### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				-	ncies	3			ructor	Course	-		Level	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	497/1649	4.61	4.47	4.28	4.29	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	2	13	4.37	756/1648	4.37	4.18	4.23	4.25	4.37
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	401/1375	4.67	4.44	4.27	4.37	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	5	10	4.33	722/1595	4.33	4.27	4.20	4.22	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	133/1533	4.84	4.53	4.04	4.04	4.84
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	3	11	4.11	835/1512	4.11	4.09	4.10	4.14	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	6	4	8	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	4.17	4.16	4.21	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.63	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	547/1621	4.38	4.02	4.06	4.01	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	З	16	4.84	330/1568	4.84	4.67	4.43	4.39	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	355/1572	4.95	4.76	4.70	4.73	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	5	2	12	4.37	822/1564	4.37	4.18	4.28	4.27	4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	13	4.53	673/1559	4.53	4.46	4.29	4.33	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	16	2	0	0	1	0		****/1352	****	3.33	3.98	4.07	****
Discussion	_		_	_	_	_	_							
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	655/1384		3.93	4.08	3.99	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	4	2	8	4.29	812/1382	4.29	4.10	4.29	4.19	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	2	0	2	10	4.43	732/1368	4.43	4.38	4.30	4.21	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	5	7	2	1	2	2	0	2.57	908/ 948	2.57	2.57	3.95	3.89	2.57
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	* * * *	5.00	4.29	4.33	* * * *
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 110	* * * *	* * * *	3.99	3.72	* * * *

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	С	1	General	6	Under-grad	19	Non-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	2						

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				Frequencies					ructor	Course Dept				
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	1	5	8	4.33	871/1649	4.33	4.47	4.28	4.27	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	5	4.00	1124/1648	4.00	4.18	4.23	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	9	4	4.21	840/1375	4.21	4.44	4.27	4.22	4.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	890/1595	4.20	4.27	4.20	4.21	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	3	8	4.21	663/1533	4.21	4.53	4.04	4.05	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	6	5	4.07	854/1512	4.07	4.09	4.10	4.11	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	7	7	4.33	720/1623	4.33	4.17	4.16	4.08	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	5	4.33	1340/1646	4.33	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	6	4	2	3.67	1261/1621	3.67	4.02	4.06	4.02	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	852/1568	4.50	4.67	4.43	4.39	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	2	11		1174/1572	4.57	4.76	4.70	4.64	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	5	4			1127/1564	4.00	4.18	4.28	4.25	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	б	6	4.38	851/1559	4.38	4.46	4.29	4.23	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	2	0	2	3	2	3.33	1130/1352	3.33	3.33	3.98	3.97	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	3	2	0	6	3 58	1047/1384	3.58	3.93	4.08	4.11	3.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	õ	1	0	4	1	6		1022/1382	3.92	4.10	4.29	4.37	3.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	õ	1	0	0	4	7		796/1368	4.33	4.38	4.30	4.39	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	3	9	2	0	1	0	0		****/ 948			3.95	4.00	
Tabauatau														
Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	5 00	4 29	4.22	5 00
5. Were requirements for fub reports crearry specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	5.00	1.20	1.22	5.00
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 288	* * * *	****	3.68	3.58	* * * *
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	11/ 312	4.80	4.80	3.68	3.60	4.80

# Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	5	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						