Title Interdisc Honors Semin

Instructor: Pincus, Fred L

Enrollment: 13
Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 866 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	222/1447	4.32	4.40	4.31	4.31	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	5	6	4.33	766/1447	3.83	3.95	4.31	4.23	4.03
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	0	0	1		****/1241	4.04	4.16	4.33	4.35	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	555/1402	3.91	4.28	4.24	4.24	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1358	4.28	4.34	4.11	4.12	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	312/1316	4.11	4.22	4.14	4.08	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	459/1427	3.69	3.84	4.19	4.14	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	436/1447	4.84	4.52	4.69	4.70	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	454/1434	4.13	4.38	4.10	3.97	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	521/1387	4.33	4.51	4.46	4.42	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1387	4.80	4.85	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	510/1386	4.21	4.38	4.32	4.24	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	420/1380	4.18	4.44	4.32	4.30	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1087/1193	3.95	4.11	4.02	4.04	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1172	4.40	4.53	4.15	4.12	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	219/1182	4.67	4.72	4.35	4.30	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	243/1170	4.59	4.68	4.38	4.32	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	630/ 800	2.67	3.77	4.06	4.01	3.60
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 66	4.66	4.63	4.58	4.43	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	42/ 62	4.08	4.28	4.56	4.28	4.64
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	39/ 58	3.57	3.75	4.41	3.79	4.36
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	22/ 65	4.25	4.33	4.42	4.36	4.82
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	25/ 64	3.67	3.55	4.09	3.70	4.45

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	=			
				2	Λ						

Interdisc Honors Semin

Title Instructor: Worden,Frederic

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 867 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	on Quest:	ionnaire
---------	--------	------------	-----------	----------

Questions	NR	NA	Fre 1	equei 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	Λ	Λ	Λ	2	9	11	4.41	723/1447	4.32	4.40	4.31	4.31	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	6	9	6		1141/1447	3.83	3.95	4.27	4.23	3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	2	1	13	4	3.95	956/1241		4.16	4.33	4.35	3.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	10	7	4.00	976/1402		4.28	4.24	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	4	8	9	4.09	751/1358	4.28	4.34	4.11	4.12	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	6	12	4	3.91	910/1316		4.22	4.14	4.08	3.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	5	11	4		1110/1427	3.69	3.84	4.19	4.14	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	243/1447	4.84	4.52	4.69	4.70	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	15	4	4.10	802/1434		4.38	4.10	3.97	
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	798/1387	4.33	4.51	4.46	4.42	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1387	4.80	4.85	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	8	12	4.60	510/1386	4.21	4.38	4.32	4.24	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	604/1380	4.18	4.44	4.32	4.30	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	68/1193	3.95	4.11	4.02	4.04	4.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	710/1172	4.40	4.53	4.15	4.12	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	271/1182	4.67	4.72	4.35	4.30	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1170	4.59	4.68	4.38	4.32	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	12	6	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	****/ 800	2.67	3.77	4.06	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	33/ 66	4.66	4.63	4.58	4.43	4.78
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	4	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 62	4.08	4.28	4.56	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	6	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 58	3.57	3.75	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	35/ 65	4.25	4.33	4.42	4.36	4.56
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	4	4	1	3.67	46/ 64	3.67	3.55	4.09	3.70	3.67

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General 1		Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	=			
					0						

Interdisc Honors Semin

Title Stacey, Simon P Instructor:

