

Course-Section: SCIE 501 8720
 Title PHYS CONCEPTS, PRIN, A
 Instructor: ROLAND, JONATHA
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1515
 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	0	0	14	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.23	4.27	4.44	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.26	4.23	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	105/1423	4.93	4.36	4.27	4.28	4.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.23	4.22	4.34	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	111/1585	4.86	4.04	3.96	4.23	4.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.08	4.08	4.27	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.20	4.18	4.32	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.06	4.07	4.15	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.43	4.43	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.30	4.26	4.33	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.30	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1380	5.00	3.94	3.94	3.85	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.14	4.01	4.19	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.37	4.24	4.47	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	3.97	3.94	4.07	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/ 265	5.00	4.06	4.23	4.51	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	21/ 278	4.93	4.21	4.19	4.42	4.93	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/ 260	5.00	4.43	4.46	4.67	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/ 259	5.00	4.21	4.33	4.66	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	1	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/ 233	5.00	4.36	4.20	4.53	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/ 103	5.00	4.39	4.41	4.56	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/ 101	5.00	4.33	4.48	4.62	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	24/ 95	4.92	4.15	4.31	4.43	4.92	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/ 99	5.00	4.36	4.39	4.54	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	3.76	4.14	4.26	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	3.36	3.98	4.20	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 77	5.00	3.65	3.93	4.31	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 53	5.00	4.19	4.45	4.64	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	3.86	4.12	4.35	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 49	5.00	3.74	4.27	4.46	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 61	5.00	4.03	4.09	4.46	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.21	4.26	4.59	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 50	5.00	4.23	4.44	4.64	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.22	4.36	4.84	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	4.64	****	

Course-Section: SCIE 501 8720
 Title PHYS CONCEPTS, PRIN, A
 Instructor: ROLAND, JONATHA
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1515
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	6	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						