

Course-Section: FYS 101B 0101
 Title SCI VERSUS RELIGION
 Instructor: FREELAND, STEPH
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 807
 JUN 26, 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	1	10	4.75	320/1522	4.75	4.05	4.30	4.14	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	1	9	4.42	686/1522	4.42	3.98	4.26	4.18	4.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1285	****	3.65	4.30	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	703/1476	4.33	4.22	4.22	4.09	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	231/1412	4.67	4.05	4.06	4.01	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	423/1381	4.42	4.11	4.08	3.93	4.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	4	3	4	3.75	1183/1500	3.75	3.75	4.18	4.16	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.93	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	147/1497	4.80	3.96	4.11	4.02	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	304/1440	4.83	4.10	4.45	4.40	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.74	4.71	4.63	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.00	4.29	4.24	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.10	4.29	4.23	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	156/1221	4.70	4.31	3.93	3.86	4.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	138/1280	4.90	4.27	4.10	3.92	4.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.47	4.34	4.13	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.38	4.31	4.04	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	106/ 854	4.75	4.21	4.02	3.87	4.75	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.49	4.58	4.13	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 77	5.00	4.58	4.52	4.03	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.18	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 78	5.00	4.18	4.45	3.88	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	2	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	49/ 80	4.00	3.73	4.11	3.79	4.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	2

Course-Section: FYS 102 0101
 Title FIRST YEAR SEMINAR (SS)
 Instructor: LOTTES, ILSA L.
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 808
 JUN 26, 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	1	1	3	13	4.56	548/1522	4.56	4.05	4.30	4.14	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	8	4.33	787/1522	4.33	3.98	4.26	4.18	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	706/1285	4.33	3.65	4.30	4.22	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	357/1476	4.63	4.22	4.22	4.09	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	12	4.50	339/1412	4.50	4.05	4.06	4.01	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	361/1381	4.47	4.11	4.08	3.93	4.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	799/1500	4.24	3.75	4.18	4.16	4.24	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	292/1517	4.94	4.93	4.65	4.62	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	385/1497	4.50	3.96	4.11	4.02	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	6	8	4.22	1071/1440	4.22	4.10	4.45	4.40	4.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.74	4.71	4.63	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	539/1436	4.56	4.00	4.29	4.24	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	383/1432	4.72	4.10	4.29	4.23	4.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	1	0	3	2	4	3.80	759/1221	3.80	4.31	3.93	3.86	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1280	****	4.27	4.10	3.92	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1277	****	4.47	4.34	4.13	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1269	****	4.38	4.31	4.04	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 854	****	4.21	4.02	3.87	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General 9	Under-grad 18 Non-major 18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 2	
			? 2		

