

Course-Section: HONR 100 0101
 Title HONORS FORUM
 Instructor: SHIELDS, ANNA
 Enrollment: 108
 Questionnaires: 98

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 981
 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	15	12	27	22	22	3.24	1568/1639	3.24	4.23	4.27	4.08	3.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	8	7	30	21	31	3.62	1438/1639	3.62	4.09	4.22	4.17	3.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	87	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	****/1397	****	4.57	4.28	4.18	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	40	4	2	11	23	17	3.82	1212/1583	3.82	4.37	4.19	4.01	3.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	4	11	13	28	22	17	3.23	1367/1532	3.23	4.28	4.01	3.88	3.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	12	11	21	34	15	3.31	1316/1504	3.31	4.23	4.05	3.78	3.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	26	2	2	5	9	52	4.53	469/1612	4.53	4.00	4.16	4.10	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	1	0	0	2	93	4.94	463/1635	4.94	4.63	4.65	4.56	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	24	7	1	0	7	50	9	3.99	922/1579	3.99	4.19	4.08	3.95	3.99	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	1	1	2	24	62	4.61	670/1518	4.61	4.36	4.43	4.38	4.61	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	1	0	2	13	73	4.76	872/1520	4.76	4.91	4.70	4.61	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	2	2	11	37	36	4.17	964/1517	4.17	4.38	4.27	4.20	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	1	3	3	14	29	39	4.11	1019/1550	4.11	4.31	4.22	4.17	4.11	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	14	2	5	13	23	31	4.03	613/1295	4.03	4.18	3.94	3.84	4.03	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	10	7	15	23	25	3.58	1083/1398	3.58	4.44	4.07	3.85	3.58	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	5	7	8	16	45	4.10	940/1391	4.10	4.73	4.30	4.07	4.10	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	0	4	20	57	4.61	571/1388	4.61	4.54	4.28	4.01	4.61	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	13	3	6	8	18	31	4.03	450/ 958	4.03	4.18	3.93	3.71	4.03	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	96	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	96	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	95	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	96	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	81	2	0	0	4	6	5	4.07	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	83	14	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	83	1	1	1	4	4	4	3.64	****/ 80	****	4.33	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	84	1	1	1	0	4	7	4.15	****/ 82	****	4.50	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	96	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	97	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	97	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	37	0.00-0.99 16	A 8	Required for Majors	1
28-55	23	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Under-grad 98
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives	2
			P 80		### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	84

Course-Section: HONR 200B 0101
 Title HONORS SEMINAR
 Instructor: SENG, PHILLIP
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 982
 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	2	0	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	1016/1639	4.14	4.23	4.27	4.35	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	4	5	3	3.57	1455/1639	3.57	4.09	4.22	4.27	3.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	11	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1397	****	4.57	4.28	4.39	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	1	7	4	3.93	1128/1583	3.93	4.37	4.19	4.28	3.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	553/1532	4.29	4.28	4.01	4.09	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	4	6	4.00	824/1504	4.00	4.23	4.05	4.09	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	3	3	3	3	3.14	1501/1612	3.14	4.00	4.16	4.21	3.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	3	8	3	4.00	1497/1635	4.00	4.63	4.65	4.63	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	772/1579	4.15	4.19	4.08	4.14	4.15	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	0	1	7	3	3.69	1386/1518	3.69	4.36	4.43	4.48	3.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	437/1520	4.92	4.91	4.70	4.78	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	3	7	2	3.77	1256/1517	3.77	4.38	4.27	4.34	3.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	0	6	5	4.00	1077/1550	4.00	4.31	4.22	4.33	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	98/1295	4.85	4.18	3.94	4.07	4.85	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	560/1398	4.33	4.44	4.07	4.14	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	616/1391	4.50	4.73	4.30	4.35	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	609/1388	4.56	4.54	4.28	4.37	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 958	****	4.18	3.93	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	3.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	****	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	4.33	4.47	2.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	4.50	4.16	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	3
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	8
			? 0		

