

Course Section: FYS 101A 0101
 Title BECOMING AMERICAN
 Instructor: LARKEY, EDWARD
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 940
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	3	6	4	4.08	1124/1669	4.08	4.12	4.23	4.02	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	7	0	3.38	1516/1666	3.38	3.81	4.19	4.11	3.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	7	2	3.92	1051/1421	3.92	3.85	4.24	4.11	3.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	2	3.85	1201/1617	3.85	3.99	4.15	3.99	3.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	316/1555	4.54	3.90	4.00	3.92	4.54	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	5	4	3.85	1068/1543	3.85	3.99	4.06	3.86	3.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	3	4	2	3.31	1489/1647	3.31	3.81	4.12	4.06	3.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	1223/1668	4.46	4.75	4.67	4.62	4.46	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	0	3	4	0	3.57	1325/1605	3.57	3.95	4.07	3.96	3.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	6	4	3	3.77	1320/1514	3.77	4.21	4.39	4.32	3.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	1028/1551	4.67	4.79	4.66	4.55	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	1147/1503	3.92	4.14	4.24	4.17	3.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	868/1506	4.31	4.21	4.26	4.17	4.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	2	1	3	1	1	2.75	1195/1311	2.75	3.70	3.85	3.68	2.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	576/1490	4.38	4.36	4.05	3.85	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	3	5	4	3.85	1154/1502	3.85	4.50	4.26	4.06	3.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	893/1489	4.31	4.69	4.29	4.07	4.31	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	1	1	6	3	4.00	479/1006	4.00	4.14	4.00	3.81	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	61/ 112	4.55	4.30	4.38	4.04	4.55	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	65/ 97	4.09	4.47	4.36	4.19	4.09	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	62/ 92	4.09	4.08	4.22	3.79	4.09	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	61/ 105	4.20	4.31	4.20	3.94	4.20	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	4	3	2	2	3.18	81/ 98	3.18	3.92	3.95	3.90	3.18	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: FYS 101A 0101
 Title BECOMING AMERICAN
 Instructor: LARKEY, EDWARD
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 940
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 1	A 4	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 13 Non-major 13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 1	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 1		

Course Section: FYS 101C 0101
 Title BEETHOVEN'S MUSIC & CU
 Instructor: COX, FRANKLIN
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 941
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	2	2	7	4.45	662/1669	4.45	4.12	4.23	4.02	4.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	0	7	4.27	854/1666	4.27	3.81	4.19	4.11	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	429/1421	4.64	3.85	4.24	4.11	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	568/1617	4.45	3.99	4.15	3.99	4.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	709/1555	4.10	3.90	4.00	3.92	4.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	895/1543	4.00	3.99	4.06	3.86	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	839/1647	4.27	3.81	4.12	4.06	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	1039/1668	4.70	4.75	4.67	4.62	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	631/1605	4.30	3.95	4.07	3.96	4.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	0	7	4.27	1070/1514	4.27	4.21	4.39	4.32	4.27	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.79	4.66	4.55	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	1020/1503	4.09	4.14	4.24	4.17	4.09	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	706/1506	4.45	4.21	4.26	4.17	4.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1311	5.00	3.70	3.85	3.68	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	445/1490	4.50	4.36	4.05	3.85	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	880/1502	4.25	4.50	4.26	4.06	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	684/1489	4.50	4.69	4.29	4.07	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1006	5.00	4.14	4.00	3.81	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 112	5.00	4.30	4.38	4.04	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	4.47	4.36	4.19	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	4.08	4.22	3.79	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 105	5.00	4.31	4.20	3.94	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	26/ 98	4.67	3.92	3.95	3.90	4.67	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 3	Under-grad 11	Non-major 11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 0			

Course Section: FYS 101D 0101
 Title TURNING TO ONE ANOTHER
 Instructor: LEE, DIANE (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 942
