

Course-Section: FYS 101Q 1  
 Title Building a Culture of  
 Instructor: Taylor, Joby B  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 792  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	686/1509	4.44	4.02	4.31	4.18	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	859/1509	4.25	3.80	4.26	4.25	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1287	****	3.80	4.30	4.24	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	2	9	4.25	770/1459	4.25	3.91	4.22	4.11	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	294/1406	4.56	3.98	4.09	4.02	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	557/1384	4.31	3.76	4.11	3.98	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	3	12	4.63	319/1489	4.63	3.61	4.17	4.20	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	762/1506	4.81	4.76	4.67	4.66	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	325/1463	4.50	3.91	4.09	4.02	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	588/1438	4.67	4.31	4.46	4.44	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	483/1421	4.92	4.82	4.73	4.66	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	520/1411	4.58	4.16	4.31	4.27	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	459/1405	4.67	4.25	4.32	4.27	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	1	0	3	3	5	3.92	763/1236	3.92	3.76	4.00	3.87	3.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	165/1260	4.87	4.36	4.14	3.95	4.87
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	310/1255	4.79	4.60	4.33	4.15	4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.62	4.38	4.18	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	1	1	7	5	4.14	394/ 873	4.14	4.02	4.03	3.89	4.14
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/ 89	5.00	4.38	4.49	4.31	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	71/ 92	4.17	4.19	4.54	4.16	4.17
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	41/ 90	4.67	4.39	4.50	4.21	4.67
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	5	6	4.33	62/ 92	4.33	4.23	4.38	4.21	4.33
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	47/ 93	4.25	3.74	4.06	3.92	4.25
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.14	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.46	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.43	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	3.63	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	3.28	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	3.78	4.26	4.28	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	3.72	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	2.75	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 5	Under-grad 16	Non-major 16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 5	### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			

I	0	Other	1
?	0		

Course-Section: FYS 102A 1  
 Title Images of Madness  
 Instructor: Tice,Carolyn J  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 793  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	218/1509	4.83	4.02	4.31	4.18	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	447/1509	4.58	3.80	4.26	4.25	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	7	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	426/1287	4.60	3.80	4.30	4.24	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	131/1459	4.83	3.91	4.22	4.11	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	753/1406	4.08	3.98	4.09	4.02	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	349/1384	4.50	3.76	4.11	3.98	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	458/1489	4.50	3.61	4.17	4.20	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.76	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	106/1463	4.83	3.91	4.09	4.02	4.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.31	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.16	4.31	4.27	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.25	4.32	4.27	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1236	5.00	3.76	4.00	3.87	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	187/1260	4.83	4.36	4.14	3.95	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.60	4.33	4.15	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.62	4.38	4.18	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	152/ 873	4.67	4.02	4.03	3.89	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 89	5.00	4.38	4.49	4.31	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	3	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	30/ 92	4.86	4.19	4.54	4.16	4.86
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	3	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 90	5.00	4.39	4.50	4.21	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	19/ 92	4.80	4.23	4.38	4.21	4.80
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	1	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	15/ 93	4.89	3.74	4.06	3.92	4.89

