Course-Section: FYS 101Q 01

Title: Building a Culture of Pe

Instructor: Taylor, Joby B

Term - Fall 2013

Enrollment: 21

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	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	5	6	4.42	801/1644	4.42	4.31	4.32	4.16	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	1082/1644	4.17	4.19	4.28	4.23	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	337/1419	4.75	4.40	4.35	4.25	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	1008/1596	4.17	4.20	4.24	4.09	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	4	4.08	904/1535	4.08	4.20	4.15	4.02	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	629/1510	4.33	4.17	4.13	3.91	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	1134/1620	4.00	4.00	4.20	4.13	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	914/1642	4.75	4.76	4.68	4.68	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	8	3	4.27	679/1596	4.27	4.18	4.12	4.07	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	891/1534	4.50	4.46	4.48	4.45	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1539	5.00	4.89	4.76	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	852/1531	4.40	4.48	4.33	4.30	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	644/1530	4.60	4.56	4.35	4.30	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	756/1409	4.11	4.29	4.08	3.97	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	492/1366	4.50	4.42	4.18	3.96	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	1	1	0	5	3.88	1098/1364	3.88	4.37	4.33	4.10	3.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	703/1361	4.50	4.52	4.39	4.17	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	680/1019	3.88	4.04	4.09	3.97	3.88

Course-Section: FYS 101Q 01

Title: Building a Culture of Pe

Instructor: Taylor, Joby B

Term - Fall 2013

Enrollment: 21

Questionnaires: 12

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/209	****	****	4.19	4.18	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	61/72	4.20	4.43	4.53	4.35	4.20
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	2	0	2	1	3.40	67/71	3.40	4.11	4.38	4.21	3.40
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	55/68	4.00	4.27	4.41	4.22	4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	62/71	3.80	4.34	4.40	4.19	3.80
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	62/73	3.00	3.70	4.09	3.85	3.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/48	****	4.16	4.16	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/45	****	4.00	4.19	3.97	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/51	****	3.33	4.03	4.19	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/31	****	4.00	4.18	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/36	****	****	4.33	4.38	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/19	****	****	4.17	4.29	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: FYS 101Q 01

Title: Building a Culture of Pe

Instructor: Taylor, Joby B

Term - Fall 2013

Enrollment: 21

Questionnaires: 12

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/14	****	****	4.17	4.35	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	Α	8	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	6	Under-grad	12	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FYS 101R 01

Title: Sustainability in Amer C

Instructor: Turner, Rita J.

Term - Fall 2013

Enrollment: 19

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	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	4	0	1	0	2	6	6	4.07	1172/1644	4.07	4.31	4.32	4.16	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	1	0	2	6	6	4.07	1174/1644	4.07	4.19	4.28	4.23	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	2	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	760/1419	4.42	4.40	4.35	4.25	4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	1	0	0	5	9	4.40	717/1596	4.40	4.20	4.24	4.09	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	320/1535	4.64	4.20	4.15	4.02	4.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	848/1510	4.13	4.17	4.13	3.91	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	4	0	2	9	4.07	1087/1620	4.07	4.00	4.20	4.13	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	11	4	4.27	1394/1642	4.27	4.76	4.68	4.68	4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	705/1596	4.25	4.18	4.12	4.07	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	198/1534	4.93	4.46	4.48	4.45	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1539	5.00	4.89	4.76	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	406/1531	4.71	4.48	4.33	4.30	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	421/1530	4.77	4.56	4.35	4.30	4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	321/1409	4.57	4.29	4.08	3.97	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	604/1366	4.40	4.42	4.18	3.96	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	844/1364	4.30	4.37	4.33	4.10	4.30
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	503/1361	4.70	4.52	4.39	4.17	4.70

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: FYS 101R 01

Title: Sustainability in Amer C

Instructor: Turner, Rita J.

Term - Fall 2013

Enrollment: 19

Questionnaires: 19

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	262/1019	4.50	4.04	4.09	3.97	4.50

Credits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA	1	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	Α	13	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	5	Under-grad	19	Non-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	6	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Course-Section: FYS 101T 01

Title: Discussing Classics

Instructor: Irvine, David E

Term - Fall 2013

Enrollment: 20

				Fre	quend	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	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	1	0	0	2	1	11	3	3.88	1327/1644	3.88	4.31	4.32	4.16	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	7	6	4.12	1138/1644	4.12	4.19	4.28	4.23	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	942/1419	4.25	4.40	4.35	4.25	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	1076/1596	4.10	4.20	4.24	4.09	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	3	13	4.65	320/1535	4.65	4.20	4.15	4.02	4.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	538/1510	4.40	4.17	4.13	3.91	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	2	4	4	3	2	2.93	1548/1620	2.93	4.00	4.20	4.13	2.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	988/1642	4.71	4.76	4.68	4.68	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	9	4	4.13	863/1596	4.13	4.18	4.12	4.07	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1030/1534	4.40	4.46	4.48	4.45	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1539	5.00	4.89	4.76	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	275/1531	4.80	4.48	4.33	4.30	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	644/1530	4.60	4.56	4.35	4.30	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1409	****	4.29	4.08	3.97	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	101/1366	4.93	4.42	4.18	3.96	4.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	342/1364	4.80	4.37	4.33	4.10	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	173/1361	4.93	4.52	4.39	4.17	4.93

