

Course-Section: FYS 101D 0101
 Title TURNING TO ONE ANOTHER
 Instructor: LEE, DIANE
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 854
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	682/1576	4.47	3.96	4.30	4.11	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	4	7	3.84	1270/1576	3.84	4.00	4.27	4.18	3.84	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	583/1342	4.50	4.11	4.32	4.19	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	8	7	4.17	945/1520	4.17	4.16	4.25	4.09	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	7	6	3.89	996/1465	3.89	4.11	4.12	4.02	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	9	7	4.22	716/1434	4.22	4.27	4.14	3.94	4.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	8	8	4.26	827/1547	4.26	3.70	4.19	4.10	4.26	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	606/1574	4.83	4.72	4.64	4.59	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	449/1554	4.46	3.93	4.10	4.01	4.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	324/1488	4.86	4.22	4.47	4.41	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.71	4.73	4.65	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	596/1486	4.57	3.91	4.32	4.26	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	789/1489	4.43	4.04	4.32	4.22	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	7	0	3	1	0	3	3.43	1056/1277	3.43	4.16	4.03	3.91	3.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	214/1279	4.81	4.30	4.17	3.96	4.81	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	541/1270	4.63	4.34	4.35	4.09	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	444/1269	4.75	4.38	4.35	4.09	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	1	0	1	2	12	4.50	221/ 878	4.50	4.15	4.05	3.91	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	57/ 85	4.71	4.54	4.72	4.52	4.71	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	63/ 79	4.36	4.35	4.69	4.52	4.36	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	4	9	4.43	55/ 72	4.43	4.54	4.64	4.43	4.43	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	34/ 80	4.79	4.51	4.61	4.55	4.79	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	1	0	1	2	7	3	3.92	192/ 375	3.92	4.35	4.01	3.78	3.92	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	5.00	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	4.10	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: FYS 101D 0101
 Title TURNING TO ONE ANOTHER
 Instructor: LEE, DIANE
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 854
 JUL 2, 2009
 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 9	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 3	C 2	General 2	Under-grad 19 Non-major 19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 3	
			? 0		

Course-Section: FYS 102D 0101
 Title INVEST PROBS & IT SOLU
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 855
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	5	5	4	3.93	1222/1576	3.93	3.96	4.30	4.11	3.93	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	825/1576	4.36	4.00	4.27	4.18	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	850/1342	4.23	4.11	4.32	4.19	4.23	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	2	7	4.14	961/1520	4.14	4.16	4.25	4.09	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	688/1465	4.21	4.11	4.12	4.02	4.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	727/1434	4.21	4.27	4.14	3.94	4.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	657/1547	4.43	3.70	4.19	4.10	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	375/1574	4.93	4.72	4.64	4.59	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	1074/1554	3.89	3.93	4.10	4.01	3.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	1171/1488	4.17	4.22	4.47	4.41	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	1184/1493	4.54	4.71	4.73	4.65	4.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	841/1486	4.38	3.91	4.32	4.26	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	2	7	4.23	969/1489	4.23	4.04	4.32	4.22	4.23	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	593/1277	4.18	4.16	4.03	3.91	4.18	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	918/1279	3.86	4.30	4.17	3.96	3.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	928/1270	4.00	4.34	4.35	4.09	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	803/1269	4.29	4.38	4.35	4.09	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	139/ 878	4.75	4.15	4.05	3.91	4.75	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.54	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.35	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	4.54	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.51	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 375	****	4.35	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	****	5.00	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	281/ 382	3.20	4.10	4.08	3.86	3.20	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FYS 102E 0101
 Title WHAT SHOULD GOVRNMNT D
 Instructor: BRENNAN, TIMOTH
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 856
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	6	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	757/1576	4.43	3.96	4.30	4.11	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	608/1576	4.50	4.00	4.27	4.18	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1342	****	4.11	4.32	4.19	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	376/1520	4.63	4.16	4.25	4.09	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	137/1465	4.88	4.11	4.12	4.02	4.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	193/1434	4.75	4.27	4.14	3.94	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	387/1547	4.63	3.70	4.19	4.10	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	527/1574	4.88	4.72	4.64	4.59	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	532/1554	4.40	3.93	4.10	4.01	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	0	5	2	4.00	1233/1488	4.00	4.22	4.47	4.41	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.71	4.73	4.65	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	678/1486	4.50	3.91	4.32	4.26	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	378/1489	4.75	4.04	4.32	4.22	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	258/1277	4.60	4.16	4.03	3.91	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	365/1279	4.63	4.30	4.17	3.96	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	827/1270	4.25	4.34	4.35	4.09	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	567/1269	4.63	4.38	4.35	4.09	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	709/ 878	3.50	4.15	4.05	3.91	3.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 4	Under-grad 13 Non-major 13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	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 102G 0101
 Title: SEXLITY, HLTH & HUM RG
 Instructor: LOTTES, ILSA L.
