

Course-Section: INDS 330 1  
 Title Ways Of Knowing  
 Instructor: McAlpine, Steven  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 914  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	201/1509	4.61	4.21	4.31	4.32	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	12	4.71	300/1509	4.86	4.43	4.26	4.25	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	240/1287	4.71	4.74	4.30	4.33	4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	164/1459	4.71	4.48	4.22	4.26	4.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	146/1406	4.59	4.00	4.09	4.12	4.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	12	4.71	182/1384	4.54	4.11	4.11	4.15	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	121/1489	4.75	4.40	4.17	4.14	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	1146/1506	4.71	4.77	4.67	4.67	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	170/1463	4.49	4.05	4.09	4.08	4.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	175/1438	4.91	4.67	4.46	4.43	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1421	4.90	4.65	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	0	12	4.77	291/1411	4.68	4.38	4.31	4.29	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	419/1405	4.35	3.94	4.32	4.32	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	121/1236	4.68	4.13	4.00	4.07	4.77
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	230/1260	4.54	4.19	4.14	4.22	4.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	540/1255	4.72	4.73	4.33	4.37	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	584/1258	4.53	4.43	4.38	4.42	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	187/ 873	4.40	4.40	4.03	4.08	4.57

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0	Major 12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	General 1	Under-grad 14	Non-major 2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: INDS 330 2  
 Title Ways Of Knowing  
 Instructor: Vetter,Lisa Pac  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 915  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	1	8	4.36	767/1509	4.61	4.21	4.31	4.32	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1509	4.86	4.43	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	392/1287	4.71	4.74	4.30	4.33	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	313/1459	4.71	4.48	4.22	4.26	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	446/1406	4.59	4.00	4.09	4.12	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	8	4.36	492/1384	4.54	4.11	4.11	4.15	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	308/1489	4.75	4.40	4.17	4.14	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1506	4.71	4.77	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	628/1463	4.49	4.05	4.09	4.08	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	219/1438	4.91	4.67	4.46	4.43	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	794/1421	4.90	4.65	4.73	4.73	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	496/1411	4.68	4.38	4.31	4.29	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	0	2	6	4.00	1047/1405	4.35	3.94	4.32	4.32	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	211/1236	4.68	4.13	4.00	4.07	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	582/1260	4.54	4.19	4.14	4.22	4.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	221/1255	4.72	4.73	4.33	4.37	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	0	1	8	4.50	620/1258	4.53	4.43	4.38	4.42	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	350/ 873	4.40	4.40	4.03	4.08	4.22
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: INDS 330 2  
 Title Ways Of Knowing  
 Instructor: Vetter, Lisa Pac  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 915  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: INDS 430 1  
 Title Interdis Seminar  
 Instructor: Tarantino,David  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 916  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	244/1509	4.80	4.21	4.31	4.39	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	424/1509	4.60	4.43	4.26	4.26	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	208/1287	4.80	4.74	4.30	4.38	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	209/1459	4.73	4.48	4.22	4.32	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	702/1406	4.14	4.00	4.09	4.11	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	278/1384	4.60	4.11	4.11	4.23	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	674/1489	4.33	4.40	4.17	4.18	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	662/1506	4.87	4.77	4.67	4.67	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	286/1463	4.56	4.05	4.09	4.18	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.67	4.46	4.50	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	376/1421	4.93	4.65	4.73	4.76	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	180/1411	4.87	4.38	4.31	4.35	4.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	285/1405	4.80	3.94	4.32	4.34	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.13	4.00	4.03	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.19	4.14	4.25	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	344/1255	4.75	4.73	4.33	4.46	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.43	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 873	****	4.40	4.03	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.69	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	4.32	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
-----						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 12	Required for Majors	10	Graduate 0 Major 8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1	Under-grad 15 Non-major 7
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0			
			I 0	Other	0	
			? 0			

Course-Section: INDS 480 1  
 Title Inds: Capstone Prjct S  
 Instructor: Jones,James Bra  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 917  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	3	6	1	0	2.80	1486/1509	2.80	4.21	4.31	4.39	2.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	4	2	2	3.40	1404/1509	3.40	4.43	4.26	4.26	3.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	7	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1287	****	4.74	4.30	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	1192/1459	3.75	4.48	4.22	4.32	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	4	2	0	2.67	1381/1406	2.67	4.00	4.09	4.11	2.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	2	3	0	2.78	1356/1384	2.78	4.11	4.11	4.23	2.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	1188/1489	3.78	4.40	4.17	4.18	3.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	820/1506	4.78	4.77	4.67	4.67	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	2	4	0	0	2.67	1434/1463	2.67	4.05	4.09	4.18	2.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	4	0	3	3.86	1282/1438	3.86	4.67	4.46	4.50	3.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1370/1421	3.88	4.65	4.73	4.76	3.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	2	2	2	1	3.29	1328/1411	3.29	4.38	4.31	4.35	3.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	4	0	0	2.29	1392/1405	2.29	3.94	4.32	4.34	2.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	2	3	1	1	0	2.14	1216/1236	2.14	4.13	4.00	4.03	2.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1226/1260	2.67	4.19	4.14	4.25	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1255	****	4.73	4.33	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1102/1258	3.67	4.43	4.38	4.51	3.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors		8	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	1							