

Course-Section: FYS 101P 0101  
 Title ARTS,HUM,SCI:RD TO REA  
 Instructor: WELCH, G.  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 881  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR NA		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	4	6	4	3.59	1476/1649	3.59	4.00	4.28	4.11	3.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	6	5	3.76	1340/1648	3.76	3.93	4.23	4.16	3.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	3	7	3.82	1076/1375	3.82	4.16	4.27	4.10	3.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	4.09	4.20	4.03	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	4	7	4.06	781/1533	4.06	3.81	4.04	3.87	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	5	1	4	3.90	1022/1512	3.90	3.97	4.10	3.86	3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	4	6	2	2	2.76	1577/1623	2.76	3.56	4.16	4.08	2.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	5	4.29	1370/1646	4.29	4.53	4.69	4.67	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	0	6	3	3	3.36	1422/1621	3.36	3.90	4.06	3.96	3.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	9	4	3	3.53	1456/1568	3.53	4.09	4.43	4.39	3.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	912/1572	4.76	4.77	4.70	4.64	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	7	4	3	3.35	1437/1564	3.35	4.09	4.28	4.20	3.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	7	4	3.59	1349/1559	3.59	4.23	4.29	4.20	3.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	2	1	1	0	1	2.40	1316/1352	2.40	3.90	3.98	3.86	2.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	3	4	5	3.79	948/1384	3.79	4.33	4.08	3.86	3.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	3	4	3	4	3.57	1187/1382	3.57	4.42	4.29	4.03	3.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	4	3	1	5	3.36	1222/1368	3.36	4.53	4.30	4.01	3.36
4. Were special techniques successful	3	9	0	2	2	0	1	3.00	844/ 948	3.00	3.87	3.95	3.75	3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 221	****	4.17	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 243	****	4.10	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 212	****	4.60	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 209	****	4.57	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	****	3.20	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	4.22	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.34	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	4.20	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 92	****	4.00	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	****/ 288	****	3.56	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.05	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	3.85	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	3.79	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	3.20	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****

Course-Section: FYS 101P 0101  
 Title ARTS,HUM,SCI:RD TO REA  
 Instructor: WELCH, G.  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 881  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	12	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	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	4				
				?	1						

Course-Section: FYS 102A 0101  
 Title IMAGES OF MADNESS  
 Instructor: TICE, CAROLYN  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 882  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	2	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	317/1649	4.77	4.00	4.28	4.11	4.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	427/1648	4.62	3.93	4.23	4.16	4.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	4	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	505/1375	4.56	4.16	4.27	4.10	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	263/1595	4.73	4.09	4.20	4.03	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	217/1533	4.69	3.81	4.04	3.87	4.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	194/1512	4.75	3.97	4.10	3.86	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	149/1623	4.85	3.56	4.16	4.08	4.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	1004/1646	4.69	4.53	4.69	4.67	4.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	442/1621	4.45	3.90	4.06	3.96	4.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	461/1568	4.77	4.09	4.43	4.39	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.77	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.09	4.28	4.20	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	164/1559	4.92	4.23	4.29	4.20	4.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	152/1352	4.77	3.90	3.98	3.86	4.77	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	275/1384	4.73	4.33	4.08	3.86	4.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	511/1382	4.64	4.42	4.29	4.03	4.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	264/1368	4.91	4.53	4.30	4.01	4.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	555/ 948	3.86	3.87	3.95	3.75	3.86	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	****	3.20	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.22	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.34	4.47	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.00	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.56	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 312	****	3.20	3.68	3.51	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	A	8	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
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 102C 0101  
 Title DVRSTY,ETHICS & SOC JU  
