

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>FYS 101D 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Turning To One Another</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Randles,C J</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>16</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	646/1589	4.50	4.56	4.32	4.20	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	4	9	4.25	943/1589	4.25	4.38	4.29	4.28	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	921/1391	4.20	4.36	4.34	4.29	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	816/1552	4.29	4.36	4.25	4.16	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	496/1495	4.44	4.35	4.14	4.07	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	228/1457	4.69	4.46	4.15	3.99	4.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	7	7	4.19	931/1572	4.19	4.20	4.21	4.18	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	938/1589	4.69	4.50	4.66	4.59	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	0	6	6	4.23	718/1569	4.23	4.30	4.13	4.08	4.23
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	179/1530	4.87	4.58	4.49	4.45	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1533	4.94	4.87	4.75	4.69	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	405/1528	4.67	4.64	4.35	4.31	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	155/1529	4.87	4.58	4.36	4.31	4.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	290/1393	4.54	4.53	4.06	3.99	4.54
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	202/1337	4.83	4.70	4.17	4.01	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	559/1331	4.58	4.66	4.35	4.18	4.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	438/1333	4.75	4.74	4.40	4.22	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	180/1014	4.67	4.54	4.05	3.91	4.67

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>FYS 101D 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Turning To One Another</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Randles,C J</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>16</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/180	****	****	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/194	****	****	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/178	****	****	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/181	****	****	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/165	****	****	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	18/62	4.92	4.77	4.46	4.33	4.92
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	33/65	4.62	4.54	4.43	4.13	4.62
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	40/63	4.31	4.53	4.29	4.12	4.31
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	19/61	4.85	4.71	4.47	4.61	4.85
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	2	0	2	9	4.38	30/61	4.38	4.33	4.19	3.98	4.38
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/40	****	4.71	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/40	****	4.71	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/32	****	4.57	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/29	****	4.71	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/21	****	4.57	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/39	****	****	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.30	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>FYS 101D 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Turning To One Another</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Randles,C J</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>16</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1 A 6	Required for Majors	2 Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0 B 7		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0 C 0	General	6 Under-grad 16 Non-major 6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0 D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2 F 0	Electives	3 **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	1
			? 3		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>FYS 101D 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Turning To One Another</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Lee,Diane M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>16</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	646/1589	4.50	4.56	4.32	4.20	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	4	9	4.25	943/1589	4.25	4.38	4.29	4.28	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	921/1391	4.20	4.36	4.34	4.29	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	816/1552	4.29	4.36	4.25	4.16	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	496/1495	4.44	4.35	4.14	4.07	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	228/1457	4.69	4.46	4.15	3.99	4.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	7	7	4.19	931/1572	4.19	4.20	4.21	4.18	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	938/1589	4.69	4.50	4.66	4.59	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	0	0	6	6	4.23	718/1569	4.23	4.30	4.13	4.08	4.23
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	381/1530	4.87	4.58	4.49	4.45	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	671/1533	4.94	4.87	4.75	4.69	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	539/1528	4.67	4.64	4.35	4.31	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	308/1529	4.87	4.58	4.36	4.31	4.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	349/1393	4.54	4.53	4.06	3.99	4.54
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	202/1337	4.83	4.70	4.17	4.01	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	559/1331	4.58	4.66	4.35	4.18	4.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	438/1333	4.75	4.74	4.40	4.22	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	180/1014	4.67	4.54	4.05	3.91	4.67

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>FYS 101D 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Turning To One Another</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Lee,Diane M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>16</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/180	****	****	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/194	****	****	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/178	****	****	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/181	****	****	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/165	****	****	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	18/62	4.92	4.77	4.46	4.33	4.92
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	33/65	4.62	4.54	4.43	4.13	4.62
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	40/63	4.31	4.53	4.29	4.12	4.31
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	19/61	4.85	4.71	4.47	4.61	4.85
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	2	0	2	9	4.38	30/61	4.38	4.33	4.19	3.98	4.38
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/40	****	4.71	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/40	****	4.71	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/32	****	4.57	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/29	****	4.71	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/21	****	4.57	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/39	****	****	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.30	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>FYS 101D 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Turning To One Another</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Lee,Diane M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>16</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	16	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	3						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>FYS 101Q 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Building a Culture of Pe</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Taylor,Joby B</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>19</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	94/1589	4.94	4.56	4.32	4.20	4.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	266/1589	4.78	4.38	4.29	4.28	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	184/1391	4.88	4.36	4.34	4.29	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	163/1552	4.82	4.36	4.25	4.16	4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1495	5.00	4.35	4.14	4.07	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	90/1457	4.89	4.46	4.15	3.99	4.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	210/1572	4.78	4.20	4.21	4.18	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	787/1589	4.78	4.50	4.66	4.59	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	0	6	10	4.47	411/1569	4.47	4.30	4.13	4.08	4.47
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	677/1530	4.65	4.58	4.49	4.45	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	352/1533	4.94	4.87	4.75	4.69	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	259/1528	4.82	4.64	4.35	4.31	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	558/1529	4.65	4.58	4.36	4.31	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	332/1393	4.53	4.53	4.06	3.99	4.53
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	117/1337	4.92	4.70	4.17	4.01	4.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	280/1331	4.85	4.66	4.35	4.18	4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	202/1333	4.92	4.74	4.40	4.22	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	232/1014	4.54	4.54	4.05	3.91	4.54

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>FYS 101Q 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Building a Culture of Pe</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Taylor,Joby B</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>19</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/62	5.00	4.77	4.46	4.33	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/65	5.00	4.54	4.43	4.13	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	16/63	4.88	4.53	4.29	4.12	4.88
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	18/61	4.88	4.71	4.47	4.61	4.88
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	13/61	4.75	4.33	4.19	3.98	4.75

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 1	A 17	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		Major 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 6	Under-grad 19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Non-major 3
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 5	
			P 0		**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other 2	
			? 1		



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>FYS 101R 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Sustainability in Amer C</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Turner,Rita J.</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>20</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	0	4	13	4.47	686/1589	4.47	4.56	4.32	4.20	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	0	6	11	4.26	933/1589	4.26	4.38	4.29	4.28	4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	600/1391	4.50	4.36	4.34	4.29	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	5	12	4.42	636/1552	4.42	4.36	4.25	4.16	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	197/1495	4.74	4.35	4.14	4.07	4.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	228/1457	4.68	4.46	4.15	3.99	4.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	2	2	5	6	3.50	1407/1572	3.50	4.20	4.21	4.18	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	3	9	7	4.21	1385/1589	4.21	4.50	4.66	4.59	4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	495/1569	4.42	4.30	4.13	4.08	4.42
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	452/1530	4.78	4.58	4.49	4.45	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	924/1533	4.78	4.87	4.75	4.69	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	322/1528	4.78	4.64	4.35	4.31	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	366/1529	4.78	4.58	4.36	4.31	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	3	1	13	4.59	282/1393	4.59	4.53	4.06	3.99	4.59
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	337/1337	4.67	4.70	4.17	4.01	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	599/1331	4.53	4.66	4.35	4.18	4.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	2	3	9	4.27	878/1333	4.27	4.74	4.40	4.22	4.27
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	102/1014	4.83	4.54	4.05	3.91	4.83

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>FYS 101R 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Sustainability in Amer C</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Turner,Rita J.</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>20</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/62	****	4.77	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/65	****	4.54	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/63	****	4.53	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	21/61	4.80	4.71	4.47	4.61	4.80
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	12/61	4.80	4.33	4.19	3.98	4.80
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	4.71	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	4.71	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	4.57	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	4.71	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	4.57	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/39	****	****	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.30	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>FYS 101R 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Sustainability in Amer C</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Turner,Rita J.</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>20</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 3	A 12	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 9	Under-grad 20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Non-major 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 5	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 4		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>FYS 101U 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>But is it Art? Filmmaker</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Kreizenbeck,Ala</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>17</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	845/1589	4.35	4.56	4.32	4.20	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	6	4.06	1121/1589	4.06	4.38	4.29	4.28	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	9	0	2	0	2	2	3.67	1250/1391	3.67	4.36	4.34	4.29	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	2	8	4	3.81	1259/1552	3.81	4.36	4.25	4.16	3.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	2	0	1	1	3	3.43	1347/1495	3.43	4.35	4.14	4.07	3.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	3	2	10	4.25	680/1457	4.25	4.46	4.15	3.99	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	8	3	4	3.63	1355/1572	3.63	4.20	4.21	4.18	3.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	14	1	4.00	1500/1589	4.00	4.50	4.66	4.59	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	9	3	4.15	816/1569	4.15	4.30	4.13	4.08	4.15
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	1	1	5	5	3.92	1371/1530	3.92	4.58	4.49	4.45	3.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	1167/1533	4.62	4.87	4.75	4.69	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	695/1528	4.50	4.64	4.35	4.31	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	3	2	3	5	3.77	1330/1529	3.77	4.58	4.36	4.31	3.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	426/1393	4.42	4.53	4.06	3.99	4.42
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	452/1337	4.50	4.70	4.17	4.01	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	379/1331	4.75	4.66	4.35	4.18	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	3	1	12	4.56	649/1333	4.56	4.74	4.40	4.22	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	341/1014	4.33	4.54	4.05	3.91	4.33

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>FYS 101U 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>But is it Art? Filmmaker</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Kreizenbeck,Ala</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>17</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/180	****	****	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/194	****	****	4.17	4.36	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	35/62	4.63	4.77	4.46	4.33	4.63
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	1	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	43/65	4.33	4.54	4.43	4.13	4.33
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	23/63	4.62	4.53	4.29	4.12	4.62
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	26/61	4.60	4.71	4.47	4.61	4.60
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	3	3	6	4	3.69	47/61	3.69	4.33	4.19	3.98	3.69
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/40	****	4.71	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/40	****	4.71	3.89	3.11	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>FYS 101U 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>But is it Art? Filmmaker</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Kreizenbeck,Ala</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>17</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/39	****	****	4.00	3.52	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 3	A 8	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 3	General 9	Under-grad 17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
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 2	
			? 0		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>FYS 102A 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Images of Madness</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tice,Carolyn J</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>14</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	505/1589	4.62	4.56	4.32	4.20	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	279/1589	4.77	4.38	4.29	4.28	4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	340/1391	4.71	4.36	4.34	4.29	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	238/1552	4.75	4.36	4.25	4.16	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	693/1495	4.25	4.35	4.14	4.07	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	218/1457	4.69	4.46	4.15	3.99	4.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	299/1572	4.69	4.20	4.21	4.18	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	1231/1589	4.38	4.50	4.66	4.59	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	155/1569	4.80	4.30	4.13	4.08	4.80
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	329/1530	4.85	4.58	4.49	4.45	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	469/1533	4.92	4.87	4.75	4.69	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.64	4.35	4.31	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	382/1529	4.77	4.58	4.36	4.31	4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	65/1393	4.92	4.53	4.06	3.99	4.92
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	337/1337	4.67	4.70	4.17	4.01	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	379/1331	4.75	4.66	4.35	4.18	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1333	5.00	4.74	4.40	4.22	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	1	2	0	5	4.13	491/1014	4.13	4.54	4.05	3.91	4.13

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>FYS 102A 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Images of Madness</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tice,Carolyn J</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>14</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/180	****	****	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	****	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/178	****	****	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/181	****	****	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	****	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/62	****	4.77	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/65	****	4.54	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/63	****	4.53	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/61	****	4.71	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/61	****	4.33	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	4.71	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	4.71	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	4.57	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	4.71	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	4.57	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/39	****	****	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.30	****



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>FYS 102A 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Images of Madness</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tice,Carolyn J</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>14</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 4	Under-grad 14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Non-major 2
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 5	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 2	
			? 2		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>FYS 102C 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Dvrsty,Ethics &amp; Social J</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Williams,Vickie</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>16</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	341/1589	4.73	4.56	4.32	4.20	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	467/1589	4.60	4.38	4.29	4.28	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	402/1391	4.67	4.36	4.34	4.29	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	286/1552	4.71	4.36	4.25	4.16	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	462/1495	4.47	4.35	4.14	4.07	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	372/1457	4.53	4.46	4.15	3.99	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	255/1572	4.73	4.20	4.21	4.18	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	373/1589	4.93	4.50	4.66	4.59	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	439/1569	4.43	4.30	4.13	4.08	4.43
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	523/1530	4.70	4.58	4.49	4.45	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.87	4.75	4.69	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	281/1528	4.78	4.64	4.35	4.31	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	428/1529	4.70	4.58	4.36	4.31	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	221/1393	4.63	4.53	4.06	3.99	4.63
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	146/1337	4.91	4.70	4.17	4.01	4.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	311/1331	4.82	4.66	4.35	4.18	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	253/1333	4.91	4.74	4.40	4.22	4.91
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	110/1014	4.80	4.54	4.05	3.91	4.80

