

Course-Section: SCIE 505 8020
 Title EAR/SPA SCI CON PRIN A
 Instructor: RUSSELL, NEILL
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1318
 JUN 13, 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	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1481/1481	2.38	4.26	4.29	4.28	1.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1420/1481	3.38	4.26	4.23	4.11	3.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	893/1249	3.88	4.37	4.27	4.24	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1424/1424	2.97	4.27	4.21	4.16	2.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1391/1396	2.84	4.07	3.98	4.00	2.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1269/1342	3.18	4.12	4.07	4.18	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1456/1459	2.56	4.19	4.16	4.01	1.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1447/1450	2.35	4.10	4.09	3.96	1.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1356/1409	3.68	4.46	4.42	4.36	3.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	4.94	4.77	4.69	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1399/1399	2.29	4.30	4.26	4.16	1.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1393/1400	2.82	4.35	4.27	4.17	2.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	590/1179	4.06	3.94	3.96	3.81	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1260/1262	2.20	4.18	4.05	4.07	1.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1257/1259	2.20	4.40	4.29	4.30	1.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1254/1256	2.17	4.34	4.30	4.33	1.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	240/ 246	3.50	4.26	4.20	4.27	3.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	248/ 249	2.93	4.08	4.11	3.93	2.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	184/ 242	4.36	4.45	4.40	4.27	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	236/ 240	2.96	4.37	4.20	4.15	2.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SCIE 505 8720
 Title EAR/SPA SCI CON PRIN A
 Instructor: RUSSELL, NEILL
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1319
 JUN 13, 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	1	2	4	3	7	3.76	1248/1481	2.38	4.26	4.29	4.28	3.76	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	7	1	7	3.76	1200/1481	3.38	4.26	4.23	4.11	3.76	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	3	1	8	3.75	1046/1249	3.88	4.37	4.27	4.24	3.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	4	3	7	3.94	1048/1424	2.97	4.27	4.21	4.16	3.94	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	2	7	4	3.69	972/1396	2.84	4.07	3.98	4.00	3.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	5	1	3	6	3.35	1180/1342	3.18	4.12	4.07	4.18	3.35	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	5	8	4.12	899/1459	2.56	4.19	4.16	4.01	4.12	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	6	2	4	3.69	1146/1450	2.35	4.10	4.09	3.96	3.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	3	10	4.35	946/1409	3.68	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.35	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	568/1407	4.94	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	4	3	6	4	3.59	1221/1399	2.29	4.30	4.26	4.16	3.59	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	3	4	6	3.65	1190/1400	2.82	4.35	4.27	4.17	3.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	5	1	10	4.12	549/1179	4.06	3.94	3.96	3.81	4.12	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	4	2	5	3.40	1034/1262	2.20	4.18	4.05	4.07	3.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	4	1	2	6	3.40	1127/1259	2.20	4.40	4.29	4.30	3.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	4	1	3	5	3.33	1134/1256	2.17	4.34	4.30	4.33	3.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	1	3	1	3	3	3.36	662/ 788	3.36	4.03	4.00	3.97	3.36	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	2	6	5	4.00	155/ 246	3.50	4.26	4.20	4.27	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	1	2	5	5	3.86	167/ 249	2.93	4.08	4.11	3.93	3.86	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	71/ 242	4.36	4.45	4.40	4.27	4.71	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	2	3	2	6	3.92	171/ 240	2.96	4.37	4.20	4.15	3.92	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	109/ 217	4.23	4.42	4.04	3.73	4.23	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	54/ 68	4.00	4.66	4.49	4.23	4.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	1	2	0	0	2	3.00	66/ 69	3.00	4.26	4.53	4.46	3.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	30/ 63	4.60	4.24	4.44	4.44	4.60	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.16	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	46/ 68	3.60	3.98	3.92	3.71	3.60	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.01	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.65	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	4.27	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	4.58	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.38	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.95	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.54	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	5.00	****	

Course-Section: SCIE 505 8720
 Title EAR/SPA SCI CON PRIN A
 Instructor: RUSSELL, NEILL
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1319
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	4	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						