 Instructor: WILLIAMS, VICKI (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 883  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	7	7	6	3.81	1351/1649	3.81	4.00	4.28	4.11	3.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	7	6	3.81	1313/1648	3.81	3.93	4.23	4.16	3.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1375	****	4.16	4.27	4.10	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	4	6	7	4.06	1038/1595	4.06	4.09	4.20	4.03	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	5	7	5	3.57	1200/1533	3.57	3.81	4.04	3.87	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	3	9	5	3.67	1170/1512	3.67	3.97	4.10	3.86	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	8	9	4.10	984/1623	4.10	3.56	4.16	4.08	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	1	18	4.76	897/1646	4.76	4.53	4.69	4.67	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	2	0	0	1	9	3	4.15	801/1621	4.15	3.90	4.06	3.96	4.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	3	10	6	4.00	1279/1568	4.07	4.09	4.43	4.39	4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	840/1572	4.79	4.77	4.70	4.64	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	5	10	6	4.05	1109/1564	4.05	4.09	4.28	4.20	4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	8	8	3.95	1159/1559	3.98	4.23	4.29	4.20	3.98
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	4	11	5	3.90	818/1352	3.86	3.90	3.98	3.86	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	3	6	7	3.89	896/1384	3.89	4.33	4.08	3.86	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	3	3	11	4.33	774/1382	4.33	4.42	4.29	4.03	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	616/1368	4.56	4.53	4.30	4.01	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	1	4	4	9	4.17	380/ 948	4.17	3.87	3.95	3.75	4.17
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 555	****	3.20	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	2	9	9	4.35	60/ 88	4.35	4.22	4.54	4.31	4.35
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	1	3	5	10	4.26	61/ 85	4.26	4.34	4.47	4.30	4.26
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	8	7	4.05	61/ 81	4.05	4.20	4.43	4.39	4.05
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	8	7	4.22	63/ 92	4.22	4.00	4.35	4.01	4.22
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	2	1	9	7	4.11	80/ 288	4.11	3.56	3.68	3.54	4.11
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	0	10	8	4.05	33/ 52	4.05	4.05	4.06	3.72	4.05
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	1	1	4	8	6	3.85	33/ 48	3.85	3.85	4.09	3.65	3.85
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	6	0	2	3	5	4	3.79	36/ 39	3.79	3.79	4.47	4.36	3.79
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	3	0	1	4	5	6	4.00	27/ 39	4.00	4.00	4.38	4.37	4.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	9	1	0	3	3	4	3.82	183/ 312	3.82	3.20	3.68	3.51	3.82

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	6	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	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FYS 102C 0101  
 Title DVRSTY,ETHICS & SOC JU  
 Instructor: SMALL, SUE (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 884  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	7	7	6	3.81	1351/1649	3.81	4.00	4.28	4.11	3.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	7	6	3.81	1313/1648	3.81	3.93	4.23	4.16	3.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1375	****	4.16	4.27	4.10	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	4	6	7	4.06	1038/1595	4.06	4.09	4.20	4.03	4.06	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	5	7	5	3.57	1200/1533	3.57	3.81	4.04	3.87	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	3	9	5	3.67	1170/1512	3.67	3.97	4.10	3.86	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	8	9	4.10	984/1623	4.10	3.56	4.16	4.08	4.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	1	18	4.76	897/1646	4.76	4.53	4.69	4.67	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	2	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	801/1621	4.15	3.90	4.06	3.96	4.15	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	11	6	4.15	1198/1568	4.07	4.09	4.43	4.39	4.07	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	912/1572	4.79	4.77	4.70	4.64	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	6	8	7	4.05	1109/1564	4.05	4.09	4.28	4.20	4.05	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	8	8	4.00	1121/1559	3.98	4.23	4.29	4.20	3.98	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	6	9	5	3.81	879/1352	3.86	3.90	3.98	3.86	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	3	6	7	3.89	896/1384	3.89	4.33	4.08	3.86	3.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	3	3	11	4.33	774/1382	4.33	4.42	4.29	4.03	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	616/1368	4.56	4.53	4.30	4.01	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	1	4	4	9	4.17	380/ 948	4.17	3.87	3.95	3.75	4.17	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 555	****	3.20	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	2	9	9	4.35	60/ 88	4.35	4.22	4.54	4.31	4.35	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	1	3	5	10	4.26	61/ 85	4.26	4.34	4.47	4.30	4.26	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	8	7	4.05	61/ 81	4.05	4.20	4.43	4.39	4.05	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	8	7	4.22	63/ 92	4.22	4.00	4.35	4.01	4.22	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	2	1	9	7	4.11	80/ 288	4.11	3.56	3.68	3.54	4.11	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	0	10	8	4.05	33/ 52	4.05	4.05	4.06	3.72	4.05	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	1	1	4	8	6	3.85	33/ 48	3.85	3.85	4.09	3.65	3.85	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	6	0	2	3	5	4	3.79	36/ 39	3.79	3.79	4.47	4.36	3.79	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	3	0	1	4	5	6	4.00	27/ 39	4.00	4.00	4.38	4.37	4.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	9	1	0	3	3	4	3.82	183/ 312	3.82	3.20	3.68	3.51	3.82	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A 11	Required for Majors 6	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 1	Under-grad 21	Non-major 21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 4		
				? 0			

Course-Section: FYS 102F 0101  
 Title CNTRSTNG VISIONS SOCIE  
