

Course-Section: FYS 101 1
 Title Turning To One Another
 Instructor: Lee,Diane M (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 760
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course Mean | Dept Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|----------|-------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | | | | | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 11 | 4.53 | 551/1447 | 4.53 | 4.49 | 4.31 | 4.18 | 4.53 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 4.53 | 500/1447 | 4.53 | 4.36 | 4.27 | 4.30 | 4.53 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4.00 | 923/1241 | 4.00 | 4.10 | 4.33 | 4.25 | 4.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 10 | 4.53 | 459/1402 | 4.53 | 4.28 | 4.24 | 4.15 | 4.53 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 3.80 | 987/1358 | 3.80 | 3.99 | 4.11 | 4.03 | 3.80 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 4.43 | 476/1316 | 4.43 | 4.17 | 4.14 | 3.99 | 4.43 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 12 | 4.60 | 337/1427 | 4.60 | 4.10 | 4.19 | 4.24 | 4.60 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 4.93 | 339/1447 | 4.93 | 4.73 | 4.69 | 4.68 | 4.93 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 4.44 | 408/1434 | 4.35 | 4.18 | 4.10 | 4.10 | 4.35 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 4.58 | 684/1387 | 4.79 | 4.53 | 4.46 | 4.46 | 4.79 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 5.00 | 1/1387 | 4.92 | 4.91 | 4.73 | 4.71 | 4.92 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 4.58 | 529/1386 | 4.79 | 4.52 | 4.32 | 4.32 | 4.79 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 4.67 | 463/1380 | 4.83 | 4.55 | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.83 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3.55 | 946/1193 | 3.52 | 3.77 | 4.02 | 3.99 | 3.52 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5.00 | 1/1172 | 5.00 | 4.60 | 4.15 | 3.95 | 5.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 4.80 | 303/1182 | 4.80 | 4.49 | 4.35 | 4.18 | 4.80 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5.00 | 1/1170 | 5.00 | 4.82 | 4.38 | 4.17 | 5.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 4.67 | 133/ 800 | 4.67 | 4.26 | 4.06 | 3.95 | 4.67 |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 42/ 66 | 4.60 | 4.57 | 4.58 | 3.95 | 4.60 |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 28/ 62 | 4.80 | 4.66 | 4.56 | 4.08 | 4.80 |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 30/ 58 | 4.60 | 4.53 | 4.41 | 3.88 | 4.60 |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 23/ 65 | 4.80 | 4.70 | 4.42 | 3.78 | 4.80 |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4.20 | 31/ 64 | 4.20 | 4.17 | 4.09 | 3.75 | 4.20 |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|---|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 9 | Required for Majors | 2 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 2 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 0 | General | 2 | Under-grad | 15 | Non-major | 15 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 5 | F | 0 | Electives | 4 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 4 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: FYS 101 1
 Title Turning To One Another
 Instructor: Randles,C J (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 761
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course Mean | Dept Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|----------|-------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | | | | | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 11 | 4.53 | 551/1447 | 4.53 | 4.49 | 4.31 | 4.18 | 4.53 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 4.53 | 500/1447 | 4.53 | 4.36 | 4.27 | 4.30 | 4.53 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4.00 | 923/1241 | 4.00 | 4.10 | 4.33 | 4.25 | 4.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 10 | 4.53 | 459/1402 | 4.53 | 4.28 | 4.24 | 4.15 | 4.53 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 3.80 | 987/1358 | 3.80 | 3.99 | 4.11 | 4.03 | 3.80 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 4.43 | 476/1316 | 4.43 | 4.17 | 4.14 | 3.99 | 4.43 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 12 | 4.60 | 337/1427 | 4.60 | 4.10 | 4.19 | 4.24 | 4.60 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 4.93 | 339/1447 | 4.93 | 4.73 | 4.69 | 4.68 | 4.93 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 4.25 | 634/1434 | 4.35 | 4.18 | 4.10 | 4.10 | 4.35 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1387 | 4.79 | 4.53 | 4.46 | 4.46 | 4.79 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 707/1387 | 4.92 | 4.91 | 4.73 | 4.71 | 4.92 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1386 | 4.79 | 4.52 | 4.32 | 4.32 | 4.79 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1380 | 4.83 | 4.55 | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.83 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 10 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3.50 | 960/1193 | 3.52 | 3.77 | 4.02 | 3.99 | 3.52 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5.00 | 1/1172 | 5.00 | 4.60 | 4.15 | 3.95 | 5.