

Course Section: SCIE 501 8720
 Title: PHYS CONCEPTS, PRIN, A
 Instructor: MURDOCK, JOHN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1505
 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	5	16	4.64	433/1669	4.64	4.14	4.23	4.35	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	13	8	4.32	801/1666	4.32	3.93	4.19	4.19	4.32	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	9	7	4.05	954/1421	4.05	4.00	4.24	4.33	4.05	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	13	4.45	568/1617	4.45	4.02	4.15	4.24	4.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	5	15	4.50	340/1555	4.50	4.12	4.00	4.07	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	7	12	4.32	598/1543	4.32	3.98	4.06	4.27	4.32	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	5	6	9	3.91	1161/1647	3.91	3.81	4.12	4.15	3.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	357/1668	4.95	4.72	4.67	4.83	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	11	5	4.05	884/1605	4.32	3.90	4.07	4.13	4.32	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	505/1514	4.82	4.30	4.39	4.37	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	512/1551	4.86	4.63	4.66	4.72	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	5	7	8	4.05	1045/1503	4.42	4.15	4.24	4.22	4.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	534/1506	4.76	4.07	4.26	4.24	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	5	3	11	4.15	507/1311	4.28	4.14	3.85	3.89	4.28	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	15	4.52	433/1490	4.52	4.11	4.05	4.18	4.52	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	1	4	15	4.57	567/1502	4.57	4.32	4.26	4.46	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	1	6	13	4.48	718/1489	4.48	4.23	4.29	4.44	4.48	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	2	1	1	6	8	3.94	555/1006	3.94	4.20	4.00	4.11	3.94	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	45/ 226	4.77	4.00	4.20	4.47	4.77	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	48/ 233	4.77	3.81	4.19	4.41	4.77	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	27/ 225	4.95	4.51	4.50	4.65	4.95	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	59/ 223	4.82	4.04	4.35	4.48	4.82	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	1	2	3	16	4.55	70/ 206	4.55	3.79	4.15	4.39	4.55	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	3	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	52/ 112	4.67	4.53	4.38	4.39	4.67	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	3	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	50/ 97	4.50	4.23	4.36	4.38	4.50	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	4	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	60/ 92	4.14	3.93	4.22	4.36	4.14	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	5	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	64/ 105	4.17	4.17	4.20	4.23	4.17	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	5	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	46/ 98	4.00	3.80	3.95	3.93	4.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/ 58	****	3.70	4.22	4.53	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/ 52	****	3.53	4.06	4.57	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.39	4.90	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	2.40	3.97	4.31	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.55	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	36/ 55	4.22	4.48	4.34	4.45	4.22	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	24/ 42	4.50	4.67	4.31	4.40	4.50	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	1	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	31/ 46	4.00	4.00	4.45	4.61	4.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	4	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.60	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	4	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	

Course Section: SCIE 501 8720
 Title: PHYS CONCEPTS, PRIN, A
 Instructor: MURDOCK, JOHN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1505
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	12	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	12	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	1						

Course Section: SCIE 501 8720
 Title PHYS CONCEPTS, PRIN, A
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1506
 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	5	16	4.64	433/1669	4.64	4.14	4.23	4.35	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	13	8	4.32	801/1666	4.32	3.93	4.19	4.19	4.32	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	9	7	4.05	954/1421	4.05	4.00	4.24	4.33	4.05	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	13	4.45	568/1617	4.45	4.02	4.15	4.24	4.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	5	15	4.50	340/1555	4.50	4.12	4.00	4.07	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	7	12	4.32	598/1543	4.32	3.98	4.06	4.27	4.32	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	5	6	9	3.91	1161/1647	3.91	3.81	4.12	4.15	3.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	357/1668	4.95	4.72	4.67	4.83	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	313/1605	4.32	3.90	4.07	4.13	4.32	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	170/1514	4.82	4.30	4.39	4.37	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	760/1551	4.86	4.63	4.66	4.72	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	220/1503	4.42	4.15	4.24	4.22	4.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	164/1506	4.76	4.07	4.26	4.24	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	0	1	0	1	0	8	4.40	333/1311	4.28	4.14	3.85	3.89	4.28	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	15	4.52	433/1490	4.52	4.11	4.05	4.18	4.52	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	1	4	15	4.57	567/1502	4.57	4.32	4.26	4.46	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	1	6	13	4.48	718/1489	4.48	4.23	4.29	4.44	4.48	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	2	1	1	6	8	3.94	555/1006	3.94	4.20	4.00	4.11	3.94	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	45/ 226	4.77	4.00	4.20	4.47	4.77	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	48/ 233	4.77	3.81	4.19	4.41	4.77	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	27/ 225	4.95	4.51	4.50	4.65	4.95	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	59/ 223	4.82	4.04	4.35	4.48	4.82	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	1	2	3	16	4.55	70/ 206	4.55	3.79	4.15	4.39	4.55	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	3	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	52/ 112	4.67	4.53	4.38	4.39	4.67	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	3	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	50/ 97	4.50	4.23	4.36	4.38	4.50	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	4	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	60/ 92	4.14	3.93	4.22	4.36	4.14	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	5	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	64/ 105	4.17	4.17	4.20	4.23	4.17	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	5	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	46/ 98	4.00	3.80	3.95	3.93	4.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/ 58	****	3.70	4.22	4.53	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/ 52	****	3.53	4.06	4.57	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.39	4.90	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	2.40	3.97	4.31	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.55	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	36/ 55	4.22	4.48	4.34	4.45	4.22	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	24/ 42	4.50	4.67	4.31	4.40	4.50	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	1	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	31/ 46	4.00	4.00	4.45	4.61	4.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	4	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.60	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	4	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	