 Instructor: MITCH, DAVID F  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 885  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	4	0	0	3	8	4	0	3.07	1597/1649	3.07	4.00	4.28	4.11	3.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	1	5	7	2	0	2.67	1625/1648	2.67	3.93	4.23	4.16	2.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	10	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	1365/1375	2.60	4.16	4.27	4.10	2.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	3	3	0	3	5	1	3.08	1529/1595	3.08	4.09	4.20	4.03	3.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	4	6	4	3.80	1017/1533	3.80	3.81	4.04	3.87	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	8	4	2	3.47	1287/1512	3.47	3.97	4.10	3.86	3.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	2	4	4	3	1	2.79	1574/1623	2.79	3.56	4.16	4.08	2.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	1230/1646	4.47	4.53	4.69	4.67	4.47	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	3	7	1	0	2.82	1553/1621	2.82	3.90	4.06	3.96	2.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	2	1	3	5	1	3.17	1504/1568	3.17	4.09	4.43	4.39	3.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	1	4	4	3	3.75	1517/1572	3.75	4.77	4.70	4.64	3.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	2	5	3	1	3.08	1490/1564	3.08	4.09	4.28	4.20	3.08	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	7	3	1	3.25	1440/1559	3.25	4.23	4.29	4.20	3.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	6	1	2	1	0	1	2.60	1293/1352	2.60	3.90	3.98	3.86	2.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	582/1384	4.36	4.33	4.08	3.86	4.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	3	2	2	4	3.64	1160/1382	3.64	4.42	4.29	4.03	3.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	832/1368	4.27	4.53	4.30	4.01	4.27	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	1	5	4	0	3.30	789/ 948	3.30	3.87	3.95	3.75	3.30	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 243	****	4.10	4.12	4.08	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 555	****	3.20	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	74/ 88	4.00	4.22	4.54	4.31	4.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	4	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 85	****	4.34	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 81	****	4.20	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	2	2	3	0	2.88	90/ 92	2.88	4.00	4.35	4.01	2.88	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	1	0	2	1	3	1	3.43	199/ 288	3.43	3.56	3.68	3.54	3.43	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 52	****	4.05	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 48	****	3.85	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	3.79	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.20	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: FYS 102F 0101  
 Title CNTRSTNG VISIONS SOCIE  
 Instructor: MITCH, DAVID F  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 885  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99 6	A 3	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 6	Under-grad 19 Non-major 19
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		
			? 1		

Course-Section: FYS 102J 0101  
 Title FRANCE UNDER GERMAN OC  
 Instructor: ROSENTHAL, ALAN  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 886  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	295/1649	4.79	4.00	4.28	4.11	4.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	336/1648	4.68	3.93	4.23	4.16	4.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	206/1375	4.84	4.16	4.27	4.10	4.84	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	209/1595	4.79	4.09	4.20	4.03	4.79	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	110/1533	4.89	3.81	4.04	3.87	4.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	331/1512	4.58	3.97	4.10	3.86	4.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	3	12	4.42	608/1623	4.42	3.56	4.16	4.08	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	765/1646	4.84	4.53	4.69	4.67	4.84	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	234/1621	4.67	3.90	4.06	3.96	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	259/1568	4.89	4.09	4.43	4.39	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.77	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	178/1564	4.89	4.09	4.28	4.20	4.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	123/1559	4.95	4.23	4.29	4.20	4.95	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	2	5	11	4.32	473/1352	4.32	3.90	3.98	3.86	4.32	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.33	4.08	3.86	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	146/1382	4.94	4.42	4.29	4.03	4.94	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.53	4.30	4.01	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	196/ 948	4.53	3.87	3.95	3.75	4.53	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	****	3.20	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.22	4.54	4.31	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.00	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/ 288	****	3.56	3.68	3.54	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	2	A	10	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	8	Under-grad	18	Non-major	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						



Course-Section: FYS 103A 0101  
 Title: COMPTATION AS EXPER TO  
 Instructor: SURI, MANIL  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 887  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	3	2	4.17	1057/1649	4.17	4.00	4.28	4.11	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1124/1648	4.00	3.93	4.23	4.16	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	733/1375	4.33	4.16	4.27	4.10	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	1242/1595	3.83	4.09	4.20	4.03	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1249/1533	3.50	3.81	4.04	3.87	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	3	1	3.33	1345/1512	3.33	3.97	4.10	3.86	3.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	502/1623	4.50	3.56	4.16	4.08	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1193/1646	4.50	4.53	4.69	4.67	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1151/1621	3.80	3.90	4.06	3.96	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1191/1568	4.17	4.09	4.43	4.39	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	765/1572	4.83	4.77	4.70	4.64	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	854/1564	4.33	4.09	4.28	4.20	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	901/1559	4.33	4.23	4.29	4.20	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	303/1352	4.50	3.90	3.98	3.86	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	937/1384	3.80	4.33	4.08	3.86	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	540/1382	4.60	4.42	4.29	4.03	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	579/1368	4.60	4.53	4.30	4.01	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	645/ 948	3.67	3.87	3.95	3.75	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	192/ 221	3.50	4.17	4.16	4.05	3.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	210/ 243	3.50	4.10	4.12	4.08	3.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	4.60	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	109/ 209	4.50	4.57	4.35	4.38	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	490/ 555	3.00	3.20	4.29	4.14	3.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	45/ 88	4.67	4.22	4.54	4.31	4.67	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	46/ 85	4.50	4.34	4.47	4.30	4.50	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	41/ 81	4.50	4.20	4.43	4.39	4.50	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	66/ 92	4.00	4.00	4.35	4.01	4.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	72/ 288	4.20	3.56	3.68	3.54	4.20	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	307/ 312	1.33	3.20	3.68	3.51	1.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: FYS 103B 0101  
 Title PARADIGMS & PARADOXES  
 Instructor: LIEBMAN, JOEL F  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 888  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	2	5	1	3	2	2.85	1626/1649	2.85	4.00	4.28	4.11	2.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	4	3	2	3.00	1591/1648	3.00	3.93	4.23	4.16	3.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1375	****	4.16	4.27	4.10	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	0	6	2	2	3.17	1510/1595	3.17	4.09	4.20	4.03	3.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	3	0	2	1	1	2.57	1504/1533	2.57	3.81	4.04	3.87	2.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	2	5	2	3.55	1240/1512	3.55	3.97	4.10	3.86	3.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	3	1	2	2	1	2.67	1591/1623	2.67	3.56	4.16	4.08	2.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	1092/1646	4.62	4.53	4.69	4.67	4.62	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	2	3	5	1	3.25	1451/1621	3.25	3.90	4.06	3.96	3.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	4	0	3	1	5	3.23	1497/1568	3.23	4.09	4.43	4.39	3.23	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.77	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	2	3	3	3	3.23	1464/1564	3.23	4.09	4.28	4.20	3.23	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	1038/1559	4.15	4.23	4.29	4.20	4.15	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	690/1352	4.00	3.90	3.98	3.86	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	247/1384	4.75	4.33	4.08	3.86	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	740/1382	4.38	4.42	4.29	4.03	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	771/1368	4.38	4.53	4.30	4.01	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	578/ 948	3.80	3.87	3.95	3.75	3.80	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 221	****	4.17	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 243	****	4.10	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 212	****	4.60	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 209	****	4.57	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	1	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	479/ 555	3.40	3.20	4.29	4.14	3.40	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	83/ 88	3.75	4.22	4.54	4.31	3.75	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 85	****	4.34	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 81	****	4.20	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	81/ 92	3.50	4.00	4.35	4.01	3.50	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	1	2	2	2	0	2.71	248/ 288	2.71	3.56	3.68	3.54	2.71	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 52	****	4.05	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 48	****	3.85	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 39	****	3.79	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	1	0	1	0	4	1	3.83	181/ 312	3.83	3.20	3.68	3.51	3.83	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	1	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: FYS 103B 0101  
 Title PARADIGMS & PARADOXES  
 Instructor: LIEBMAN, JOEL F  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 888  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
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	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: FYS 103K 0101  
 Title SFERICS,TWEEKS,WHISTLE  
 Instructor: ROUS, PHILIP (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 889  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	13	4.58	550/1649	4.58	4.00	4.28	4.11	4.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	10	4.47	599/1648	4.47	3.93	4.23	4.16	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	12	4.47	581/1375	4.47	4.16	4.27	4.10	4.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	417/1595	4.58	4.09	4.20	4.03	4.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	4	7	2	3.71	1103/1533	3.71	3.81	4.04	3.87	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	493/1512	4.42	3.97	4.10	3.86	4.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	5	3	4	3	2	2	2.71	1586/1623	2.71	3.56	4.16	4.08	2.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	1	13	4	4.17	1462/1646	4.17	4.53	4.69	4.67	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1621	4.43	3.90	4.06	3.96	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1568	4.89	4.09	4.43	4.39	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1572	5.00	4.77	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1564	4.83	4.09	4.28	4.20	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1559	4.88	4.23	4.29	4.20	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1352	4.83	3.90	3.98	3.86	4.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	400/1384	4.56	4.33	4.08	3.86	4.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	272/1382	4.88	4.42	4.29	4.03	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	358/1368	4.81	4.53	4.30	4.01	4.81	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	411/ 948	4.09	3.87	3.95	3.75	4.09	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	64/ 221	4.50	4.17	4.16	4.05	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	94/ 243	4.40	4.10	4.12	4.08	4.40	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	94/ 212	4.60	4.60	4.40	4.43	4.60	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	90/ 209	4.60	4.57	4.35	4.38	4.60	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	3	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 555	****	3.20	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	69/ 88	4.20	4.22	4.54	4.31	4.20	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 85	****	4.34	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	55/ 81	4.20	4.20	4.43	4.39	4.20	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	35/ 92	4.60	4.00	4.35	4.01	4.60	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	222/ 288	3.17	3.56	3.68	3.54	3.17	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	4.05	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.85	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	3.79	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	3.20	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: FYS 103K 0101  
 Title SFERICS,TWEEKS,WHISTLE  
 Instructor: ROUS, PHILIP (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 889  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 5	Under-grad 19 Non-major 19
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		
			? 1		

Course-Section: FYS 103K 0101  
 Title SFERICs,TWEEKS,WHISTLE  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 890  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	13	4.58	550/1649	4.58	4.00	4.28	4.11	4.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	10	4.47	599/1648	4.47	3.93	4.23	4.16	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	12	4.47	581/1375	4.47	4.16	4.27	4.10	4.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	417/1595	4.58	4.09	4.20	4.03	4.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	4	7	2	3.71	1103/1533	3.71	3.81	4.04	3.87	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	493/1512	4.42	3.97	4.10	3.86	4.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	5	3	4	3	2	2	2.71	1586/1623	2.71	3.56	4.16	4.08	2.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	1	13	4	4.17	1462/1646	4.17	4.53	4.69	4.67	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	483/1621	4.43	3.90	4.06	3.96	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	273/1568	4.89	4.09	4.43	4.39	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.77	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	234/1564	4.83	4.09	4.28	4.20	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	227/1559	4.88	4.23	4.29	4.20	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	123/1352	4.83	3.90	3.98	3.86	4.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	400/1384	4.56	4.33	4.08	3.86	4.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	272/1382	4.88	4.42	4.29	4.03	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	358/1368	4.81	4.53	4.30	4.01	4.81	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	411/ 948	4.09	3.87	3.95	3.75	4.09	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	64/ 221	4.50	4.17	4.16	4.05	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	94/ 243	4.40	4.10	4.12	4.08	4.40	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	94/ 212	4.60	4.60	4.40	4.43	4.60	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	90/ 209	4.60	4.57	4.35	4.38	4.60	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	3	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 555	****	3.20	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	69/ 88	4.20	4.22	4.54	4.31	4.20	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 85	****	4.34	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	55/ 81	4.20	4.20	4.43	4.39	4.20	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	35/ 92	4.60	4.00	4.35	4.01	4.60	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	222/ 288	3.17	3.56	3.68	3.54	3.17	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	4.05	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.85	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	3.79	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	3.20	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: FYS 103K 0101  
 Title SFERICS,TWEEKS,WHISTLE  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 890  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors	7	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 5				
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General	5	Under-grad 19	Non-major 19
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	1		
			? 1				