

Course-Section: HONR 200A 0101
 Title INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY
 Instructor: HATCH, DAVID
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 912
 JUN 26, 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	0	4	4	4.50	605/1522	4.50	4.21	4.30	4.34	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	738/1522	4.38	3.95	4.26	4.29	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1038/1285	3.88	4.27	4.30	4.36	3.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	792/1476	4.25	4.16	4.22	4.20	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	1	3	3.63	1100/1412	3.63	4.52	4.06	4.00	3.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	733/1381	4.13	4.11	4.08	3.97	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	3	2	1	3.43	1345/1500	3.43	3.50	4.18	4.20	3.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	1343/1517	4.13	4.42	4.65	4.63	4.13	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	782/1497	4.14	3.96	4.11	4.11	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	1023/1440	4.29	4.19	4.45	4.42	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.84	4.71	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	972/1436	4.14	4.02	4.29	4.29	4.14	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	227/1432	4.86	4.19	4.29	4.31	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1221	****	4.06	3.93	4.02	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1280	5.00	3.97	4.10	4.08	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.31	4.34	4.33	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.17	4.31	4.33	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	57/ 79	4.50	4.30	4.58	4.58	4.50	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 77	5.00	5.00	4.52	5.00	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 65	5.00	5.00	4.49	5.00	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 78	5.00	4.38	4.45	5.00	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	49/ 80	4.00	4.00	4.11	4.00	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	2						

Course-Section: HONR 210 0101
 Title GREAT BOOKS SEMINAR I
 Instructor: SPITZ, ELLEN
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 913
 JUN 26, 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	0	6	9	4.60	492/1522	4.60	4.21	4.30	4.34	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	7	5	4.00	1080/1522	4.00	3.95	4.26	4.29	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	938/1285	4.00	4.27	4.30	4.36	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	6	4.20	860/1476	4.20	4.16	4.22	4.20	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	119/1412	4.86	4.52	4.06	4.00	4.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	9	5	4.20	663/1381	4.20	4.11	4.08	3.97	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	2	5	2	3	3.14	1415/1500	3.14	3.50	4.18	4.20	3.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	6	4.40	1161/1517	4.40	4.42	4.65	4.63	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	0	7	0	3.75	1147/1497	3.75	3.96	4.11	4.11	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	851/1440	4.46	4.19	4.45	4.42	4.46	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	656/1448	4.85	4.84	4.71	4.78	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	896/1436	4.23	4.02	4.29	4.29	4.23	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	600/1432	4.54	4.19	4.29	4.31	4.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	7	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	860/1221	3.60	4.06	3.93	4.02	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	499/1280	4.38	3.97	4.10	4.08	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	508/1277	4.63	4.31	4.34	4.33	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	1089/1269	3.63	4.17	4.31	4.33	3.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	2	0	2	1	3.40	705/ 854	3.40	3.28	4.02	4.00	3.40	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.30	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.38	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 80	****	4.00	4.11	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 15	Non-major 15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 12		
				? 0			

Course-Section: HONR 220 0101
 Title HONORS LEADERSHIP SEMI
 Instructor: KORN, MARCELLA
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 914
 JUN 26, 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	4	4	4	4.00	1122/1522	4.00	4.21	4.30	4.34	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	4	4.08	1037/1522	4.08	3.95	4.26	4.29	4.08	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	873/1285	4.11	4.27	4.30	4.36	4.11	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	4	6	4.17	892/1476	4.17	4.16	4.22	4.20	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	339/1412	4.50	4.52	4.06	4.00	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	604/1381	4.25	4.11	4.08	3.97	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	5	3	3	3.58	1269/1500	3.58	3.50	4.18	4.20	3.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.42	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	9	2	4.18	731/1497	4.18	3.96	4.11	4.11	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	917/1440	4.42	4.19	4.45	4.42	4.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	683/1448	4.83	4.84	4.71	4.78	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	876/1436	4.25	4.02	4.29	4.29	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	745/1432	4.42	4.19	4.29	4.31	4.42	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	907/1280	3.75	3.97	4.10	4.08	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	254/1277	4.88	4.31	4.34	4.33	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	586/1269	4.50	4.17	4.31	4.33	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	756/ 854	3.17	3.28	4.02	4.00	3.17	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	4.30	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 78	****	4.38	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.00	4.11	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.75	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.75	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	

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	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 12	Non-major 12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 7		
				? 1			