Course-Section: HONR 200C 0101
 Title HONORS SEMINAR
 Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 983
 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	4	4	6	4.14	1016/1639	4.14	4.23	4.27	4.35	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	5	6	4.07	1036/1639	4.07	4.09	4.22	4.27	4.07	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	12	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1397	****	4.57	4.28	4.39	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	524/1583	4.46	4.37	4.19	4.28	4.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	3	8	4.21	616/1532	4.21	4.28	4.01	4.09	4.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	260/1504	4.64	4.23	4.05	4.09	4.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	1221/1612	3.85	4.00	4.16	4.21	3.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	4	7	2	3.85	1578/1635	3.85	4.63	4.65	4.63	3.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	8	2	4.00	889/1579	4.00	4.19	4.08	4.14	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	3	4	3	3.67	1392/1518	3.67	4.36	4.43	4.48	3.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	491/1520	4.92	4.91	4.70	4.78	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	973/1517	4.17	4.38	4.27	4.34	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	2	3	5	3.83	1198/1550	3.83	4.31	4.22	4.33	3.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	978/1295	3.50	4.18	3.94	4.07	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	708/1398	4.14	4.44	4.07	4.14	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	546/1388	4.63	4.54	4.28	4.37	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	456/ 958	4.00	4.18	3.93	4.00	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	3.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	****	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	4.47	2.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 82	****	4.50	4.16	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 1		

Course-Section: HONR 300A 0101
 Title ARISTOTLE & THE VERB A
 Instructor: GLASSER, JOEL
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 984
 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	0	1	5	4.83	231/1639	4.83	4.23	4.27	4.28	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	349/1639	4.67	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	230/1397	4.80	4.57	4.28	4.26	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	164/1583	4.86	4.37	4.19	4.24	4.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	203/1532	4.71	4.28	4.01	4.05	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	208/1504	4.71	4.23	4.05	4.12	4.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	718/1612	4.33	4.00	4.16	4.12	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.63	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	473/1579	4.43	4.19	4.08	4.07	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.36	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.91	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	347/1517	4.71	4.38	4.27	4.23	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	231/1550	4.86	4.31	4.22	4.20	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1295	****	4.18	3.94	3.95	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.44	4.07	4.13	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	944/1388	4.00	4.54	4.28	4.34	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	201/ 958	4.50	4.18	3.93	3.97	4.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.50	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.59	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	52/ 80	4.33	4.33	4.47	4.65	4.33	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	33/ 82	4.50	4.50	4.16	4.08	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 7
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: HONR 300B 0101
 Title HONORS SEMINAR
 Instructor: MACAULAY, JANIC
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 985
 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	2	1	4	4.29	860/1639	4.29	4.23	4.27	4.28	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	650/1639	4.43	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	323/1397	4.71	4.57	4.28	4.26	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	164/1583	4.86	4.37	4.19	4.24	4.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	133/1532	4.83	4.28	4.01	4.05	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	367/1504	4.50	4.23	4.05	4.12	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	913/1612	4.17	4.00	4.16	4.12	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.63	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	889/1579	4.00	4.19	4.08	4.07	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	720/1518	4.57	4.36	4.43	4.39	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	674/1520	4.86	4.91	4.70	4.68	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	198/1517	4.86	4.38	4.27	4.23	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	742/1550	4.43	4.31	4.22	4.20	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	329/1295	4.43	4.18	3.94	3.95	4.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.44	4.07	4.13	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	332/1391	4.80	4.73	4.30	4.35	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	571/1388	4.60	4.54	4.28	4.34	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	****	4.18	3.93	3.97	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HONR 300C 0101
 Title HONORS SEMINAR
 Instructor: STACEY, SIMON
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 986
 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	1	10	4.75	318/1639	4.75	4.23	4.27	4.28	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	948/1639	4.17	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	850/1397	4.20	4.57	4.28	4.26	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	771/1583	4.27	4.37	4.19	4.24	4.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	1	9	4.42	430/1532	4.42	4.28	4.01	4.05	4.42	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	678/1504	4.18	4.23	4.05	4.12	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	1044/1612	4.00	4.00	4.16	4.12	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.63	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	342/1579	4.55	4.19	4.08	4.07	4.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	684/1518	4.60	4.36	4.43	4.39	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.91	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	474/1517	4.60	4.38	4.27	4.23	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	522/1550	4.60	4.31	4.22	4.20	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	569/1295	4.11	4.18	3.94	3.95	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	386/1398	4.57	4.44	4.07	4.13	4.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	276/1388	4.86	4.54	4.28	4.34	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 958	****	4.18	3.93	3.97	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.59	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.50	4.16	4.08	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 1		