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: FYS 101T 01

Title: Discussing Classics

Instructor: Irvine, David E

Term - Fall 2013

Enrollment: 20

Questionnaires: 18

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	2	8	5	4.20	462/1019	4.20	4.04	4.09	3.97	4.20

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	Α	14	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	5	Under-grad	18	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	6	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	2				
				?	3						

Course-Section: FYS 101U 01

Title: But is it Art? Filmmaker

Instructor: Kreizenbeck, Ala

Term - Fall 2013

Enrollment: 20

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	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	3	4	10	4.41	801/1644	4.41	4.31	4.32	4.16	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	3	10	4.24	1008/1644	4.24	4.19	4.28	4.23	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	9	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	632/1419	4.50	4.40	4.35	4.25	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	0	5	9	4.40	717/1596	4.40	4.20	4.24	4.09	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	300/1535	4.67	4.20	4.15	4.02	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	6	10	4.47	461/1510	4.47	4.17	4.13	3.91	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	9	6	4.24	923/1620	4.24	4.00	4.20	4.13	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	988/1642	4.71	4.76	4.68	4.68	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	578/1596	4.36	4.18	4.12	4.07	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	946/1534	4.47	4.46	4.48	4.45	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1539	5.00	4.89	4.76	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	676/1531	4.53	4.48	4.33	4.30	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	805/1530	4.47	4.56	4.35	4.30	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	296/1409	4.60	4.29	4.08	3.97	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	471/1366	4.54	4.42	4.18	3.96	4.54
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	625/1364	4.54	4.37	4.33	4.10	4.54
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	677/1361	4.54	4.52	4.39	4.17	4.54
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	1	0	2	4	1	3.50	842/1019	3.50	4.04	4.09	3.97	3.50

Course-Section: FYS 101U 01

Title: But is it Art? Filmmaker

Instructor: Kreizenbeck, Ala

Term - Fall 2013

Enrollment: 20

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/209	****	****	4.19	4.18	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/72	****	4.43	4.53	4.35	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/71	****	4.11	4.38	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/68	****	4.27	4.41	4.22	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/71	****	4.34	4.40	4.19	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/73	****	3.70	4.09	3.85	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/48	****	4.16	4.16	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/45	****	4.00	4.19	3.97	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/27	****	****	4.25	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/25	****	****	4.35	4.63	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/51	****	3.33	4.03	4.19	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	4.00	4.18	4.46	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: FYS 101U 01

Title: But is it Art? Filmmaker

Instructor: Kreizenbeck, Ala

Term - Fall 2013

Enrollment: 20

Questionnaires: 17

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/14	****	****	4.17	4.35	***

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	3	Α	11	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	12	Under-grad	17	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: FYS 101V 01

Title: : Perspect. on the Heroi

Instructor: McAlpine, Steven

Term - Fall 2013

Enrollment: 16

	_			Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	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	4	12	4.75	358/1644	4.75	4.31	4.32	4.16	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	302/1644	4.75	4.19	4.28	4.23	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	236/1419	4.83	4.40	4.35	4.25	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	141/1596	4.88	4.20	4.24	4.09	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	182/1535	4.81	4.20	4.15	4.02	4.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	107/1510	4.88	4.17	4.13	3.91	4.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	488/1620	4.53	4.00	4.20	4.13	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	1149/1642	4.56	4.76	4.68	4.68	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1596	5.00	4.18	4.12	4.07	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	173/1534	4.94	4.46	4.48	4.45	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1539	5.00	4.89	4.76	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	113/1531	4.94	4.48	4.33	4.30	4.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	248/1530	4.88	4.56	4.35	4.30	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	2	3	9	4.27	617/1409	4.27	4.29	4.08	3.97	4.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	145/1366	4.90	4.42	4.18	3.96	4.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	342/1364	4.80	4.37	4.33	4.10	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	503/1361	4.70	4.52	4.39	4.17	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	262/1019	4.50	4.04	4.09	3.97	4.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: FYS 101V 01

