```
Course-Section: HONR 200B 0101              University of Maryland                          Page  977
Title          ETHICS AND PUBLIC POLI        Baltimore County                             JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:    STACEY, SIMON                  Spring 2009                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    29
Questionnaires: 29                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                        Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 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  0  0  4 21  4.84  211/1576  4.84  4.49  4.30  4.35  4.84
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     5   0  0  0  3  5 16  4.54  555/1576  4.54  4.08  4.27  4.32  4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    5  14  0  0  0  0 10  5.00    1/1342  5.00  4.27  4.32  4.41  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     5   1  0  0  1  2 20  4.83  185/1520  4.83  4.23  4.25  4.26  4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 4   0  0  0  0  3 22  4.88  132/1465  4.88  4.64  4.12  4.09  4.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 5  2  0  0  1  4 17  4.73  218/1434  4.73  4.26  4.14  4.06  4.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             5   0  1  1  1  4 17  4.46  608/1547  4.46  3.92  4.19  4.22  4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled                   5   0  0  0  0  2 22  4.92  422/1574  4.92  4.37  4.64  4.62  4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4  1  1  0  0  5 18  4.63  298/1554  4.63  4.22  4.10  4.05  4.63

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        16   0  1  0  0  1 11  4.62  736/1488  4.62  4.63  4.47  4.44  4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   18   0  0  0  0  0 11  5.00    1/1493  5.00  4.98  4.73  4.75  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 17  0  0  0  0  1 11  4.92  154/1486  4.92  4.56  4.32  4.29  4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     19   0  0  0  0  0 10  5.00    1/1489  5.00  4.59  4.32  4.31  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 19  8  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/1277  ****  4.02  4.03  4.01  ****

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18  0  0  0  0  1 10  4.91  169/1279  4.91  4.57  4.17  4.14  4.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18  0  0  0  1  1  9  4.73  447/1270  4.73  4.63  4.35  4.30  4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19  0  0  0  0  1  9  4.90  278/1269  4.90  4.58  4.35  4.29  4.90
4. Were special techniques successful                  19   9  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 878  ****  4.11  4.05  3.92  ****

            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 11  0  0  0  0  0 18  5.00    1/  85  5.00  4.94  4.72  4.78  5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 12  8  0  0  0  2  7  4.78   45/  79  4.78  4.78  4.69  4.72  4.78
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 11 11  0  0  1  1  5  4.57 ****/  72  ****  4.50  4.64  4.83  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    11   1  0  0  0  3 14  4.82   33/  80  4.82  4.52  4.61  4.80  4.82
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 9   3  0  1  0  2 14  4.71  143/ 375  4.71  4.13  4.01  4.21  4.71

            Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 28   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 326  ****  ****  4.03  4.43  ****

            Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     22   0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00 ****/ 382  ****  5.00  4.08  4.39  ****
```

                                        Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons              Type                 Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     2        0.00-0.99    0        A   12        Required for Majors   0      Graduate      0       Major        0
  28-55     1        1.00-1.99    0        B    9
  56-83     6        2.00-2.99    0        C    0        General               5      Under-grad   29       Non-major   29
  84-150    6        3.00-3.49    3        D    0
  Grad.     0        3.50-4.00   14        F    0        Electives             1      #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                           I    0        Other                16
                                           ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: HONR 211  0101                      University of Maryland                                    Page  978
Title       GREAT BOOKS SEMINAR II                      Baltimore County                                      JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:  SPITZ, ELLEN                               Spring 2009                                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    21
Questionnaires:  18                            Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                    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  4 11  4.44  727/1576   4.44  4.49  4.30 4.35  4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   1  4  4  2  7  3.56 1380/1576   3.56  4.08  4.27 4.32  3.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  14   0  0  2  0  2  4.00 ****/1342   ****  4.27  4.32 4.41  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   2   2  3  3  2  6  3.44 1388/1520   3.44  4.23  4.25 4.26  3.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0   0  0  1  0 16  4.88  132/1465   4.88  4.64  4.12 4.09  4.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0  1  1  4  5  6  3.82 1051/1434   3.82  4.26  4.14 4.06  3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   6   2  1  3  1  4  3.36 1389/1547   3.36  3.92  4.19 4.22  3.36
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0  0  0  5 12  4.71  851/1574   4.71  4.37  4.64 4.62  4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 2  0  0  4  5  1  3.70 1201/1554   3.70  4.22  4.10 4.05  3.70

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        8   0   1  0  1  1  7  4.30 1072/1488   4.30  4.63  4.47 4.44  4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   8   0   0  0  0  0 10  5.00    1/1493   5.00  4.98  4.73 4.75  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 10 0  0  0  2  1  5  4.38  851/1486   4.38  4.56  4.32 4.29  4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     9   0   1  1  1  1  5  3.89 1200/1489   3.89  4.59  4.32 4.31  3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8 5  2  0  0  1  2  3.20 1119/1277   3.20  4.02  4.03 4.01  3.20

