

Course-Section: FYS 101A 0101
 Title SENSE OF PLACE
 Instructor: ORSER, EDWARD W
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 818
 JAN 19, 2005
 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	1	4	5	4	3.86	1242/1556	3.86	4.23	4.25	4.06	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	10	2	3.93	1171/1557	3.93	4.23	4.21	4.13	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	3	3.93	1018/1335	3.93	4.32	4.24	4.13	3.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	5	2	6	4.08	938/1510	4.08	4.18	4.19	4.07	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	436/1479	4.36	4.08	3.97	3.90	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	3	5	3.71	1074/1424	3.71	4.08	4.08	3.91	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	6	4	3	3.64	1263/1537	3.64	4.18	4.15	4.12	3.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	761/1553	4.86	4.69	4.69	4.66	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	7	2	4.10	805/1536	4.10	4.05	4.07	3.91	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	975/1487	4.38	4.41	4.44	4.37	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	1066/1491	4.62	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	919/1489	4.23	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	1036/1481	4.08	4.30	4.28	4.18	4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	5	3	4	3.77	795/1246	3.77	3.87	3.93	3.78	3.77
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	551/1411	4.31	4.13	4.00	3.78	4.31
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	340/1413	4.77	4.38	4.23	3.96	4.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	424/1408	4.69	4.37	4.27	4.03	4.69
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	278/ 856	4.38	3.96	4.00	3.87	4.38
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	3.90	4.07	3.82	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 102	****	4.57	4.50	3.92	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.45	4.39	4.03	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	4.29	4.36	3.72	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	4.39	4.49	3.93	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.06	4.03	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	3.83	3.92	3.19	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 60	****	4.27	3.86	3.35	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.09	3.67	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	4	Under-grad	14	Non-major	5
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
				P	0			responses to be significant
				I	0	Other	3	
				?	0			

Course-Section: FYS 101B 0101
 Title LIVING/DYING ANC ATHEN
 Instructor: GOLDBERG, MARIL
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 819
 JAN 19, 2005
 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	4	8	2	3.86	1242/1556	3.86	4.23	4.25	4.06	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	3	4	3	3.43	1410/1557	3.43	4.23	4.21	4.13	3.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	3	4.00	958/1335	4.00	4.32	4.24	4.13	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	7	2	3.57	1311/1510	3.57	4.18	4.19	4.07	3.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	7	3	3.93	836/1479	3.93	4.08	3.97	3.90	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	6	4	0	3.00	1345/1424	3.00	4.08	4.08	3.91	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	0	5	4	1	2.86	1477/1537	2.86	4.18	4.15	4.12	2.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1553	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	4	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	1321/1536	3.43	4.05	4.07	3.91	3.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	3	2	5	4	3.71	1348/1487	3.71	4.41	4.44	4.37	3.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	410/1491	4.93	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	4	5	2	3.36	1360/1489	3.36	4.28	4.27	4.18	3.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	7	4	3.93	1142/1481	3.93	4.30	4.28	4.18	3.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	2	6	1	4	3.36	1018/1246	3.36	3.87	3.93	3.78	3.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	2	4	4	3.43	1109/1411	3.43	4.13	4.00	3.78	3.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	832/1413	4.21	4.38	4.23	3.96	4.21
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	676/1408	4.43	4.37	4.27	4.03	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	3	3	5	3	3.57	638/ 856	3.57	3.96	4.00	3.87	3.57
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	78/ 102	4.17	4.57	4.50	3.92	4.17
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	56/ 101	4.50	4.45	4.39	4.03	4.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	59/ 90	4.17	4.29	4.36	3.72	4.17
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	72/ 98	4.17	4.39	4.49	3.93	4.17
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	1	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	91/ 101	2.60	4.06	4.03	3.92	2.60
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	9	4	0	3.21	41/ 61	3.21	3.83	3.92	3.19	3.21
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	1	0	2	8	3	3.86	36/ 60	3.86	4.27	3.86	3.35	3.86
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	2	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	17/ 52	4.83	4.54	4.31	4.65	4.83
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	5	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	24/ 47	4.33	4.25	4.09	3.67	4.33
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	5	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	30/ 44	3.78	4.00	4.09	3.39	3.78

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	9	A	3	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	14	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	1	
?	2			

Course-Section: FYS 101C 0101
 Title BEETHOVEN'S MUSIC & CU
 Instructor: COX, FRANKLIN
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 820
 JAN 19, 2005
 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	

