

Course-Section: HONR 100 1
 Title Honors Forum
 Instructor: Shields, Anna M. (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 142
 Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 907
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	4	4	19	21	4.12	1021/1509	4.12	4.60	4.31	4.18	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	8	14	23	4.12	992/1509	4.12	4.32	4.26	4.25	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	41	0	1	4	3	4.25	****/1287	****	4.78	4.30	4.24	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	1	8	13	21	4.18	843/1459	4.18	4.43	4.22	4.11	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	4	15	15	11	3.56	1155/1406	3.56	4.46	4.09	4.02	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	8	16	21	4.22	659/1384	4.22	4.35	4.11	3.98	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	11	1	0	7	8	20	4.28	738/1489	4.28	4.32	4.17	4.20	4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	46	4.96	292/1506	4.96	4.70	4.67	4.66	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	2	0	0	2	17	20	4.46	381/1463	4.45	4.58	4.09	4.02	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	4	38	4.90	219/1438	4.91	4.84	4.46	4.44	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	43	5.00	1/1421	4.95	4.97	4.73	4.66	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	2	11	30	4.65	429/1411	4.62	4.70	4.31	4.27	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	3	9	29	4.49	658/1405	4.45	4.73	4.32	4.27	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	3	1	1	6	6	26	4.38	383/1236	4.26	4.43	4.00	3.87	4.26
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	5	7	21	4.31	574/1260	4.31	4.65	4.14	3.95	4.31
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	2	2	2	29	4.66	453/1255	4.66	4.64	4.33	4.15	4.66
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	5	30	4.86	299/1258	4.86	4.76	4.38	4.18	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	0	2	2	8	19	4.42	255/ 873	4.42	4.23	4.03	3.89	4.42
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	44	0	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	****/ 89	****	4.93	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	2	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 92	****	4.70	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	44	2	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 90	****	4.40	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	44	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	****/ 92	****	4.42	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 93	****	3.86	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	3	A	18	Required for Majors		47	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	17	1.00-1.99	0	B	0							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	49	Non-major	49
84-150	1	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	28							
				I	0	Other		0				

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	4	4	19	21	4.12	1021/1509	4.12	4.60	4.31	4.18	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	8	14	23	4.12	992/1509	4.12	4.32	4.26	4.25	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	41	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	****/1287	****	4.78	4.30	4.24	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	1	8	13	21	4.18	843/1459	4.18	4.43	4.22	4.11	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	4	15	15	11	3.56	1155/1406	3.56	4.46	4.09	4.02	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	8	16	21	4.22	659/1384	4.22	4.35	4.11	3.98	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	11	1	0	7	8	20	4.28	738/1489	4.28	4.32	4.17	4.20	4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	46	4.96	292/1506	4.96	4.70	4.67	4.66	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	2	0	0	0	20	15	4.43	438/1463	4.45	4.58	4.09	4.02	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	0	3	34	4.92	197/1438	4.91	4.84	4.46	4.44	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	1	2	34	4.89	562/1421	4.95	4.97	4.73	4.66	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	1	2	8	26	4.59	508/1411	4.62	4.70	4.31	4.27	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	0	3	8	24	4.41	758/1405	4.45	4.73	4.32	4.27	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	7	1	2	4	7	15	4.14	589/1236	4.26	4.43	4.00	3.87	4.26
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	5	7	21	4.31	574/1260	4.31	4.65	4.14	3.95	4.31
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	2	2	2	29	4.66	453/1255	4.66	4.64	4.33	4.15	4.66
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	5	30	4.86	299/1258	4.86	4.76	4.38	4.18	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	0	2	2	8	19	4.42	255/ 873	4.42	4.23	4.03	3.89	4.42
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	44	0	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	****/ 89	****	4.93	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	2	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 92	****	4.70	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	44	2	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 90	****	4.40	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	44	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	****/ 92	****	4.42	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 93	****	3.86	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	3	A	18	Required for Majors	47	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	17	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	49	Non-major	49
84-150	1	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	28						
				I	0						

Course-Section: HONR 200 1
 Title Interdisc Honors Semin
 Instructor: Shields, Anna M.
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 909
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	291/1509	4.76	4.60	4.31	4.34	4.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	589/1509	4.47	4.32	4.26	4.32	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	426/1287	4.60	4.78	4.30	4.35	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	2	13	4.59	367/1459	4.59	4.43	4.22	4.30	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	158/1406	4.76	4.46	4.09	4.09	4.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	505/1384	4.35	4.35	4.11	4.09	4.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	434/1489	4.53	4.32	4.17	4.19	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.70	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	209/1463	4.67	4.58	4.09	4.08	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	262/1438	4.88	4.84	4.46	4.48	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.97	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	303/1411	4.75	4.70	4.31	4.37	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	273/1405	4.81	4.73	4.32	4.39	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	421/1236	4.33	4.43	4.00	4.11	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	287/1260	4.69	4.65	4.14	4.19	4.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	494/1255	4.62	4.64	4.33	4.37	4.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	486/1258	4.69	4.76	4.38	4.44	4.69
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	1	1	0	7	3	3.83	570/ 873	3.83	4.23	4.03	4.04	3.83
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 89	****	4.93	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.70	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.40	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.42	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 93	****	3.86	4.06	2.88	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors		13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	4							
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		3	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	1							

