

Course-Section: HONR 211 0101  
 Title GREAT BOOKS SEMINAR II  
 Instructor: SPITZ, ELLEN  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 904  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	3	3	4.50	549/1481	4.50	4.26	4.29	4.40	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	909/1481	4.17	4.26	4.23	4.29	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	2	0	4.00	893/1249	4.00	4.37	4.27	4.36	4.00		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	645/1424	4.33	4.27	4.21	4.28	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	102/1396	4.83	4.07	3.98	3.94	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	303/1342	4.50	4.12	4.07	4.05	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	0	1	3	0	3.20	1348/1459	3.20	4.19	4.16	4.17	3.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	951/1480	4.67	4.64	4.68	4.68	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	836/1450	4.00	4.10	4.09	4.15	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	1152/1409	4.00	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	753/1399	4.33	4.30	4.26	4.29	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	218/1400	4.83	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	840/1179	3.67	3.94	3.96	4.05	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	167/1262	4.80	4.18	4.05	4.11	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.40	4.29	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	680/1256	4.40	4.34	4.30	4.28	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	4.03	4.00	3.98	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.72	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.55	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	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	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	7	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HONR 220 0101  
 Title HONORS LEADERSHIP SEMI  
 Instructor: KORN, MARCELLA  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 905  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	2	3	3.75	1254/1481	3.75	4.26	4.29	4.40	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1136/1481	3.88	4.26	4.23	4.29	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1174/1249	3.20	4.37	4.27	4.36	3.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	740/1424	4.25	4.27	4.21	4.28	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	297/1396	4.50	4.07	3.98	3.94	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	434/1342	4.38	4.12	4.07	4.05	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	2	1	3.25	1337/1459	3.25	4.19	4.16	4.17	3.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	1215/1480	4.25	4.64	4.68	4.68	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	722/1450	4.17	4.10	4.09	4.15	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	648/1409	4.60	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1002/1399	4.00	4.30	4.26	4.29	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1017/1400	4.00	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	345/1262	4.50	4.18	4.05	4.11	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	358/1259	4.75	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	571/1256	4.50	4.34	4.30	4.28	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	604/ 788	3.50	4.03	4.00	3.98	3.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 68	5.00	4.66	4.49	5.00	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	36/ 69	4.50	4.26	4.53	4.83	4.50	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	3	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	45/ 63	4.00	4.24	4.44	4.00	4.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	34/ 69	4.60	4.19	4.35	4.72	4.60	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	54/ 68	3.20	3.98	3.92	3.55	3.20	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HONR 300A 0101  
 Title ARAB-ISRAELI CONFLICT  
 Instructor: FREEDMAN, ROBER  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 906  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1358/1481	3.50	4.26	4.29	4.29	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1320/1481	3.50	4.26	4.23	4.23	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	4.00	893/1249	4.00	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.27	4.21	4.27	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1083/1396	3.50	4.07	3.98	4.00	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	460/1459	4.50	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1349/1480	4.00	4.64	4.68	4.65	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1223/1450	3.50	4.10	4.09	4.10	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1152/1409	4.00	4.46	4.42	4.43	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1107/1407	4.50	4.77	4.69	4.67	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1002/1399	4.00	4.30	4.26	4.27	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	591/1400	4.50	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1179	5.00	3.94	3.96	4.02	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1146/1262	3.00	4.18	4.05	4.14	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1247/1259	2.00	4.40	4.29	4.34	2.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1246/1256	2.00	4.34	4.30	4.34	2.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: HONR 300B 0101  
 Title LITERATURE OF HOLOCAUS  
 Instructor: SKOLNIK, JONATH  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 907  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	996/1481	4.11	4.26	4.29	4.29	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	2	2	2	3.11	1410/1481	3.11	4.26	4.23	4.23	3.11	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1224/1424	3.67	4.27	4.21	4.27	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	193/1396	4.67	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	3	3	3.56	1093/1342	3.56	4.12	4.07	4.12	3.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	0	0	3	3	3.63	1219/1459	3.63	4.19	4.16	4.17	3.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	951/1480	4.67	4.64	4.68	4.65	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	5	2	0	3.00	1354/1450	3.00	4.10	4.09	4.10	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	968/1409	4.33	4.46	4.42	4.43	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	785/1407	4.78	4.77	4.69	4.67	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	4	1	2	3.38	1267/1399	3.38	4.30	4.26	4.27	3.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	1	4	3.67	1183/1400	3.67	4.35	4.27	4.28	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	541/1179	4.13	3.94	3.96	4.02	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	4	0	2	3.67	931/1262	3.67	4.18	4.05	4.14	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	588/1259	4.50	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	457/1256	4.67	4.34	4.30	4.34	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

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

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: HONR 300C 0101  
 Title ANTI-HERO EURO AMER LI  
 Instructor: GLASSER, JOEL  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 908  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	12	4.50	549/1481	4.50	4.26	4.29	4.29	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	12	2	3.75	1205/1481	3.75	4.26	4.23	4.23	3.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	4	5	3	3.92	971/1249	3.92	4.37	4.27	4.28	3.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	2	9	5	4.06	933/1424	4.06	4.27	4.21	4.27	4.06	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	96/1396	4.85	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.85	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	6	8	5	3.80	956/1342	3.80	4.12	4.07	4.12	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	9	6	4	3.65	1205/1459	3.65	4.19	4.16	4.17	3.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	11	3	4.13	751/1450	4.13	4.10	4.09	4.10	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	290/1409	4.83	4.46	4.42	4.43	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	545/1407	4.89	4.77	4.69	4.67	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	9	8	4.39	703/1399	4.39	4.30	4.26	4.27	4.39	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	480/1400	4.61	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.61	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	9	1	0	0	7	0	3.63	853/1179	3.63	3.94	3.96	4.02	3.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	610/1262	4.20	4.18	4.05	4.14	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	2	0	2	6	4.20	821/1259	4.20	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	1	6	2	3.90	984/1256	3.90	4.34	4.30	4.34	3.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	640/ 788	3.43	4.03	4.00	4.07	3.43	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	39/ 68	4.71	4.66	4.49	4.70	4.71	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	3	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	4	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	1	0	3	2	3.57	56/ 69	3.57	4.19	4.35	4.48	3.57	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	1	4	2	0	3.14	55/ 68	3.14	3.98	3.92	4.43	3.14	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	20	Non-major	4
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	1						

Course-Section: HONR 300D 0101  
 Title PERFORMANCE IN BALTIMO  
 Instructor: KREIZENBECK, AL  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 909  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	0	0	1	1	1	5	2	3.60	1324/1481	3.60	4.26	4.29	4.29	3.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	4	1	3.20	1394/1481	3.20	4.26	4.23	4.23	3.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1249	****	4.37	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	5	3	3.80	1160/1424	3.80	4.27	4.21	4.27	3.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	1345/1396	2.75	4.07	3.98	4.00	2.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	4	4	3.90	884/1342	3.90	4.12	4.07	4.12	3.90	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	1364/1459	3.13	4.19	4.16	4.17	3.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	997/1480	4.60	4.64	4.68	4.65	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	1098/1450	3.75	4.10	4.09	4.10	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	0	4	2	3.44	1303/1409	3.44	4.46	4.42	4.43	3.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	1069/1407	4.56	4.77	4.69	4.67	4.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	1	4	2	3.56	1227/1399	3.56	4.30	4.26	4.27	3.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1095/1400	3.89	4.35	4.27	4.28	3.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	0	1	5	0	3.43	934/1179	3.43	3.94	3.96	4.02	3.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	507/1262	4.33	4.18	4.05	4.14	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	729/1259	4.33	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	723/1256	4.33	4.34	4.30	4.34	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	650/ 788	3.40	4.03	4.00	4.07	3.40	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	4.13	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0	
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 0
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Other 7

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: HONR 300F 0101  
 Title DEATH AND DYING  
 Instructor: SMITH-CUMBERLAN  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 910  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	1	2	4	2	3.27	1419/1481	3.27	4.26	4.29	4.29	3.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	4	2	3.36	1368/1481	3.36	4.26	4.23	4.23	3.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	1	4	2	3.18	1175/1249	3.18	4.37	4.27	4.28	3.18	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	0	3	4	1	3.00	1361/1424	3.00	4.27	4.21	4.27	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	2	3	2	3.00	1292/1396	3.00	4.07	3.98	4.00	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	2	3	2	3.09	1257/1342	3.09	4.12	4.07	4.12	3.09	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	0	3	5	3.91	1048/1459	3.91	4.19	4.16	4.17	3.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	702/1480	4.90	4.64	4.68	4.65	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	6	1	0	2.78	1403/1450	2.78	4.10	4.09	4.10	2.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	1	4	2	3.40	1311/1409	3.40	4.46	4.42	4.43	3.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	728/1407	4.80	4.77	4.69	4.67	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	2	4	1	3.20	1303/1399	3.20	4.30	4.26	4.27	3.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	1	3	1	2.80	1344/1400	2.80	4.35	4.27	4.28	2.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	2	2	3	3	0	2.70	1109/1179	2.70	3.94	3.96	4.02	2.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	3	2	1	2.80	1190/1262	2.80	4.18	4.05	4.14	2.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	4	3	2	3.60	1079/1259	3.60	4.40	4.29	4.34	3.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	3	1	2	3	1	2.80	1203/1256	2.80	4.34	4.30	4.34	2.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	2	4	2	1	3.00	713/ 788	3.00	4.03	4.00	4.07	3.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	59/ 68	3.88	4.66	4.49	4.70	3.88	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	1	1	2	0	4	3.63	64/ 69	3.63	4.26	4.53	4.66	3.63	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	2	1	3	3.38	60/ 63	3.38	4.24	4.44	4.56	3.38	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	0	5	1	3.38	58/ 69	3.38	4.19	4.35	4.48	3.38	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	2	0	1	2	3	3.50	47/ 68	3.50	3.98	3.92	4.43	3.50	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	2	2	2	3.11	52/ 59	3.11	3.92	4.30	4.48	3.11	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	2	0	3	1	3	3.33	45/ 51	3.33	4.04	4.00	4.13	3.33	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	7	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	2	3	0	1	2	1	2.71	40/ 41	2.71	3.68	4.26	3.90	2.71	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	6	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	30/ 31	2.00	3.50	4.42	4.00	2.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 11	Non-major 0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 7		
				? 0			