Title: : Perspect. on the Heroi

Instructor: McAlpine, Steven

Term - Fall 2013

Enrollment: 16

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/209	****	****	4.19	4.18	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	27/72	4.83	4.43	4.53	4.35	4.83
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	35/71	4.50	4.11	4.38	4.21	4.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	18/68	4.80	4.27	4.41	4.22	4.80
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	27/71	4.67	4.34	4.40	4.19	4.67
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	55/73	3.67	3.70	4.09	3.85	3.67
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/48	****	4.16	4.16	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/45	****	4.00	4.19	3.97	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.25	4.37	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/51	****	3.33	4.03	4.19	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: FYS 101V 01

Title: : Perspect. on the Heroi

Instructor: McAlpine, Steven

Term - Fall 2013

Enrollment: 16

Questionnaires: 16

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/36	****	****	4.33	4.38	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	Α	15	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	5	Under-grad	16	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	6	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FYS 102A 01

Title: Images of Madness

Instructor: Tice, Carolyn J

Term - Fall 2013

Enrollment: 18

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	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	4	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	601/1644	4.57	4.31	4.32	4.16	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	870/1644	4.36	4.19	4.28	4.23	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	9	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	543/1419	4.60	4.40	4.35	4.25	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	383/1596	4.64	4.20	4.24	4.09	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	253/1535	4.71	4.20	4.15	4.02	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	234/1510	4.71	4.17	4.13	3.91	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	436/1620	4.57	4.00	4.20	4.13	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	869/1642	4.79	4.76	4.68	4.68	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	85/1596	4.92	4.18	4.12	4.07	4.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	381/1534	4.83	4.46	4.48	4.45	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1539	5.00	4.89	4.76	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	162/1531	4.91	4.48	4.33	4.30	4.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	202/1530	4.91	4.56	4.35	4.30	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.29	4.08	3.97	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	130/1366	4.92	4.42	4.18	3.96	4.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	398/1364	4.75	4.37	4.33	4.10	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	340/1361	4.83	4.52	4.39	4.17	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	216/1019	4.60	4.04	4.09	3.97	4.60

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: FYS 102A 01

Title: Images of Madness

Instructor: Tice, Carolyn J

Term - Fall 2013

Enrollment: 18

Questionnaires: 18

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/72	****	4.43	4.53	4.35	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/71	****	4.11	4.38	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	4.27	4.41	4.22	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/71	****	4.34	4.40	4.19	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.70	4.09	3.85	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	Α	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	С	1	General	5	Under-grad	18	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	5						

Course-Section: FYS 102C 01

Title: Dvrsty, Ethics & Social J

Instructor: Williams, Vickie

Term - Fall 2013

Enrollment: 20

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	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	5	5	4.36	857/1644	4.36	4.31	4.32	4.16	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	1060/1644	4.18	4.19	4.28	4.23	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	632/1419	4.50	4.40	4.35	4.25	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	859/1596	4.30	4.20	4.24	4.09	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	802/1535	4.18	4.20	4.15	4.02	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	879/1510	4.09	4.17	4.13	3.91	4.09
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	3	4	3.82	1299/1620	3.82	4.00	4.20	4.13	3.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	632/1642	4.91	4.76	4.68	4.68	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	8	1	4.00	971/1596	4.06	4.18	4.12	4.07	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	6	4	4.18	1207/1534	4.20	4.46	4.48	4.45	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	1047/1539	4.75	4.89	4.76	4.72	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	788/1531	4.39	4.48	4.33	4.30	4.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	606/1530	4.60	4.56	4.35	4.30	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	270/1409	4.60	4.29	4.08	3.97	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	492/1366	4.50	4.42	4.18	3.96	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	756/1364	4.40	4.37	4.33	4.10	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	380/1361	4.80	4.52	4.39	4.17	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	166/1019	4.70	4.04	4.09	3.97	4.70

Course-Section: FYS 102C 01

Title: Dvrsty, Ethics & Social J

Instructor: Williams, Vickie

Term - Fall 2013

Enrollment: 20

Questionnaires: 11

<u>'</u>				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/185	****	****	4.23	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/209	****	****	4.19	4.18	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/181	****	****	4.53	4.68	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/183	****	****	4.46	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/172	****	****	4.14	4.22	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	51/72	4.43	4.43	4.53	4.35	4.43
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	46/71	4.33	4.11	4.38	4.21	4.33
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	50/68	4.17	4.27	4.41	4.22	4.17
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	43/71	4.43	4.34	4.40	4.19	4.43
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	44/73	4.00	3.70	4.09	3.85	4.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	30/48	4.33	4.16	4.16	3.97	4.33
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	28/45	4.00	4.00	4.19	3.97	4.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/30	****	****	4.57	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/27	****	****	4.25	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/25	****	****	4.35	4.63	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	44/51	3.33	3.33	4.03	4.19	3.33
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	22/31	4.00	4.00	4.18	4.46	4.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/36	****	****	4.33	4.38	****

Run Date: 1/30/2014 2:21:29 PM

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: FYS 102C 01

Title: Dvrsty, Ethics & Social J

Instructor: Williams, Vickie

Term - Fall 2013

Enrollment: 20

Questionnaires: 11

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/19	****	****	4.17	4.29	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/14	****	****	4.17	4.35	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	Α	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	С	1	General	3	Under-grad	11	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	2						

Course-Section: FYS 102C 01

Title: Dvrsty, Ethics & Social J

Instructor: Small, Sue E

Term - Fall 2013

Enrollment: 20

·	_			Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	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	5	5	4.36	857/1644	4.36	4.31	4.32	4.16	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	1060/1644	4.18	4.19	4.28	4.23	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	632/1419	4.50	4.40	4.35	4.25	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	859/1596	4.30	4.20	4.24	4.09	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	802/1535	4.18	4.20	4.15	4.02	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	879/1510	4.09	4.17	4.13	3.91	4.09
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	3	4	3.82	1299/1620	3.82	4.00	4.20	4.13	3.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	632/1642	4.91	4.76	4.68	4.68	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	877/1596	4.06	4.18	4.12	4.07	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	1178/1534	4.20	4.46	4.48	4.45	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	951/1539	4.75	4.89	4.76	4.72	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	916/1531	4.39	4.48	4.33	4.30	4.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	699/1530	4.60	4.56	4.35	4.30	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	338/1409	4.60	4.29	4.08	3.97	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	492/1366	4.50	4.42	4.18	3.96	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	756/1364	4.40	4.37	4.33	4.10	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	380/1361	4.80	4.52	4.39	4.17	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	166/1019	4.70	4.04	4.09	3.97	4.70

Course-Section: FYS 102C 01

Title: Dvrsty, Ethics & Social J

Instructor: Small, Sue E

Term - Fall 2013

Enrollment: 20

'				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/185	****	****	4.23	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/209	****	****	4.19	4.18	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/181	****	****	4.53	4.68	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/183	****	****	4.46	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/172	****	****	4.14	4.22	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	51/72	4.43	4.43	4.53	4.35	4.43
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	46/71	4.33	4.11	4.38	4.21	4.33
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	50/68	4.17	4.27	4.41	4.22	4.17
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	43/71	4.43	4.34	4.40	4.19	4.43
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	44/73	4.00	3.70	4.09	3.85	4.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	30/48	4.33	4.16	4.16	3.97	4.33
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	28/45	4.00	4.00	4.19	3.97	4.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/30	****	****	4.57	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/27	****	****	4.25	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/25	****	****	4.35	4.63	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	44/51	3.33	3.33	4.03	4.19	3.33
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	22/31	4.00	4.00	4.18	4.46	4.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/36	****	****	4.33	4.38	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: FYS 102C 01

Title: Dvrsty, Ethics & Social J

Instructor: Small, Sue E

Term - Fall 2013

Enrollment: 20

Questionnaires: 11

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/19	****	****	4.17	4.29	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/14	****	****	4.17	4.35	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP/	A	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	Α	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	С	1	General	3	Under-grad	11	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	2						

Course-Section: FYS 102K 01

Title: Passive-Aggressive Behav

Instructor: Freiberg, Karen

Term - Fall 2013

Enrollment: 20

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	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	2	1	6	5	3.80	1387/1644	3.80	4.31	4.32	4.16	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	7	4.20	1038/1644	4.20	4.19	4.28	4.23	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1419	****	4.40	4.35	4.25	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	4	3	3.40	1469/1596	3.40	4.20	4.24	4.09	3.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	0	6	6	4.07	912/1535	4.07	4.20	4.15	4.02	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	5	4	4	3.79	1122/1510	3.79	4.17	4.13	3.91	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	5	8	4.20	968/1620	4.20	4.00	4.20	4.13	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1642	5.00	4.76	4.68	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	2	7	2	3.83	1183/1596	3.83	4.18	4.12	4.07	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	1147/1534	4.27	4.46	4.48	4.45	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	1	13	4.73	1028/1539	4.73	4.89	4.76	4.72	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	8	5	4.07	1136/1531	4.07	4.48	4.33	4.30	4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	644/1530	4.60	4.56	4.35	4.30	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	4	1	6	4.00	825/1409	4.00	4.29	4.08	3.97	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	471/1366	4.54	4.42	4.18	3.96	4.54
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1364	5.00	4.37	4.33	4.10	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	514/1361	4.69	4.52	4.39	4.17	4.69
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	351/1019	4.38	4.04	4.09	3.97	4.38

