

Course-Section: SCIE 501 8720
 Title PHYS CONCEPTS, PRIN, A
 Instructor: MCKIM, JOHN
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1423
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1	0	2	6	7	4.13	1073/1576	4.13	4.51	4.30	4.43	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	6	5	3.82	1281/1576	3.82	4.33	4.27	4.32	3.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	8	6	4.00	972/1342	4.00	4.50	4.32	4.38	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	7	4.24	880/1520	4.24	4.35	4.25	4.36	4.24	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	7	6	4.06	824/1465	4.06	4.27	4.12	4.25	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	5	7	4.06	852/1434	4.06	4.42	4.14	4.35	4.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	434/1547	4.59	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.78	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	11	0	3.79	1145/1554	3.79	4.24	4.10	4.18	3.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	1	14	4.71	610/1488	4.71	4.55	4.47	4.52	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.90	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	4	5	7	4.00	1101/1486	4.00	4.54	4.32	4.37	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	5	8	4.18	1012/1489	4.18	4.49	4.32	4.38	4.18	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	2	0	3	11	4.24	551/1277	4.24	4.26	4.03	4.08	4.24	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	4	2	8	4.00	802/1279	4.00	4.66	4.17	4.34	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	827/1270	4.25	4.76	4.35	4.53	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	6	9	4.44	702/1269	4.44	4.81	4.35	4.55	4.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	5	7	3	3.87	575/ 878	3.87	4.28	4.05	4.11	3.87	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	83/ 234	4.47	4.47	4.23	4.36	4.47	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	139/ 240	4.29	3.81	4.35	4.37	4.29	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	50/ 229	4.82	4.82	4.51	4.51	4.82	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	70/ 232	4.69	4.69	4.29	4.47	4.69	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	35/ 379	4.82	4.82	4.20	4.37	4.82	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	53/ 85	4.80	4.40	4.72	4.79	4.80	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 79	****	3.33	4.69	4.77	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.70	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.00	4.61	4.70	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.39	4.01	4.10	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.40	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.76	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.88	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.65	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.96	4.03	4.10	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	3.67	4.60	4.50	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.80	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.33	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.75	****	

Course-Section: SCIE 501 8720
 Title PHYS CONCEPTS, PRIN, A
 Instructor: MCKIM, JOHN
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1423
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	8	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SCIE 507 8020
 Title ADV T,L&C ELEM/MID/SCI
 Instructor: IRISH, TERESA J
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1424
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	0	4.00	1148/1576	4.27	4.51	4.30	4.43	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1392/1576	3.87	4.33	4.27	4.32	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	511/1520	4.48	4.35	4.25	4.36	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	850/1465	4.23	4.27	4.12	4.25	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	878/1434	4.31	4.42	4.14	4.35	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1347/1547	3.75	4.22	4.19	4.24	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1079/1574	4.56	4.78	4.64	4.75	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1303/1554	3.85	4.24	4.10	4.18	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1233/1488	4.31	4.55	4.47	4.52	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1493	4.96	4.90	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	678/1486	4.56	4.54	4.32	4.37	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	696/1489	4.52	4.49	4.32	4.38	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	692/1277	4.04	4.26	4.03	4.08	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1279	4.85	4.66	4.17	4.34	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	4.88	4.76	4.35	4.53	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	4.92	4.81	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 878	4.73	4.28	4.05	4.11	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SCIE 507 8720
 Title ADV T,L&C ELEM/MID/SCI
 Instructor: IRISH, TERESA J
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1425
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	0	6	7	4.54	595/1576	4.27	4.51	4.30	4.43	4.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	8	4	4.23	958/1576	3.87	4.33	4.27	4.32	4.23	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1342	****	4.50	4.32	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	579/1520	4.48	4.35	4.25	4.36	4.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	424/1465	4.23	4.27	4.12	4.25	4.46	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	314/1434	4.31	4.42	4.14	4.35	4.62	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	2	3	6	4.00	1041/1547	3.75	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	987/1574	4.56	4.78	4.64	4.75	4.62	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	772/1554	3.85	4.24	4.10	4.18	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	736/1488	4.31	4.55	4.47	4.52	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	445/1493	4.96	4.90	4.73	4.80	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	545/1486	4.56	4.54	4.32	4.37	4.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	660/1489	4.52	4.49	4.32	4.38	4.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	5	2	6	4.08	664/1277	4.04	4.26	4.03	4.08	4.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	312/1279	4.85	4.66	4.17	4.34	4.69	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	401/1270	4.88	4.76	4.35	4.53	4.77	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	342/1269	4.92	4.81	4.35	4.55	4.85	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	245/ 878	4.73	4.28	4.05	4.11	4.46	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	4.47	4.23	4.36	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	3.81	4.35	4.37	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.82	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.69	4.29	4.47	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	4.82	4.20	4.37	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 382	****	4.95	4.08	4.13	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	7	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						