University of Maryland Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Fall 2007

Instructor: MCALPINE, STEVE Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 11

Title

Course-Section: INDS 330 0101

WAYS OF KNOWING

Seminar 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned

Page 989 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eauei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	0	3	8	4.73	354/1639	4.74	4.74	4.27	4.28	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	191/1639	4.72	4.76	4.22	4.20	4.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	392/1397	4.51	4.86	4.28	4.26	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	347/1583	4.51	4.51	4.19	4.24	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	105/1532	4.83	4.18	4.01	4.05	4.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	146/1504	4.60	3.92	4.05	4.12	4.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	249/1612	4.65	4.25	4.16	4.12	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	928/1635	4.80	4.87	4.65	4.66	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	116/1579	4.84	4.67	4.08	4.07	4.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.81	4.43	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	546/1520	4.95	4.93	4.70	4.68	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	335/1517	4.72	4.74	4.27	4.23	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	276/1550	4.72	4.01	4.22	4.20	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	577/1295	4.55	4.48	3.94	3.95	4.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	369/1398	4.80	4.76	4.07	4.13	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	543/1391	4.80	4.95	4.30	4.35	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	224/1388		4.99	4.28	4.34	4.91
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	364/ 958		4.46	3.93	3.97	4.22
1. Here spectar econniques successful	_	_	0	3		3	-	1.22	301/ 330	1.10	1.10	3.73	3.71	1.22
Laboratory														
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.21	****

Frequency Distribution

10 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 80 5.00 5.00 4.47 4.65 ****

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Fall 2007

Page 990

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Course-Section: INDS 330 0201 University of Maryland Title WAYS OF KNOWING Instructor: MCALPINE, STEVE

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 8

14

	0		NID	27.7	Fre	equer 2	ncies		_		ructor		Dept		Level	Se
	Questions 			NA 			3 	4	5 	Mean	Rank 	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Ме
	General	. 1 . 1	0		0	0	0		_	4 55	210/162		4 5 4	4 00	4 00	
. Did you gain new insi	-		0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	318/163		4.74	4.27	4.28	4.
2. Did the instructor ma	_	_	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	393/1639		4.76	4.22	4.20	4.
Did the exam question			0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	687/139		4.86	4.28	4.26	4.
Did other evaluations	_	_	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	640/158		4.51	4.19	4.24	4.
Did assigned readings		_	0	0	0	0 1	0	2	6	4.75 4.38	178/153		4.18	4.01	4.05 4.12	4. 4.
. Did written assignmer		_	1	0	0	1	0	0		4.57	514/150		3.92 4.25	4.05 4.16		4.
. Was the grading syste . How many times was cl		nea	0	0	0	0	0	1	-	4.88	418/161: 706/163:		4.25	4.16	4.12 4.66	
. How many times was cl		ing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1		4.80	137/157		4.67	4.08	4.00	4. 4.
. now would you grade t	lie Overail teach	ing effectiveness	J	U	U	U	U	_	1	1.00	137/137.	7 1.01	4.07	1.00	1.07	1.
	Lecture	,	_						_		a (a = a .					_
. Were the instructor's	_	_	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/151		4.81	4.43	4.39	5.
l. Did the instructor se			1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/152		4.93	4.70	4.68	5.
. Was lecture material			1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	347/151		4.74	4.27	4.23	4.
. Did the lectures cont			0	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	500/155		4.01	4.22	4.20	4.
. Did audiovisual techr	niques enhance yo	ur understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/129	4.55	4.48	3.94	3.95	5.
	Discussion															
. Did class discussions		-	1	0	0	0	0	0	7		1/139		4.76	4.07	4.13	5.
. Were all students act			1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/139		4.95	4.30	4.35	5.
. Did the instructor er		open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/138		4.99	4.28		5.
. Were special techniqu	ues successful		1	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	411/ 95	3 4.18	4.46	3.93	3.97	4.
. Were requirements for	Laboratory	arly specified	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3 00	****/ 19	2 ****	****	4.18	4.04	**
. Were requirements for	l lab lepolts cle	ally specified	,	U	U	U	_	U	U	3.00	/ 10	,		1.10	1.01	
. Were assigned topics	Seminar	announged theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 8	5 5.00	5.00	4.58	4.50	5.
. Were assigned topics . Was the instructor av			6 6	0	0	0	0	1	1		47/ 8		4.50	4.52	4.59	4.
. Was the instructor at . Did research projects			6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 7		5.00	4.47	4.60	5.
Did research projects. Did presentations cor			6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 8		5.00	4.47	4.65	5.
. Did presentations con . Were criteria for gra		you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 8:		5.00	4.16	4.03	5.
. Were criteria for gre	ading made crear		Ü	J	J	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	3.00	1, 0.	3.00	3.00	1.10	1.00	٥.
Did self-paced system	Self Paced	hat was laawaad	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 5) ****	****	4.45	5.00	* *
. Did sell-paced system			7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 3	-	****	4.45	5.00	*
. Did study questions of the study questions			7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 4		****	4.69	5.00	* *
. Were your contacts who was the feedback/tuto			7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 3:		****	4.37	5.00	* *
. Was the reeuback/tutt	oring by proceors	Heipidi	,	U	U	U	U	U		3.00	/ 5.	2		1.57	3.00	
		Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	ıtior	ı									
redits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades					asons				T	<i>т</i> ре			Majors	5
00-27 1 0.0	 00-0.99 1	A 2		Red			or Ma			0	Gradua	 :e	0	Majo	 or	
28-55 0 1.0	00-1.99 0 00-2.99 0	B 3 C 1			neral			J		0	Under-		8	_	-major	
	00-2.99 0	D 0		Gel	лст а.	-				U	onder -	ji au	U	NOII-	ilia JUI	
Grad. 0 3.5	50-4.00 1	F 0 P 0		Ele	ectiv	res				0		Means t ses to b				gh
		I O		Otl	ner					5	T CDPOIN		, bigi	cai		
		? 1		- 0-						-						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2007

