

Course-Section: FYS 101B 0101  
 Title SCI VERSES RELIGION  
 Instructor: FREELAND, STEPH  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 771  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	750/1504	4.36	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	919/1503	4.18	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	8	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1290	****	4.32	4.28	4.19	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	643/1453	4.36	4.22	4.21	4.11	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	532/1421	4.27	4.08	4.00	3.91	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	558/1365	4.27	4.11	4.08	3.96	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	943/1485	4.09	4.20	4.16	4.13	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	1130/1504	4.45	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	137/1483	4.78	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	331/1425	4.80	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	502/1426	4.90	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	342/1418	4.70	4.29	4.25	4.20	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	407/1416	4.70	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	479/1199	4.27	3.95	3.97	3.82	4.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	638/1312	4.18	4.12	4.00	3.69	4.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	390/1303	4.73	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	203/1299	4.91	4.34	4.25	3.94	4.91
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	243/ 758	4.40	4.05	4.01	3.80	4.40
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.07	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 227	****	4.49	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 225	****	4.40	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	50/ 76	4.67	4.60	4.61	4.64	4.67
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	48/ 70	4.44	4.54	4.35	4.43	4.44
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	47/ 67	4.22	4.32	4.34	3.88	4.22
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	54/ 76	4.33	4.41	4.44	4.51	4.33
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	43/ 73	4.11	4.17	4.17	3.83	4.11
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	4.12	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	4.68	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.32	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.61	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														

1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	40	****	4.28	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	35	****	4.43	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	36	****	4.38	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	20	****	5.00	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	16	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: FYS 101B 0101  
 Title SCI VERSES RELIGION  
 Instructor: FREELAND, STEPH  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 771  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	5	Under-grad	14	Non-major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	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				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FYS 102 0101  
 Title FIRST YEAR SEMINAR (SS)  
 Instructor: STOLLE-MCALLIST  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 772  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.24	4.27	4.13	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.22	4.20	4.16	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1290	****	4.32	4.28	4.19	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.22	4.21	4.11	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.08	4.00	3.91	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1365	5.00	4.11	4.08	3.96	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.20	4.16	4.13	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	830/1504	4.80	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	119/1483	4.80	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.41	4.41	4.36	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.56	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.29	4.25	4.20	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.34	4.26	4.21	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1199	5.00	3.95	3.97	3.82	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.12	4.00	3.69	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.39	4.24	3.93	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.34	4.25	3.94	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 758	5.00	4.05	4.01	3.80	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: FYS 102A 0101  
 Title SEX, HLTH & HUMAN RIGH  
 Instructor: LOTTES, ILSA L.  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 773  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	191/1504	4.82	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	633/1503	4.41	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	7	4.24	800/1290	4.24	4.32	4.28	4.19	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	352/1453	4.59	4.22	4.21	4.11	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.08	4.00	3.91	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	164/1365	4.71	4.11	4.08	3.96	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	370/1485	4.59	4.20	4.16	4.13	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	173/1483	4.71	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.71
-----														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	688/1425	4.59	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.56	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	402/1418	4.65	4.29	4.25	4.20	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	164/1416	4.88	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	2	3	5	7	4.00	636/1199	4.00	3.95	3.97	3.82	4.00
-----														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	132/1312	4.87	4.12	4.00	3.69	4.87
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	248/1303	4.86	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	323/1299	4.79	4.34	4.25	3.94	4.79
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	260/ 758	4.36	4.05	4.01	3.80	4.36
-----														
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	29/ 76	4.93	4.60	4.61	4.64	4.93
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	4	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	28/ 70	4.78	4.54	4.35	4.43	4.78
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	11	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	29/ 76	4.79	4.41	4.44	4.51	4.79
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	1	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	34/ 73	4.38	4.17	4.17	3.83	4.38

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	17	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FYS 102B 0101  
 Title WHAT SHOULD GOVT DO?  
 Instructor: BRENNAN, TIMOTH  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 774  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	889/1504	4.25	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	972/1503	4.13	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	440/1453	4.50	4.22	4.21	4.11	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	548/1421	4.25	4.08	4.00	3.91	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	782/1365	4.00	4.11	4.08	3.96	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	990/1485	4.00	4.20	4.16	4.13	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	731/1483	4.17	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.17
-----														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	1165/1425	4.00	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	895/1426	4.71	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1013/1418	4.00	4.29	4.25	4.20	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	961/1416	4.14	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	987/1199	3.33	3.95	3.97	3.82	3.33
-----														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	716/1312	4.00	4.12	4.00	3.69	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	652/1303	4.43	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	395/1299	4.71	4.34	4.25	3.94	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	557/ 758	3.60	4.05	4.01	3.80	3.60
-----														
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	37/ 76	4.88	4.60	4.61	4.64	4.88
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	30/ 70	4.75	4.54	4.35	4.43	4.75
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	55/ 67	3.88	4.32	4.34	3.88	3.88
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	64/ 76	3.88	4.41	4.44	4.51	3.88
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	4	2	2	3.75	55/ 73	3.75	4.17	4.17	3.83	3.75

Frequency Distribution

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