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 4.80 | 303/1182 | 4.80 | 4.49 | 4.35 | 4.18 | 4.80 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5.00 | 1/1170 | 5.00 | 4.82 | 4.38 | 4.17 | 5.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 4.67 | 133/ 800 | 4.67 | 4.26 | 4.06 | 3.95 | 4.67 |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 42/ 66 | 4.60 | 4.57 | 4.58 | 3.95 | 4.60 |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 28/ 62 | 4.80 | 4.66 | 4.56 | 4.08 | 4.80 |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 30/ 58 | 4.60 | 4.53 | 4.41 | 3.88 | 4.60 |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 23/ 65 | 4.80 | 4.70 | 4.42 | 3.78 | 4.80 |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4.20 | 31/ 64 | 4.20 | 4.17 | 4.09 | 3.75 | 4.20 |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|---|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 9 | Required for Majors | 2 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 2 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 0 | General | 2 | Under-grad | 15 | Non-major | 15 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 5 | F | 0 | Electives | 4 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 4 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course Mean | Dept Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | | | | | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 3.86 | 1198/1447 | 3.86 | 4.49 | 4.31 | 4.18 | 3.86 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 7 | 4.00 | 1053/1447 | 4.00 | 4.36 | 4.27 | 4.30 | 4.00 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3.75 | 1068/1241 | 3.75 | 4.10 | 4.33 | 4.25 | 3.75 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3.36 | 1298/1402 | 3.36 | 4.28 | 4.24 | 4.15 | 3.36 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 3.43 | 1203/1358 | 3.43 | 3.99 | 4.11 | 4.03 | 3.43 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3.64 | 1063/1316 | 3.64 | 4.17 | 4.14 | 3.99 | 3.64 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 3.71 | 1180/1427 | 3.71 | 4.10 | 4.19 | 4.24 | 3.71 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 3.86 | 1409/1447 | 3.86 | 4.73 | 4.69 | 4.68 | 3.86 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 3.11 | 1338/1434 | 3.11 | 4.18 | 4.10 | 4.10 | 3.11 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 4.00 | 1176/1387 | 4.00 | 4.53 | 4.46 | 4.46 | 4.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 12 | 4.79 | 814/1387 | 4.79 | 4.91 | 4.73 | 4.71 | 4.79 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 4.00 | 1047/1386 | 4.00 | 4.52 | 4.32 | 4.32 | 4.00 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 3.77 | 1165/1380 | 3.77 | 4.55 | 4.32 | 4.31 | 3.77 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3.10 | 1075/1193 | 3.10 | 3.77 | 4.02 | 3.99 | 3.10 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4.25 | 580/1172 | 4.25 | 4.60 | 4.15 | 3.95 | 4.25 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4.13 | 817/1182 | 4.13 | 4.49 | 4.35 | 4.18 | 4.13 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.43 | 640/1170 | 4.43 | 4.82 | 4.38 | 4.17 | 4.43 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 6 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 3.83 | 547/ 800 | 3.83 | 4.26 | 4.06 | 3.95 | 3.83 |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/ 66 | **** | 4.57 | 4.58 | 3.95 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 62 | **** | 4.66 | 4.56 | 4.08 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 58 | **** | 4.53 | 4.41 | 3.88 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 13 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 65 | **** | 4.70 | 4.42 | 3.78 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 13 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 64 | **** | 4.17 | 4.09 | 3.75 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: FYS 106 01
 Title Vienna 1900
 Instructor: Rosenthal, Alan
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 763
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course Mean | Dept Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean | | |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|------------|----|-------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | | | | Mean | Rank |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 14 | 4.68 | 386/1447 | 4.76 | 4.49 | 4.31 | 4.18 | 4.68 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 12 | 4.21 | 892/1447 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.27 | 4.30 | 4.21 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 11 | 4.26 | 774/1241 | 4.38 | 4.10 | 4.33 | 4.25 | 4.26 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 11 | 4.65 | 336/1402 | 4.49 | 4.28 | 4.24 | 4.15 | 4.65 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 13 | 4.53 | 332/1358 | 4.47 | 3.99 | 4.11 | 4.03 | 4.53 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 3.89 | 921/1316 | 4.17 | 4.17 | 4.14 | 3.99 | 3.89 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 3.68 | 1192/1427 | 3.80 | 4.10 | 4.19 | 4.24 | 