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0  0  0  1  1 13  4.80  219/1279   4.80  4.57  4.17 4.14  4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0  1  0  1  2 10  4.43  716/1270   4.43  4.63  4.35 4.30  4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 2  2  1  1  8  3.79 1025/1269   3.79  4.58  4.35 4.29  3.79
4. Were special techniques successful                  4   6   1  0  2  1  4  3.88  570/ 878   3.88  4.11  4.05 3.92  3.88

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 5  3  0  0  0  0 10  5.00    1/  85   5.00  4.94  4.72 4.78  5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 6 11 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  79   ****  4.78  4.69 4.72  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    6   0   0  1  0  2  9  4.58   45/  80   4.58  4.52  4.61 4.80  4.58
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                6   0   6  0  2  3  1  2.42  373/ 375   2.42  4.13  4.01 4.21  2.42

              Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 14  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00 ****/ 326   **** ****  4.03 4.43  ****

              Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    15   0   0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/ 382   ****  5.00  4.08 4.39  ****
```

```
                                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                 Type                    Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      3        0.00-0.99   0        A   7        Required for Majors  0      Graduate     0        Major       0
 28-55      3        1.00-1.99   0        B   5
 56-83      6        2.00-2.99   0        C   0        General              2      Under-grad  18        Non-major  18
 84-150     4        3.00-3.49   3        D   0
 Grad.      0        3.50-4.00   8        F   0        Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P   0                                   responses to be significant
                                          I   0        Other               15
                                          ?   5
```

```
Course-Section: HONR 300F 0101          University of Maryland                              Page  979
Title      SCIENCE, POLICY, DIPLO       Baltimore County                                   JUL  2, 2009
Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN             Spring 2009                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     23
Questionnaires: 23                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                        Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions             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  3  5 14  4.50  637/1576  4.50  4.49  4.30  4.30  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  0  3  2 17  4.64  434/1576  4.64  4.08  4.27  4.28  4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0  0  1  1  5 15  4.55  541/1342  4.55  4.27  4.32  4.30  4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   0  0  0  2  3 17  4.68  320/1520  4.68  4.23  4.25  4.25  4.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  5  1  0  3  3 10  4.24  668/1465  4.24  4.64  4.12  4.09  4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0  0  1  6 15  4.64  296/1434  4.64  4.26  4.14  4.15  4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  1  0  1  6 14  4.45  608/1547  4.45  3.92  4.19  4.21  4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0 17  5  4.23 1346/1574  4.23  4.37  4.64  4.61  4.23
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 1  0  2  4 14  4.43  504/1554  4.43  4.22  4.10  4.09  4.43

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        14  0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89  278/1488  4.89  4.63  4.47  4.47  4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   13  0  0  0  0  0 10  5.00    1/1493  5.00  4.98  4.73  4.70  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 14 0 0  0  0  2  7  4.78  311/1486  4.78  4.56  4.32  4.32  4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     13  0  0  0  0  0 10  5.00    1/1489  5.00  4.59  4.32  4.34  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 13 2 0  1  1  1  5  4.25  533/1277  4.25  4.02  4.03  4.11  4.25

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0  0  0  2  2 16  4.70  312/1279  4.70  4.57  4.17  4.20  4.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0  0  0  0  4 16  4.80  355/1270  4.80  4.63  4.35  4.42  4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0  1  3  1 15  4.50  644/1269  4.50  4.58  4.35  4.41  4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                   4  9  0  0  3  3  4  4.10  446/ 878  4.10  4.11  4.05  4.09  4.10

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 19 0 0  0  0  1  3  4.75 ****/  85  ****  4.94  4.72  4.67  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 21 0 0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  79  ****  4.78  4.69  4.69  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 20 0 0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/  72  ****  4.50  4.64  4.53  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    20  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/  80  ****  4.52  4.61  4.22  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                17  0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/ 375  5.00  4.13  4.01  4.12  5.00

              Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 19  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00 ****/ 326  ****  ****  4.03  4.23  ****

              Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     17  0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/ 382  5.00  5.00  4.08  4.24  5.00

                                        Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades         Reasons              Type                  Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0        0.00-0.99   0       A   15        Required for Majors  2      Graduate     0       Major        0
  28-55      0        1.00-1.99   0       B    2
  56-83      6        2.00-2.99   0       C    0        General              1      Under-grad  23       Non-major   23
  84-150     5        3.00-3.49   3       D    0
  Grad.      0        3.50-4.00  10       F    0        Electives            1      #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                          I    0        Other               16
                                          ?    2
```

```
Course-Section: HONR 300G 0101            University of Maryland                              Page  980
Title     SCIENCE, TECH IN ANCIE          Baltimore County                                   JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:   MASON, RICHARD              Spring 2009                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    24
Questionnaires:  19              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions               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  6  8  4.00 1148/1576  4.00  4.49  4.30  4.30  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  1  4  8  3  3  3.16 1505/1576  3.16  4.08  4.27  4.28  3.16
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  2  4  4  5  4  3.26 1267/1342  3.26  4.27  4.32  4.30  3.26
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   2  0  3  4  4  5  3.69 1290/1520  3.69  4.23  4.25  4.25  3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  1  1  0  4 13  4.42  483/1465  4.42  4.64  4.12  4.09  4.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  1  1  5  7  5  3.74 1105/1434  3.74  4.26  4.14  4.15  3.74
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  2  6  1  8  2  3.11 1449/1547  3.11  3.92  4.19  4.21  3.11
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  5 13  1  3.79 1538/1574  3.79  4.37  4.64  4.61  3.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0  0  5 10  2  3.82 1117/1554  3.82  4.22  4.10  4.09  3.82