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	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	6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FYS 102C 1  
 Title Dvrsty,Ethics & Social  
 Instructor: Williams,Vickie  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 794  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	458/1509	4.63	4.02	4.31	4.18	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	507/1509	4.53	3.80	4.26	4.25	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	359/1287	4.67	3.80	4.30	4.24	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	647/1459	4.38	3.91	4.22	4.11	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	502/1406	4.33	3.98	4.09	4.02	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	479/1384	4.38	3.76	4.11	3.98	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	630/1489	4.38	3.61	4.17	4.20	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.76	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	774/1463	4.13	3.91	4.09	4.02	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	545/1438	4.69	4.31	4.46	4.44	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	483/1421	4.92	4.82	4.73	4.66	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	580/1411	4.54	4.16	4.31	4.27	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	419/1405	4.69	4.25	4.32	4.27	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	223/1236	4.58	3.76	4.00	3.87	4.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	323/1260	4.64	4.36	4.14	3.95	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	463/1255	4.64	4.60	4.33	4.15	4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	521/1258	4.64	4.62	4.38	4.18	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	283/ 873	4.36	4.02	4.03	3.89	4.36
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	28/ 184	4.75	4.75	4.16	4.06	4.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	123/ 198	4.00	3.00	4.22	4.14	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	2	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	124/ 184	4.40	4.40	4.48	4.48	4.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	3	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	87/ 177	4.50	4.50	4.36	4.29	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	2	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	88/ 165	4.20	4.20	4.18	4.15	4.20
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	51/ 89	4.67	4.38	4.49	4.31	4.67
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	58/ 92	4.50	4.19	4.54	4.16	4.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	34/ 90	4.75	4.39	4.50	4.21	4.75
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	25/ 92	4.75	4.23	4.38	4.21	4.75
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	15/ 93	4.88	3.74	4.06	3.92	4.88
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	29/ 48	4.29	3.14	4.39	3.75	4.29
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	28/ 48	4.43	3.46	4.41	4.29	4.43
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	26/ 47	4.67	4.43	4.51	4.53	4.67
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	29/ 47	4.00	3.63	4.18	4.26	4.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	2	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	36/ 44	3.80	3.28	4.32	4.12	3.80
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	23/ 49	4.40	3.78	4.26	4.28	4.40
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	16/ 41	4.20	3.50	4.14	4.13	4.20
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	24/ 46	4.60	3.72	4.31	4.52	4.60
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 37	****	2.75	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: FYS 102C 1  
 Title Dvrsty, Ethics & Social  
 Instructor: Williams, Vickie  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 794  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	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	3	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FYS 102L 1  
 Title Banned Books  
 Instructor: Fletcher, Patric  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 795  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	3	13	4.42	698/1509	4.42	4.02	4.31	4.18	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	6	9	4.11	1013/1509	4.11	3.80	4.26	4.25	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/1287	****	3.80	4.30	4.24	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	5	11	4.26	759/1459	4.26	3.91	4.22	4.11	4.26
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	2	12	4.21	635/1406	4.21	3.98	4.09	4.02	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	7	6	3.84	985/1384	3.84	3.76	4.11	3.98	3.84
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	3	4	7	3	3.32	1364/1489	3.32	3.61	4.17	4.20	3.32
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	13	5	4.11	1346/1506	4.11	4.76	4.67	4.66	4.11
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	381/1463	4.47	3.91	4.09	4.02	4.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	2	0	1	11	4.50	800/1438	4.50	4.31	4.46	4.44	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	496/1411	4.60	4.16	4.31	4.27	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	0	13	4.60	540/1405	4.60	4.25	4.32	4.27	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	6	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	607/1236	4.11	3.76	4.00	3.87	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	0	12	4.77	237/1260	4.77	4.36	4.14	3.95	4.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	254/1255	4.85	4.60	4.33	4.15	4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	409/1258	4.77	4.62	4.38	4.18	4.77
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	419/ 873	4.09	4.02	4.03	3.89	4.09
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	3.00	4.22	4.14	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	4.50	4.36	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	33/ 89	4.87	4.38	4.49	4.31	4.87
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	2	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	62/ 92	4.42	4.19	4.54	4.16	4.42
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	2	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	34/ 90	4.75	4.39	4.50	4.21	4.75
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	1	1	11	4.40	58/ 92	4.40	4.23	4.38	4.21	4.40
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	1	1	1	7	3	3.77	67/ 93	3.77	3.74	4.06	3.92	3.77
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	3.14	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	3.46	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.43	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	3.63	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	3.28	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.78	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	3.50	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 46	****	3.72	4.31	4.52	****

Course-Section: FYS 102L 1  
 Title Banned Books  
 Instructor: Fletcher, Patric  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 795  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	1	Electives	9	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FYS 103B 1  
 Title Paradigms & Paradoxes  
 Instructor: Liebman, Joel F  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 796  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	4	6	2	3	3.13	1467/1509	3.13	4.02	4.31	4.18	3.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	5	3	6	0	2.93	1477/1509	2.93	3.80	4.26	4.25	2.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1287	****	3.80	4.30	4.24	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	5	3	3	3.36	1360/1459	3.36	3.91	4.22	4.11	3.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1105/1406	3.67	3.98	4.09	4.02	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	3	6	2	3.13	1309/1384	3.13	3.76	4.11	3.98	3.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	5	2	7	1	1	2.44	1471/1489	2.44	3.61	4.17	4.20	2.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	1070/1506	4.50	4.76	4.67	4.66	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	2	3	4	1	3.18	1359/1463	3.18	3.91	4.09	4.02	3.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	2	10	4.31	1021/1438	4.31	4.31	4.46	4.44	4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	614/1421	4.88	4.82	4.73	4.66	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	4	9	1	3.56	1264/1411	3.56	4.16	4.31	4.27	3.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	1	5	7	3.81	1172/1405	3.81	4.25	4.32	4.27	3.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	616/1236	4.10	3.76	4.00	3.87	4.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	2	5	5	3.79	919/1260	3.79	4.36	4.14	3.95	3.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	554/1255	4.53	4.60	4.33	4.15	4.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	507/1258	4.67	4.62	4.38	4.18	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	1	1	1	6	2	3.64	660/ 873	3.64	4.02	4.03	3.89	3.64
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	4	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 184	****	4.75	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	3	0	1	1	0	2.00	198/ 198	2.00	3.00	4.22	4.14	2.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	5	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 184	****	4.40	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 177	****	4.50	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	4	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 165	****	4.20	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	1	3	5	5	4.00	67/ 89	4.00	4.38	4.49	4.31	4.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	3	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	48/ 92	4.67	4.19	4.54	4.16	4.67
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	68/ 90	4.10	4.39	4.50	4.21	4.10
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	2	5	5	3.86	78/ 92	3.86	4.23	4.38	4.21	3.86
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	3	3	2	3	4	0	2.67	87/ 93	2.67	3.74	4.06	3.92	2.67
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	3	0	1	1	0	2.00	48/ 48	2.00	3.14	4.39	3.75	2.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	48/ 48	2.50	3.46	4.41	4.29	2.50
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	36/ 47	4.20	4.43	4.51	4.53	4.20
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	1	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	39/ 47	3.25	3.63	4.18	4.26	3.25
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	1	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	43/ 44	2.75	3.28	4.32	4.12	2.75
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	44/ 49	3.17	3.78	4.26	4.28	3.17
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	1	0	2	2	1	0	2.80	40/ 41	2.80	3.50	4.14	4.13	2.80
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	2	3	1	0	2.83	44/ 46	2.83	3.72	4.31	4.52	2.83
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	2	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	32/ 37	2.75	2.75	4.05	4.47	2.75
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	3	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****



