

Course-Section: FYS 102 0101  
 Title: FIRST YEAR SEMINAR (SS)  
 Instructor: STOLLE-MCALLIST  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2004

Page 781  
 JUN 14, 2004  
 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	1	1	9	4.73	285/1470	4.73	4.22	4.29	4.13	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	429/1470	4.55	4.19	4.23	4.17	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	747/1252	4.25	4.29	4.27	4.21	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	97/1413	4.90	4.19	4.24	4.12	4.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	77/1391	4.90	4.09	4.02	3.96	4.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	377/1347	4.44	4.05	4.10	4.01	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	437/1455	4.50	4.10	4.16	4.16	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	1117/1469	4.44	4.63	4.70	4.65	4.44	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	569/1451	4.30	4.00	4.08	3.99	4.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	952/1407	4.33	4.38	4.43	4.40	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	1061/1404	4.56	4.68	4.70	4.62	4.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	500/1401	4.56	4.24	4.28	4.22	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	270/1398	4.78	4.27	4.27	4.21	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	366/1176	4.38	3.80	3.96	3.84	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	344/1276	4.50	4.10	4.06	3.81	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	787/1277	4.25	4.42	4.30	4.02	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	469/1271	4.63	4.31	4.28	4.02	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	307/ 763	4.29	3.98	4.06	3.92	4.29	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 248	****	4.08	4.23	4.12	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 73	****	4.53	4.59	4.40	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	48/ 73	4.67	4.90	4.70	4.88	4.67	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	40/ 64	4.67	4.67	4.66	4.83	4.67	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	34/ 74	4.75	4.51	4.50	4.56	4.75	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	21/ 71	4.75	4.13	4.16	4.29	4.75	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	4.00	4.34	4.44	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	4.60	4.17	4.29	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	3.47	4.42	4.03	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	11	Non-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FYS 102A 0101  
 Title SEX, HLTH & HUMAN RIGH  
 Instructor: LOTTES, ILSA L.  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2004

Page 782  
 JUN 14, 2004  
 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	0	1	0	1	12	4.71	297/1470	4.71	4.22	4.29	4.13	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	1	9	4.36	692/1470	4.36	4.19	4.23	4.17	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	2	0	9	4.00	904/1252	4.00	4.29	4.27	4.21	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	346/1413	4.57	4.19	4.24	4.12	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	95/1391	4.86	4.09	4.02	3.96	4.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	2	11	4.57	264/1347	4.57	4.05	4.10	4.01	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	631/1455	4.36	4.10	4.16	4.16	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1469	5.00	4.63	4.70	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	0	8	3	4.08	800/1451	4.08	4.00	4.08	3.99	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	627/1407	4.62	4.38	4.43	4.40	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1404	5.00	4.68	4.70	4.62	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	249/1401	4.77	4.24	4.28	4.22	4.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	2	9	4.38	733/1398	4.38	4.27	4.27	4.21	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	2	1	0	6	3.80	767/1176	3.80	3.80	3.96	3.84	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	1	11	4.62	282/1276	4.62	4.10	4.06	3.81	4.62	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	172/1277	4.92	4.42	4.30	4.02	4.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1271	5.00	4.31	4.28	4.02	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	1	0	2	0	8	4.27	312/ 763	4.27	3.98	4.06	3.92	4.27	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	32/ 73	4.80	4.53	4.59	4.40	4.80	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 73	****	4.90	4.70	4.88	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 64	****	4.67	4.66	4.83	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	40/ 74	4.60	4.51	4.50	4.56	4.60	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	27/ 71	4.50	4.13	4.16	4.29	4.50	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	3.47	4.42	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.60	4.48	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 43	****	4.40	4.62	4.70	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.40	4.71	4.63	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 23	****	4.40	4.66	4.40	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	1	A 6	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 7	Under-grad 15	Non-major 10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	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 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: FYS 102B 0101  
 Title WHAT SHOULD GOVERNMENT  
 Instructor: BRENNAN, TIMOTH  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2004

Page 783  
 JUN 14, 2004  
 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	1	5	2	3.89	1187/1470	3.89	4.22	4.29	4.13	3.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	1	3.56	1298/1470	3.56	4.19	4.23	4.17	3.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1252	****	4.29	4.27	4.21	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	805/1413	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.12	4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	560/1391	4.22	4.09	4.02	3.96	4.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	592/1347	4.22	4.05	4.10	4.01	4.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	4	2	0	2.67	1413/1455	2.67	4.10	4.16	4.16	2.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	689/1469	4.89	4.63	4.70	4.65	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	845/1451	4.00	4.00	4.08	3.99	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	6	2	0	3.00	1370/1407	3.00	4.38	4.43	4.40	3.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	508/1404	4.89	4.68	4.70	4.62	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	4	3	0	3.00	1352/1401	3.00	4.24	4.28	4.22	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	1021/1398	4.00	4.27	4.27	4.21	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	3	2	0	3.17	1011/1176	3.17	3.80	3.96	3.84	3.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	572/1276	4.25	4.10	4.06	3.81	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	589/1277	4.50	4.42	4.30	4.02	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	337/1271	4.75	4.31	4.28	4.02	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	578/ 763	3.67	3.98	4.06	3.92	3.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	56/ 73	4.14	4.53	4.59	4.40	4.14	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	45/ 73	4.71	4.90	4.70	4.88	4.71	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	51/ 64	4.17	4.67	4.66	4.83	4.17	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	56/ 74	4.00	4.51	4.50	4.56	4.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	4	3	0	3.43	62/ 71	3.43	4.13	4.16	4.29	3.43	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	9	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FYS 103 0101  
 Title FIRST YEAR SEMINAR (MS)  
 Instructor: CRAIG, NESSLY C  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2004