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: FYS 102K 01

Title: Passive-Aggressive Behav

Instructor: Freiberg, Karen

Term - Fall 2013

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 15

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	38/72	4.67	4.43	4.53	4.35	4.67
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	2	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	51/71	4.25	4.11	4.38	4.21	4.25
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	2	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	55/68	4.00	4.27	4.41	4.22	4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	54/71	4.17	4.34	4.40	4.19	4.17
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	55/73	3.67	3.70	4.09	3.85	3.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	Α	13	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	3	Under-grad	15	Non-major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	9	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Run Date: 1/30/2014 2:21:29 PM

Course-Section: FYS 102P 01

Title: Creativity, Innov & Inv

Instructor: LaCourse, Willia

Term - Fall 2013

Enrollment: 18

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	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	3	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	288/1644	4.80	4.31	4.32	4.16	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	0	2	2	10	4.33	897/1644	4.33	4.19	4.28	4.23	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	13	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1419	****	4.40	4.35	4.25	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	745/1596	4.38	4.20	4.24	4.09	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	8	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	845/1535	4.14	4.20	4.15	4.02	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	429/1510	4.50	4.17	4.13	3.91	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	590/1620	4.47	4.00	4.20	4.13	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	736/1642	4.86	4.76	4.68	4.68	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	4	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	144/1596	4.78	4.18	4.12	4.07	4.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	974/1534	4.63	4.46	4.48	4.45	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1539	5.00	4.89	4.76	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	218/1531	4.79	4.48	4.33	4.30	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	940/1530	4.62	4.56	4.35	4.30	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	124/1409	4.63	4.29	4.08	3.97	4.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	200/1366	4.85	4.42	4.18	3.96	4.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	386/1364	4.77	4.37	4.33	4.10	4.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	514/1361	4.69	4.52	4.39	4.17	4.69

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: FYS 102P 01
Title: Creativity, Innov & Inv

Term - Fall 2013

Enrollment: 18

Questionnaires: 18

Instructor: LaCourse, Willia

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	243/1019	4.55	4.04	4.09	3.97	4.55

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP	4	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	Α	11	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	С	0	General	2	Under-grad	18	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	6	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	2				
				?	3						

Course-Section: FYS 102P 01

Title: Creativity, Innov & Inv

Instructor: Mason, Gilbert A

Term - Fall 2013

Enrollment: 18

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	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	3	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	288/1644	4.80	4.31	4.32	4.16	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	0	2	2	10	4.33	897/1644	4.33	4.19	4.28	4.23	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	13	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1419	****	4.40	4.35	4.25	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	745/1596	4.38	4.20	4.24	4.09	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	8	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	845/1535	4.14	4.20	4.15	4.02	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	429/1510	4.50	4.17	4.13	3.91	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	590/1620	4.47	4.00	4.20	4.13	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	736/1642	4.86	4.76	4.68	4.68	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	178/1596	4.78	4.18	4.12	4.07	4.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	419/1534	4.63	4.46	4.48	4.45	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1539	5.00	4.89	4.76	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	391/1531	4.79	4.48	4.33	4.30	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	202/1530	4.62	4.56	4.35	4.30	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	1	0	0	2	7	4.40	486/1409	4.63	4.29	4.08	3.97	4.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	200/1366	4.85	4.42	4.18	3.96	4.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	386/1364	4.77	4.37	4.33	4.10	4.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	514/1361	4.69	4.52	4.39	4.17	4.69

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: FYS 102P 01 Title: Creativity, Innov & Inv

Instructor: Mason, Gilbert A

Term - Fall 2013

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 18

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	243/1019	4.55	4.04	4.09	3.97	4.55

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP	4	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	Α	11	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	С	0	General	2	Under-grad	18	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	6	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	2				
				?	3						

Course-Section: FYS 102R 01

Title: Learning About, With, an

Instructor: Wolff, Michele K

Term - Fall 2013

Enrollment: 28

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	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	14	0	0	0	3	3	16	4.59	576/1644	4.59	4.31	4.32	4.16	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	14	0	0	1	3	7	11	4.27	968/1644	4.27	4.19	4.28	4.23	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	14	15	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	****/1419	****	4.40	4.35	4.25	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	15	2	0	0	4	5	10	4.32	844/1596	4.32	4.20	4.24	4.09	4.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	3	3	6	10	4.05	937/1535	4.05	4.20	4.15	4.02	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	429/1510	4.50	4.17	4.13	3.91	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	14	1	0	3	4	4	10	4.00	1134/1620	4.00	4.00	4.20	4.13	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	15	1	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	736/1642	4.85	4.76	4.68	4.68	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	1	0	0	4	12	4	4.00	971/1596	4.00	4.18	4.12	4.07	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	1	0	2	7	10	4.25	1155/1534	4.25	4.46	4.48	4.45	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	751/1539	4.85	4.89	4.76	4.72	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	1	0	1	7	11	4.35	898/1531	4.35	4.48	4.33	4.30	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	1	5	13	4.50	755/1530	4.50	4.56	4.35	4.30	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	2	0	1	2	2	12	4.47	412/1409	4.47	4.29	4.08	3.97	4.47
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	536/1366	4.47	4.42	4.18	3.96	4.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	649/1364	4.50	4.37	4.33	4.10	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	1	1	1	11	4.57	644/1361	4.57	4.52	4.39	4.17	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	22	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	196/1019	4.64	4.04	4.09	3.97	4.64