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 991

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Course-Section: INDS 330H 0101 Title WAYS OF KNOWING Instructor: MCALPINE, STEVE Enrollment: 2

Questionnaires: 1

			Fre	equei	ncie	S		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	Λ	Λ	Λ	Λ	0	Λ	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.74	4.27	4.28	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639		4.76	4.22	4.20	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1397		4.86	4.28	4.26	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583		4.51	4.19	4.24	5.00
1 3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1532		4.18	4.19	4.05	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	-	0	-	0	-	•	1		,					
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	•	0	0	0	0	Τ	5.00	1/1504		3.92	4.05	4.12	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0		1044/1612		4.25	4.16	4.12	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1635		4.87	4.65	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.67	4.08	4.07	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.81	4.43	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520		4.93	4.70	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517		4.74	4.27	4.23	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1550		4.01	4.22	4.20	5.00
_	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1295		4.48	3.94	3.95	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	U	U	U	U	U	Т	5.00	1/1295	5.00	4.48	3.94	3.95	5.00
To a control of the c		- -	2 1											

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: INDS 330H 0201 University of Maryland Page 992
Title WAYS OF KNOWING Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008

Instructor: MCALPINE, STEVE (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 2
Questionnaires: 2

Fall 2007
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

Ober 1								Fre	eque	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 6. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 7. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 8. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 9. O 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0			Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 6. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 7. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 8. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 9. O 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0			Genera	 I															
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1639 5.00 4.76 4.22 4.20 5.00 4.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1	1. Did vo	u gain ne		=	this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.74	4.27	4.28	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1397 5.00 4.86 4.28 4.26 5.00 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1583 5.00 4.51 4.19 4.24 5.00 5.01 do ther evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 335/1532 4.67 4.18 4.01 4.05 4.50 5.01 do sasigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 335/1532 4.67 4.18 4.01 4.05 4.50 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1612 4.67 4.25 4.16 4.12 5.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1612 5.00 4.67 4.08 4.16 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1613 5.00 4.87 4.65 4.66 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1570 5.00 4.67 4.08 4.07 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1.50 1/1570 5.00 4.67 4.08 4.67 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0						0	-	-	-	-	-	_		,					
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1612 4.67 4.18 4.01 4.05 4.05 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1. 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1612 4.67 4.18 4.05 4.05 4.05 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1. 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1, 5.00 1/1635 5.00 4.87 4.05 4.05 5.00 9. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1. 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1, 5.00 1/1635 5.00 4.87 4.05 4.05 5.00 9. How many times was class cancelled 1. O 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1/1579 5.00 4.87 4.05 4.05 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1. 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1/1579 5.00 4.87 4.05 4.05 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1. 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1/1579 5.00 4.81 4.43 4.39 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1. 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1/1579 5.00 4.81 4.43 4.39 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1. 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0						0		0	0										
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.50 335/1532 4.67 4.18 4.01 4.05 4.50 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1612 4.67 4.25 4.16 4.12 5.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1612 4.67 4.25 4.16 4.12 5.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1612 4.67 4.25 4.16 4.12 5.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1635 5.00 4.87 4.05 4.66 5.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1579 5.00 4.67 4.08 4.05 4.66 5.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1529 5.00 4.87 4.08 4.07 5.00 4.67 4.08 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09						0	0	0	0	0	0								