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 19

Baltimore County Spring 2010

University of Maryland

Page 868 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre 1	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
01														
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	408/1447	4.32	4.40	4.31	4.31	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	1	5	7-7		1053/1447	3.83	3.95	4.27	4.23	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	866/1241	4.04	4.16	4.33	4.35	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	0	2	2	10	4.33	685/1402	3.91	4.28	4.24	4.24	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	158/1358	4.28	4.34	4.11	4.12	4.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	5	12	4.50	392/1316	4.11	4.22	4.14	4.08	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	398/1427	3.69	3.84	4.19	4.14	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	978/1447	4.84	4.52	4.69	4.70	4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	190/1434	4.13	4.38	4.10	3.97	4.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	1000/1387	4.33	4.51	4.46	4.42	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1387	4.80	4.85	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	691/1386	4.21	4.38	4.32	4.24	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	463/1380	4.18	4.44	4.32	4.30	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	8	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1193	3.95	4.11	4.02	4.04	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1172	4.40	4.53	4.15	4.12	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	198/1182	4.67	4.72	4.35	4.30	4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	327/1170	4.59	4.68	4.38	4.32	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	9	6	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 800	2.67	3.77	4.06	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/ 66	4.66	4.63	4.58	4.43	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	6	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 62	4.08	4.28	4.56	4.28	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	12	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	3.57	3.75	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	3	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	23/ 65	4.25	4.33	4.42	4.36	4.80
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	5	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	16/ 64	3.67	3.55	4.09	3.70	4.75

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0		14	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				2	1						

Course-Section: HONR 200 04 University of Maryland Title Interdisc Honors Semin Baltimore County

Interdisc Honors Semin
Spitz,Ellen H (Instr. A)

Instructor: Spitz,Eller
Enrollment: 15

Questionnaires: 13

Baltimore County Spring 2010 Page 869 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

	Evaluation	

			Fre	equer		s		Ins	tructor	Course	_	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	1	3	6	3	3.85	1206/1447	4.32	4.40	4.31	4.31	3.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	4	2	3.46	1333/1447	3.83	3.95	4.27	4.23	3.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	4	2	3.38	1292/1402	3.91	4.28	4.24	4.24	3.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	4	4	3.77	1015/1358	4.28	4.34	4.11	4.12	3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	4	4	3.77	991/1316	4.11	4.22	4.14	4.08	3.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	0	5	3	1	2.77	1377/1427	3.69	3.84	4.19	4.14	2.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	673/1447	4.84	4.52	4.69	4.70	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	2	5	2	3.55	1218/1434	4.13	4.38	4.10	3.97	3.72
Lecture	-	0	0	^	1	2	0	4 1 7	1105/1207	4 22	4 51	1 10	4 40	4 00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	/	0	0	0	Ţ	3	2		1105/1387		4.51		4.42	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0 0	0	0 1	0	4	3		1055/1387 1237/1386	4.80 4.21	4.85	4.73 4.32	4.71 4.24	4.50 3.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	4	0		1237/1386	4.21	4.38	4.32	4.24	3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	0	1	1	0	1		****/1193			4.32	4.30	3.5U ****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	U	Т	Т	U	1	3.33	^^^/1193	3.95	4.11	4.02	4.04	* * * *
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	4	3	4.00	710/1172	4.40	4.53	4.15	4.12	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	660/1182	4.67	4.72	4.35	4.30	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	839/1170	4.59	4.68	4.38	4.32	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	1	2	2	0	0	2.20	789/ 800	2.67	3.77	4.06	4.01	2.20
Seminar		_				_								
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	1	6	4		56/ 66		4.63	4.58	4.43	4.27
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	5	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	57/ 62	4.08	4.28	4.56	4.28	3.33
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	5	1	1	1	2	1		54/ 58	3.57	3.75	4.41	3.79	3.17
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	2	2	4		59/ 65		4.33	4.42	4.36	3.55
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	4	1	2	2	2	2.73	61/ 64	3.67	3.55	4.09	3.70	2.73
Frequ	ency.	Dist	ribu	ution	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				?	1						