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1556	5.00	4.23	4.25	4.06	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	308/1557	4.67	4.23	4.21	4.13	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	309/1335	4.67	4.32	4.24	4.13	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1510	5.00	4.18	4.19	4.07	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1479	5.00	4.08	3.97	3.90	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	524/1424	4.33	4.08	4.08	3.91	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	285/1537	4.67	4.18	4.15	4.12	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1553	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1536	5.00	4.05	4.07	3.91	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	595/1487	4.67	4.41	4.44	4.37	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1491	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.61	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	389/1489	4.67	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.30	4.28	4.18	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1246	5.00	3.87	3.93	3.78	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.13	4.00	3.78	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1413	5.00	4.38	4.23	3.96	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1408	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.03	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 856	5.00	3.96	4.00	3.87	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 102	5.00	4.57	4.50	3.92	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 101	5.00	4.45	4.39	4.03	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 90	5.00	4.29	4.36	3.72	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 98	5.00	4.39	4.49	3.93	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 101	5.00	4.06	4.03	3.92	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 1	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	Under-grad 3
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Non-major 0
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	
					Electives 0
					Other 0

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: FYS 102A 0101
 Title IMAGES OF MADNESS
 Instructor: TICE, CAROLYN
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 821
 JAN 19, 2005
 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	4	0	0	0	2	8	5	4.20	955/1556	4.20	4.23	4.25	4.06	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	907/1557	4.20	4.23	4.21	4.13	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	6	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	958/1335	4.00	4.32	4.24	4.13	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	484/1510	4.47	4.18	4.19	4.07	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	1	4	3	3	3.31	1267/1479	3.31	4.08	3.97	3.90	3.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	524/1424	4.33	4.08	4.08	3.91	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	397/1537	4.57	4.18	4.15	4.12	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1553	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	659/1536	4.25	4.05	4.07	3.91	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	956/1487	4.40	4.41	4.44	4.37	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	613/1491	4.87	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	558/1489	4.53	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	905/1481	4.27	4.30	4.28	4.18	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	163/1246	4.69	3.87	3.93	3.78	4.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	512/1411	4.36	4.13	4.00	3.78	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	472/1413	4.64	4.38	4.23	3.96	4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	469/1408	4.64	4.37	4.27	4.03	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	5	10	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 856	****	3.96	4.00	3.87	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	65/ 102	4.57	4.57	4.50	3.92	4.57
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	2	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	65/ 101	4.40	4.45	4.39	4.03	4.40
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	2	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	37/ 90	4.80	4.29	4.36	3.72	4.80
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	77/ 98	4.00	4.39	4.49	3.93	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	1	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	56/ 101	4.00	4.06	4.03	3.92	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	19	Non-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FYS 102C 0101
 Title SOC JUSTICE IN SCHOOLI
 Instructor: OLIVA, LINDA M. (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 822
 JAN 19, 2005
 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	2	5	5	2	3.50	1400/1556	3.50	4.23	4.25	4.06	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	5	4	3.79	1277/1557	3.79	4.23	4.21	4.13	3.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1335	****	4.32	4.24	4.13	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	4	5	3.93	1083/1510	3.93	4.18	4.19	4.07	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	6	3	2	3.42	1215/1479	3.42	4.08	3.97	3.90	3.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	5	5	4.00	806/1424	4.00	4.08	4.08	3.91	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	2	6	3.93	1087/1537	3.93	4.18	4.15	4.12	3.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	867/1553	4.79	4.69	4.69	4.66	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	0	8	2	0	3.20	1411/1536	3.20	4.05	4.07	3.91	3.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	8	3	4.08	1208/1487	4.17	4.41	4.44	4.37	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	1258/1491	4.42	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	875/1489	4.27	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	2	1	4	4	3.91	1161/1481	3.91	4.30	4.28	4.18	3.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	1	2	3	2	3.44	974/1246	3.44	3.87	3.93	3.78	3.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	420/1411	4.45	4.13	4.00	3.78	4.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	779/1413	4.27	4.38	4.23	3.96	4.27
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	395/1408	4.73	4.37	4.27	4.03	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	3	0	2	4	1	3.00	768/ 856	3.00	3.96	4.00	3.87	3.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	64/ 102	4.63	4.57	4.50	3.92	4.63
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	1	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	73/ 101	4.25	4.45	4.39	4.03	4.25
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	71/ 90	3.88	4.29	4.36	3.72	3.88
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	62/ 98	4.44	4.39	4.49	3.93	4.44
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	51/ 101	4.33	4.06	4.03	3.92	4.33
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 61	****	3.83	3.92	3.19	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 60	****	4.27	3.86	3.35	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.54	4.31	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.09	3.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	4.00	4.09	3.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	2	A	7	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	14	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	1	
?	1			

Course-Section: FYS 102C 0101
 Title SOC JUSTICE IN SCHOOLI
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 823
 JAN 19, 2005
 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	2	5	5	2	3.50	1400/1556	3.50	4.23	4.25	4.06	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	5	4	3.79	1277/1557	3.79	4.23	4.21	4.13	3.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1335	****	4.32	4.24	4.13	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	4	5	3.93	1083/1510	3.93	4.18	4.19	4.07	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	6	3	2	3.42	1215/1479	3.42	4.08	3.97	3.90	3.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	5	5	4.00	806/1424	4.00	4.08	4.08	3.91	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	2	6	3.93	1087/1537	3.93	4.18	4.15	4.12	3.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	867/1553	4.79	4.69	4.69	4.66	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1536	3.20	4.05	4.07	3.91	3.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1092/1487	4.17	4.41	4.44	4.37	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1491	4.42	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1489	4.27	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1481	3.91	4.30	4.28	4.18	3.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1246	3.44	3.87	3.93	3.78	3.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	420/1411	4.45	4.13	4.00	3.78	4.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	779/1413	4.27	4.38	4.23	3.96	4.27
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	395/1408	4.73	4.37	4.27	4.03	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	3	0	2	4	1	3.00	768/ 856	3.00	3.96	4.00	3.87	3.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	64/ 102	4.63	4.57	4.50	3.92	4.63
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	1	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	73/ 101	4.25	4.45	4.39	4.03	4.25
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	71/ 90	3.88	4.29	4.36	3.72	3.88
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	62/ 98	4.44	4.39	4.49	3.93	4.44
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	51/ 101	4.33	4.06	4.03	3.92	4.33
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 61	****	3.83	3.92	3.19	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 60	****	4.27	3.86	3.35	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.54	4.31	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.09	3.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	4.00	4.09	3.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	2	A	7	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	14	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	1	
?	1			

Course-Section: FYS 103B 0101
 Title ATTEMPT TO UNDSND UNV
 Instructor: LIEBMAN, JOEL F
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 824
 JAN 19, 2005
 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	1	1	3	3	5	3.77	1291/1556	3.77	4.23	4.25	4.06	3.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	4	2	3.31	1445/1557	3.31	4.23	4.21	4.13	3.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1335	****	4.32	4.24	4.13	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	2	2	3	3	3.25	1426/1510	3.25	4.18	4.19	4.07	3.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	3	0	4	2	3.56	1126/1479	3.56	4.08	3.97	3.90	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	2	6	3.77	1028/1424	3.77	4.08	4.08	3.91	3.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	1	2	3	3	1	3.10	1442/1537	3.10	4.18	4.15	4.12	3.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	973/1553	4.69	4.69	4.69	4.66	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	0	2	4	2	3.67	1201/1536	3.67	4.05	4.07	3.91	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	1076/1487	4.27	4.41	4.44	4.37	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1491	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.61	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	7	1	3.82	1217/1489	3.82	4.28	4.27	4.18	3.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	705/1481	4.45	4.30	4.28	4.18	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	905/1246	3.57	3.87	3.93	3.78	3.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	174/1411	4.82	4.13	4.00	3.78	4.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	198/1413	4.91	4.38	4.23	3.96	4.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	216/1408	4.90	4.37	4.27	4.03	4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	316/ 856	4.30	3.96	4.00	3.87	4.30
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	1	1	0	0	7	3	4.00	80/ 102	4.00	4.57	4.50	3.92	4.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	3	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	61/ 101	4.44	4.45	4.39	4.03	4.44
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	53/ 90	4.43	4.29	4.36	3.72	4.43
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	76/ 98	4.09	4.39	4.49	3.93	4.09
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	5	2	1	1	3	0	2.71	90/ 101	2.71	4.06	4.03	3.92	2.71

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	13	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: FYS 104A 0101
 Title STEREOTYPES
 Instructor: ROSENTHAL, ALAN
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 825
 JAN 19, 2005
 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		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	352/1556	4.67	4.23	4.25	4.06	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	9	4.44	603/1557	4.44	4.23	4.21	4.13	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	484/1335	4.50	4.32	4.24	4.13	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	5	8	4.11	907/1510	4.11	4.18	4.19	4.07	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	121/1479	4.82	4.08	3.97	3.90	4.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	1	7	5	3.65	1127/1424	3.65	4.08	4.08	3.91	3.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	3	7	5	3.88	1123/1537	3.88	4.18	4.15	4.12	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1553	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	8	10	4.56	314/1536	4.56	4.05	4.07	3.91	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	1	16	4.78	390/1487	4.78	4.41	4.44	4.37	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	0	17	4.83	688/1491	4.83	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	2	15	4.72	315/1489	4.72	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	97/1481	4.94	4.30	4.28	4.18	4.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	1	0	5	9	4.25	452/1246	4.25	3.87	3.93	3.78	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	224/1411	4.72	4.13	4.00	3.78	4.72
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	5	12	4.56	541/1413	4.56	4.38	4.23	3.96	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	1	15	4.72	395/1408	4.72	4.37	4.27	4.03	4.72
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	292/ 856	4.35	3.96	4.00	3.87	4.35
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 244	****	3.90	4.07	3.82	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 102	****	4.57	4.50	3.92	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.45	4.39	4.03	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.29	4.36	3.72	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	16	0.00-0.99	14	A	10	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	14	Under-grad	18	Non-major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						