Page 784  
 JUN 14, 2004  
 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	1	0	3.00	1442/1470	3.00	4.22	4.29	4.13	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1428/1470	3.00	4.19	4.23	4.17	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1407/1413	2.50	4.19	4.24	4.12	2.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1364/1391	2.50	4.09	4.02	3.96	2.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1166/1347	3.50	4.05	4.10	4.01	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1453/1455	1.00	4.10	4.16	4.16	1.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1469	5.00	4.63	4.70	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1374/1451	3.00	4.00	4.08	3.99	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1161/1407	4.00	4.38	4.43	4.40	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1397/1404	3.00	4.68	4.70	4.62	3.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1352/1401	3.00	4.24	4.28	4.22	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.27	4.27	4.21	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1034/1176	3.00	3.80	3.96	3.84	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1273/1276	1.00	4.10	4.06	3.81	1.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.02	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1271	5.00	4.31	4.28	4.02	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 73	5.00	4.53	4.59	4.40	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 73	5.00	4.90	4.70	4.88	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 64	5.00	4.67	4.66	4.83	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	56/ 74	4.00	4.51	4.50	4.56	4.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	70/ 71	2.00	4.13	4.16	4.29	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 1			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 2	Non-major 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: FYS 105A 0101  
 Title FERMAT, UNCLE PETROS,  
 Instructor: SURI, MANIL  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2004

Page 785  
 JUN 14, 2004  
 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	2	5.00	1/1470	5.00	4.22	4.29	4.13	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1470	5.00	4.19	4.23	4.17	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1413	5.00	4.19	4.24	4.12	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.09	4.02	3.96	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1347	5.00	4.05	4.10	4.01	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1469	5.00	4.63	4.70	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1451	5.00	4.00	4.08	3.99	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.38	4.43	4.40	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1404	5.00	4.68	4.70	4.62	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1401	5.00	4.24	4.28	4.22	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.27	4.27	4.21	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1176	5.00	3.80	3.96	3.84	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1276	5.00	4.10	4.06	3.81	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.02	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1271	5.00	4.31	4.28	4.02	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 763	5.00	3.98	4.06	3.92	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 73	5.00	4.53	4.59	4.40	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 73	5.00	4.90	4.70	4.88	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 64	5.00	4.67	4.66	4.83	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 74	5.00	4.51	4.50	4.56	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 71	5.00	4.13	4.16	4.29	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	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 2	Under-grad 2	Non-major 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: FYS 106 0101  
 Title: DIVERSITY & PLURALISM  
 Instructor: PINCUS, FRED L (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2004

Page 786  
 JUN 14, 2004  
 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	1	6	4.86	149/1470	4.86	4.22	4.29	4.13	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	243/1470	4.71	4.19	4.23	4.17	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	232/1252	4.71	4.29	4.27	4.21	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	423/1413	4.50	4.19	4.24	4.12	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	162/1391	4.71	4.09	4.02	3.96	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	681/1347	4.14	4.05	4.10	4.01	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	548/1455	4.43	4.10	4.16	4.16	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1469	5.00	4.63	4.70	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	723/1451	4.08	4.00	4.08	3.99	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1407	4.70	4.38	4.43	4.40	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1404	4.70	4.68	4.70	4.62	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	379/1401	4.43	4.24	4.28	4.22	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	528/1398	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.21	4.39	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1176	5.00	3.80	3.96	3.84	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1276	5.00	4.10	4.06	3.81	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.02	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1271	5.00	4.31	4.28	4.02	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	350/763	4.20	3.98	4.06	3.92	4.20	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/73	5.00	4.53	4.59	4.40	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/73	5.00	4.90	4.70	4.88	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/64	5.00	4.67	4.66	4.83	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/74	5.00	4.51	4.50	4.56	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	40/71	4.00	4.13	4.16	4.29	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: FYS 106 0101  
 Title: DIVERSITY & PLURALISM  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2004

Page 787  
 JUN 14, 2004  
 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	1	6	4.86	149/1470	4.86	4.22	4.29	4.13	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	243/1470	4.71	4.19	4.23	4.17	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	232/1252	4.71	4.29	4.27	4.21	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	423/1413	4.50	4.19	4.24	4.12	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	162/1391	4.71	4.09	4.02	3.96	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	681/1347	4.14	4.05	4.10	4.01	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	548/1455	4.43	4.10	4.16	4.16	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1469	5.00	4.63	4.70	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	845/1451	4.08	4.00	4.08	3.99	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	889/1407	4.70	4.38	4.43	4.40	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	1199/1404	4.70	4.68	4.70	4.62	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	915/1401	4.43	4.24	4.28	4.22	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	894/1398	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.21	4.39	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1176	5.00	3.80	3.96	3.84	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1276	5.00	4.10	4.06	3.81	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.02	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1271	5.00	4.31	4.28	4.02	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	350/ 763	4.20	3.98	4.06	3.92	4.20	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 73	5.00	4.53	4.59	4.40	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 73	5.00	4.90	4.70	4.88	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 64	5.00	4.67	4.66	4.83	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 74	5.00	4.51	4.50	4.56	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	40/ 71	4.00	4.13	4.16	4.29	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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