Course Section: SCIE 501 8720
 Title PHYS CONCEPTS, PRIN, A
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1506
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	12	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	12	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	1						

Title

Baltimore County

JAN 18, 2007

Instructor: ENSOR, SUSAN

Fall 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 17

Questionnaires: 5

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	3	4.60	478/1669	3.34	4.14	4.23	4.35	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	181/1666	3.61	3.93	4.19	4.19	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	466/1421	3.51	4.00	4.24	4.33	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	161/1617	3.76	4.02	4.15	4.24	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	141/1555	3.68	4.12	4.00	4.07	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	142/1543	3.36	3.98	4.06	4.27	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1647	3.89	3.81	4.12	4.15	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	901/1668	4.65	4.72	4.67	4.83	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	139/1605	3.40	3.90	4.07	4.13	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1514	3.61	4.30	4.39	4.37	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1551	3.96	4.63	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	220/1503	3.44	4.15	4.24	4.22	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1506	3.43	4.07	4.26	4.24	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	116/1311	3.35	4.14	3.85	3.89	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1490	3.57	4.11	4.05	4.18	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1502	3.57	4.32	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	3.50	4.23	4.29	4.44	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1006	5.00	4.20	4.00	4.11	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 226	3.86	4.00	4.20	4.47	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 233	3.75	3.81	4.19	4.41	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 225	4.89	4.51	4.50	4.65	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 223	4.23	4.04	4.35	4.48	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 206	4.00	3.79	4.15	4.39	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	52/ 112	4.08	4.53	4.38	4.39	4.67	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	58/ 97	3.37	4.23	4.36	4.38	4.33	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	52/ 92	2.97	3.93	4.22	4.36	4.33	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 105	3.50	4.17	4.20	4.23	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	38/ 98	3.33	3.80	3.95	3.93	4.33	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	3.70	4.22	4.53	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.53	4.06	4.57	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.39	4.90	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	2.40	3.97	4.31	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.55	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.48	4.34	4.45	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 42	5.00	4.67	4.31	4.40	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.00	4.45	4.61	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.60	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	

Course Section: SCIE 502S 2301
 Title
 Instructor: ENSOR, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1507
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	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	3	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Title

Baltimore County

JAN 18, 2007

Instructor: HERSHEL, TIM

Fall 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 15

Questionnaires: 14

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	7	3	2	0	2	2.07	1663/1669	3.34	4.14	4.23	4.35	2.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	6	2	3	0	3	2.43	1640/1666	3.61	3.93	4.19	4.19	2.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	4	3	2	1	2.43	1411/1421	3.51	4.00	4.24	4.33	2.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	3	1	5	1	2.71	1579/1617	3.76	4.02	4.15	4.24	2.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	4	1	0	2	2.56	1517/1555	3.68	4.12	4.00	4.07	2.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	8	2	2	1	1	1.93	1536/1543	3.36	3.98	4.06	4.27	1.93	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	3	2	2	3	2.79	1557/1647	3.89	3.81	4.12	4.15	2.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	1190/1668	4.65	4.72	4.67	4.83	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	5	5	1	2	0	2.00	1585/1605	3.40	3.90	4.07	4.13	2.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	5	4	2	3	0	2.21	1497/1514	3.61	4.30	4.39	4.37	2.21	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	3	3	6	0	2.93	1540/1551	3.96	4.63	4.66	4.72	2.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	6	3	3	2	0	2.07	1489/1503	3.44	4.15	4.24	4.22	2.07	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	8	2	2	2	0	1.86	1497/1506	3.43	4.07	4.26	4.24	1.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	5	2	2	1	0	1.90	1281/1311	3.35	4.14	3.85	3.89	1.90	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	5	1	3	0	2.14	1467/1490	3.57	4.11	4.05	4.18	2.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	6	2	4	2	0	2.14	1492/1502	3.57	4.32	4.26	4.46	2.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	6	4	2	2	0	2.00	1481/1489	3.50	4.23	4.29	4.44	2.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	11	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/1006	5.00	4.20	4.00	4.11	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	4	3	2	3	2	2.71	225/ 226	3.86	4.00	4.20	4.47	2.71	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	4	3	3	4	0	2.50	227/ 233	3.75	3.81	4.19	4.41	2.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	78/ 225	4.89	4.51	4.50	4.65	4.79	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	1	1	2	2	6	2	3.46	202/ 223	4.23	4.04	4.35	4.48	3.46	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	2	3	3	5	1	3.00	189/ 206	4.00	3.79	4.15	4.39	3.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	1	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	94/ 112	4.08	4.53	4.38	4.39	3.50	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	1	1	2	1	1	0	2.40	95/ 97	3.37	4.23	4.36	4.38	2.40	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	1	4	0	0	1	0	1.60	91/ 92	2.97	3.93	4.22	4.36	1.60	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	3	0	1	0	2.00	100/ 105	3.50	4.17	4.20	4.23	2.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	2	2	0	2	0	2.33	89/ 98	3.33	3.80	3.95	3.93	2.33	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 58	****	3.70	4.22	4.53	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 52	****	3.53	4.06	4.57	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.39	4.90	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	2.40	3.97	4.31	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.55	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	4.48	4.34	4.45	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	5.00	4.67	4.31	4.40	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	4.00	4.45	4.61	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.60	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	