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>FYS 102C 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Dvrsty,Ethics &amp; Social J</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Williams,Vickie</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>16</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/180	****	****	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/194	****	****	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/178	****	****	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/181	****	****	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/165	****	****	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	33/62	4.67	4.77	4.46	4.33	4.67
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	35/65	4.50	4.54	4.43	4.13	4.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	27/63	4.50	4.53	4.29	4.12	4.50
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	27/61	4.58	4.71	4.47	4.61	4.58
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	18/61	4.50	4.33	4.19	3.98	4.50
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	12/40	4.71	4.71	3.85	3.17	4.71
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	10/40	4.71	4.71	3.89	3.11	4.71
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	8/32	4.57	4.57	4.30	3.86	4.57
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	6/29	4.71	4.71	4.15	4.81	4.71
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	9/21	4.57	4.57	4.32	4.57	4.57
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/39	****	****	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.30	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>FYS 102C 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Dvrsty,Ethics &amp; Social J</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Williams,Vickie</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>16</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 7	Under-grad 16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	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 1	
			? 2		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>FYS 102C 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Dvrsty,Ethics &amp; Social J</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Small,Sue E</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>16</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	341/1589	4.73	4.56	4.32	4.20	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	467/1589	4.60	4.38	4.29	4.28	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	402/1391	4.67	4.36	4.34	4.29	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	286/1552	4.71	4.36	4.25	4.16	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	462/1495	4.47	4.35	4.14	4.07	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	372/1457	4.53	4.46	4.15	3.99	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	255/1572	4.73	4.20	4.21	4.18	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	373/1589	4.93	4.50	4.66	4.59	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	509/1569	4.43	4.30	4.13	4.08	4.43
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	644/1530	4.70	4.58	4.49	4.45	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.87	4.75	4.69	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	350/1528	4.78	4.64	4.35	4.31	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	530/1529	4.70	4.58	4.36	4.31	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	282/1393	4.63	4.53	4.06	3.99	4.63
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	146/1337	4.91	4.70	4.17	4.01	4.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	311/1331	4.82	4.66	4.35	4.18	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	253/1333	4.91	4.74	4.40	4.22	4.91
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	110/1014	4.80	4.54	4.05	3.91	4.80

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>FYS 102C 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Dvrsty,Ethics &amp; Social J</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Small,Sue E</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>16</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/180	****	****	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/194	****	****	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/178	****	****	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/181	****	****	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/165	****	****	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	33/62	4.67	4.77	4.46	4.33	4.67
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	35/65	4.50	4.54	4.43	4.13	4.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	27/63	4.50	4.53	4.29	4.12	4.50
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	27/61	4.58	4.71	4.47	4.61	4.58
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	18/61	4.50	4.33	4.19	3.98	4.50
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	12/40	4.71	4.71	3.85	3.17	4.71
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	10/40	4.71	4.71	3.89	3.11	4.71
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	8/32	4.57	4.57	4.30	3.86	4.57
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	6/29	4.71	4.71	4.15	4.81	4.71
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	9/21	4.57	4.57	4.32	4.57	4.57
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/39	****	****	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.30	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>FYS 102C 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Dvrsty,Ethics &amp; Social J</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Small,Sue E</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>16</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 7	Under-grad 16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	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 1	
			? 2		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>FYS 102Q 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>History under the Micros</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Erill Sagales,I</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	806/1589	4.39	4.56	4.32	4.20	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	5	6	3.72	1386/1589	3.72	4.38	4.29	4.28	3.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	3	10	4.11	996/1391	4.11	4.36	4.34	4.29	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	1	1	4	9	4.00	1081/1552	4.00	4.36	4.25	4.16	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	1	13	4.39	553/1495	4.39	4.35	4.14	4.07	4.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	2	5	8	4.00	886/1457	4.00	4.46	4.15	3.99	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	5	2	7	3.65	1344/1572	3.65	4.20	4.21	4.18	3.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	651/1589	4.83	4.50	4.66	4.59	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	2	6	5	4.00	957/1569	4.00	4.30	4.13	4.08	4.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	1	3	12	4.39	1038/1530	4.39	4.58	4.49	4.45	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	1012/1533	4.72	4.87	4.75	4.69	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	2	7	7	4.00	1171/1528	4.00	4.64	4.35	4.31	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	4	10	4.17	1081/1529	4.17	4.58	4.36	4.31	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	2	1	0	2	9	4.07	758/1393	4.07	4.53	4.06	3.99	4.07
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	631/1337	4.29	4.70	4.17	4.01	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	1	3	12	4.47	650/1331	4.47	4.66	4.35	4.18	4.47
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	570/1333	4.65	4.74	4.40	4.22	4.65
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	258/1014	4.47	4.54	4.05	3.91	4.47



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>FYS 102Q 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>History under the Micros</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Erill Sagales,I</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/194	****	****	4.17	4.36	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	1	1	0	1	12	4.47	39/62	4.47	4.77	4.46	4.33	4.47
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	2	2	3	3	5	3.47	58/65	3.47	4.54	4.43	4.13	3.47
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	2	4	8	4.20	43/63	4.20	4.53	4.29	4.12	4.20
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	3	11	4.53	31/61	4.53	4.71	4.47	4.61	4.53
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	4	1	3	2	5	3.20	54/61	3.20	4.33	4.19	3.98	3.20
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/40	****	4.71	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/40	****	4.71	3.89	3.11	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/29	****	4.71	4.15	4.81	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/39	****	****	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.30	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>FYS 102Q 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>History under the Micros</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Erill Sagales,I</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	16	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	11	Under-grad	18	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	6	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> FYS 102R 01	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 26
<b>Title:</b> Learning About, With, an		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 25
<b>Instructor:</b> Wolff,Michele K		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	2	2	4	15	4.25	957/1589	4.25	4.56	4.32	4.20	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	10	10	4.25	943/1589	4.25	4.38	4.29	4.28	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	16	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1162/1391	3.88	4.36	4.34	4.29	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	3	4	7	7	3.73	1320/1552	3.73	4.36	4.25	4.16	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	3	5	2	4	7	3.33	1381/1495	3.33	4.35	4.14	4.07	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	3	5	5	7	3.55	1252/1457	3.55	4.46	4.15	3.99	3.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	2	4	7	10	4.09	1023/1572	4.09	4.20	4.21	4.18	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	13	9	4.29	1313/1589	4.29	4.50	4.66	4.59	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	4	11	3	3.94	1031/1569	3.94	4.30	4.13	4.08	3.94
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	745/1530	4.61	4.58	4.49	4.45	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	2	18	4.73	1012/1533	4.73	4.87	4.75	4.69	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	1	5	15	4.43	780/1528	4.43	4.64	4.35	4.31	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	5	14	4.39	862/1529	4.39	4.58	4.36	4.31	4.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	1	5	15	4.55	315/1393	4.55	4.53	4.06	3.99	4.55
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	631/1337	4.29	4.70	4.17	4.01	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	2	4	10	4.29	795/1331	4.29	4.66	4.35	4.18	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	570/1333	4.65	4.74	4.40	4.22	4.65
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	2	0	0	5	9	4.19	444/1014	4.19	4.54	4.05	3.91	4.19

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>FYS 102R 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Learning About, With, an</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Wolff,Michele K</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>25</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/180	****	****	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/194	****	****	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/178	****	****	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/181	****	****	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/165	****	****	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	****/62	****	4.77	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	25/65	4.86	4.54	4.43	4.13	4.86
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	20/63	4.71	4.53	4.29	4.12	4.71
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	28/61	4.57	4.71	4.47	4.61	4.57
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	10/61	4.86	4.33	4.19	3.98	4.86
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/40	****	4.71	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/40	****	4.71	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/32	****	4.57	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	4.71	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/21	****	4.57	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/39	****	****	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.30	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>FYS 102R 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Learning About, With, an</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Wolff,Michele K</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>25</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 2	A 18	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		Major 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 5	Under-grad 25
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Non-major 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives 6	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 4	
			? 6		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>FYS 107C 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Love's Philosophy</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Seng, Phillip S</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>15</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	435/1589	4.67	4.56	4.32	4.20	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	467/1589	4.60	4.38	4.29	4.28	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	600/1391	4.50	4.36	4.34	4.29	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	668/1552	4.40	4.36	4.25	4.16	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	73/1495	4.93	4.35	4.14	4.07	4.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	308/1457	4.60	4.46	4.15	3.99	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	3	7	4.07	1041/1572	4.07	4.20	4.21	4.18	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	12	0	3.80	1556/1589	3.80	4.50	4.66	4.59	3.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	804/1569	4.17	4.30	4.13	4.08	4.17
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	6	4	4.08	1292/1530	4.08	4.58	4.49	4.45	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.87	4.75	4.69	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	554/1528	4.62	4.64	4.35	4.31	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	397/1529	4.75	4.58	4.36	4.31	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	435/1393	4.40	4.53	4.06	3.99	4.40
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	146/1337	4.90	4.70	4.17	4.01	4.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	322/1331	4.80	4.66	4.35	4.18	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	373/1333	4.80	4.74	4.40	4.22	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	5	7	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1014	****	4.54	4.05	3.91	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>FYS 107C 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Love's Philosophy</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Seng, Phillip S</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>15</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	23/62	4.89	4.77	4.46	4.33	4.89
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	3	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/65	5.00	4.54	4.43	4.13	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	5	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	19/63	4.75	4.53	4.29	4.12	4.75
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	17/61	4.89	4.71	4.47	4.61	4.89
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	36/61	4.22	4.33	4.19	3.98	4.22

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 5	A 13	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 8	Under-grad 15 Non-major 2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 0		