Interdisc Honors Semin

Title Instructor: Freyman, Jay M (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 870 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Ex	00110	ncies	,		Tnat	tructor		Course	Dont	TIMDC	Level	Sect
		Question	ns		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank			_		Mean	
		 Genera																	
1 Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	1	3	6	3	3 85	1206/14	147	4.32	4 40	4.31	4.31	3.85
		tor make clear			0	0	0	2	5	4	2		1333/14		3.83	3.95	4.27	4.23	3.46
		ations reflect			0	0	1	1	5	4	2		1292/14		3.91	4.28	4.24	4.24	3.38
5. Did as	signed re	adings contrib	oute to	what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	4	4	3.77	1015/13	358	4.28	4.34	4.11	4.12	3.77
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute	to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	4	4	3.77	991/13	316	4.11	4.22	4.14	4.08	3.77
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expl	ained	0	0	4	0	5	3	1	2.77	1377/14	127	3.69	3.84	4.19	4.14	2.77
		was class cand			1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	673/14	47	4.84	4.52	4.69	4.70	4.83
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	all tea	ching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	983/14	134	4.13	4.38	4.10	3.97	3.72
		Lectur	re .																
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture		prepared	8	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1176/13	887	4.33	4.51	4.46	4.42	4.08
		tor seem inter			8	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1203/13	887	4.80	4.85	4.73	4.71	4.50
				explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1174/13	886	4.21	4.38	4.32	4.24	3.70
4. Did th	d the lectures contribute to what you learned d audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding				8	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1218/13	880	4.18	4.44	4.32	4.30	3.50
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques en	hance	your understanding	8	2	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/11	.93	3.95	4.11	4.02	4.04	****
		Discus	ssion																
1. Did cl	ass discu			what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	4	3	4.00	710/11	72	4.40	4.53	4.15	4.12	4.00
				ed to participate	5	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	660/11	.82	4.67	4.72	4.35	4.30	4.38
3. Did th	e instruc	tor encourage	fair a	nd open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	839/11	70	4.59	4.68	4.38	4.32	4.13
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succe	essful		5	3	1	2	2	0	0	2.20	789/ 8	300	2.67	3.77	4.06	4.01	2.20
		Semina	ır																
1. Were a	ssigned t	opics relevant	to th	e announced theme	2	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	56/	66	4.66	4.63	4.58	4.43	4.27
2. Was th	e instruc	tor available	for in	dividual attention	2	5	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	57/	62	4.08	4.28	4.56	4.28	3.33
3. Did re	search pr	ojects contrib	oute to	what you learned	2	5	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	54/	58	3.57	3.75	4.41	3.79	3.17
4. Did pr	esentatio	ons contribute	to wha	t you learned	2	0	1	2	2	2	4	3.55	59/	65	4.25	4.33	4.42	4.36	3.55
5. Were c	riteria f	or grading mad	le clea	r	2	0	4	1	2	2	2	2.73	61/	64	3.67	3.55	4.09	3.70	2.73
				Frequ	lency	, Dist	trib	utio	n										
G.,		G GD3		Book and a Consider				ъ.										25	
Credits E	arnea 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				ке:	asons	5 				Тур	.е 			Majors 	;
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А 6		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	8	Gradu	ate	9	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 4															
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Gei	nera	1				1	Under	-gr	ad 1	.3	Non-	-major	13
04150		2 00 2 40		D 0															

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: HONR 211 1 University of Maryland Title Great Books Seminar II

Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 871

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: Spitz,Ellen H Enrollment: 12 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Questionnaires: 12

?

0

				~										
			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	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	1	10	4.75	309/1447	4.75	4.40	4.31	4.31	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	662/1447		3.95	4.27	4.23	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.16	4.33	4.35	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	448/1402	4.55	4.28	4.24	4.24	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.34	4.11	4.12	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	4		4.17		4.17	4.22	4.14	4.08	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	1	3	5	4.00	971/1427	4.00	3.84	4.19	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	6		1079/1447		4.52	4.69		4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	206/1434	4.70	4.38	4.10	3.97	4.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	200/1387	4.90	4.51	4.46	4.42	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.85	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.38	4.32	4.24	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.44	4.32	4.30	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	2	0	0	1	3	3.50	960/1193	3.50	4.11	4.02	4.04	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.53	4.15	4.12	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.72	4.35	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	364/1170	4.78	4.68	4.38	4.32	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	169/ 800	4.57	3.77	4.06	4.01	4.57
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	29/ 66	4.82	4.63	4.58	4.43	4.82
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	2	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	44/ 62	4.56	4.28	4.56	4.28	4.56
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	35/ 58	4.44	3.75	4.41	3.79	4.44
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	30/ 65	4.73	4.33	4.42	4.36	4.73
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	1	1	3	3	3	3.55	51/ 64	3.55	3.55	4.09	3.70	3.55
Frequ	ıency	7 Dist	trib	ution	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 1 A 11		Red	านเรา	ed fo	 or Ma			6	Graduat	 e	 0	 Majo	 r	0
28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 1		1000	quii.	cu i	JI 140	1,01	5	O	Gradact	C	O	riaje	71	O
56-83 3 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 2 D 0		Ger	nera	1				3	Under-g	rad 1	2	Non-	-major	12
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 6 F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				2					_	ıh
P 0 I 0		Otl	ner					0	<pre>#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant</pre>					