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	2	3	2	7	4.00	1173/1669	4.00	4.12	4.23	4.02	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	3	5	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	3.81	4.19	4.11	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	1386/1421	2.80	3.85	4.24	4.11	2.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	987/1617	4.08	3.99	4.15	3.99	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	2	7	4.07	728/1555	4.07	3.90	4.00	3.92	4.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	850/1543	4.08	3.99	4.06	3.86	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	2	9	4.29	828/1647	4.29	3.81	4.12	4.06	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	857/1605	4.05	3.95	4.07	3.96	4.05	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	505/1514	4.69	4.21	4.39	4.32	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1551	4.92	4.79	4.66	4.55	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	686/1503	4.46	4.14	4.24	4.17	4.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	642/1506	4.17	4.21	4.26	4.17	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	1084/1311	3.17	3.70	3.85	3.68	3.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	576/1490	4.38	4.36	4.05	3.85	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	604/1502	4.54	4.50	4.26	4.06	4.54	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	422/1489	4.77	4.69	4.29	4.07	4.77	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	199/1006	4.60	4.14	4.00	3.81	4.60	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	65/ 112	4.50	4.30	4.38	4.04	4.50	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	41/ 97	4.75	4.47	4.36	4.19	4.75	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	50/ 92	4.42	4.08	4.22	3.79	4.42	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	42/ 105	4.67	4.31	4.20	3.94	4.67	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	28/ 98	4.50	3.92	3.95	3.90	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	6	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	4	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course Section: FYS 101D 0101
 Title TURNING TO ONE ANOTHER
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 943
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	2	3	2	7	4.00	1173/1669	4.00	4.12	4.23	4.02	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	3	5	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	3.81	4.19	4.11	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	1386/1421	2.80	3.85	4.24	4.11	2.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	987/1617	4.08	3.99	4.15	3.99	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	2	7	4.07	728/1555	4.07	3.90	4.00	3.92	4.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	850/1543	4.08	3.99	4.06	3.86	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	2	9	4.29	828/1647	4.29	3.81	4.12	4.06	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	918/1605	4.05	3.95	4.07	3.96	4.05	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	584/1514	4.69	4.21	4.39	4.32	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	705/1551	4.92	4.79	4.66	4.55	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	556/1503	4.46	4.14	4.24	4.17	4.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	4	1	3.83	1209/1506	4.17	4.21	4.26	4.17	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	4	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1311	3.17	3.70	3.85	3.68	3.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	576/1490	4.38	4.36	4.05	3.85	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	604/1502	4.54	4.50	4.26	4.06	4.54	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	422/1489	4.77	4.69	4.29	4.07	4.77	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	199/1006	4.60	4.14	4.00	3.81	4.60	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	65/ 112	4.50	4.30	4.38	4.04	4.50	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	41/ 97	4.75	4.47	4.36	4.19	4.75	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	50/ 92	4.42	4.08	4.22	3.79	4.42	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	42/ 105	4.67	4.31	4.20	3.94	4.67	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	28/ 98	4.50	3.92	3.95	3.90	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	6	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	4	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course Section: FYS 102A 0101
 Title IMAGES OF MADNESS
 Instructor: TICE, CAROLYN
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 944
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	2	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	463/1669	4.62	4.12	4.23	4.02	4.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	231/1666	4.77	3.81	4.19	4.11	4.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	255/1421	4.78	3.85	4.24	4.11	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	414/1617	4.58	3.99	4.15	3.99	4.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	0	10	4.46	379/1555	4.46	3.90	4.00	3.92	4.46	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	290/1543	4.62	3.99	4.06	3.86	4.62	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	389/1647	4.58	3.81	4.12	4.06	4.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	591/1605	4.33	3.95	4.07	3.96	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	663/1514	4.62	4.21	4.39	4.32	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	677/1551	4.85	4.79	4.66	4.55	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	347/1503	4.69	4.14	4.24	4.17	4.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	340/1506	4.77	4.21	4.26	4.17	4.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	1	0	11	4.54	250/1311	4.54	3.70	3.85	3.68	4.54	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	214/1490	4.80	4.36	4.05	3.85	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	459/1502	4.70	4.50	4.26	4.06	4.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.69	4.29	4.07	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1006	****	4.14	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	
Self Paced															
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	8	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Course Section: FYS 102C 0101
 Title SOC JUSTICE IN SCHOOLI
 Instructor: OLIVA, LINDA M.