Course-Section: HONR 300B 0101
 Title PHIL REFLECTIONS ON WA
 Instructor: SENG, PHILLIP
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 915
 JUN 26, 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	5	4	6	3.94	1190/1522	3.94	4.21	4.30	4.34	3.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	4	7	3.94	1157/1522	3.94	3.95	4.26	4.25	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	766/1285	4.25	4.27	4.30	4.30	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	4	5	5	3.93	1091/1476	3.93	4.16	4.22	4.26	3.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	305/1412	4.56	4.52	4.06	4.03	4.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	6	4	3.88	961/1381	3.88	4.11	4.08	4.13	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	9	4	1	3.19	1408/1500	3.19	3.50	4.18	4.13	3.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	4	6	6	0	3.13	1503/1517	3.13	4.42	4.65	4.62	3.13	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	11	1	4.00	898/1497	4.00	3.96	4.11	4.13	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	1155/1440	4.08	4.19	4.45	4.46	4.08	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	1001/1448	4.67	4.84	4.71	4.71	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	7	3	4.08	1013/1436	4.08	4.02	4.29	4.30	4.08	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	1036/1432	4.00	4.19	4.29	4.29	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	695/1221	3.90	4.06	3.93	3.94	3.90	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	5	6	4.07	694/1280	4.07	3.97	4.10	4.14	4.07	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	594/1277	4.50	4.31	4.34	4.38	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	586/1269	4.50	4.17	4.31	4.39	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	11	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 854	****	3.28	4.02	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.30	4.58	4.53	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	69/ 78	3.75	4.38	4.45	4.34	3.75	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.00	4.11	3.33	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	0	C	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	3
			Required for Majors	2	Graduate
			General	2	Under-grad
			Electives	0	Major
			Other	12	Non-major
					16
					0

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: HONR 300C 0101
 Title BARDIC VOICE
 Instructor: GLASSER, JOEL
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 916
 JUN 26, 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	4	3	5	3.79	1279/1522	3.79	4.21	4.30	4.34	3.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	2	6	3.60	1323/1522	3.60	3.95	4.26	4.25	3.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	650/1285	4.40	4.27	4.30	4.30	4.40		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	3	5	3	3.75	1198/1476	3.75	4.16	4.22	4.26	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	115/1412	4.87	4.52	4.06	4.03	4.87	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	7	4	3.93	911/1381	3.93	4.11	4.08	4.13	3.93	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	0	0	7	5	4.15	882/1500	4.15	3.50	4.18	4.13	4.15	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.42	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	1	5	5	3	3.53	1265/1497	3.53	3.96	4.11	4.13	3.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	1079/1440	4.21	4.19	4.45	4.46	4.21	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	629/1448	4.86	4.84	4.71	4.71	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	4	5	3	3.57	1267/1436	3.57	4.02	4.29	4.30	3.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	3	3	4	3.36	1316/1432	3.36	4.19	4.29	4.29	3.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	4	0	0	3	2	2.89	1227/1280	2.89	3.97	4.10	4.14	2.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	4	1	0	0	4	2.89	1246/1277	2.89	4.31	4.34	4.38	2.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	3	1	1	2	2	2.89	1232/1269	2.89	4.17	4.31	4.39	2.89	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	4	3	0	2	0	5	3.40	73/ 79	3.40	4.30	4.58	4.53	3.40	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	13	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 78	****	4.38	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	11	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 80	****	4.00	4.11	3.33	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 4	Graduate	0
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	9
			? 1		

Course-Section: HONR 300D 0101
 Title ETHICAL ISSUES IN ARTS
 Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 917
 JUN 26, 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	0	0	4	3	4.43	707/1522	4.43	4.21	4.30	4.34	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1285/1522	3.71	3.95	4.26	4.25	3.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.27	4.30	4.30	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	316/1476	4.67	4.16	4.22	4.26	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	191/1412	4.71	4.52	4.06	4.03	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	575/1381	4.29	4.11	4.08	4.13	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1298/1500	3.50	3.50	4.18	4.13	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	600/1517	4.86	4.42	4.65	4.62	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	756/1497	4.17	3.96	4.11	4.13	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	0	2	2	3.67	1331/1440	3.67	4.19	4.45	4.46	3.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	683/1448	4.83	4.84	4.71	4.71	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	4	1	3.83	1185/1436	3.83	4.02	4.29	4.30	3.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1036/1432	4.00	4.19	4.29	4.29	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	175/1221	4.67	4.06	3.93	3.94	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	907/1280	3.75	3.97	4.10	4.14	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	930/1277	4.00	4.31	4.34	4.38	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	586/1269	4.50	4.17	4.31	4.39	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 854	****	3.28	4.02	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 8	Non-major 8
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	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 5		
				? 1			