Course-Section: HONR 216 01 University of Maryland
Title Phage Hunters II Baltimore County

Title Phage Hunters II Baltimore Counting
Instructor: Sandoz, James W (Instr. A) Spring 2010

Enrollment: 14

Questionnaires: 13 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 2 3 8 4.46 640/1447 4.46 4.40 4.31 4.31 4.46 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 1 1 1 6 4 3.85 1182/1447 3.85 3.95 4.27 4.23 3.85 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 2 8 2 $3.85 \ 1028/1241$ 3.85 4.16 4.33 4.35 3.85 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 4 8 4.54 $4.54 \ 4.54 \ 4.54 \ 4.54 \ 4.54$ 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 3 3 7 4.31 563/1358 4.31 4.34 4.11 4.12 4.31 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 2 4 7 4.38 512/1316 4.38 4.22 4.14 4.08 4.38 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 1 0 2 5 5 4.00 971/1427 4.00 3.84 4.19 4.14 4.00 0 0 0 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 9 4 4.31 1223/1447 4.31 4.52 4.69 4.70 4.31 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 1 4 7 4.50 341/1434 4.63 4.38 4.10 3.97 4.63 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 1 3 9 4.62 641/1387 4.64 4.51 4.46 4.42 4.64 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 3 10 4.77 844/1387 4.73 4.85 4.73 4.71 4.73 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 2 5 6 4.31 839/1386 4.36 4.38 4.32 4.24 4.36 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 4 8 4.67 463/1380 4.65 4.44 4.32 4.30 4.65 0 2 0 0 0 5 6 4.55 262/1193 4.55 4.11 4.02 4.04 4.55 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding Discussion 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/1172 **** 4.53 4.15 4.12 **** 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0 0 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1182 **** 4.72 4.35 4.30 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/1170 **** 4.68 4.38 4.32 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/ 189 5.00 5.00 4.34 4.47 5.00 6 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 6 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 26/ 192 4.86 4.86 4.34 4.38 4.86 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities $6 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 4.57$ 90/ 186 4.57 4.57 4.48 4.57 4.57 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 6 0 0 0 1 1 5 4.57 91/187 4.57 4.57 4.33 4.46 4.57 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 6 0 0 1 1 2 3 4.00 107/168 4.00 4.00 4.20 4.15 4.00 Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** **** 4.72 **** **** Frequency Distribution

Page 872

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	6	Required for Majors	7	 Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				2	1						

Course-Section: HONR 216 01 University of Maryland Title Phage Hunters II

Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 873

JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: Caruso, Steven M (Instr. B) Enrollment: 14

