

Course-Section: LLC 684 0101
 Title QUAL RSCH IN SCHLS & C
 Instructor: WALLACE, KENDRA
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 973
 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	8	5.00	1/1470	5.00	5.00	4.29	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	101/1470	4.88	4.88	4.23	4.34	4.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	473/1252	4.50	4.50	4.27	4.35	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	112/1413	4.88	4.88	4.24	4.37	4.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1391	5.00	5.00	4.02	4.25	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	76/1347	4.88	4.88	4.10	4.31	4.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	92/1455	4.88	4.88	4.16	4.22	4.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1469	5.00	5.00	4.70	4.82	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	89/1451	4.83	4.83	4.08	4.23	4.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1407	5.00	5.00	4.43	4.53	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1404	5.00	5.00	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	263/1401	4.75	4.75	4.28	4.40	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	300/1398	4.75	4.75	4.27	4.39	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	539/1176	4.14	4.14	3.96	4.02	4.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1276	5.00	5.00	4.06	4.31	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	238/1277	4.88	4.88	4.30	4.60	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1271	5.00	5.00	4.28	4.57	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 763	5.00	5.00	4.06	4.11	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 73	5.00	5.00	4.59	4.71	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 73	5.00	5.00	4.70	4.63	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 64	5.00	5.00	4.66	4.58	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 74	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.48	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	24/ 71	4.60	4.60	4.16	4.12	4.60	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	16/ 45	4.86	4.86	4.34	4.07	4.86	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	10/ 42	4.57	4.57	4.17	4.12	4.57	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 37	5.00	5.00	4.48	4.53	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	8/ 35	4.71	4.71	4.18	4.43	4.71	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	7/ 30	4.83	4.83	4.30	4.47	4.83	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 3	Major 4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 5	Non-major 4
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 7		
				? 1			