Course Section: SCIE 502S 2302
 Title
 Instructor: HERSHEL, TIM
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1508
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	11	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	3	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: SCIE 510 8720
 Title LUNAR ROBOTICS
 Instructor: HOBAN, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1509
 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	1	3	4	7	4	3.53	1471/1669	3.53	4.14	4.23	4.35	3.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	6	5	4	1	2.68	1622/1666	2.68	3.93	4.19	4.19	2.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	3	0	5	5	3	3.31	1296/1421	3.31	4.00	4.24	4.33	3.31	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	6	8	1	3.26	1470/1617	3.26	4.02	4.15	4.24	3.26	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	5	3	5	3.33	1326/1555	3.33	4.12	4.00	4.07	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	6	3	5	3	3.17	1372/1543	3.17	3.98	4.06	4.27	3.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	2	7	4	2	3.00	1526/1647	3.00	3.81	4.12	4.15	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	1004/1668	4.72	4.72	4.67	4.83	4.72	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	2	1	6	3	0	2.83	1535/1605	2.83	3.90	4.07	4.13	2.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	1	6	7	2	3.33	1418/1514	3.33	4.30	4.39	4.37	3.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	567/1551	4.88	4.63	4.66	4.72	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	2	8	3	1	2.82	1445/1503	2.82	4.15	4.24	4.22	2.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	4	4	4	2	2.88	1423/1506	2.88	4.07	4.26	4.24	2.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	3	1	3	4	5	3.44	978/1311	3.44	4.14	3.85	3.89	3.44	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	3	2	7	2	3.00	1328/1490	3.00	4.11	4.05	4.18	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	7	0	6	1	4	2.72	1456/1502	2.72	4.32	4.26	4.46	2.72	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	6	3	4	2	3	2.61	1460/1489	2.61	4.23	4.29	4.44	2.61	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	8	0	0	7	1	2	3.50	759/1006	3.50	4.20	4.00	4.11	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	2	2	0	4	2	0	2.75	224/ 226	2.75	4.00	4.20	4.47	2.75	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	3	3	3	0	0	2.00	232/ 233	2.00	3.81	4.19	4.41	2.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	1	3	2	0	2	2.88	224/ 225	2.88	4.51	4.50	4.65	2.88	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	3	1	4	0	0	2.13	220/ 223	2.13	4.04	4.35	4.48	2.13	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	1	3	2	2	0	0	1.86	206/ 206	1.86	3.79	4.15	4.39	1.86	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.53	4.38	4.39	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.23	4.36	4.38	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	3.93	4.22	4.36	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 105	****	4.17	4.20	4.23	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	3.80	3.95	3.93	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	3	0	0	2.40	54/ 58	2.40	3.70	4.22	4.53	2.40	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	1	3	0	0	1	2.40	47/ 52	2.40	3.53	4.06	4.57	2.40	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	1	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.39	4.90	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	1	2	1	1	0	2.40	38/ 40	2.40	2.40	3.97	4.31	2.40	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	2	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.55	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 55	****	4.48	4.34	4.45	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	4.67	4.31	4.40	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 46	****	4.00	4.45	4.61	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.60	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	

Course Section: SCIE 510 8720
 Title LUNAR ROBOTICS
 Instructor: HOBAN, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1509
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	10	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						