Course-Section: FYS 103B 1  
 Title Paradigms & Paradoxes  
 Instructor: Liebman, Joel F  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 796  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
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	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FYS 103C 1  
 Title Issues In Biotechnology  
 Instructor: Craig,Nessly C  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 797  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	2	2	6	3	3.25	1447/1509	3.25	4.02	4.31	4.18	3.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	3	3	6	1	2.94	1477/1509	2.94	3.80	4.26	4.25	2.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	3	2	5	2	3.00	1247/1287	3.00	3.80	4.30	4.24	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	5	3	1	4	3.00	1422/1459	3.00	3.91	4.22	4.11	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	4	3	4	3.33	1258/1406	3.33	3.98	4.09	4.02	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	4	3	2	2	2.71	1364/1384	2.71	3.76	4.11	3.98	2.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	4	1	5	2	1	2.62	1457/1489	2.62	3.61	4.17	4.20	2.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	408/1506	4.93	4.76	4.67	4.66	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	1	5	6	0	3.07	1384/1463	3.07	3.91	4.09	4.02	3.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	3	3	2	3	3.08	1403/1438	3.08	4.31	4.46	4.44	3.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	1072/1421	4.62	4.82	4.73	4.66	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	2	4	3	3	3.38	1312/1411	3.38	4.16	4.31	4.27	3.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	1	2	4	3	3.23	1324/1405	3.23	4.25	4.32	4.27	3.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	4	3	1	0	0	1.63	1231/1236	1.63	3.76	4.00	3.87	1.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	1	2	2	4	3.45	1068/1260	3.45	4.36	4.14	3.95	3.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	1	1	3	5	3.91	992/1255	3.91	4.60	4.33	4.15	3.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	0	1	3	5	3.82	1049/1258	3.82	4.62	4.38	4.18	3.82
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	550/ 873	3.88	4.02	4.03	3.89	3.88
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.75	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	3.00	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.40	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	4.50	4.36	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	1	2	1	4	3	3.55	81/ 89	3.55	4.38	4.49	4.31	3.55
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	2	4	0	2	3	3.00	91/ 92	3.00	4.19	4.54	4.16	3.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	2	1	5	2	3.45	87/ 90	3.45	4.39	4.50	4.21	3.45
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	2	0	3	4	3.45	85/ 92	3.45	4.23	4.38	4.21	3.45
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	3	2	4	2	0	2.45	89/ 93	2.45	3.74	4.06	3.92	2.45
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	3.14	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.46	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.43	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	3.63	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	3.28	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	3.78	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	3.50	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	3.72	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	2.75	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: FYS 103C 1  
 Title Issues In Biotechnolog  
 Instructor: Craig,Nessly C  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 797  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
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	2				
				?	2						

Course-Section: FYS 103L 1  
 Title What is the World made  
 Instructor: Takacs,Laszlo  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 798  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	1	5	3	3.46	1409/1509	3.46	4.02	4.31	4.18	3.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	2	3	3	3.23	1436/1509	3.23	3.80	4.26	4.25	3.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	1	4	4	1	2.92	1268/1287	2.92	3.80	4.30	4.24	2.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	3	5	2	3.31	1379/1459	3.31	3.91	4.22	4.11	3.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	3	5	3.69	1087/1406	3.69	3.98	4.09	4.02	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	3	4	3.46	1209/1384	3.46	3.76	4.11	3.98	3.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	6	2	3	3.38	1347/1489	3.38	3.61	4.17	4.20	3.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.76	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	3	1	7	0	3.17	1364/1463	3.17	3.91	4.09	4.02	3.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	2	3	6	3.92	1255/1438	3.92	4.31	4.46	4.44	3.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	1	2	9	4.38	1228/1421	4.38	4.82	4.73	4.66	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	3	5	2	3.46	1289/1411	3.46	4.16	4.31	4.27	3.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	2	6	3.77	1188/1405	3.77	4.25	4.32	4.27	3.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	2	0	2	2	1	3.00	1131/1236	3.00	3.76	4.00	3.87	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	681/1260	4.17	4.36	4.14	3.95	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	575/1255	4.50	4.60	4.33	4.15	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	710/1258	4.42	4.62	4.38	4.18	4.42
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	738/ 873	3.40	4.02	4.03	3.89	3.40
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	1	3	4	1	3.56	81/ 89	3.56	4.38	4.49	4.31	3.56
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	2	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	88/ 92	3.71	4.19	4.54	4.16	3.71
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	2	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	69/ 90	4.00	4.39	4.50	4.21	4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	67/ 92	4.00	4.23	4.38	4.21	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	2	0	2	3	0	2	3.29	77/ 93	3.29	3.74	4.06	3.92	3.29

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	7	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						