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 857
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	179/1576	4.88	3.96	4.30	4.11	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	336/1576	4.71	4.00	4.27	4.18	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	480/1342	4.60	4.11	4.32	4.19	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	487/1520	4.53	4.16	4.25	4.09	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	159/1465	4.83	4.11	4.12	4.02	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	270/1434	4.67	4.27	4.14	3.94	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	4	10	4.22	871/1547	4.22	3.70	4.19	4.10	4.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.72	4.64	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	263/1554	4.67	3.93	4.10	4.01	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	1	14	4.61	736/1488	4.61	4.22	4.47	4.41	4.61	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	734/1493	4.83	4.71	4.73	4.65	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	379/1486	4.72	3.91	4.32	4.26	4.72	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	15	4.67	500/1489	4.67	4.04	4.32	4.22	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	229/1277	4.64	4.16	4.03	3.91	4.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	184/1279	4.88	4.30	4.17	3.96	4.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	288/1270	4.88	4.34	4.35	4.09	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	444/1269	4.75	4.38	4.35	4.09	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	245/ 878	4.46	4.15	4.05	3.91	4.46	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	71/ 85	4.43	4.54	4.72	4.52	4.43	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	49/ 79	4.71	4.35	4.69	4.52	4.71	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	42/ 72	4.71	4.54	4.64	4.43	4.71	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	45/ 80	4.57	4.51	4.61	4.55	4.57	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	161/ 375	4.43	4.35	4.01	3.78	4.43	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	5.00	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	4.10	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: FYS 102G 0101
 Title: SEXLITY, HLTH & HUM RG
 Instructor: LOTTES, ILSA L.
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 857
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: FYS 103C 0101
 Title ISSUES IN BIOTECHNOLOG
 Instructor: CRAIG, NESSLY C
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 858
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	3	2	1	3.67	1383/1576	3.67	3.96	4.30	4.11	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	0	2	1	3.17	1503/1576	3.17	4.00	4.27	4.18	3.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	899/1342	4.17	4.11	4.32	4.19	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1041/1520	4.00	4.16	4.25	4.09	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	738/1465	4.17	4.11	4.12	4.02	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	777/1434	4.17	4.27	4.14	3.94	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	1	0	1	2.33	1527/1547	2.33	3.70	4.19	4.10	2.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	606/1574	4.83	4.72	4.64	4.59	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1227/1554	3.67	3.93	4.10	4.01	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1233/1488	4.00	4.22	4.47	4.41	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	734/1493	4.83	4.71	4.73	4.65	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1330/1486	3.50	3.91	4.32	4.26	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1313/1489	3.50	4.04	4.32	4.22	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	1119/1277	3.20	4.16	4.03	3.91	3.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1022/1279	3.60	4.30	4.17	3.96	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	559/1270	4.60	4.34	4.35	4.09	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	584/1269	4.60	4.38	4.35	4.09	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	631/ 878	3.75	4.15	4.05	3.91	3.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	76/ 85	4.00	4.54	4.72	4.52	4.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	77/ 79	3.67	4.35	4.69	4.52	3.67	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	59/ 72	4.00	4.54	4.64	4.43	4.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	79/ 80	3.67	4.51	4.61	4.55	3.67	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	178/ 375	4.20	4.35	4.01	3.78	4.20	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	5.00	4.03	3.64	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.10	4.08	3.86	5.00	

Course-Section: FYS 103C 0101
 Title ISSUES IN BIOTECHNOLOG
 Instructor: CRAIG, NESSLY C
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 858
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: FYS 103D 0101
 Title GLOBAL WARMING
 Instructor: STAFF
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 859