Course-Section: FYS 102A 0101
 Title INVESTIG.EVERYDAY PRBL
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 809
 JUN 26, 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	0	3	11	4.79	275/1522	4.79	4.05	4.30	4.14	4.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	383/1522	4.64	3.98	4.26	4.18	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	337/1285	4.69	3.65	4.30	4.22	4.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	226/1476	4.75	4.22	4.22	4.09	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	0	7	4	4.17	646/1412	4.17	4.05	4.06	4.01	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	297/1381	4.55	4.11	4.08	3.93	4.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	87/1500	4.92	3.75	4.18	4.16	4.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	389/1517	4.92	4.93	4.65	4.62	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	264/1497	4.67	3.96	4.11	4.02	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	353/1440	4.80	4.10	4.45	4.40	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	737/1448	4.82	4.74	4.71	4.63	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	207/1436	4.82	4.00	4.29	4.24	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	418/1432	4.70	4.10	4.29	4.23	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	114/1221	4.78	4.31	3.93	3.86	4.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	184/1280	4.80	4.27	4.10	3.92	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.47	4.34	4.13	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.38	4.31	4.04	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	194/ 854	4.50	4.21	4.02	3.87	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.50	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	5.00	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	3.00	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	41/ 79	4.80	4.49	4.58	4.13	4.80	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	41/ 77	4.80	4.58	4.52	4.03	4.80	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	30/ 65	4.80	4.18	4.49	3.85	4.80	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	46/ 78	4.60	4.18	4.45	3.88	4.60	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	3.73	4.11	3.79	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: FYS 102A 0101
 Title INVESTIG.EVERYDAY PRBL
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 809
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FYS 103A 0101
 Title THINKING W/VISUALIZATI
 Instructor: RHEINGANS, PENN
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 810
 JUN 26, 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	0	2	2	4.50	605/1522	4.50	4.05	4.30	4.14	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	255/1522	4.75	3.98	4.26	4.18	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	473/1476	4.50	4.22	4.22	4.09	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	1287/1412	3.25	4.05	4.06	4.01	3.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	331/1381	4.50	4.11	4.08	3.93	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	312/1500	4.67	3.75	4.18	4.16	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.93	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	898/1497	4.00	3.96	4.11	4.02	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	798/1440	4.50	4.10	4.45	4.40	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.74	4.71	4.63	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	876/1436	4.25	4.00	4.29	4.24	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	632/1432	4.50	4.10	4.29	4.23	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	124/1221	4.75	4.31	3.93	3.86	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.27	4.10	3.92	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.47	4.34	4.13	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.38	4.31	4.04	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.21	4.02	3.87	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	44/ 79	4.75	4.49	4.58	4.13	4.75	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	45/ 77	4.75	4.58	4.52	4.03	4.75	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	34/ 65	4.75	4.18	4.49	3.85	4.75	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	49/ 78	4.50	4.18	4.45	3.88	4.50	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	31/ 80	4.50	3.73	4.11	3.79	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	4	Non-major	4
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 103B 0101
 Title HOW WE VIEW THE WORLD
 Instructor: KARPEL, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 811
 JUN 26, 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	5	1	0	0	0	1.17	1521/1522	1.17	4.05	4.30	4.14	1.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	1.33	1521/1522	1.33	3.98	4.26	4.18	1.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	1283/1285	1.67	3.65	4.30	4.22	1.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1448/1476	2.75	4.22	4.22	4.09	2.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	1	1	0	2.20	1398/1412	2.20	4.05	4.06	4.01	2.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	1	0	1	0	1.67	1374/1381	1.67	4.11	4.08	3.93	1.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	0	1	2	0	2.33	1477/1500	2.33	3.75	4.18	4.16	2.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.93	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	2	0	0	0	1.50	1494/1497	1.50	3.96	4.11	4.02	1.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	1439/1440	1.33	4.10	4.45	4.40	1.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1437/1448	3.25	4.74	4.71	4.63	3.25	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	1429/1436	2.00	4.00	4.29	4.24	2.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	1430/1432	1.00	4.10	4.29	4.23	1.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	1211/1221	1.67	4.31	3.93	3.86	1.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	1	0	1	2.40	1264/1280	2.40	4.27	4.10	3.92	2.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	2	1	0	1	2.60	1265/1277	2.60	4.47	4.34	4.13	2.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	3	1	0	1	0	1.80	1266/1269	1.80	4.38	4.31	4.04	1.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	779/ 854	3.00	4.21	4.02	3.87	3.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	1	1	2	0	0	2.25	78/ 79	2.25	4.49	4.58	4.13	2.25	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	73/ 77	3.00	4.58	4.52	4.03	3.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	1.00	64/ 65	1.00	4.18	4.49	3.85	1.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	0	0	0	1.25	77/ 78	1.25	4.18	4.45	3.88	1.25	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	3	1	0	0	0	1.25	79/ 80	1.25	3.73	4.11	3.79	1.25	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: FYS 103C 0101
 Title COMPUTATION AS EXPERIM
 Instructor: SURI, MANIL
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 812
 JUN 26, 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	1	0	0	4	4.40	733/1522	4.40	4.05	4.30	4.14	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	432/1522	4.60	3.98	4.26	4.18	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	178/1476	4.80	4.22	4.22	4.09	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	167/1412	4.75	4.05	4.06	4.01	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	247/1381	4.60	4.11	4.08	3.93	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1183/1500	3.75	3.75	4.18	4.16	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	994/1517	4.60	4.93	4.65	4.62	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	147/1497	4.80	3.96	4.11	4.02	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	353/1440	4.80	4.10	4.45	4.40	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	765/1448	4.80	4.74	4.71	4.63	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	934/1436	4.20	4.00	4.29	4.24	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.10	4.29	4.23	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1221	5.00	4.31	3.93	3.86	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	390/1280	4.50	4.27	4.10	3.92	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.47	4.34	4.13	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.38	4.31	4.04	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 854	****	4.21	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	83/ 228	4.50	4.50	4.35	4.33	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 216	5.00	5.00	4.42	4.41	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	194/ 205	3.00	3.00	4.23	4.28	3.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.49	4.58	4.13	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	45/ 77	4.75	4.58	4.52	4.03	4.75	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	34/ 65	4.75	4.18	4.49	3.85	4.75	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 78	5.00	4.18	4.45	3.88	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	49/ 80	4.00	3.73	4.11	3.79	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: FYS 103D 0101
 Title GLOBAL WARMING
 Instructor: HOFF, RAYMOND
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 813
 JUN 26, 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	3	0	4	4.14	1012/1522	4.14	4.05	4.30	4.14	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	0	3.57	1335/1522	3.57	3.98	4.26	4.18	3.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1088/1285	3.75	3.65	4.30	4.22	3.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	758/1476	4.29	4.22	4.22	4.09	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	299/1412	4.57	4.05	4.06	4.01	4.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	519/1381	4.33	4.11	4.08	3.93	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	0	3	3.71	1211/1500	3.71	3.75	4.18	4.16	3.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.93	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1089/1497	3.83	3.96	4.11	4.02	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1047/1440	4.25	4.10	4.45	4.40	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.74	4.71	4.63	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1378/1436	3.00	4.00	4.29	4.24	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	632/1432	4.50	4.10	4.29	4.23	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	461/1221	4.25	4.31	3.93	3.86	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	343/1280	4.57	4.27	4.10	3.92	4.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	672/1277	4.43	4.47	4.34	4.13	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	532/1269	4.57	4.38	4.31	4.04	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	3	1	1	2	3.29	737/ 854	3.29	4.21	4.02	3.87	3.29	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.31	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.49	4.58	4.13	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 77	5.00	4.58	4.52	4.03	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 65	5.00	4.18	4.49	3.85	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 78	5.00	4.18	4.45	3.88	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	3.73	4.11	3.79	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	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	1	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	7	Non-major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	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 104 0101
 Title FIRST YEAR SEMINAR (C)
 Instructor: BELL, ALAN S
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 814
 JUN 26, 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	0	6	3	4	3.47	1417/1522	3.47	4.05	4.30	4.14	3.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	3	3	5	3.47	1380/1522	3.47	3.98	4.26	4.18	3.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	3	5	2	3.29	1218/1285	3.29	3.65	4.30	4.22	3.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	3	6	2	3.40	1349/1476	3.40	4.22	4.22	4.09	3.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	1	4	6	3.73	1029/1412	3.73	4.05	4.06	4.01	3.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	4	1	4	5	3.71	1070/1381	3.71	4.11	4.08	3.93	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	6	2	1	3	2.67	1464/1500	2.67	3.75	4.18	4.16	2.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.93	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	4	2	5	0	2.77	1456/1497	2.77	3.96	4.11	4.02	2.77	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	2	4	2	4	3.29	1391/1440	3.29	4.10	4.45	4.40	3.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	802/1448	4.79	4.74	4.71	4.63	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	2	4	3	3	3.21	1356/1436	3.21	4.00	4.29	4.24	3.21	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	6	2	1	2	3	2.57	1397/1432	2.57	4.10	4.29	4.23	2.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	92/1221	4.83	4.31	3.93	3.86	4.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	3	1	2	3	3.09	1178/1280	3.09	4.27	4.10	3.92	3.09	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	0	1	4	4	3.73	1075/1277	3.73	4.47	4.34	4.13	3.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	2	0	1	4	4	3.73	1047/1269	3.73	4.38	4.31	4.04	3.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	8	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 854	****	4.21	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 228	****	4.50	4.35	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	66/ 79	4.14	4.49	4.58	4.13	4.14	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	2	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/ 77	****	4.58	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	4	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	4.18	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	1	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	73/ 78	3.20	4.18	4.45	3.88	3.20	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	1	2	3	0	0	0	1.60	76/ 80	1.60	3.73	4.11	3.79	1.60	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	3.90	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				

