

Course Section: HONR 100 0101
 Title HONORS FORUM
 Instructor: STAFF
 Enrollment: 77
 Questionnaires: 71

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1049
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	3	0	6	8	21	17	16	3.43	1516/1669	3.43	4.04	4.23	4.02	3.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	2	12	19	22	12	3.45	1493/1666	3.45	3.87	4.19	4.11	3.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	63	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	****/1421	****	4.23	4.24	4.11	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	9	3	9	19	13	15	3.47	1387/1617	3.47	3.98	4.15	3.99	3.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	45	6	4	5	4	4	2.83	1479/1555	2.83	3.96	4.00	3.92	2.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	1	5	11	19	18	13	3.35	1319/1543	3.35	3.91	4.06	3.86	3.35	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	18	1	5	7	8	28	4.16	948/1647	4.16	3.38	4.12	4.06	4.16	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	0	0	0	0	66	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.69	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	3	0	1	9	27	20	4.16	800/1605	4.16	4.09	4.07	3.96	4.16	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	1	3	19	19	22	3.91	1270/1514	3.91	4.39	4.39	4.32	3.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	1	1	5	21	36	4.41	1270/1551	4.41	4.85	4.66	4.55	4.41	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	1	26	21	15	3.75	1235/1503	3.75	4.30	4.24	4.17	3.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	1	1	3	15	19	24	4.00	1069/1506	4.00	4.34	4.26	4.17	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	15	0	3	18	14	13	3.77	780/1311	3.77	3.99	3.85	3.68	3.77	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	6	8	15	18	15	3.45	1184/1490	3.45	3.95	4.05	3.85	3.45	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	4	7	11	13	26	3.82	1172/1502	3.82	4.31	4.26	4.06	3.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	2	0	6	11	41	4.48	707/1489	4.48	4.44	4.29	4.07	4.48	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	5	7	8	11	17	13	3.38	823/1006	3.38	3.74	4.00	3.81	3.38	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	70	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	69	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	70	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	70	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	53	1	0	1	3	5	8	4.18	****/ 112	****	4.67	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	53	16	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	53	16	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	53	3	1	1	2	5	6	3.93	****/ 105	****	4.33	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	53	7	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	****/ 98	****	3.00	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	70	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.17	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	70	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.50	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	69	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.39	4.30	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	70	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	3.50	4.33	4.30	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons		Type	Majors			

00-27	24	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	71	Non-major	71
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	44						
				I	0	Other	63				

Course Section: HONR 200C 0101
 Title ANATOMY OF DEVIANCE
 Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1050
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	3	0	0	2	2	3	7	4.07	1124/1669	4.07	4.04	4.23	4.34	4.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	1	6	4	2	3.36	1523/1666	3.36	3.87	4.19	4.29	3.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	4	0	2	4	2	2	3.40	1425/1617	3.40	3.98	4.15	4.24	3.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	4	5	4	3.86	980/1555	3.86	3.96	4.00	3.96	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	7	2	4	3.64	1205/1543	3.64	3.91	4.06	4.10	3.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	5	5	2	1	0	0	1.50	1636/1647	1.50	3.38	4.12	4.19	1.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	1364/1668	4.29	4.69	4.67	4.59	4.29	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	473/1605	4.43	4.09	4.07	4.15	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	1106/1514	4.21	4.39	4.39	4.39	4.21	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.85	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	914/1503	4.21	4.30	4.24	4.29	4.21	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	884/1506	4.29	4.34	4.26	4.33	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	2	6	5	4.07	552/1311	4.07	3.99	3.85	3.96	4.07	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	2	0	3	2	3.71	1062/1490	3.71	3.95	4.05	4.11	3.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	438/1502	4.71	4.31	4.26	4.31	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	478/1489	4.71	4.44	4.29	4.36	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	0	4	0	1	3.40	810/1006	3.40	3.74	4.00	3.99	3.40	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 112	****	4.67	4.38	4.59	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 105	****	4.33	4.20	4.63	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 98	****	3.00	3.95	4.20	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	2
			Required for Majors	0	Graduate
			General	2	Under-grad
			Electives	0	Major
			Other	11	Non-major
					17
					#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: HONR 300A 0101
 Title HERO AND THE QUEST
 Instructor: GLASSER, JOEL
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1051
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	2	2	4	7	4.07	1131/1669	4.07	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	868/1666	4.27	3.87	4.19	4.20	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	4	7	4.13	909/1421	4.13	4.23	4.24	4.25	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	6	6	4.13	934/1617	4.13	3.98	4.15	4.22	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	70/1555	4.93	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	6	5	4.07	857/1543	4.07	3.91	4.06	4.14	4.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	2	5	4	3.47	1411/1647	3.47	3.38	4.12	4.14	3.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.69	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	2	4	4	5	3.80	1172/1605	3.80	4.09	4.07	4.09	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	923/1514	4.43	4.39	4.39	4.46	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.85	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	852/1503	4.29	4.30	4.24	4.28	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	642/1506	4.50	4.34	4.26	4.30	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	676/1311	3.92	3.99	3.85	3.97	3.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	849/1490	4.00	3.95	4.05	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	540/1502	4.60	4.31	4.26	4.28	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	953/1489	4.20	4.44	4.29	4.35	4.20	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	78/ 112	4.33	4.67	4.38	4.53	4.33	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 105	****	4.33	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	3	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	3.00	3.95	4.15	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	16
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 0		