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0  0  0  1  7  9  4.47  907/1488  4.47  4.63  4.47  4.47  4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0  0  0  1  0 16  4.88  607/1493  4.88  4.98  4.73  4.70  4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  2  3  5  7  4.00 1101/1486  4.00  4.56  4.32  4.32  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0  0  1  3  6  7  4.12 1057/1489  4.12  4.59  4.32  4.34  4.12


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 14 0  0  1  0  2  2  4.00  802/1279  4.00  4.57  4.17  4.20  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 14 0  0  0  0  2  3  4.60  559/1270  4.60  4.63  4.35  4.42  4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 14 0 0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1269  5.00  4.58  4.35  4.41  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  14   3  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 878  ****  4.11  4.05  4.09  ****


                 Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 15 0  0  3  0  1  0  2.50 ****/  85  ****  4.94  4.72  4.67  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    15   1  0  0  2  1  0  3.33 ****/  80  ****  4.52  4.61  4.22  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                14   2  0  1  0  1  1  3.67 ****/ 375  ****  4.13  4.01  4.12  ****


                 Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     18   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 382  ****  5.00  4.08  4.24  ****


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA         Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                  Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      2        0.00-0.99   0       A   13         Required for Majors  0     Graduate     0        Major        0
  28-55      3        1.00-1.99   0       B    4
  56-83      5        2.00-2.99   0       C    0         General              2     Under-grad  19        Non-major   19
  84-150     4        3.00-3.49   2       D    0
  Grad.      0        3.50-4.00  11       F    0         Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                          I    0         Other               14
                                          ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: HONR 300J 0101          University of Maryland                              Page  981
Title       IMAGES OF JOAN OF ARC            Baltimore County                               JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:  ORGELFINGER, GA                    Spring 2009                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    20
Questionnaires: 18                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                         Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions               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 13  4.67  415/1576  4.67  4.49  4.30  4.30  4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  9  9  4.50  608/1576  4.50  4.08  4.27  4.28  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  16  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/1342  ****  4.27  4.32  4.30  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   1  0  0  1  6 10  4.53  487/1520  4.53  4.23  4.25  4.25  4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  4 14  4.78  193/1465  4.78  4.64  4.12  4.09  4.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0  1  9  8  4.39  544/1434  4.39  4.26  4.14  4.15  4.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  0  3  8  7  4.22  871/1547  4.22  3.92  4.19  4.21  4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0 14  4  4.22 1346/1574  4.22  4.37  4.64  4.61  4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 9  9  4.50  395/1554  4.50  4.22  4.10  4.09  4.50


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       3   0  0  0  0  2 13  4.87  309/1488  4.87  4.63  4.47  4.47  4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  3   0  0  0  0  0 15  5.00    1/1493  5.00  4.98  4.73  4.70  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 0 0 0  4 11  4.73  366/1486  4.73  4.56  4.32  4.32  4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    3   0  0  0  0  1 14  4.93  136/1489  4.93  4.59  4.32  4.34  4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 0 0 0 1  4 10  4.60  258/1277  4.60  4.02  4.03  4.11  4.60


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 1  5  6  4.42  543/1279  4.42  4.57  4.17  4.20  4.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6 0 0 0 2  1  9  4.58  574/1270  4.58  4.63  4.35  4.42  4.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 0  3  8  4.73  479/1269  4.73  4.58  4.35  4.41  4.73
4. Were special techniques successful                 6   1  0  0  1  5  5  4.36  305/ 878  4.36  4.11  4.05  4.09  4.36


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2 0 0 0 0  3 13  4.81   52/  85  4.81  4.94  4.72  4.67  4.81
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 4 0 0 0 0  3 11  4.79   44/  79  4.79  4.78  4.69  4.69  4.79
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 0  7  7  4.50   47/  72  4.50  4.50  4.64  4.53  4.50
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   4   0  0  1  2  5  6  4.14   69/  80  4.14  4.52  4.61  4.22  4.14
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               5   0  0  1  0  5  7  4.38  166/ 375  4.38  4.13  4.01  4.12  4.38


            Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 17 0 0 0 0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 326  ****  ****  4.03  4.23  ****


            Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    14  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00 ****/ 382  ****  5.00  4.08  4.24  ****

                                 Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     0      0.00-0.99   0       A   8       Required for Majors  0     Graduate      0     Major       0
  28-55     1      1.00-1.99   0       B   8
  56-83     6      2.00-2.99   0       C   0       General              3     Under-grad   18     Non-major  18
  84-150    7      3.00-3.49   4       D   0
  Grad.     0      3.50-4.00   9       F   0       Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P   0                                 responses to be significant
                                       I   0       Other               14
                                       ?   0
```