3.68 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 5.00 | 1/1447 | 4.96 | 4.73 | 4.69 | 4.68 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 8 | 4.47 | 374/1434 | 4.54 | 4.18 | 4.10 | 4.10 | 4.47 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 10 | 4.33 | 970/1387 | 4.54 | 4.53 | 4.46 | 4.46 | 4.33 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 5.00 | 1/1387 | 4.96 | 4.91 | 4.73 | 4.71 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 12 | 4.44 | 691/1386 | 4.51 | 4.52 | 4.32 | 4.32 | 4.44 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 4.56 | 604/1380 | 4.65 | 4.55 | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.56 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 4.31 | 440/1193 | 4.36 | 3.77 | 4.02 | 3.99 | 4.31 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 4.63 | 309/1172 | 4.36 | 4.60 | 4.15 | 3.95 | 4.63 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 4.75 | 347/1182 | 4.38 | 4.49 | 4.35 | 4.18 | 4.75 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | 254/1170 | 4.84 | 4.82 | 4.38 | 4.17 | 4.88 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 11 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 4.33 | 290/ 800 | 4.07 | 4.26 | 4.06 | 3.95 | 4.33 |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | A | 13 | Required for Majors | 5 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 7 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 4 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 1 | General | 1 | Under-grad | 19 | Non-major | 19 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 10 | F | 0 | Electives | 10 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: FYS 106 01
 Title Latin America and the
 Instructor: Sinnigen,John H
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 764
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course Mean | Dept Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean | | |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|------------|----|-------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | | | | Mean | Rank |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 4.83 | 222/1447 | 4.76 | 4.49 | 4.31 | 4.18 | 4.83 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 4.50 | 532/1447 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.27 | 4.30 | 4.50 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 4.50 | 541/1241 | 4.38 | 4.10 | 4.33 | 4.25 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 4.33 | 685/1402 | 4.49 | 4.28 | 4.24 | 4.15 | 4.33 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 4.42 | 441/1358 | 4.47 | 3.99 | 4.11 | 4.03 | 4.42 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 4.45 | 444/1316 | 4.17 | 4.17 | 4.14 | 3.99 | 4.45 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 3.92 | 1066/1427 | 3.80 | 4.10 | 4.19 | 4.24 | 3.92 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 4.92 | 436/1447 | 4.96 | 4.73 | 4.69 | 4.68 | 4.92 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 4.60 | 278/1434 | 4.54 | 4.18 | 4.10 | 4.10 | 4.60 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 4.75 | 429/1387 | 4.54 | 4.53 | 4.46 | 4.46 | 4.75 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 4.92 | 475/1387 | 4.96 | 4.91 | 4.73 | 4.71 | 4.92 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 4.58 | 529/1386 | 4.51 | 4.52 | 4.32 | 4.32 | 4.58 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 4.75 | 339/1380 | 4.65 | 4.55 | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.75 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 4.42 | 367/1193 | 4.36 | 3.77 | 4.02 | 3.99 | 4.42 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 4.10 | 672/1172 | 4.36 | 4.60 | 4.15 | 3.95 | 4.10 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4.00 | 856/1182 | 4.38 | 4.49 | 4.35 | 4.18 | 4.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 4.80 | 327/1170 | 4.84 | 4.82 | 4.38 | 4.17 | 4.80 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 3.80 | 562/ 800 | 4.07 | 4.26 | 4.06 | 3.95 | 3.80 |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4.50 | 47/ 66 | 4.50 | 4.57 | 4.58 | 3.95 | 4.50 |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4.38 | 48/ 62 | 4.38 | 4.66 | 4.56 | 4.08 | 4.38 |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4.38 | 38/ 58 | 4.38 | 4.53 | 4.41 | 3.88 | 4.38 |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4.50 | 37/ 65 | 4.50 | 4.70 | 4.42 | 3.78 | 4.50 |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 4.13 | 35/ 64 | 4.13 | 4.17 | 4.09 | 3.75 | 4.13 |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|--------|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | A 8 | Required for Majors | 1 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | B 2 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | C 0 | General | 6 | Under-grad | 12 | Non-major | 12 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | D 1 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | F 0 | Electives | 2 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | P 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 2 | | | | |
| | | | ? 0 | | | | | | |