Course Section: HONR 300B 0101
 Title DEATH AND DYING
 Instructor: CUMBERLAND, TRA
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1052
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	1	3	3	4.29	876/1669	4.29	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	841/1666	4.29	3.87	4.19	4.20	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	746/1421	4.33	4.23	4.24	4.25	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	424/1617	4.57	3.98	4.15	4.22	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	980/1555	3.86	3.96	4.00	4.03	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	895/1543	4.00	3.91	4.06	4.14	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	828/1647	4.29	3.38	4.12	4.14	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.69	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1132/1605	3.86	4.09	4.07	4.09	3.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	505/1514	4.71	4.39	4.39	4.46	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	650/1551	4.86	4.85	4.66	4.70	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	491/1503	4.57	4.30	4.24	4.28	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	744/1506	4.43	4.34	4.26	4.30	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	744/1311	3.83	3.99	3.85	3.97	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1117/1490	3.60	3.95	4.05	4.11	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1338/1502	3.40	4.31	4.26	4.28	3.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	1168/1489	3.80	4.44	4.29	4.35	3.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	891/1006	3.20	3.74	4.00	4.10	3.20	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	36/ 58	4.17	4.17	4.22	4.29	4.17	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	23/ 52	4.50	4.50	4.06	3.59	4.50	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	24/ 39	4.50	4.50	4.39	3.82	4.50	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	3	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	19/ 40	4.00	4.00	3.97	3.34	4.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	4	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	24/ 30	3.50	3.50	4.33	3.49	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 7
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	4
			? 0		

Course Section: HONR 300C 0101
 Title ART,CULTURE & CHILDHOOD
 Instructor: SPITZ, ELLEN
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1053
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	1	0	1	4	4.33	816/1669	4.33	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	3.87	4.19	4.20	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	717/1617	4.33	3.98	4.15	4.22	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	492/1555	4.33	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	390/1543	4.50	3.91	4.06	4.14	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	4	0	3.50	1393/1647	3.50	3.38	4.12	4.14	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	1438/1668	4.17	4.69	4.67	4.68	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	759/1605	4.20	4.09	4.07	4.09	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	584/1514	4.67	4.39	4.39	4.46	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.85	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	386/1503	4.67	4.30	4.24	4.28	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	642/1506	4.50	4.34	4.26	4.30	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	389/1311	4.33	3.99	3.85	3.97	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1490	5.00	3.95	4.05	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.31	4.26	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.44	4.29	4.35	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1006	5.00	3.74	4.00	4.10	5.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.13	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 112	5.00	4.67	4.38	4.53	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	5.00	4.36	4.12	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	59/ 105	4.33	4.33	4.20	4.45	4.33	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	82/ 98	3.00	3.00	3.95	4.15	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	1 Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 1		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1 Under-grad 6 Non-major 6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	4
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant