

Course-Section: INDS 430A 0101  
 Title COMPLEMENTARY MEDICINE  
 Instructor: DUGGAN, ROBERT  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 927  
 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	2	6	9	4.41	684/1556	4.41	4.64	4.25	4.39	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	8	6	4.06	1035/1557	4.06	4.35	4.21	4.27	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1335	5.00	5.00	4.24	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	7	4.18	835/1510	4.18	4.32	4.19	4.26	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	4	9	4.18	600/1479	4.18	4.45	3.97	4.05	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	2	7	5	4.00	806/1424	4.00	4.50	4.08	4.18	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	5	3	5	2	3.27	1408/1537	3.27	3.80	4.15	4.22	3.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1553	5.00	4.53	4.69	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	508/1536	4.38	4.57	4.07	4.20	4.38
-----														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	1024/1487	4.33	4.67	4.44	4.52	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	613/1491	4.87	4.89	4.70	4.79	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	5	5	5	3.81	1217/1489	3.81	4.33	4.27	4.32	3.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	969/1481	4.19	4.44	4.28	4.38	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	11	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/1246	****	****	3.93	3.99	****
-----														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	273/1411	4.64	4.79	4.00	4.14	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	315/1413	4.79	4.79	4.23	4.43	4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	853/1408	4.21	4.61	4.27	4.41	4.21
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	269/ 856	4.40	4.40	4.00	4.20	4.40
-----														
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	53/ 102	4.86	4.93	4.50	4.83	4.86
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	91/ 101	3.57	4.22	4.39	4.73	3.57
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	72/ 90	3.86	4.30	4.36	4.73	3.86
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	48/ 98	4.71	4.73	4.49	4.77	4.71
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	73/ 101	3.71	3.79	4.03	4.33	3.71

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	17	Non-major	2
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: INDS 430B 0101  
 Title NUCLEAR ISSUES/TERRORI  
 Instructor: HAGERTY, DEVIN  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 928  
 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	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	168/1556	4.87	4.64	4.25	4.39	4.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	332/1557	4.64	4.35	4.21	4.27	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1335	****	5.00	4.24	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	484/1510	4.46	4.32	4.19	4.26	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	166/1479	4.73	4.45	3.97	4.05	4.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.50	4.08	4.18	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	692/1537	4.33	3.80	4.15	4.22	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	14	1	4.07	1422/1553	4.07	4.53	4.69	4.71	4.07
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	150/1536	4.75	4.57	4.07	4.20	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1487	5.00	4.67	4.44	4.52	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	410/1491	4.92	4.89	4.70	4.79	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	195/1489	4.85	4.33	4.27	4.32	4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	388/1481	4.69	4.44	4.28	4.38	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	10	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1246	****	****	3.93	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	101/1411	4.93	4.79	4.00	4.14	4.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	0	13	4.79	315/1413	4.79	4.79	4.23	4.43	4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1408	5.00	4.61	4.27	4.41	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	11	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 856	****	4.40	4.00	4.20	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 258	****	****	4.10	3.71	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 102	5.00	4.93	4.50	4.83	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	43/ 101	4.88	4.22	4.39	4.73	4.88
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	40/ 90	4.75	4.30	4.36	4.73	4.75
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	46/ 98	4.75	4.73	4.49	4.77	4.75
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	1	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	65/ 101	3.86	3.79	4.03	4.33	3.86
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	****	3.92	4.03	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 60	****	****	3.86	3.87	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	16	Non-major	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough			

P 0  
I 0  
? 2

Other

9

responses to be significant