

Course-Section: FYS 101B 0101
 Title SCI VERSES RELIGION
 Instructor: FREELAND, STEPH
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 800
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	9	4.90	159/1481	4.90	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	399/1481	4.60	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	742/1249	4.25	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	178/1424	4.80	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	82/1396	4.90	4.07	3.98	3.89	4.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	86/1342	4.90	4.12	4.07	3.88	4.90	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	344/1459	4.60	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	839/1480	4.80	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	111/1450	4.88	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.46	4.42	4.36	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.57	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	267/1399	4.75	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	177/1400	4.88	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	223/1179	4.57	3.94	3.96	3.85	4.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.18	4.05	3.77	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	451/1259	4.67	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.34	4.30	4.08	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	133/ 788	4.67	4.03	4.00	3.80	4.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	42/ 68	4.67	4.66	4.49	4.54	4.67	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	31/ 69	4.75	4.26	4.53	4.18	4.75	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	4	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	31/ 69	4.67	4.19	4.35	4.14	4.67	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	28/ 68	4.50	3.98	3.92	3.80	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	10	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FYS 104 0101
 Title: FIRST YEAR SEMINAR (C)
 Instructor: BELL, ALAN S
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 801
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	5	2	3	3	6	3.16	1434/1481	3.16	4.26	4.29	4.14	3.16	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	8	4	4	3	3.11	1412/1481	3.11	4.26	4.23	4.18	3.11	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	4	3	1	2	6	3.19	1175/1249	3.19	4.37	4.27	4.14	3.19	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	1	4	4	6	3.50	1275/1424	3.50	4.27	4.21	4.06	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	5	3	6	3.42	1125/1396	3.42	4.07	3.98	3.89	3.42	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	1	3	8	3	3.39	1171/1342	3.39	4.12	4.07	3.88	3.39	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	6	3	5	3	2	2.58	1425/1459	2.58	4.19	4.16	4.17	2.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	4	7	3	2	3.06	1348/1450	3.06	4.10	4.09	3.97	3.06	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	2	2	5	1	3	3.08	1353/1409	3.08	4.46	4.42	4.36	3.08	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	1	1	12	4.60	1031/1407	4.60	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	2	1	5	2	3	3.23	1297/1399	3.23	4.30	4.26	4.23	3.23	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	5	0	3	2	3	2.85	1340/1400	2.85	4.35	4.27	4.19	2.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	331/1179	4.42	3.94	3.96	3.85	4.42	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	5	0	3	1	5	3.07	1137/1262	3.07	4.18	4.05	3.77	3.07	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	169/1259	4.93	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	5	0	2	1	6	3.21	1149/1256	3.21	4.34	4.30	4.08	3.21	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	9	3	1	1	0	0	1.60	786/ 788	1.60	4.03	4.00	3.80	1.60	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	34/ 68	4.86	4.66	4.49	4.54	4.86	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	1	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	58/ 69	4.00	4.26	4.53	4.18	4.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	56/ 63	3.67	4.24	4.44	4.17	3.67	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	5	1	3.71	54/ 69	3.71	4.19	4.35	4.14	3.71	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	2	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	57/ 68	3.00	3.98	3.92	3.80	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	19	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	16	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						