

Course-Section: HONR 100 0101
 Title HONORS FORUM
 Instructor: KORN, MARCELLA
 Enrollment: 122
 Questionnaires: 107

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1005
 JAN 21, 2006
 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 | 50 | 20 | 22 | 12 | 2 | 2.02 | 1670/1674 | 2.02 | 4.23 | 4.27 | 4.07 | 2.02 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 41 | 23 | 19 | 17 | 7 | 2.31 | 1668/1674 | 2.31 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.16 | 2.31 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 70 | 14 | 7 | 11 | 1 | 3 | 2.22 | 1419/1423 | 2.22 | 4.36 | 4.27 | 4.16 | 2.22 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 8 | 29 | 16 | 24 | 23 | 7 | 2.63 | 1598/1609 | 2.63 | 4.23 | 4.22 | 4.05 | 2.63 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 41 | 23 | 24 | 11 | 8 | 2.27 | 1563/1585 | 2.27 | 4.04 | 3.96 | 3.88 | 2.27 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 44 | 23 | 26 | 10 | 4 | 2.13 | 1522/1535 | 2.13 | 4.08 | 4.08 | 3.89 | 2.13 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 1 | 20 | 24 | 20 | 17 | 24 | 3.01 | 1562/1651 | 3.01 | 4.20 | 4.18 | 4.10 | 3.01 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 102 | 4.96 | 283/1673 | 4.96 | 4.65 | 4.69 | 4.67 | 4.96 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 8 | 6 | 24 | 32 | 33 | 3 | 1 | 2.19 | 1638/1656 | 2.19 | 4.06 | 4.07 | 3.96 | 2.19 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 11 | 0 | 6 | 18 | 43 | 19 | 10 | 3.09 | 1532/1586 | 3.09 | 4.43 | 4.43 | 4.37 | 3.09 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 10 | 0 | 13 | 6 | 27 | 29 | 22 | 3.42 | 1557/1585 | 3.42 | 4.72 | 4.69 | 4.60 | 3.42 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 10 | 0 | 16 | 17 | 35 | 21 | 8 | 2.88 | 1533/1582 | 2.88 | 4.30 | 4.26 | 4.17 | 2.88 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 10 | 1 | 41 | 13 | 23 | 13 | 6 | 2.27 | 1558/1575 | 2.27 | 4.32 | 4.27 | 4.17 | 2.27 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 13 | 24 | 26 | 10 | 24 | 7 | 3 | 2.30 | 1344/1380 | 2.30 | 3.94 | 3.94 | 3.78 | 2.30 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 31 | 0 | 12 | 14 | 18 | 17 | 15 | 3.12 | 1330/1520 | 3.12 | 4.14 | 4.01 | 3.76 | 3.12 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 30 | 0 | 8 | 18 | 15 | 21 | 15 | 3.22 | 1388/1515 | 3.22 | 4.37 | 4.24 | 3.97 | 3.22 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 30 | 0 | 8 | 10 | 24 | 17 | 18 | 3.35 | 1346/1511 | 3.35 | 4.37 | 4.27 | 4.00 | 3.35 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 30 | 9 | 20 | 10 | 9 | 17 | 12 | 2.87 | 928/ 994 | 2.87 | 3.97 | 3.94 | 3.73 | 2.87 | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 99 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3.75 | ****/ 103 | **** | 4.39 | 4.41 | 4.33 | **** | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 99 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3.33 | ****/ 101 | **** | 4.33 | 4.48 | 4.18 | **** | |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 99 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/ 95 | **** | 4.15 | 4.31 | 3.99 | **** | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 99 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3.63 | ****/ 99 | **** | 4.36 | 4.39 | 4.10 | **** | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 99 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2.75 | ****/ 97 | **** | 3.76 | 4.14 | 3.69 | **** | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 105 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 76 | **** | 3.36 | 3.98 | 3.32 | **** | |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 106 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 77 | **** | 3.65 | 3.93 | 3.42 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|-----------------------|---|--------------|
| 00-27 | 32 | 0.00-0.99 | 6 | A 17 | Required for Majors 1 | Graduate 0 | Major 0 |
| 28-55 | 26 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B 0 | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C 1 | General 0 | Under-grad 107 | Non-major 22 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 2 | D 0 | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 5 | F 1 | Electives 1 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | |
| | | | | P 81 | | | |
| | | | | I 0 | Other 94 | | |
| | | | | ? 0 | | | |

Course-Section: HONR 210 0101
 Title GREAT BOOKS SEMINAR I
 Instructor: SPITZ, ELLEN
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1006
 JAN 21, 2006
 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 4.08 | 1139/1674 | 4.08 | 4.23 | 4.27 | 4.32 | 4.08 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3.69 | 1406/1674 | 3.69 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.26 | 3.69 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 3.20 | 1342/1423 | 3.20 | 4.36 | 4.27 | 4.36 | 3.20 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 1 | 3.69 | 1360/1609 | 3.69 | 4.23 | 4.22 | 4.23 | 3.69 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 4.77 | 160/1585 | 4.77 | 4.04 | 3.96 | 3.91 | 4.77 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 7 | 4.08 | 840/1535 | 4.08 | 4.08 | 4.08 | 4.03 | 4.08 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2.92 | 1585/1651 | 2.92 | 4.20 | 4.18 | 4.20 | 2.92 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 4.69 | 1040/1673 | 4.69 | 4.65 | 4.69 | 4.67 | 4.69 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 2 | 3.92 | 1107/1656 | 3.92 | 4.06 | 4.07 | 4.10 | 3.92 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 4.18 | 1198/1586 | 4.18 | 4.43 | 4.43 | 4.48 | 4.18 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 4.82 | 786/1585 | 4.82 | 4.72 | 4.69 | 4.76 | 4.82 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 4.09 | 1084/1582 | 4.09 | 4.30 | 4.26 | 4.35 | 4.09 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4.09 | 1103/1575 | 4.09 | 4.32 | 4.27 | 4.39 | 4.09 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 3.64 | 980/1380 | 3.64 | 3.94 | 3.94 | 4.03 | 3.64 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.50 | 397/1520 | 4.50 | 4.14 | 4.01 | 4.03 | 4.50 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4.17 | 960/1515 | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.24 | 4.28 | 4.17 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4.00 | 1050/1511 | 4.00 | 4.37 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.00 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 3.40 | 784/ 994 | 3.40 | 3.97 | 3.94 | 3.98 | 3.40 | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 103 | **** | 4.39 | 4.41 | 4.07 | **** | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 101 | **** | 4.33 | 4.48 | 4.45 | **** | |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 95 | **** | 4.15 | 4.31 | 4.33 | **** | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 99 | **** | 4.36 | 4.39 | 4.22 | **** | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 97 | **** | 3.76 | 4.14 | 4.63 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|---|---|----|-----------|---|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 6 | Required for Majors | 1 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 3 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 2 | General | 3 | Under-grad | 13 | Non-major | 3 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | 2 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 5 | F | 0 | Electives | 1 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 8 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: HONR 300A 0101
 Title ARISTOTLE AND VERBAL A
 Instructor: GLASSER, JOEL
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1007
 JAN 21, 2006
 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 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 4.75 | 298/1674 | 4.75 | 4.23 | 4.27 | 4.26 | 4.75 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.38 | 776/1674 | 4.38 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.21 | 4.38 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1423 | 5.00 | 4.36 | 4.27 | 4.27 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | 136/1609 | 4.88 | 4.23 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.88 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 4.75 | 167/1585 | 4.75 | 4.04 | 3.96 | 3.95 | 4.75 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4.50 | 373/1535 | 4.50 | 4.08 | 4.08 | 4.15 | 4.50 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4.25 | 866/1651 | 4.25 | 4.20 | 4.18 | 4.16 | 4.25 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1673 | 5.00 | 4.65 | 4.69 | 4.68 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.29 | 680/1656 | 4.29 | 4.06 | 4.07 | 4.07 | 4.29 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1586 | 5.00 | 4.43 | 4.43 | 4.42 | 5.00 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1585 | 5.00 | 4.72 | 4.69 | 4.66 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 4.75 | 313/1582 | 4.75 | 4.30 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.75 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | 203/1575 | 4.88 | 4.32 | 4.27 | 4.25 | 4.88 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.00 | 666/1380 | 4.00 | 3.94 | 3.94 | 4.01 | 4.00 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 173/1520 | 4.83 | 4.14 | 4.01 | 4.09 | 4.83 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1515 | 5.00 | 4.37 | 4.24 | 4.32 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 323/1511 | 4.83 | 4.37 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.83 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/ 994 | 5.00 | 3.97 | 3.94 | 3.96 | 5.00 | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 39/ 103 | 4.80 | 4.39 | 4.41 | 4.10 | 4.80 | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 51/ 101 | 4.67 | 4.33 | 4.48 | 4.30 | 4.67 | |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 95 | **** | 4.15 | 4.31 | 3.91 | **** | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 99 | **** | 4.36 | 4.39 | 4.29 | **** | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 97 | **** | 3.76 | 4.14 | 3.48 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | A 6 | Required for Majors | 0 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | B 2 | | Graduate 0 |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | C 0 | General | 2 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | D 0 | | Under-grad 9 |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | F 0 | Electives | 0 |
| | | | P 0 | | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 6 |
| | | | ? 0 | | |

Course-Section: HONR 300B 0101
 Title THE BEATLES
 Instructor: MORIN, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1008
 JAN 21, 2006
 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 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 13 | 4.61 | 471/1674 | 4.61 | 4.23 | 4.27 | 4.26 | 4.61 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 7 | 4.22 | 968/1674 | 4.22 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.21 | 4.22 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 2 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1423 | **** | 4.36 | 4.27 | 4.27 | **** | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 9 | 4.31 | 771/1609 | 4.31 | 4.23 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.31 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 9 | 4.28 | 539/1585 | 4.28 | 4.04 | 3.96 | 3.95 | 4.28 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 9 | 4.56 | 319/1535 | 4.56 | 4.08 | 4.08 | 4.15 | 4.56 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3.53 | 1430/1651 | 3.53 | 4.20 | 4.18 | 4.16 | 3.53 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 9 | 4.53 | 1189/1673 | 4.53 | 4.65 | 4.69 | 4.68 | 4.53 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 6 | 4.33 | 615/1656 | 4.33 | 4.06 | 4.07 | 4.07 | 4.33 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 11 | 4.56 | 805/1586 | 4.56 | 4.43 | 4.43 | 4.42 | 4.56 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 4.94 | 340/1585 | 4.94 | 4.72 | 4.69 | 4.66 | 4.94 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 11 | 4.56 | 578/1582 | 4.56 | 4.30 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.56 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 15 | 4.72 | 407/1575 | 4.72 | 4.32 | 4.27 | 4.25 | 4.72 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 13 | 4.80 | 114/1380 | 4.80 | 3.94 | 3.94 | 4.01 | 4.80 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 12 | 4.56 | 361/1520 | 4.56 | 4.14 | 4.01 | 4.09 | 4.56 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 4.93 | 145/1515 | 4.93 | 4.37 | 4.24 | 4.32 | 4.93 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 4.87 | 289/1511 | 4.87 | 4.37 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.87 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 5 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4.43 | 270/ 994 | 4.43 | 3.97 | 3.94 | 3.96 | 4.43 | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/ 103 | **** | 4.39 | 4.41 | 4.10 | **** | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | ****/ 101 | **** | 4.33 | 4.48 | 4.30 | **** | |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/ 95 | **** | 4.15 | 4.31 | 3.91 | **** | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/ 99 | **** | 4.36 | 4.39 | 4.29 | **** | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 17 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3.33 | ****/ 97 | **** | 3.76 | 4.14 | 3.48 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | A 12 | Required for Majors | 5 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | B 3 | | Graduate 0 |
| 56-83 | 6 | 2.00-2.99 | C 0 | General | 3 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | D 0 | | Under-grad 20 |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | F 0 | Electives | 1 |
| | | | P 0 | | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 9 |
| | | | ? 0 | | |

Course-Section: HONR 300C 0101
 Title SCI,MATH,TECH IN ANCIE
 Instructor: MASON, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1009
 JAN 21, 2006
 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 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 10 | 4.24 | 979/1674 | 4.24 | 4.23 | 4.27 | 4.26 | 4.24 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 6 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 7 | 3.62 | 1446/1674 | 3.62 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.21 | 3.62 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 10 | 4.24 | 861/1423 | 4.24 | 4.36 | 4.27 | 4.27 | 4.24 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 6 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 10 | 4.25 | 852/1609 | 4.25 | 4.23 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.25 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 14 | 4.55 | 295/1585 | 4.55 | 4.04 | 3.96 | 3.95 | 4.55 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 7 | 3.85 | 1066/1535 | 3.85 | 4.08 | 4.08 | 4.15 | 3.85 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 7 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 9 | 5 | 3.75 | 1324/1651 | 3.75 | 4.20 | 4.18 | 4.16 | 3.75 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 16 | 4.80 | 887/1673 | 4.80 | 4.65 | 4.69 | 4.68 | 4.80 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 6 | 4.16 | 838/1656 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.07 | 4.07 | 4.16 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 13 | 4.48 | 901/1586 | 4.48 | 4.43 | 4.43 | 4.42 | 4.48 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 17 | 4.76 | 896/1585 | 4.76 | 4.72 | 4.69 | 4.66 | 4.76 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 9 | 4.14 | 1043/1582 | 4.14 | 4.30 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.14 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 15 | 4.57 | 612/1575 | 4.57 | 4.32 | 4.27 | 4.25 | 4.57 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 6 | 17 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1.50 | ****/1380 | **** | 3.94 | 3.94 | 4.01 | **** | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 15 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 4.00 | 810/1520 | 4.00 | 4.14 | 4.01 | 4.09 | 4.00 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 15 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 4.17 | 960/1515 | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.24 | 4.32 | 4.17 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 15 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 4.08 | 1024/1511 | 4.08 | 4.37 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.08 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 15 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 994 | **** | 3.97 | 3.94 | 3.96 | **** | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 16 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 3.82 | 86/ 103 | 3.82 | 4.39 | 4.41 | 4.10 | 3.82 | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 16 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3.50 | 93/ 101 | 3.50 | 4.33 | 4.48 | 4.30 | 3.50 | |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 16 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 3.40 | 83/ 95 | 3.40 | 4.15 | 4.31 | 3.91 | 3.40 | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 16 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4.33 | 59/ 99 | 4.33 | 4.36 | 4.39 | 4.29 | 4.33 | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 16 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3.75 | 69/ 97 | 3.75 | 3.76 | 4.14 | 3.48 | 3.75 | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|-----------------------|---|-------------|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A 11 | Required for Majors 3 | Graduate 0 | Major 0 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B 9 | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C 0 | General 2 | Under-grad 27 | Non-major 8 |
| 84-150 | 8 | 3.00-3.49 | 2 | D 0 | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 10 | F 0 | Electives 0 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | |
| | | | | P 0 | | | |
| | | | | I 0 | Other 15 | | |
| | | | | ? 0 | | | |