Questionnaires	: 13	Stude	ent	Course	Evaluat	ion	Questi	onnaire

								Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
			General																
1. D	id vou	gain n	ew insights,skil		om this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	640/1447	4.46	4.40	4.31	4.31	4.46
			ctor make clear			0	0	1	1	1	6	4		1182/1447		3.95	4.27	4.23	3.85
			uestions reflect			0	0	0	1	2	8	2		1028/1241		4.16	4.33	4.35	3.85
4. D	id oth	er eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	459/1402	4.54	4.28	4.24	4.24	4.54
5. D	id ass	igned r	eadings contribu	ite to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	563/1358	4.31	4.34	4.11	4.12	4.31
					to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	512/1316	4.38	4.22	4.14	4.08	4.38
			g system clearly		ained	0	0	1	0	2	5	5	4.00	971/1427	4.00	3.84	4.19	4.14	4.00
			was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	9	4	4.31	1223/1447	4.31	4.52	4.69	4.70	4.31
9. H	low wou	ld you	grade the overal	l teac	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	290/1434	4.63	4.38	4.10	3.97	4.63
			Lecture	2															
1. W	Jere t.h	e instr	uctor's lectures		prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	566/1387	4.64	4.51	4.46	4.42	4.64
			ctor seem intere			3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	,	4.73	4.85	4.73	4.71	4.73
					explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42			4.38	4.32	4.24	4.36
			es contribute to			2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64			4.44	4.32	4.30	4.65
					your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	262/1193		4.11	4.02		4.55
			-	_	_														
			Discuss								_					4 = 0			
					what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	Ţ		****/1172		4.53	4.15	4.12	****
					ed to participate	11 11	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1182	****	4.72	4.35	4.30	****
3. D	old the	instru	ctor encourage i	air an	nd open discussion	11	U	U	U	U	1	1	4.50	****/1170	****	4.68	4.38	4.32	* * * *
			Laborat	ory															
1. D	id the	lab in	crease understar	nding c	of the material	6	2	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 189	5.00	5.00	4.34	4.47	5.00
2. W	Jere yo	u provi	ded with adequat	e back	ground information	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	26/ 192	4.86	4.86	4.34	4.38	4.86
3. W	Jere ne	cessary	materials avail	able f	for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	90/ 186	4.57	4.57	4.48	4.57	4.57
4. D	id the	lab in	structor provide	assis	stance	6	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	91/ 187	4.57	4.57	4.33	4.46	4.57
5. W	lere re	quireme	nts for lab repo	rts cl	early specified	6	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	107/ 168	4.00	4.00	4.20	4.15	4.00
			Self F	Paced															
1. D	id sel	f-paced	system contribu	ite to	what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	****	****
					_		<u> </u>	,											
					Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utioi	n									
Cred	lits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	1
00-	· ·27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 A 6		Red	auir	ed f	or Ma	iors	. – – –	7	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r	0
28-		3	1.00-1.99	0	В 4		1000	7411	- A I	C1 11C	. , 0	•	•	Gradade	_	•	114)	-	J
56-		3	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	.3	Non-	major	13
84-		2	3.00-3.49	3	D 0									5				-	
Grad	ıd.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				2	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
					P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
					I 0		Otl	ner					0						
					? 1														

Course-Section: HONR 216 01 University of Maryland Page 874 Title Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010 Phage Hunters II

Instructor:

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 13 (Instr. C)

Spring 2010 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

Ouest	ons		NR	NA	Fro	eque: 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
Gen	eral															
 Did you gain new insights, 			0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	640/1447		4.40	4.31		4.46
2. Did the instructor make cl			0	0	1	1	1	6	4		1182/1447		3.95	4.27	4.23	3.85
3. Did the exam questions ref			0	0	0	1	2	8	2		1028/1241		4.16	4.33	4.35	3.85
4. Did other evaluations refl			0	0	0	0	1	4	8		459/1402		4.28	4.24	4.24	4.54
5. Did assigned readings cont			0	0	0	0	3	3	-/	4.31			4.34	4.11	4.12	4.31
6. Did written assignments co			0	0	0 1	0	2	4	./		512/1316		4.22	4.14	4.08	4.38
7. Was the grading system cle		inea	0	0	0 T	0	2	5 9	5 4		971/1427		3.84	4.19	4.14	4.00 4.31
8. How many times was class c 9. How would you grade the ov			8	0	0	0	0	9	4		1223/1447 117/1434		4.52	4.69 4.10	4.70	4.31
9. How would you grade the ov	erali teaci	ing effectiveness	8	U	U	U	U	Т	4	4.80	11//1434	4.63	4.38	4.10	3.97	4.63
Lec	ture															
1. Were the instructor's lect	res well ı	prepared	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1387	4.64	4.51	4.46	4.42	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem in	erested in	the subject	10	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1387	4.73	4.85	4.73	4.71	4.73
3. Was lecture material prese			10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1386	4.36	4.38	4.32	4.24	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribut	to what	ou learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1380	4.65	4.44	4.32	4.30	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques	enhance yo	our understanding	10	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1193	4.55	4.11	4.02	4.04	4.55
	cussion			•	•			_	_				4 = 0			
1. Did class discussions cont		-	11	0	0	0	0	1	Ţ		****/1172		4.53	4.15	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively			11	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1182		4.72	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encoura-	ge fair and	d open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1170	****	4.68	4.38	4.32	****
Lab	oratory															
1. Did the lab increase under	standing of	the material	6	2	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 189	5.00	5.00	4.34	4.47	5.00
2. Were you provided with ade	quate back	ground information	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	26/ 192	4.86	4.86	4.34	4.38	4.86
3. Were necessary materials a	railable f	or lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	90/ 186	4.57	4.57	4.48	4.57	4.57
4. Did the lab instructor pro-	vide assist	ance	6	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	91/ 187	4.57	4.57	4.33	4.46	4.57
5. Were requirements for lab	reports cle	early specified	6	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	107/ 168	4.00	4.00	4.20	4.15	4.00
g-1	Paced															
1. Did self-paced system cont		what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	****	****
		1									,					
		Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum.	GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	\$			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00 07																
00-27 0 0.00-0.9 28-55 3 1.00-1.9		A 6 B 4		Re	quir	ea I	or Ma	jors	5	7	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
56-83 3 2.00-2.9		C 0		Ger	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	.3	Non-	-major	13
84-150 2 3.00-3.4	-	D 0		00.	c. a	-				-	011461 -9			14011		10
Grad. 0 3.50-4.0		F 0		E1	ecti [.]	ves				2	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enone	rh
3.30 1.0	•	P 0								_	respons				_	
		I O		Ot.	her					0					-	
		? 1														

General Honors Seminar

Title Instructor: Radtke,Katherin

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 875 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
Quescions	11117								Raiik	Mean		Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	408/1447	4.36	4.40	4.31	4.32	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	532/1447	4.03	3.95	4.27	4.23	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	8	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1241	4.35	4.16	4.33	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	314/1402	4.43	4.28	4.24	4.24	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	299/1358	4.30	4.34	4.11	4.10	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	166/1316	4.25	4.22	4.14	4.13	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	866/1427	3.87	3.84	4.19	4.15	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	2	8	1	3.91	1405/1447	4.35	4.52	4.69	4.65	3.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	93/1434	4.41	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	566/1387	4.56	4.51	4.46	4.44	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1387	4.92	4.85	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1386	4.43	4.38	4.32	4.30	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	463/1380	4.50	4.44	4.32	4.32	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1193	4.12	4.11	4.02	4.05	***
Diamondo														
Discussion	2	0	0	0	0	^	1.0	F 00	1 /1170	4 57	4 52	4 1 5	4 0 4	г оо
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1172		4.53	4.15	4.24	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	Τ	9 10	4.90	198/1182	4.71 4.76	4.72	4.35 4.38	4.42	4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	3	0	0	0	0		5.00 4.57	1/1170 169/ 800	4.76	4.68 3.77	4.38	4.49 4.12	5.00 4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	U	U	U	3	4	4.5/	169/ 800	4.61	3.77	4.06	4.12	4.5/
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 66	4.44	4.63	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 62	4.54	4.28	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	3.63	3.75	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	4.33	4.33	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 64	3.25	3.55	4.09	3.38	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