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 824/1504 4.33 3.92 4.05 4.12 4.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1635 5.00 4.67 4.05 4.12 5.00 9. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1635 5.00 4.67 4.65 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1635 5.00 4.67 4.08 4.07 5.00 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1635 5.00 4.67 4.08 4.07 5.00 1/1635 5.00 4.67 4.08 4.07 5.00 1/1635 5.00 4.67 4.08 4.07 5.00 1/1635 5.00 4.67 4.08 4.07 5.00 1/1635 5.00 4.67 4.08 4.07 5.00 1/1635 5.00 4.67 4.08 4.07 5.00 1/1635 5.00 4.67 4.08 4.07 5.00 1/1635 5.00 4.67 4.08 4.07 5.00 1/1635 5.00 4.67 4.08 4.07 5.00 1/1635 5.00 4.67 4.08 4.07 5.00 1/1635 5.00 4.67 4.08 4.07 5.00 1/1635 5.00 4.67 4.08 4.07 5.00 1/1635 5.00 4.67 4.08 4.07 5.00 1/1635 5.00 4.67 4.08 4.07 5.00 1/1635 5.00 4.67 4.08 4.07 5.00 1/1635 5.00 4.67 4.08 4.07 5.00 1/1635 5.00 4.08 4.07 5.00 1/1635 5.00 1/1635 5.00 4.08 4.09 5.00 1/1635 5.00 1/1635 5.00 4.08 4.09 5.00 1/1635 5.00 1/1635 5.00 4.08 4.09 5.00 1/1635 5.00 1/1635 5.00 4.08 4.09 4.09 5.00 1/1635 5.00 4.09 4.09 4.09 5.00 1/1635 5.00 4.09 4.09 4.09 5.00 1/1635 5.00 4.09 4.09 4.09 5.00 1/1635 5.00 4.09 4.09 4.09 5.00 1/1635 5.00 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 5.00 1/1635 5.00 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 5.00 1/1635 5.00 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 5.00 1/1635 5.00 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 5.00 1/1635 5.00 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 5.00 1/1635 5.00 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 5.00 1/1635 5.00 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 5.00 1/1635 5.00 4.09 4.09 4.09 5.00 1/1635 5.00 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4				_		0	0	0	0	0	1							4.05	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1612 4.67 4.25 4.16 4.12 5.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1615 5.00 4.87 4.65 4.66 5.00 8. How mould you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1579 5.00 4.67 4.08 4.07 5.00 **Lecture** 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1518 5.00 4.81 4.43 4.39 5.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1517 5.00 4.93 4.70 4.68 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1517 5.00 4.93 4.70 4.68 5.00 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1517 5.00 4.74 4.27 4.23 5.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1517 5.00 4.48 3.94 3.95 5.00 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1398 5.00 4.76 4.07 4.13 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1398 5.00 4.76 4.07 4.13 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1398 5.00 4.76 4.07 4.13 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0		_	_		-		0	0	0	0	2							4.12	
Lecture Lect			-		_	0	0	0	0	0	0							4.12	5.00
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1518 5.00 4.81 4.43 4.39 5.00			-	-		0	0	0	0	0	0							4.66	
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1518 5.00 4.81 4.43 4.39 5.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1520 5.00 4.93 4.70 4.68 5.00 4. Did the instructor seem interested and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1517 5.00 4.74 4.27 4.23 5.00 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1550 4.67 4.01 4.22 4.20 4.50 5.01 daudiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1550 4.67 4.01 4.22 4.20 4.50 5.01 daudiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1295 5.00 4.48 3.94 3.95 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5	9. How wo	uld you g	rade the overal	ll teach	ning effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.67	4.08	4.07	5.00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1518 5.00 4.81 4.43 4.39 5.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1520 5.00 4.93 4.70 4.68 5.00 4. Did the instructor seem interested and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1517 5.00 4.74 4.27 4.23 5.00 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1550 4.67 4.01 4.22 4.20 4.50 5.01 daudiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1550 4.67 4.01 4.22 4.20 4.50 5.01 daudiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1295 5.00 4.48 3.94 3.95 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5			T	_															
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1520 5.00 4.93 4.70 4.68 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1517 5.00 4.74 4.27 4.23 5.00 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1550 4.67 4.01 4.22 4.20 4.50 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1295 5.00 4.48 3.94 3.95 5.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1295 5.00 4.48 3.94 3.95 5.