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 945
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	2	2	4	4	3	3.27	1560/1669	3.27	4.12	4.23	4.02	3.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	2	3	3	2	2.67	1624/1666	2.67	3.81	4.19	4.11	2.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1421	****	3.85	4.24	4.11	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	5	3	3	3.54	1360/1617	3.54	3.99	4.15	3.99	3.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	4	3	2	1	2.33	1539/1555	2.33	3.90	4.00	3.92	2.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	5	5	2	3.33	1322/1543	3.33	3.99	4.06	3.86	3.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	3	4	1	3	3.00	1526/1647	3.00	3.81	4.12	4.06	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	4	4	1	3.27	1449/1605	3.27	3.95	4.07	3.96	3.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	2	3	4	3	3.29	1426/1514	3.29	4.21	4.39	4.32	3.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	1354/1551	4.21	4.79	4.66	4.55	4.21	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	4	3	3	4	3.50	1330/1503	3.50	4.14	4.24	4.17	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	5	2	4	3.36	1357/1506	3.36	4.21	4.26	4.17	3.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	2	2	5	0	2	2.82	1183/1311	2.82	3.70	3.85	3.68	2.82	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	849/1490	4.00	4.36	4.05	3.85	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	741/1502	4.42	4.50	4.26	4.06	4.42	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	684/1489	4.50	4.69	4.29	4.07	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	463/1006	4.08	4.14	4.00	3.81	4.08	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	1	1	3	0	1	2.83	106/ 112	2.83	4.30	4.38	4.04	2.83	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	81/ 97	3.83	4.47	4.36	4.19	3.83	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	3	1	0	1	2.50	88/ 92	2.50	4.08	4.22	3.79	2.50	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	0	2	1	1	2.83	97/ 105	2.83	4.31	4.20	3.94	2.83	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	2	1	2	0	1	2.50	88/ 98	2.50	3.92	3.95	3.90	2.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	0

Course Section: FYS 103B 0101
 Title ATTEMPT TO UNDISTND UNV
 Instructor: LIEBMAN, JOEL F
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 946
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	0	1	4	6	4.17	1026/1669	4.17	4.12	4.23	4.02	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	2	4	3	3.42	1507/1666	3.42	3.81	4.19	4.11	3.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	1	3	4	3.42	1419/1617	3.42	3.99	4.15	3.99	3.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	2	3	2	1	3.25	1359/1555	3.25	3.90	4.00	3.92	3.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	6	2	3.75	1138/1543	3.75	3.99	4.06	3.86	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	3	3	1	1	3	2.82	1555/1647	2.82	3.81	4.12	4.06	2.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	1265/1668	4.42	4.75	4.67	4.62	4.42	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	840/1605	4.11	3.95	4.07	3.96	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	2	2	4	3.80	1307/1514	3.80	4.21	4.39	4.32	3.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	512/1551	4.90	4.79	4.66	4.55	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	6	0	3.56	1315/1503	3.56	4.14	4.24	4.17	3.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	0	3	5	4.00	1069/1506	4.00	4.21	4.26	4.17	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1115/1311	3.00	3.70	3.85	3.68	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	849/1490	4.00	4.36	4.05	3.85	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	306/1502	4.83	4.50	4.26	4.06	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	532/1489	4.67	4.69	4.29	4.07	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	967/1006	2.50	4.14	4.00	3.81	2.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	92/ 112	3.86	4.30	4.38	4.04	3.86	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	2	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	57/ 97	4.40	4.47	4.36	4.19	4.40	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	4	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	72/ 92	3.67	4.08	4.22	3.79	3.67	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	64/ 105	4.17	4.31	4.20	3.94	4.17	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	3	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	46/ 98	4.00	3.92	3.95	3.90	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Course Section: FYS 103C 0101
 Title ISSUES IN BIOTECHNOLOG
 Instructor: CRAIG, NESSLY C
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 947
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	6	6	4.38	757/1669	4.38	4.12	4.23	4.02	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	3.81	4.19	4.11	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	886/1421	4.17	3.85	4.24	4.11	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	3	3.92	1140/1617	3.92	3.99	4.15	3.99	3.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	453/1555	4.38	3.90	4.00	3.92	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	680/1543	4.23	3.99	4.06	3.86	4.23	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	3	5	3.92	1137/1647	3.92	3.81	4.12	4.06	3.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	1289/1668	4.38	4.75	4.67	4.62	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	1092/1605	3.91	3.95	4.07	3.96	3.91	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	739/1514	4.56	4.21	4.39	4.32	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	567/1551	4.89	4.79	4.66	4.55	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	653/1503	4.44	4.14	4.24	4.17	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	718/1506	4.44	4.21	4.26	4.17	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	219/1311	4.60	3.70	3.85	3.68	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	512/1490	4.44	4.36	4.05	3.85	4.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	256/1502	4.89	4.50	4.26	4.06	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.69	4.29	4.07	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	407/1006	4.20	4.14	4.00	3.81	4.20	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.42	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	43/ 112	4.88	4.30	4.38	4.04	4.88	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	50/ 97	4.50	4.47	4.36	4.19	4.50	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	42/ 92	4.50	4.08	4.22	3.79	4.50	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	44/ 105	4.63	4.31	4.20	3.94	4.63	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	1	2	0	5	4.13	45/ 98	4.13	3.92	3.95	3.90	4.13	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	2	A	1	Required for Majors	2	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	2	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				