General Honors Seminar

Instructor: Provencher, Deni

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 15

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010 Page 876 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

								equer			_		ructor		_		Level	
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 I															
1. Did vou	gain ne	ew insights,skil		this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	190/1447	4.36	4.40	4.31	4.32	4.87
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	352/1447	4.03	3.95	4.27	4.23	4.67
		uestions reflect	_	3	0	3	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	282/1241	4.35	4.16	4.33	4.33	4.75
		uations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	121/1402	4.43	4.28	4.24	4.24	4.87
		eadings contribu			0	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	387/1358	4.30	4.34	4.11	4.10	4.47
	_	-		what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	292/1316	4.25	4.22	4.14	4.13	4.60
		g system clearly			0	0	0	0	2	5	-8	4.40	596/1427	3.87	3.84	4.19	4.15	4.40
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	11	4	4.27	1246/1447		4.52	4.69	4.65	4.27
	-			ing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	149/1434	4.41	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.77
		,		3														
		Lecture	9															
1. Were th	ne instr	uctor's lectures	s well pi	repared	3	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	566/1387	4.56	4.51	4.46	4.44	4.67
2. Did the	instru	ctor seem intere	ested in	the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1387	4.92	4.85	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was led	ture mat	terial presented	d and exp	plained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	431/1386	4.43	4.38	4.32	4.30	4.67
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute to	what yo	ou learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	143/1380	4.50	4.44	4.32	4.32	4.92
5. Did aud	diovisua	l techniques enh	nance you	ur understanding	3	1	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	65/1193	4.12	4.11	4.02	4.05	4.91
		Discuss																
		ussions contribu		4	10	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	181/1172	4.57	4.53	4.15	4.24	4.80
		nts actively end	_		10	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1182	4.71	4.72	4.35	4.42	5.00
		ructor encourage fair and open discussion 10			0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1170	4.76	4.68	4.38	4.49	5.00	
4. Were sp	pecial to	istructor encourage lair and open discussion is techniques successful			10	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	159/ 800	4.61	3.77	4.06	4.12	4.60
		G																
1 1/2		Seminar topics relevant			1	0	0	0	0	0	11	г оо	1/ 66	1 11	4 62	4 50	1 17	г оо
				announced theme vidual attention	4	0 5	0	0	0	0	11 5	5.00 4.83	1/ 66			4.58	4.17	5.00
					4	2	0	0	0	1 2	5 7	4.83	26/ 62 25/ 65	4.34	4.28	4.56 4.42	4.21	4.83 4.78
		ons contribute t for grading made		you rearned	4	3	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	42/ 64		3.55	4.42	3.38	3.88
5. Were Cr	riceria .	for grading made	e clear		4	3	U	Т	4	2	3	3.88	42/ 64	3.25	3.55	4.09	3.38	3.88
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	ı									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Туј	pe			Majors	1
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 13	Required for Majors 11		Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0						
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 1	negation for hajorb if						_							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0		0	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non-	major	15					
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	3	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0		Electives						3	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h

Other

1

Ρ

I

0

0

0

General Honors Seminar

Title Instructor: Orgelfinger, Gai

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 877 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	equei	ncie	5		Inst	ructor	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	0	2	7	4.78	287/1447	4.36	4.40	4.31	4.32	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	479/1447	4.03	3.95	4.27	4.23	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	107/1402	4.43	4.28	4.24	4.24	4.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	97/1358	4.30	4.34	4.11	4.10	4.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	239/1316	4.25	4.22	4.14	4.13	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	398/1427	3.87	3.84	4.19	4.15	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1447	4.35	4.52	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	190/1434	4.41	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1387	4.56	4.51	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1387	4.92	4.85	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	316/1386	4.43	4.38	4.32	4.30	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	193/1380	4.50	4.44	4.32	4.32	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	131/1193	4.12	4.11	4.02	4.05	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	203/1172	4.57	4.53	4.15	4.24	4.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	521/1182	4.71	4.72	4.35	4.42	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1170	4.76	4.68	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	133/ 800	4.61	3.77	4.06	4.12	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 66	4.44	4.63	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 62	4.54	4.28	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	3.63	3.75	4.41	2.87	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 65	4.33	4.33	4.42	4.01	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 64	3.25	3.55	4.09	3.38	****
Floor		- -			_									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	9	Non-major	9
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	Į
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
					0						

