Course-Section: INDS 330 0101 University of Maryland Title WAYS OF KNOWING

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 913

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 31 Questionnaires: 17 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

GWIAZDA, PIOTR (Instr. A)

Instructor:

| Quescioni | idileb. i | , | beadene coe | AL DC | Lvai | | | | | 10110 | • | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|-----------|-------|---------|-----------|-----------|--------|-----------|-------------|--|-------------|--------------|--------|---|-------|
| | | Ouestions | | MD | NA | Fr 1 | eque 2 | ncie 3 | s 4 | 5 | Ins Mean | tructor Rank | | Dept Mean | | | Sect |
| | | | | | | | | | | Mean | Ralik | меап | Mean | Mean | Mean | меа | |
| | | General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean | |
| | | ew insights,skills f | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16 | 4.94 | 95/1481 | | 4.63 | 4.29 | | 4.9 |
| | | ctor make clear the | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 14 | 4.82 | | | 4.61 | | | 4.8 |
| | | uestions reflect the | | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | | | | 5.00 | | | |
| | | ations reflect the | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 12 | 4.53 | | | 4.38 | | | 4.5 |
| | _ | eadings contribute t | _ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 14 | 4.76 | | | 4.39 | | | 4.7 |
| | | _ | to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 12 | 4.47 | 333/1342 | | 4.23 | | | |
| | | g system clearly exp | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | | | 595/1459 | | | | | |
| | _ | was class cancelled | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 6 | | 1146/1480 | | 4.51 | | | |
| 9. How wo | ould you g | grade the overall te | aching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 6 | 4.25 | 630/1450 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.09 | 4.10 | 4.2 |
| | | Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were t | he instru | uctor's lectures wel | l prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 4.67 | 559/1409 | 4.67 | 4.61 | 4.42 | 4.43 | 4.6 |
| 2. Did th | ne instruc | ctor seem interested | in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 4.93 | 350/1407 | 7 4.97 | 4.92 | 4.69 | 4.67 | 4.9 |
| | cture mat | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 13 | 4.80 | 212/1399 | 4.90 | 4.70 | 4.26 | 4.27 | 4.9 | | |
| 4. Did th | e lecture | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 10 | 4.53 | 561/1400 | 4.60 | 4.53 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.6 | | |
| 5. Did au | diovisual | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 10 | 4.64 | 187/1179 | 4.69 | 4.46 | 3.96 | 4.02 | 4.6 | | |
| | | Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| L. Did cl | o what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 4.86 | 146/1262 | 4.86 | 4.93 | 4.05 | 4.14 | 4.8 | | |
| . Were a | ged to participate | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 4.93 | 169/1259 | 4.93 | 4.96 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.9 | | |
| 3. Did th | e instruc | ctor encourage fair | and open discussion | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 12 | 4.79 | 320/1256 | 4.79 | 4.89 | 4.30 | 4.34 | 4. |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | | | | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 4.00 | 394/ 788 | 3 4.00 | 4.13 | 4.00 | 4.07 | 4.0 |
| | | Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were a | ssigned t | copics relevant to t | he announced theme | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 68 | **** | 4.71 | 4.49 | 4.70 | * * * |
| 2. Was th | e instruc | ctor available for i | ndividual attention | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 69 | **** | 4.71 | 4.53 | 4.66 | *** |
| 3. Did re | search pr | rojects contribute t | o what you learned | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 63 | 3 **** | 4.50 | 4.44 | 4.56 | |
| 4. Did pr | esentatio | ons contribute to wh | at you learned | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 69 | **** | 4.57 | 4.35 | 4.48 | *** |
| 5. Were d | riteria f | for grading made cle | ar | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 68 | 3 **** | 4.43 | 3.92 | 4.43 | *** |
| | | Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| L. Did fi | eld exper | rience contribute to | what you learned | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 59 | **** | **** | | 4.48 | |
| 2. Did yo | ou clearly | y understand your ev | aluation criteria | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 51 | **** | **** | 4.00 | 4.13 | |
| 3. Was th | e instruc | ctor available for c | onsultation | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 36 | 5 **** | **** | 4.60 | 4.33 | *** |
| 1. To wha | ıt degree | could you discuss y | our evaluations | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | , | **** | **** | 4.26 | 3.90 | *** |
| Did co | nferences | s help you carry out | field activities | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 31 | **** | **** | 4.42 | 4.00 | **: |
| | | | Frequ | ıency | / Dis | trib | utio | n | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits E | arned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | | | | Re | ason | s | | | Τs | <i>т</i> ре | | | Maiors | 3 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 00-27 28-55 | 0 3 | 0.00-0.99 0 1.00-1.99 0 | A 12 B 3 | | Re | quir | ed f | or M | ajor | îs. | 0 | Graduat | ce | 1 | Мајс | or | C |
| 28-55 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 1 | C 0 | | Co | nera | 1 | | | | 3 | Under- | rrad 1 | L6 | Mon | -maiox | , |
| | D 0 | | Ge. | ner d | _ | | | | ے | origer -6 | ji au i | LU | 14011- | ilia JOI | 4 | | |
| 84-150 Grad. | 6 1 | 3.00-3.49 5 3.50-4.00 5 | Б 0 F 0 | | רים | 0a+ - | 7700 | | | | 1 | #### | Means + | here - | re not | enous | rh |
| Grau. | Т | 3.50-4.00 5 | | Electives | | | | | | | | <pre>#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant</pre> | | | | | |
| | | | P 0 I 0 | | ٥- | her | | | 11 | | respons | ses to 1 | be sigr | ıııcar | IL | | |
| | | | 5 U | | UE. | ner. | | | | 1 | Τ. | | | | | | |
| | | | : U | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Course-Section: INDS 330 0101 University of Maryland