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1 Wome +	ho inatan			boxonoxod	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	E 00	1 /1 E 1 0	E 00	1 01	1 12	1 20	E 00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1517 5.00 4.74 4.27 4.23 5.00 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1550 4.67 4.01 4.22 4.20 4.50 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1295 5.00 4.48 3.94 3.95 5.00 Discussion Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1398 5.00 4.76 4.07 4.13 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1398 5.00 4.95 4.30 4.35 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1398 5.00 4.95 4.30 4.35 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 201/958 4.50 4.46 3.93 3.97 4.50 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 2 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0 Graduate 0 Under-grad 2 Non-major 0 84-150 2 3.00-3.49 0 D 0 Graduate 0 Under-grad 2 Non-major 0 84-150 2 3.00-3.49 0 D 0 Graduate 0 Winder-grad 2 Non-major 0 84-150 2 3.00-3.49 0 D 0 Graduate 0 Winder-grad 2 Non-major 0 84-150 2 3.00-3.49 0 D 0 Graduate 0 Winder-grad 2 Non-major 0 84-150 2 3.00-3.49 0 D 0 Graduate 0 Winder-grad 2 Non-major 0 84-150 2 3.00-3.49 0 D 0 Graduate 0 Winder-grad 2 Non-major 0 84-150 2 3.00-3.49 0 D 0 Graduate 0 Winder-grad 2 Non-major 0 84-150 2 Significant D Other D Othe				_	_		-	-	-	-	0								
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1550 4.67 4.01 4.22 4.20 4.50 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1295 5.00 4.48 3.94 3.95 5.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1398 5.00 4.76 4.07 4.13 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1391 5.00 4.76 4.07 4.13 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1391 5.00 4.95 4.30 4.35 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1388 5.00 4.99 4.28 4.34 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 201/ 958 4.50 4.46 3.93 3.97 4.50 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 2 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 2 Non-major 0 84-150 2 3.00-3.49 0 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			ture material presented and explained clearly					-											
Discussion Dis			_																
Discussion Dis				_		-	-	•	-	-									
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1398 5.00 4.76 4.07 4.13 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1391 5.00 4.95 4.30 4.35 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1388 5.00 4.99 4.28 4.34 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 201/958 4.50 4.46 3.93 3.97 4.50 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 2 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 2 Non-major 0 84-150 2 3.00-3.49 0 D 0 Graduate 0 Winder-grad 2 Non-major 0 Graduate 0 Significant 1 0 Other 2	5. Did au	.aiovisuai	techniques em	lance yo	our understanding	U	U	U	U	U	U	2	5.00	1/1295	5.00	4.40	3.94	3.95	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1391 5.00 4.95 4.30 4.35 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1388 5.00 4.99 4.28 4.34 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 201/958 4.50 4.46 3.93 3.97 4.50 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors			Discuss	sion															
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1/1388 5.00 4.99 4.28 4.34 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful	1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contribu	ite to w	hat you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0			1/1398	5.00	4.76	4.07	4.13	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 201/ 958 4.50 4.46 3.93 3.97 4.50 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 2 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 2 Non-major 0 84-150 2 3.00-3.49 0 D 0 Graduate 0 Major 2 Belectives 0 Wajor 2 Comparison of the company of the c	2. Were a	.11 studen	ts actively end	couraged	l to participate	0	0				0			1/1391	5.00	4.95	4.30	4.35	5.00
Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 2 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 2 Non-major 0 84-150 2 3.00-3.49 0 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 2	3. Did th	e instruc	tor encourage f	fair and	l open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.99	4.28	4.34	5.00
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 2 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 2 Non-major 0 84-150 2 3.00-3.49 0 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 2	4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succes	ssful		0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	201/ 958	4.50	4.46	3.93	3.97	4.50
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 2 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 2 Non-major 0 84-150 2 3.00-3.49 0 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 2					Frequ	ency	, Dist	ribu	utio	ı									
00-27					1.														
28-55	Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Tyl	pe			Majors	}
28-55	00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Rec	 guire	ed f	or Ma	ior	 S	0	Graduate	 e	0	Maio	r •	2
84-150 2 3.00-3.49 0 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 2	28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0			-			,								
84-150 2 3.00-3.49 0 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 I 0 Other 2		0		0	C 0		Ger	neral	L				0	Under-q	rad	2	Non-	major	0
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 2		2			D 0									5				3 -	
P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 2		0		1	F 0	Electives						0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ŗh	
I 0 Other 2					P 0	Electives												_	
					I 0		Oth	ner					2	-					
? 0					? 0														