Course-Section: FYS 102R 01

Title: Learning About, With, an

Instructor: Wolff, Michele K

Term - Fall 2013

Enrollment: 28

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/185	****	****	4.23	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/209	****	****	4.19	4.18	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/181	****	****	4.53	4.68	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/183	****	****	4.46	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	34	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/172	****	****	4.14	4.22	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	57/72	4.33	4.43	4.53	4.35	4.33
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	39/71	4.44	4.11	4.38	4.21	4.44
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	42/68	4.33	4.27	4.41	4.22	4.33
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	52/71	4.22	4.34	4.40	4.19	4.22
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	42/73	4.22	3.70	4.09	3.85	4.22
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/48	****	4.16	4.16	3.97	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.57	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	34	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/27	****	****	4.25	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	34	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/25	****	****	4.35	4.63	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/51	****	3.33	4.03	4.19	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	34	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/36	****	****	4.33	4.38	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	34	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/19	****	****	4.17	4.29	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: FYS 102R 01

Title: Learning About, With, an

Term - Fall 2013

Enrollment: 28

Questionnaires: 36

Instructor: Wolff, Michele K

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	34	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/14	****	****	4.17	4.35	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	2	Α	19	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	7	Under-grad	35	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	7	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	16						

Course-Section: FYS 102S 01

Title: The Deaf Comm. and Its C

Instructor: Braunschweig, Su

Term - Fall 2013

Enrollment: 19

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	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	2	0	1	1	1	1	13	4.41	801/1644	4.41	4.31	4.32	4.16	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	785/1644	4.41	4.19	4.28	4.23	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	3	10	4.35	837/1419	4.35	4.40	4.35	4.25	4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	2	0	6	8	4.25	911/1596	4.25	4.20	4.24	4.09	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	3	10	4.18	813/1535	4.18	4.20	4.15	4.02	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	4	3	8	4.13	857/1510	4.13	4.17	4.13	3.91	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	2	1	3	9	4.06	1087/1620	4.06	4.00	4.20	4.13	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1642	5.00	4.76	4.68	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	1	3	7	3	3.67	1302/1596	3.90	4.18	4.12	4.07	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	0	6	9	4.44	988/1534	4.47	4.46	4.48	4.45	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	666/1539	4.91	4.89	4.76	4.72	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	692/1531	4.62	4.48	4.33	4.30	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	732/1530	4.59	4.56	4.35	4.30	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	454/1409	4.53	4.29	4.08	3.97	4.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	581/1366	4.43	4.42	4.18	3.96	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	0	5	8	4.43	734/1364	4.43	4.37	4.33	4.10	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	644/1361	4.57	4.52	4.39	4.17	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	1	4	3	6	4.00	559/1019	4.00	4.04	4.09	3.97	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: FYS 102S 01

Title: The Deaf Comm. and Its C

Instructor: Braunschweig, Su

Term - Fall 2013

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 19

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	43/72	4.62	4.43	4.53	4.35	4.62
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	46/71	4.33	4.11	4.38	4.21	4.33
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	22/68	4.69	4.27	4.41	4.22	4.69
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	24/71	4.69	4.34	4.40	4.19	4.69
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	1	1	1	1	9	4.23	42/73	4.23	3.70	4.09	3.85	4.23
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/51	****	3.33	4.03	4.19	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	4.00	4.18	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/36	****	****	4.33	4.38	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	Α	9	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	С	1	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	7	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	4						