Course-Section: FYS 105 0101
 Title: FIRST YEAR SEMINAR
 Instructor: SCHALLER, THOMA
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 815
 JUN 26, 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	9	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	365/1522	4.73	4.05	4.30	4.14	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	9	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	288/1522	4.73	3.98	4.26	4.18	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	9	6	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	809/1285	4.20	3.65	4.30	4.22	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	10	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	473/1476	4.50	4.22	4.22	4.09	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	257/1412	4.64	4.05	4.06	4.01	4.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	168/1381	4.73	4.11	4.08	3.93	4.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	0	0	2	4	0	5	3.73	1204/1500	3.73	3.75	4.18	4.16	3.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	487/1517	4.91	4.93	4.65	4.62	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	172/1497	4.78	3.96	4.11	4.02	4.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	192/1440	4.90	4.10	4.45	4.40	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.74	4.71	4.63	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.00	4.29	4.24	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	161/1432	4.90	4.10	4.29	4.23	4.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1221	5.00	4.31	3.93	3.86	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	138/1280	4.91	4.27	4.10	3.92	4.91	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.47	4.34	4.13	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	223/1269	4.91	4.38	4.31	4.04	4.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	121/ 854	4.71	4.21	4.02	3.87	4.71	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.50	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	5.00	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 205	****	3.00	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.49	4.58	4.13	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	43/ 77	4.78	4.58	4.52	4.03	4.78	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	32/ 65	4.78	4.18	4.49	3.85	4.78	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	29/ 78	4.89	4.18	4.45	3.88	4.89	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	1	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	31/ 80	4.50	3.73	4.11	3.79	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 5	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	Under-grad 20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Non-major 20
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Electives 1
					Other 1

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant