

Course-Section: INDS 330 0101
 Title WAYS OF KNOWING
 Instructor: MCALPINE, STEVE
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 984
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	2	13	4.87	195/1576	4.89	4.54	4.30	4.30	4.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	392/1576	4.83	4.29	4.27	4.28	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	583/1342	4.71	4.49	4.32	4.30	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	270/1520	4.82	4.38	4.25	4.25	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	264/1465	4.72	4.42	4.12	4.09	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	270/1434	4.76	4.17	4.14	4.15	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	690/1547	4.70	4.09	4.19	4.21	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	1	4.07	1438/1574	4.19	4.33	4.64	4.61	4.07	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	307/1554	4.59	4.07	4.10	4.09	4.62	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.58	4.47	4.47	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	211/1486	4.86	4.40	4.32	4.32	4.87	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	240/1489	4.86	4.33	4.32	4.34	4.87	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	143/1277	4.56	4.09	4.03	4.11	4.79	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	312/1279	4.75	4.57	4.17	4.20	4.69	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1270	4.95	4.72	4.35	4.42	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	222/1269	4.91	4.47	4.35	4.41	4.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	258/ 878	4.16	4.45	4.05	4.09	4.44	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 15 Non-major 1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 13	
			? 0		

Course-Section: INDS 330 0201
 Title WAYS OF KNOWING
 Instructor: VETTER, LISA D
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 985
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	1	12	4.92	130/1576	4.89	4.54	4.30	4.30	4.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1576	4.83	4.29	4.27	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	161/1342	4.71	4.49	4.32	4.30	4.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	124/1520	4.82	4.38	4.25	4.25	4.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	200/1465	4.72	4.42	4.12	4.09	4.77	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	134/1434	4.76	4.17	4.14	4.15	4.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1547	4.70	4.09	4.19	4.21	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	4	4.31	1288/1574	4.19	4.33	4.64	4.61	4.31	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	355/1554	4.59	4.07	4.10	4.09	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.58	4.47	4.47	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	231/1486	4.86	4.40	4.32	4.32	4.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	263/1489	4.86	4.33	4.32	4.34	4.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	463/1277	4.56	4.09	4.03	4.11	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	219/1279	4.75	4.57	4.17	4.20	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	260/1270	4.95	4.72	4.35	4.42	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	278/1269	4.91	4.47	4.35	4.41	4.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	570/ 878	4.16	4.45	4.05	4.09	3.88	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 9
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 13 Non-major 4
84-150	3	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 0		
			I 0	Other 10	
			? 0		

Course-Section: INDS 430A 0101
 Title AMERICAN ENTREP IN 21C
 Instructor: FRIEDENSOHN, DA
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 986
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	2	1	3	2	8	3.81	1316/1576	3.81	4.54	4.30	4.46	3.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	7	2	5	3.50	1392/1576	3.50	4.29	4.27	4.35	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	879/1342	4.20	4.49	4.32	4.46	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	2	8	2	3.38	1408/1520	3.38	4.38	4.25	4.38	3.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	2	4	5	3.38	1302/1465	3.38	4.42	4.12	4.22	3.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	5	2	4	4	3.31	1297/1434	3.31	4.17	4.14	4.30	3.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	5	3	3	0	3	2	2.82	1495/1547	2.82	4.09	4.19	4.24	2.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	645/1574	4.81	4.33	4.64	4.69	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	2	3	3	2	3.27	1384/1554	3.27	4.07	4.10	4.24	3.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	6	5	4.00	1233/1488	4.00	4.58	4.47	4.55	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	1	12	4.60	1125/1493	4.60	4.86	4.73	4.80	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	5	4	4	3.71	1269/1486	3.71	4.40	4.32	4.41	3.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	3	4	5	3.79	1243/1489	3.79	4.33	4.32	4.38	3.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	0	4	3	5	3.85	834/1277	3.85	4.09	4.03	4.04	3.85	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	625/1279	4.30	4.57	4.17	4.31	4.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	1	0	8	4.50	636/1270	4.50	4.72	4.35	4.53	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	1	2	1	5	3.55	1104/1269	3.55	4.47	4.35	4.55	3.55	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	221/ 878	4.50	4.45	4.05	4.33	4.50	
Laboratory															
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.70	****	

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	2	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 1		

Course-Section: INDS 430B 0101
 Title TRAVEL NARRATIVES
 Instructor: VETTER, LISA D
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 987
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	3	4	4.57	541/1576	4.57	4.54	4.30	4.46	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1138/1576	4.00	4.29	4.27	4.35	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	770/1342	4.33	4.49	4.32	4.46	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.38	4.25	4.38	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	148/1465	4.86	4.42	4.12	4.22	4.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	4	2	3.86	1033/1434	3.86	4.17	4.14	4.30	3.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	939/1547	4.14	4.09	4.19	4.24	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	1398/1574	4.14	4.33	4.64	4.69	4.14	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1110/1554	3.83	4.07	4.10	4.24	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1048/1488	4.33	4.58	4.47	4.55	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	734/1493	4.83	4.86	4.73	4.80	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	1025/1486	4.17	4.40	4.32	4.41	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1222/1489	3.83	4.33	4.32	4.38	3.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1066/1277	3.40	4.09	4.03	4.04	3.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	445/1279	4.50	4.57	4.17	4.31	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	636/1270	4.50	4.72	4.35	4.53	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	644/1269	4.50	4.47	4.35	4.55	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.45	4.05	4.33	5.00	

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 5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 7 Non-major 2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 6	
			? 0		

Course-Section: INDS 480 0101
 Title Capstone Project Sem
 Instructor: Lanoue, Patricia
 Enrollment: 0
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 2
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	0	1	6	4.86	203/1576	****	4.51	4.30	4.11	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	187/1576	****	4.33	4.27	4.18	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	648/1520	****	4.35	4.25	4.09	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	231/1465	****	4.27	4.12	4.02	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	345/1434	****	4.42	4.14	3.94	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	1041/1547	****	4.22	4.19	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	832/1574	****	4.78	4.64	4.59	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	805/1554	****	4.24	4.10	4.01	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	355/1488	****	4.55	4.47	4.41	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1493	****	4.90	4.73	4.65	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	241/1486	****	4.54	4.32	4.26	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	500/1489	****	4.49	4.32	4.22	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	309/1277	****	4.26	4.03	3.91	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1279	****	4.66	4.17	3.96	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1270	****	4.76	4.35	4.09	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1269	****	4.81	4.35	4.09	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	367/ 878	****	4.28	4.05	3.91	4.25	

Frequency Distribution

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