.90 | 74/ 82 | 3.90 | 4.47 | 4.52 | 4.12 | 3.90 | |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 4.00 | 53/ 78 | 4.00 | 4.28 | 4.47 | 4.25 | 4.00 | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4.40 | 50/ 80 | 4.40 | 4.44 | 4.47 | 4.39 | 4.40 | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 2.60 | 75/ 82 | 2.60 | 3.75 | 4.16 | 3.90 | 2.60 | |

Frequency Distribution

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