General Honors Seminar

Instructor: Mason,Richard S

Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 17

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 878 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

			Frequencies			Inst	tructor	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	Λ	Ω	0	2	4	4	7	3 94	1118/1447	4.36	4.40	4.31	4.32	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	6	5	2		1374/1447	4.03	3.95	4.27	4.23	3.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	11	3		962/1241	4.35	4.16	4.33	4.33	3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	6	4.18	,	4.43	4.28	4.24	4.24	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	5	5		1022/1358	4.30	4.34	4.11	4.10	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	9	3	3.88	927/1316	4.25	4.22	4.14	4.13	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	4	6	4	0	2.87	1370/1427	3.87	3.84	4.19	4.15	2.87
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	15	1	4.06	1343/1447	4.35	4.52	4.69	4.65	4.06
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	3	7	4	3.93	942/1434	4.41	4.38	4.10	4.09	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	8	6	4.18	1098/1387	4.56	4.51	4.46	4.44	4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	732/1387	4.92	4.85	4.73	4.71	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	8	5	4.00	1047/1386	4.43	4.38	4.32	4.30	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	8	6	4.18	952/1380	4.50	4.44	4.32	4.32	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	1	3	1	1	1	2.71	1141/1193	4.12	4.11	4.02	4.05	2.71
Diamondan														
Discussion	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4 25	F00/1170	4 57	4 52	4 1 5	4.24	4.25
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.25	580/1172 470/1182		4.53	4.15 4.35	4.44	4.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	3	5		- ,	4.71 4.76	4.72 4.68	4.35	4.42	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	4.63	****/ 800		3.77	4.38	4.49	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	U	U	U	U	3	5.00	***/ 800	4.01	3.//	4.06	4.12	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	4.44	4.63	4.58	4.17	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65		4.33	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	3.25	3.55	4.09	3.38	****
J 3														

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	 11	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	5							
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17	
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	6	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	0	-				
				2	Λ							

General Honors Seminar

Instructor: Messinger, Set

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 22

Title

Messinger, Seth

Spring 2010

Page 879 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Frequencies			Inst	tructor	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	Λ	0	1	3	7	5	6	3 55	1327/1447	4.36	4.40	4 31	4.32	3.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	11	2	4		1380/1447	4.03	3.95	4.27	4.23	3.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	6	7	5		1249/1402	4.43	4.28	4.24	4.24	3.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	4	1	8	8	3.82	- ,	4.30	4.34	4.11	4.10	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	4	7	5	4	3.33	1200/1316	4.25	4.22	4.14	4.13	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	6	6	6	4	3.36	1303/1427	3.87	3.84	4.19	4.15	3.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	11	4.50	1079/1447	4.35	4.52	4.69	4.65	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	7	5	3	3.73	1103/1434	4.41	4.38	4.10	4.09	3.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	1 20	1015/1387	4.56	4.51	4.46	4.44	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	0	13	4.29		4.92	4.85	4.73	4.71	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	2	2	6	13		1205/1386		4.38	4.73	4.71	3.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	Ω	0	0	2	2	6	4		1128/1380		4.44	4.32	4.32	3.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	12	1	0	1	0	0		****/1193		4.11		4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	1	5	4	4.00	710/1172	4.57	4.53	4.15	4.24	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	595/1182	4.71	4.72	4.35	4.42	4.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	804/1170		4.68	4.38	4.49	4.18
4. Were special techniques successful	11	10	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 800	4.61	3.77	4.06	4.12	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	60/ 66	4.44	4.63	4.58	4.17	3.88
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	3	0	5	4.25	51/ 62		4.28	4.56	4.21	4.25
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	53/ 58	3.63	3.75	4.41	2.87	3.63
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	55/ 65	4.33	4.33	4.42	4.01	3.88
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	2	2	2	1	1	2.63	62/ 64	3.25	3.55	4.09	3.38	2.63

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	18	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	0	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0							
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22	
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	3	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant		
				I	1	Other	0	=				
					0							