Title WAYS OF KNOWING Baltimore County Instructor: KELBER-KAYE, JO (Instr. B) Spring 2006

Enrollment: 31
Ouestionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 914

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Questions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 0 1 16 4.94 95/1481 4.94 4.63 4.29 4.29 4.94 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 1 10 4.94 93/1481 4.82 4.61 4.23 4.23 4.82 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 13 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 ****/1249 **** 5.00 4.27 4.28 **** 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 3 2 12 4.53 416/1424 4.53 4.38 4.21 4.27 4.53 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 2 14 4.76 131/1396 4.76 4.39 3.98 4.00 4.76 0 1 3 12 4.47 333/1342 4.47 4.23 4.07 4.12 4.47 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 3 4 10 4.41 595/1459 4.41 3.74 4.16 4.17 4.41 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 11 6 4.35 1146/1480 4.35 4.51 4.68 4.65 4.35 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 2 6 7 4.33 546/1450 4.29 4.33 4.09 4.10 4.29 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 5 0 0 0 1 2 9 4.67 559/1409 4.67 4.61 4.42 4.43 4.67 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 5 0 0 0 0 0 12 5.00 1/1407 4.97 4.92 4.69 4.67 4.97 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5 0 0 0 0 0 12 5.00 1/1399 4.90 4.70 4.26 4.27 4.90 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 1 2 9 4.67 421/1400 4.60 4.53 4.27 4.28 4.60 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 0 0 0 3 8 4.73 147/1179 4.69 4.46 3.96 4.02 4.69 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 1 0 13 4.86 146/1262 4.86 4.93 4.05 4.14 4.86 0 1 13 4.93 169/1259 4.93 4.96 4.29 4.34 4.93 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 0 1 1 12 4.79 320/1256 4.79 4.89 4.30 4.34 4.79 4. Were special techniques successful 4 5 1 0 0 4 3 4.00 394/ 788 4.00 4.13 4.00 4.07 4.00 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 16 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 68 **** 4.71 4.49 4.70 **** 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 69 **** 4.71 4.53 4.66 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16 0 0Ω 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 63 **** 4.50 4.44 4.56 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 69 **** 4.57 4.35 4.48 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 16 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 68 **** 4.43 3.92 4.43 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 15 0 2 5.00 ****/ 59 **** **** 4.30 4.48 **** 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 51 **** 4.00 4.13 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 15 0 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 15 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 36 **** **** 4.60 4.33 **** 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** **** 4.26 3.90 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 16 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** **** 4.42 4.00 **** Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | Expected | Grades | Reasons | | Type | Majors | | | |
|----------------|---|--------------------|----------|---------------------|---------|-----------|------|--------------|--------|----------------|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 12 | | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 1 | Major | 0 | | |
| 28-55 | 3 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 3 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C | 0 | General | 3 | Under-grad | 16 | Non-major | 4 |
| 84-150 | 6 | 3.00-3.49 | 5 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 1 | 3.50-4.00 | 5 | F | 0 | Electives | 1 | #### - Means | there | are not enough | 1 |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be sig | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 11 | _ | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: INDS 480 0101

Title INDS: CAPSTONE PRJCT S

Instructor: LEONARD, JEANNI

Enrollment: 9
Questionnaires: 9

Spring 2006

Page 915 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

| | | | | | | Frequencies | | | 3 . | | | tructor | | Course | _ | | Level | Sect | | |
|--|----------|------------------------|---------|---------------------|-------|-------------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|---------|---------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|------|--|
| | | Question | s | | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | |
| | | Genera | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did yo | u gain n | ew insights,ski | | om this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 4.56 | 505/14 | 81 | 4.43 | 4.63 | 4.29 | 4.45 | 4.56 | |
| _ | _ | ctor make clear | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 4.67 | 324/14 | 81 | 4.46 | 4.61 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.67 | |
| | | uestions reflec | | _ | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/12 | | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.27 | 4.44 | 5.00 | |
| | _ | uations reflect | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4.22 | | | 4.27 | 4.38 | 4.21 | 4.35 | 4.22 | |
| | | | | what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4.22 | | | 4.13 | 4.39 | 3.98 | 4.09 | 4.22 | |
| | | | | to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4.00 | | | 4.07 | 4.23 | 4.07 | 4.21 | 4.00 | |
| | | g system clearl | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | | 4.56 | | | 3.30 | 3.74 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.56 | |
| | | was class canc | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4.63 | - , | | 4.61 | 4.51 | 4.68 | 4.74 | 4.63 | |
| | - | | | ching effectiveness | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | | , | | | 4.33 | | 4.28 | 4.29 | |
| | | Lectur | ۵ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were t | he instr | uctor's lecture | _ | prepared | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4.50 | 762/14 | 09 | 4.58 | 4.61 | 4.42 | 4.51 | 4.50 | |
| | | ctor seem inter | | | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 823/14 | | 4.88 | 4.92 | 4.69 | 4.79 | 4.75 | |
| | | | | explained clearly | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | 4.50 | | | 4.50 | 4.70 | 4.26 | 4.36 | 4.50 | |
| 4. Did th | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4.50 | | | 4.45 | 4.53 | 4.27 | 4.38 | 4.50 | | | | | |
| | 5 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4.00 | | | 4.00 | 4.46 | 3.96 | 4.07 | | | | | | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | | | | | | 1 | U | 1 | U | U | ۷ | 4.00 | 590/11 | 19 | 4.00 | 4.40 | 3.90 | 4.07 | 4.00 | |
| | | Discus | | | 7 | | | | | _ | _ | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | | ****/12 | | 5.00 | 4.93 | 4.05 | 4.33 | **** | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | | | | | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | | ****/12 | | 5.00 | 4.96 | 4.29 | 4.57 | **** | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | | | | | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | | ****/12 | | 5.00 | 4.89 | 4.30 | 4.60 | **** | |
| 4. Were s | pecial t | echniques succe | ssful | | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 7 | 88 | 4.25 | 4.13 | 4.00 | 4.26 | **** | |
| | | Labora | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did th | e lab in | crease understa | nding o | of the material | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 2 | 46 | **** | **** | 4.20 | 4.45 | **** | |
| | | Semina | r | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were a | ssigned | topics relevant | to the | e announced theme | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 39/ | 68 | 4.71 | 4.71 | 4.49 | 4.68 | 4.71 | |
| 2. Was th | e instru | ctor available | for ind | dividual attention | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 4.71 | 33/ | 69 | 4.71 | 4.71 | 4.53 | 4.64 | 4.71 | |
| 3. Did re | search p | rojects contrib | ute to | what you learned | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4.50 | 31/ | 63 | 4.50 | 4.50 | 4.44 | 4.49 | 4.50 | |
| 4. Did pr | esentati | ons contribute | to what | you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4.57 | 35/ | 69 | 4.57 | 4.57 | 4.35 | 4.53 | 4.57 | |
| 5. Were c | riteria | for grading mad | e clear | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 4.43 | 29/ | 68 | 4.43 | 4.43 | 3.92 | 4.10 | 4.43 | |
| | | | | Frequ | iency | Dis | trib | utio | n | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades | | | | | | | | Re | asons | 5 | | | | Гур | е | | | Majors | \$ | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 00-27 28-55 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99 | 0 | A 6 B 3 | | Re | quir | ed f | or Ma | ajors | S | 0 | Gradua | ate | | 0 | Majo | or | 0 | |
| 26-55 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C 0 | | Co | nera | 1 | | | | 1 | Under- | -ar | ad | 9 | Non | -major | 0 | |
| 84-150 | 5 | | | | | | пета | | | | | _ | onder. | 9r | au | J | MOII- | iia jui | U | |
| 84-150 5 3.00-3.49 3 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 | | | | | | 77.7 | ecti | 1100 | | | | 0 | #### | 1./ | oona ± | horo - | | enoug | rh | |
| Grau. | U | 3.50-4.00 | 3 | P 0 | | E10 | ECLI | ves | | | | U | | | | | | _ | ìīī | |
| | | | | I 0 | Other | | | | | | | 6 | respoi | 126 | a co D | e sign | ıııcar | ificant | | |
| | | | | | | OE. | ner. | | | | | U | | | | | | | | |
| | | | ? 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Course-Section: INDS 480 0102

INDS: CAPSTONE PRJCT S

Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 11

Baltimore County LEONARD, JEANNI (Instr. A) Spring 2006

JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Page 916

Questionnaires: 11

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

| | | Frequencies | | | 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 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 4.36 | 718/1481 | 4.43 | 4.63 | 4.29 | 4.45 | 4.36 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 4.36 | 704/1481 | 4.46 | 4.61 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.36 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1249 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.27 | 4.44 | **** |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 4.30 | 684/1424 | 4.27 | 4.38 | 4.21 | 4.35 | 4.30 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 4.09 | 649/1396 | 4.13 | 4.39 | 3.98 | 4.09 | 4.09 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 4.10 | 695/1342 | 4.07 | 4.23 | 4.07 | 4.21 | 4.10 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2.67 | 1419/1459 | 3.30 | 3.74 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 2.67 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 4.60 | 997/1480 | 4.61 | 4.51 | 4.68 | 4.74 | 4.60 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4.38 | 504/1450 | 4.35 | 4.33 | 4.09 | 4.28 | 4.39 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4.57 | 682/1409 | 4.58 | 4.61 | 4.42 | 4.51 | 4.62 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1407 | 4.88 | 4.92 | 4.69 | 4.79 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4.50 | 567/1399 | 4.50 | 4.70 | 4.26 | 4.36 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4.40 | 704/1400 | 4.45 | 4.53 | 4.27 | 4.38 | 4.40 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 5 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/1179 | 4.00 | 4.46 | 3.96 | 4.07 | **** |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 5.00 | 1/1262 | 5.00 | 4.93 | 4.05 | 4.33 | 5.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 5.00 | 1/1259 | 5.00 | 4.96 | 4.29 | 4.57 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 5.00 | 1/1256 | 5.00 | 4.89 | 4.30 | 4.60 | 5.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 4.25 | 291/ 788 | 4.25 | 4.13 | 4.00 | 4.26 | 4.25 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 68 | 4.71 | 4.71 | 4.49 | 4.68 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | ****/ 69 | 4.57 | 4.57 | 4.35 | 4.53 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 68 | 4.43 | 4.43 | 3.92 | 4.10 | **** |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | Expected | d Grades | Reasons | | Type | Majors | | | |
|----------------|---|-----------|----------|----------|---------|---------------------|------|--------------|--------|----------------|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 3 | Required for Majors | 0 | 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 | 2 | Under-grad | 11 | Non-major | 1 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 2 | F | 0 | Electives | 2 | #### - Means | there | are not enough | ı |
| | | | | P | 1 | | | responses to | be sig | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 6 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: INDS 480 0102

INDS: CAPSTONE PRJCT S

Title Instructor: LANOUE, PATRICI (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 11 Questionnaires: 11 Baltimore County Spring 2006

University of Maryland

Page 917 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| | | | Frequencies I | | | | 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 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 4.36 | 718/1481 | 4.43 | 4.63 | 4.29 | 4.45 | 4.36 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 4.36 | 704/1481 | 4.46 | 4.61 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.36 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1249 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.27 | 4.44 | **** |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 4.30 | 684/1424 | 4.27 | 4.38 | 4.21 | 4.35 | 4.30 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 4.09 | 649/1396 | 4.13 | 4.39 | 3.98 | 4.09 | 4.09 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 4.10 | 695/1342 | 4.07 | 4.23 | 4.07 | 4.21 | 4.10 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2.67 | 1419/1459 | 3.30 | 3.74 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 2.67 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 4.60 | 997/1480 | 4.61 | 4.51 | 4.68 | 4.74 | 4.60 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4.40 | 473/1450 | 4.35 | 4.33 | 4.09 | 4.28 | 4.39 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 559/1409 | 4.58 | 4.61 | 4.42 | 4.51 | 4.62 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/1407 | 4.88 | 4.92 | 4.69 | 4.79 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/1399 | 4.50 | 4.70 | 4.26 | 4.36 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/1400 | 4.45 | 4.53 | 4.27 | 4.38 | 4.40 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 5.00 | 1/1262 | 5.00 | 4.93 | 4.05 | 4.33 | 5.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 5.00 | 1/1259 | 5.00 | 4.96 | 4.29 | 4.57 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 5.00 | 1/1256 | | 4.89 | 4.30 | 4.60 | 5.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 4.25 | 291/ 788 | 4.25 | 4.13 | 4.00 | 4.26 | 4.25 |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 68 | 4.71 | 4.71 | 4.49 | 4.68 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | ****/ 69 | 4.57 | 4.57 | 4.35 | 4.53 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | | ****/ 68 | | | 3.92 | 4.10 | **** |
| Frequ | ency. | Dist | rib | ution | n | | | | | | | | | |
| • | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | |
| Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades | | | | Rea | asons | 3 | | | Ту] | pe | | | Majors | |

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