Course-Section: HONR 210 1
 Title Great Books Seminar I
 Instructor: Spitz, Ellen H
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 910
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	574/1509	4.52	4.60	4.31	4.34	4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	8	5	7	3.86	1196/1509	3.86	4.32	4.26	4.32	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	17	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1287	****	4.78	4.30	4.35	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	1	7	9	4.33	686/1459	4.33	4.43	4.22	4.30	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	90/1406	4.90	4.46	4.09	4.09	4.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	5	9	4	3.62	1138/1384	3.62	4.35	4.11	4.09	3.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	4	9	1	5	3.25	1374/1489	3.25	4.32	4.17	4.19	3.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	682/1506	4.86	4.70	4.67	4.61	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	2	1	4	7	4.14	750/1463	4.14	4.58	4.09	4.08	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	917/1438	4.41	4.84	4.46	4.48	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	376/1421	4.94	4.97	4.73	4.76	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	617/1411	4.50	4.70	4.31	4.37	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	1	13	4.67	459/1405	4.67	4.73	4.32	4.39	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	466/1236	4.29	4.43	4.00	4.11	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	209/1260	4.80	4.65	4.14	4.19	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	443/1255	4.67	4.64	4.33	4.37	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	1	3	10	4.40	721/1258	4.40	4.76	4.38	4.44	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	526/ 873	3.92	4.23	4.03	4.04	3.92
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 89	5.00	4.93	4.49	5.00	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	7	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.70	4.54	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	67/ 92	4.00	4.42	4.38	4.00	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	2	2	1	1	2	2.88	84/ 93	2.88	3.86	4.06	2.88	2.88

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: HONR 300 2
 Title General Honors Seminar
 Instructor: King-Meadows,Ty
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 911
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1509	4.89	4.60	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	543/1509	4.57	4.32	4.26	4.25	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	261/1287	4.88	4.78	4.30	4.33	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	454/1459	4.57	4.43	4.22	4.26	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1406	4.82	4.46	4.09	4.12	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	225/1384	4.68	4.35	4.11	4.15	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	133/1489	4.64	4.32	4.17	4.14	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1070/1506	4.38	4.70	4.67	4.67	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1463	4.80	4.58	4.09	4.08	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1438	4.93	4.84	4.46	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	4.98	4.97	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	303/1411	4.80	4.70	4.31	4.29	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1405	4.90	4.73	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	176/1236	4.63	4.43	4.00	4.07	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	209/1260	4.80	4.65	4.14	4.22	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	505/1255	4.63	4.64	4.33	4.37	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	363/1258	4.84	4.76	4.38	4.42	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	442/ 873	4.35	4.23	4.03	4.08	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 89	4.90	4.93	4.49	4.86	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	48/ 92	4.70	4.70	4.54	4.67	4.67
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	65/ 90	4.40	4.40	4.50	4.63	4.17
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	36/ 92	4.63	4.42	4.38	4.73	4.67
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	50/ 93	4.35	3.86	4.06	3.94	4.17

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HONR 300 3
 Title General Honors Seminar
 Instructor: Stacey, Simon P
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 912
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	291/1509	4.89	4.60	4.31	4.32	4.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	322/1509	4.57	4.32	4.26	4.25	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1287	4.88	4.78	4.30	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	0	3	16	4.65	291/1459	4.57	4.43	4.22	4.26	4.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	90/1406	4.82	4.46	4.09	4.12	4.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	149/1384	4.68	4.35	4.11	4.15	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	1	6	12	4.45	541/1489	4.64	4.32	4.17	4.14	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	16	5	4.24	1273/1506	4.38	4.70	4.67	4.67	4.24
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	196/1463	4.80	4.58	4.09	4.08	4.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	276/1438	4.93	4.84	4.46	4.43	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	376/1421	4.98	4.97	4.73	4.73	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	327/1411	4.80	4.70	4.31	4.29	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	285/1405	4.90	4.73	4.32	4.32	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	5	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	211/1236	4.63	4.43	4.00	4.07	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	258/1260	4.80	4.65	4.14	4.22	4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	1	1	12	4.53	554/1255	4.63	4.64	4.33	4.37	4.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	0	1	13	4.73	444/1258	4.84	4.76	4.38	4.42	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	152/ 873	4.35	4.23	4.03	4.08	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	1	0	0	14	4.80	38/ 89	4.90	4.93	4.49	4.86	4.80
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	1	0	1	13	4.73	40/ 92	4.70	4.70	4.54	4.67	4.73
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	44/ 90	4.40	4.40	4.50	4.63	4.64
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	1	12	4.60	43/ 92	4.63	4.42	4.38	4.73	4.60
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	1	0	1	1	12	4.53	32/ 93	4.35	3.86	4.06	3.94	4.53

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 16	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 2	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	1				
			? 2						

Course-Section: HONR 300 5
 Title General Honors Seminar
 Instructor: Jacob, Preminda
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 913
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	143/1509	4.89	4.60	4.31	4.32	4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	543/1509	4.57	4.32	4.26	4.25	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1287	4.88	4.78	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	410/1459	4.57	4.43	4.22	4.26	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	306/1406	4.82	4.46	4.09	4.12	4.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	251/1384	4.68	4.35	4.11	4.15	4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	308/1489	4.64	4.32	4.17	4.14	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	1156/1506	4.38	4.70	4.67	4.67	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	190/1463	4.80	4.58	4.09	4.08	4.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	219/1438	4.93	4.84	4.46	4.43	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1421	4.98	4.97	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	138/1411	4.80	4.70	4.31	4.29	4.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	172/1405	4.90	4.73	4.32	4.32	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	193/1236	4.63	4.43	4.00	4.07	4.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	157/1260	4.80	4.65	4.14	4.22	4.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	344/1255	4.63	4.64	4.33	4.37	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1258	4.84	4.76	4.38	4.42	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	274/ 873	4.35	4.23	4.03	4.08	4.38
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 89	4.90	4.93	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	4.70	4.70	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 90	4.40	4.40	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	4.63	4.42	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 93	4.35	3.86	4.06	3.94	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 12	Non-major 12
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			