Course-Section: FYS 102S 01

Title: The Deaf Comm. and Its C

Instructor: Perdue, Denise Y

Term - Fall 2013

Enrollment: 19

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	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	2	0	1	1	1	1	13	4.41	801/1644	4.41	4.31	4.32	4.16	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	785/1644	4.41	4.19	4.28	4.23	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	3	10	4.35	837/1419	4.35	4.40	4.35	4.25	4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	2	0	6	8	4.25	911/1596	4.25	4.20	4.24	4.09	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	3	10	4.18	813/1535	4.18	4.20	4.15	4.02	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	4	3	8	4.13	857/1510	4.13	4.17	4.13	3.91	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	2	1	3	9	4.06	1087/1620	4.06	4.00	4.20	4.13	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1642	5.00	4.76	4.68	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	863/1596	3.90	4.18	4.12	4.07	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	891/1534	4.47	4.46	4.48	4.45	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	365/1539	4.91	4.89	4.76	4.72	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	421/1531	4.62	4.48	4.33	4.30	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	594/1530	4.59	4.56	4.35	4.30	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	279/1409	4.53	4.29	4.08	3.97	4.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	581/1366	4.43	4.42	4.18	3.96	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	0	5	8	4.43	734/1364	4.43	4.37	4.33	4.10	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	644/1361	4.57	4.52	4.39	4.17	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	1	4	3	6	4.00	559/1019	4.00	4.04	4.09	3.97	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: FYS 102S 01

Title: The Deaf Comm. and Its C

Instructor: Perdue, Denise Y

Term - Fall 2013

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 19

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	43/72	4.62	4.43	4.53	4.35	4.62
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	46/71	4.33	4.11	4.38	4.21	4.33
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	22/68	4.69	4.27	4.41	4.22	4.69
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	24/71	4.69	4.34	4.40	4.19	4.69
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	1	1	1	1	9	4.23	42/73	4.23	3.70	4.09	3.85	4.23
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/51	****	3.33	4.03	4.19	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	4.00	4.18	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/36	****	****	4.33	4.38	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	Α	9	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	С	1	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	7	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	4						

Course-Section: FYS 102U 01

Title: Poverty Admidst Plenty

Instructor: Dasgupta, Nandit

Term - Fall 2013

Enrollment: 14

			Frequencies				Instructor		Course	Org	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	2	0	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	1028/1644	4.20	4.31	4.32	4.16	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	1038/1644	4.20	4.19	4.28	4.23	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	409/1419	4.70	4.40	4.35	4.25	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	1064/1596	4.11	4.20	4.24	4.09	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	1068/1535	3.90	4.20	4.15	4.02	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	6	0	3.30	1389/1510	3.30	4.17	4.13	3.91	3.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	0	2	3	3	3.50	1429/1620	3.50	4.00	4.20	4.13	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	9	1	4.10	1494/1642	4.10	4.76	4.68	4.68	4.10
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	971/1596	4.00	4.18	4.12	4.07	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	439/1534	4.80	4.46	4.48	4.45	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	609/1539	4.90	4.89	4.76	4.72	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	0	7	4.40	852/1531	4.40	4.48	4.33	4.30	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	519/1530	4.70	4.56	4.35	4.30	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	1379/1409	2.50	4.29	4.08	3.97	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	1337/1366	2.60	4.42	4.18	3.96	2.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	1327/1364	2.80	4.37	4.33	4.10	2.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1240/1361	3.50	4.52	4.39	4.17	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	1016/1019	1.67	4.04	4.09	3.97	1.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: FYS 102U 01

Title: Poverty Admidst Plenty

Instructor: Dasgupta, Nandit

Term - Fall 2013

Enrollment: 14

Questionnaires: 12

			Frequencies				Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	64/72	4.00	4.43	4.53	4.35	4.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	64/71	3.50	4.11	4.38	4.21	3.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	55/68	4.00	4.27	4.41	4.22	4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/71	****	4.34	4.40	4.19	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	1	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	71/73	2.33	3.70	4.09	3.85	2.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	Α	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	3	Under-grad	12	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	1				
				?	3						

Run Date: 1/30/2014 2:21:29 PM

Course-Section: FYS 103N 01

Title: Monitoring Global Enviro

Instructor: Prados, Ana

Term - Fall 2013

Enrollment: 17

			Frequencies				Instructor		Course	Org	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	1	4	6	3	3.79	1397/1644	3.79	4.31	4.32	4.16	3.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	8	2	3.71	1405/1644	3.71	4.19	4.28	4.23	3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	7	4	3.93	1147/1419	3.93	4.40	4.35	4.25	3.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	6	1	3.50	1429/1596	3.50	4.20	4.24	4.09	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	4	4	2	3.23	1426/1535	3.23	4.20	4.15	4.02	3.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	2	5	3	3.75	1137/1510	3.75	4.17	4.13	3.91	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	3	4	3	3.54	1417/1620	3.54	4.00	4.20	4.13	3.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	568/1642	4.92	4.76	4.68	4.68	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	1	0	5	7	0	3.38	1440/1596	3.38	4.18	4.12	4.07	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	0	8	2	3.83	1377/1534	3.83	4.46	4.48	4.45	3.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	1136/1539	4.67	4.89	4.76	4.72	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	4	4	3	3.75	1314/1531	3.75	4.48	4.33	4.30	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	6	2	3.83	1265/1530	3.83	4.56	4.35	4.30	3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	777/1409	4.08	4.29	4.08	3.97	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	772/1366	4.18	4.42	4.18	3.96	4.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	1	6	3	4.00	1014/1364	4.00	4.37	4.33	4.10	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	850/1361	4.36	4.52	4.39	4.17	4.36
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	2	2	2	5	0	2.91	992/1019	2.91	4.04	4.09	3.97	2.91

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: FYS 103N 01

Title: Monitoring Global Enviro

Instructor: Prados, Ana

Term - Fall 2013

Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 14

		Frequencies				Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	62/72	4.14	4.43	4.53	4.35	4.14
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	49/71	4.29	4.11	4.38	4.21	4.29
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	52/68	4.14	4.27	4.41	4.22	4.14
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	49/71	4.29	4.34	4.40	4.19	4.29
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	1	0	1	4	1	3.57	57/73	3.57	3.70	4.09	3.85	3.57

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	Α	5	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	8							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	1	General	6	Under-grad	14	Non-major	7	
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses		
				Р	0			to be significant				
				1	0	Other	2					
				?	0							

Run Date: 1/30/2014 2:21:29 PM

Course-Section: FYS 1030 01

Title: Microbes, Humans, and Hi

Instructor: Schreier, Susan

Term - Fall 2013

Enrollment: 18

'	_		Frequencies 1 2 3 4 5 M					Ins	structor	Course	Org	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	2	6	5	5	3.72	1428/1644	3.72	4.31	4.32	4.16	3.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	7	3	5	3	3.22	1560/1644	3.22	4.19	4.28	4.23	3.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	2	3	3	7	3.50	1303/1419	3.50	4.40	4.35	4.25	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	4	6	4	3.56	1410/1596	3.56	4.20	4.24	4.09	3.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	6	4	5	3.50	1327/1535	3.50	4.20	4.15	4.02	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	4	6	3	3.28	1396/1510	3.28	4.17	4.13	3.91	3.28
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	5	6	5	3.72	1342/1620	3.72	4.00	4.20	4.13	3.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	884/1642	4.78	4.76	4.68	4.68	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	3	7	4	3	3.41	1428/1596	3.41	4.18	4.12	4.07	3.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	4	6	7	4.06	1278/1534	4.06	4.46	4.48	4.45	4.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	1136/1539	4.67	4.89	4.76	4.72	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	4	8	4	3.72	1327/1531	3.72	4.48	4.33	4.30	3.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	6	7	4.06	1138/1530	4.06	4.56	4.35	4.30	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	2	5	4	4	3.50	1168/1409	3.50	4.29	4.08	3.97	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	6	3	5	3.63	1116/1366	3.63	4.42	4.18	3.96	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	2	4	5	4	3.73	1150/1364	3.73	4.37	4.33	4.10	3.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	2	1	6	2	4	3.33	1284/1361	3.33	4.52	4.39	4.17	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	3	1	0	4	4	3.42	883/1019	3.42	4.04	4.09	3.97	3.42

Course-Section: FYS 1030 01

Title: Microbes, Humans, and Hi

Instructor: Schreier, Susan

Term - Fall 2013

Enrollment: 18

Questionnaires: 18

	Frequencies						Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/185	****	****	4.23	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/209	****	****	4.19	4.18	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/181	****	****	4.53	4.68	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/183	****	****	4.46	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/172	****	****	4.14	4.22	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	1	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	45/72	4.50	4.43	4.53	4.35	4.50
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	2	0	3	4	3	3.50	64/71	3.50	4.11	4.38	4.21	3.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	1	3	6	4.00	55/68	4.00	4.27	4.41	4.22	4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	2	2	6	4.00	59/71	4.00	4.34	4.40	4.19	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	2	3	3	4	3.75	54/73	3.75	3.70	4.09	3.85	3.75
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	34/48	3.80	4.16	4.16	3.97	3.80
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	28/45	4.00	4.00	4.19	3.97	4.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/30	****	****	4.57	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/27	****	****	4.25	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	1	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/25	****	****	4.35	4.63	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/51	****	3.33	4.03	4.19	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/31	****	4.00	4.18	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/36	****	****	4.33	4.38	****

Run Date: 1/30/2014 2:21:30 PM

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: FYS 1030 01

Title: Microbes, Humans, and Hi

Instructor: Schreier, Susan

Term - Fall 2013

Enrollment: 18

Questionnaires: 18

		Frequencies			Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	1	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/19	****	****	4.17	4.29	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/14	****	****	4.17	4.35	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP/	A	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	2	Α	6	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	10							
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	9	Under-grad	18	Non-major	10	
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses		
				Р	0			to be significant				
				1	0	Other	3					
				?	2							