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	3	8	4.21	1000/1576	4.21	3.96	4.30	4.11	4.21	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	5	4	4.00	1138/1576	4.00	4.00	4.27	4.18	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1110/1342	3.80	4.11	4.32	4.19	3.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	961/1520	4.14	4.16	4.25	4.09	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	483/1465	4.43	4.11	4.12	4.02	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	7	4	4.07	848/1434	4.07	4.27	4.14	3.94	4.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	2	8	4.21	882/1547	4.21	3.70	4.19	4.10	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	1288/1574	4.31	4.72	4.64	4.59	4.31	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	849/1554	4.13	3.93	4.10	4.01	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	624/1488	4.70	4.22	4.47	4.41	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	557/1493	4.90	4.71	4.73	4.65	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	678/1486	4.50	3.91	4.32	4.26	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	696/1489	4.50	4.04	4.32	4.22	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	366/1277	4.44	4.16	4.03	3.91	4.44	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	499/1279	4.45	4.30	4.17	3.96	4.45	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	3	1	6	4.09	905/1270	4.09	4.34	4.35	4.09	4.09	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	754/1269	4.36	4.38	4.35	4.09	4.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	204/ 878	4.56	4.15	4.05	3.91	4.56	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.54	4.72	4.52	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	52/ 79	4.67	4.35	4.69	4.52	4.67	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 72	5.00	4.54	4.64	4.43	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.51	4.61	4.55	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	138/ 375	4.83	4.35	4.01	3.78	4.83	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 326	****	5.00	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 382	****	4.10	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: FYS 103D 0101
 Title GLOBAL WARMING
 Instructor: STAFF
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 859
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FYS 103I 0101
 Title DYNAMICS OF PROBLEM SO
 Instructor: CARMI, SHLOMO
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 860
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	1	0	0	0	2.00	1575/1576	2.00	3.96	4.30	4.11	2.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1138/1576	4.00	4.00	4.27	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	972/1342	4.00	4.11	4.32	4.19	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1041/1520	4.00	4.16	4.25	4.09	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1386/1465	3.00	4.11	4.12	4.02	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1459/1547	3.00	3.70	4.19	4.10	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.00	4.72	4.64	4.59	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1448/1554	3.00	3.93	4.10	4.01	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1233/1488	4.00	4.22	4.47	4.41	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1411/1493	4.00	4.71	4.73	4.65	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1483/1486	2.00	3.91	4.32	4.26	2.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1415/1489	3.00	4.04	4.32	4.22	3.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	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	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	1
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	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FYS 104A 0101
 Title INTRCULTURAL EXPLOR:FIL
 Instructor: BELL, ALAN S
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 861
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					5	Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	Mean		Rank						

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	5	8	4.11	1081/1576	4.11	3.96	4.30	4.11	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	4	8	2	3.39	1445/1576	3.39	4.00	4.27	4.18	3.39	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	1	2	11	1	3.47	1221/1342	3.47	4.11	4.32	4.19	3.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	3	7	5	3.67	1300/1520	3.67	4.16	4.25	4.09	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	4	7	3	3.47	1257/1465	3.47	4.11	4.12	4.02	3.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	2	6	6	3.76	1087/1434	3.76	4.27	4.14	3.94	3.76	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	5	4	3	4	1	2.53	1515/1547	2.53	3.70	4.19	4.10	2.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.72	4.64	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	2	2	7	0	3.25	1390/1554	3.25	3.93	4.10	4.01	3.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	2	5	4	5	3.44	1398/1488	3.44	4.22	4.47	4.41	3.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	3	13	4.56	1167/1493	4.56	4.71	4.73	4.65	4.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	3	5	5	2	3.12	1411/1486	3.12	3.91	4.32	4.26	3.12	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	5	3	4	3.24	1385/1489	3.24	4.04	4.32	4.22	3.24	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	243/1277	4.63	4.16	4.03	3.91	4.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	3	5	4	3.85	922/1279	3.85	4.30	4.17	3.96	3.85	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	2	3	3	6	3.93	990/1270	3.93	4.34	4.35	4.09	3.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	3	1	3	3	4	3.29	1175/1269	3.29	4.38	4.35	4.09	3.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	0	2	2	3	2	3.56	698/ 878	3.56	4.15	4.05	3.91	3.56	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.54	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	1	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 79	****	4.35	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 72	****	4.54	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 80	****	4.51	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	4.35	4.01	3.78	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	2						