Course-Section: INDS 330H 0201 University of Maryland Page 993 Title WAYS OF KNOWING Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008

Instructor: (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 2
Questionnaires: 2

Fall 2007

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncie	S		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	0	2	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.74	4.27	4.28	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.76	4.22	4.20	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.86	4.28	4.26	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.51	4.19	4.24	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	335/1532	4.67	4.18	4.01	4.05	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	824/1504	4.33	3.92	4.05	4.12	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1612	4.67	4.25	4.16	4.12	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.87	4.65	4.66	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.76	4.07	4.13	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.95	4.30	4.35	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.99	4.28	4.34	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	201/ 958	4.50	4.46	3.93	3.97	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: INDS 480 0101 University of Maryland Title INDS: CAPSTONE PRJCT S Baltimore County Fall 2007

Instructor: LANOUE, PATRICI (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 8

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 994

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

							Fre	eque	ncies	;		Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 I															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	w insights,skil	_	this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	890/1639	4.54	4.74	4.27	4.42	4.25
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	722/1639	4.60	4.76	4.22	4.29	4.38
		estions reflect	_	_	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1397	5.00	4.86	4.28	4.38	****
	_	ations reflect			0	1	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	761/1583	4.14	4.51	4.19	4.31	4.29
5. Did as	signed re	adings contribu	ite to w	hat you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	469/1532	3.49	4.18	4.01	4.07	4.38
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1051/1504	3.28	3.92	4.05	4.20	3.75
7. Was th	e grading	system clearly	z explai	ned	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1198/1612	3.74	4.25	4.16	4.18	3.88
8. How ma	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1045/1635	4.81	4.87	4.65	4.72	4.63
9. How wo	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teach	ing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	6	1	4.00	889/1579	4.17	4.67	4.08	4.21	4.00
		T t	_															
1 Wassa 5	b	Lecture			0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4 05	1004/1510	4 42	4 01	4 42	<i>1</i> F1	4 05
		ctor's lectures			0	0	0	0	0	1	3 7		1094/1518		4.81	4.43	4.51	
		tor seem intere		_	0	-	-	1	-	_			622/1520 886/1517	4.84 4.50	4.93 4.74	4.70	4.75 4.34	4.88
		_		plained clearly	0 0 1 0 1 2 4				_		1077/1550					4.25		
		es contribute to	_	ou learned ur understanding									4.01 4.48	4.22 3.94		3.00		
5. Did au	lalovisuai	. tecnniques en	lance yo	ur understanding	U	1	U	2	2	2	Τ	3.29	1089/1295	3.29	4.48	3.94	4.01	3.29
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contribu	ite to w	hat you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	625/1398	4.63	4.76	4.07	4.23	4.25
2. Were a	ll studer	its actively end	couraged	to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.95	4.30	4.48	5.00
				open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.99	4.28	4.50	5.00
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succes	ssful		0	1	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	411/ 958	4.57	4.46	3.93	4.24	4.14
				Frequ	iencs	, Dist	trib	ıt i oı	n									
				1104	.01107	210	0110											
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	;			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Red	 quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	 3	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r or	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0	Required for Majors										5			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General					0	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	major	1		
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D 0								5				3 -		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives						1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ŗh	
				P 0									respons				_	
				I 0		Oth	her					5	-					
				? 0														

Course-Section: INDS 480 0101 University of Maryland Page 995 FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Title INDS: CAPSTONE PRJCT S Baltimore County Instructor: (Instr. B)
Enrollment: 9 Fall 2007

DILL OTTINCITE.			
Questionnaires:	8	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	Course Evaluation

			Fr	equer	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	4	3	4.25	890/1639	4.54	4.74	4.27	4.42	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	722/1639	4.60	4.76	4.22	4.29	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1397	5.00	4.86	4.28	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	761/1583	4.14	4.51	4.19	4.31	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	469/1532	3.49	4.18	4.01	4.07	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1051/1504	3.28	3.92	4.05	4.20	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1198/1612	3.74	4.25	4.16	4.18	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1045/1635	4.81	4.87	4.65	4.72	4.63
Lecture														
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	1518/1550	3.17	4.01	4.22	4.24	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	625/1398	4.63	4.76	4.07	4.23	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.95	4.30	4.48	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.99	4.28	4.50	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	411/ 958	4.57	4.46	3.93	4.24	4.14
Frequ	lency	Dis	trib	ution	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Por	aara	,			т.	20			Majora	
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				ке:	sons	j 		Ту]				Majors		
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 6		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduat	9	0	Majo	r	7

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0	-					
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: INDS 480 0201 University of Maryland Title INDS: CAPSTONE PRJCT S

Instructor: DONATO, PAUL (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 6

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Page 996

							Frequencies					Inc	tructor	Course	e Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5		Rank		Mean		Mean		
1 54	General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course							0	0	1	_	4 02	021/1620	4 54	4 74	4 07	4 40	4 02
					0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	- ,			4.27	4.42	4.83
	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals						0	0	0	1	5	4.83	,		4.76	4.22	4.29	4.83
	3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals						0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1397		4.86	4.28	4.38	5.00
				1 3	0	3	0	1	0	0	2		1010/1583			4.19		4.00
				what you learned	1	0	2	0	2	0	1		1491/1532		4.18	4.01	4.07	2.60
				o what you learned	0	1	1	1	2	0	1		1445/1504		3.92	4.05	4.20	2.80
	-	g system clearly	-	ained	1	0	1	0	1	Ι	2		1360/1612		4.25	4.16	4.18	3.60
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1635			4.65	4.72	
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa.	ll tead	ching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	569/1579	4.17	4.67	4.08	4.21	4.33
		Lecture	9															
1. Were t	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared							0	1	0	4	4.60	684/1518	4.43	4.81	4.43	4.51	4.60
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	ested :	n the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	802/1520	4.84	4.93	4.70	4.75	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	299/1517	4.50	4.74	4.27	4.34	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1550	3.17	4.01	4.22	4.24	3.33
		Discus	sion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1398	4.63	4.76	4.07	4.23	5.00
2. Were a	all studer	nts actively end	courage	ed to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.95	4.30	4.48	5.00
				nd open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.99	4.28	4.50	5.00
		echniques succes			3	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 958				4.24	5.00
		Semina	r															
1 Were a	ssianed t			announced theme	5	0	0	0	1	Ω	0	3 00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.83	****
	_	-		dividual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	-		****/ 82		4.50	4.52	4.49	****
		ons contribute			5	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 80		5.00	4.47	4.59	****
_		for grading made		-	5	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 82		5.00	4.16	4.02	****
				Frequ	onat	. Diat	-rih	1+101	2									
				rrequ	епсу	DISC	LIID	ucioi	.1									
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades							Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	}
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jors	 3	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r or	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2			-									J -		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad	6	Non-	major	2
04 150		2.00 2.33	^	D 0	ociici ai							-	onaci grad		5 1,011 111			_

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	2
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	are not enough		
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3	-			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: INDS 480 0201 University of Maryland Page 997 Title INDS: CAPSTONE PRJCT S Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008

Instructor: (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 6

Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

							Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course	e Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	Questions			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean		
General																		
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course						0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	231/1639	4.54	4.74	4.27	4.42	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals						0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	177/1639	4.60	4.76	4.22	4.29	4.83
3. Did	the exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.86	4.28	4.38	5.00
4. Did	other eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	3	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1010/1583	4.14	4.51	4.19	4.31	4.00
5. Did	assigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	1491/1532	3.49	4.18	4.01	4.07	2.60
	_	-		to what you learned	0	1	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	1445/1504	3.28	3.92	4.05	4.20	2.80
7. Was	the gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ained	1	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1360/1612	3.74	4.25	4.16	4.18	3.60
8. How 1	many times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1635	4.81	4.87	4.65	4.72	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did	class disc			what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1398	4.63	4.76	4.07	4.23	5.00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate					3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1391		4.95	4.30	4.48	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion					3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1388		4.99	4.28	4.50	5.00
		echniques succe			3	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 958	4.57	4.46	3.93	4.24	5.00
		Semina	r															
1. Were	assigned			announced theme	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.83	****
	_	-		dividual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82		4.50	4.52	4.49	****
		ons contribute			5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80		5.00	4.47	4.59	****
	_	for grading mad		-	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.16	4.02	****
				Frequ	iency	/ Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades						Reasons							Ту				Majors	•
Creates marned Cum. GPA Expected Grades																		, . – – – –
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	Required for Majors			3	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	4	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-9	rad	6	Non-	-major	2
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0.00-0.99 0 A 3 F		Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	2
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0 Electives		1	#### - Means	are not enough	ı	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						