

Course-Section: HONR 200A 0101  
 Title TRAD CHINESE WRITERS  
 Instructor: SHIELDS, ANNA  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 973  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	271/1670	4.83	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	415/1666	4.67	3.84	4.27	4.27	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	191/1406	4.91	3.92	4.32	4.39	4.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	158/1615	4.92	3.91	4.24	4.29	4.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	170/1566	4.83	4.27	4.07	4.00	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	109/1528	4.92	4.03	4.12	4.11	4.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	361/1650	4.67	3.50	4.22	4.20	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	607/1667	4.92	4.82	4.67	4.64	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.09	4.11	4.06	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	276/1559	4.90	4.51	4.46	4.40	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	202/1549	4.90	4.42	4.31	4.25	4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.34	4.32	4.30	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	692/1323	4.00	4.30	4.00	4.08	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	285/1384	4.71	4.38	4.10	4.07	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.47	4.29	4.25	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.30	4.31	4.26	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	179/ 904	4.67	4.15	4.03	4.01	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 87	5.00	4.67	4.65	5.00	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	3	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.60	4.64	4.75	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	4	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 75	5.00	4.50	4.57	4.25	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	34/ 79	4.90	4.57	4.45	3.95	4.90
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	25/ 80	4.60	3.68	3.97	4.30	4.60

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
-----											
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HONR 211 0101  
 Title GREAT BOOKS SEMINAR II  
 Instructor: MASON, RICHARD  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 974  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	2	0	1	5	2	4	7	3.58	1518/1670	3.58	4.26	4.31	4.32	3.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	3	4	7	3	2	2.84	1632/1666	2.84	3.84	4.27	4.27	2.84
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	5	4	4	3	3	2.74	1389/1406	2.74	3.92	4.32	4.39	2.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	3	3	3	4	5	3.28	1526/1615	3.28	3.91	4.24	4.29	3.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	3	4	10	4.11	790/1566	4.11	4.27	4.07	4.00	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	4	3	5	6	3.58	1245/1528	3.58	4.03	4.12	4.11	3.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	7	3	4	3	1	2.33	1630/1650	2.33	3.50	4.22	4.20	2.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	2	13	4	4.11	1472/1667	4.11	4.82	4.67	4.64	4.11
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	3	3	7	1	3.27	1487/1626	3.27	4.09	4.11	4.06	3.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	1	6	2	5	3.79	1401/1559	3.79	4.51	4.46	4.40	3.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	725/1560	4.86	4.86	4.72	4.73	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	6	5	3	3.79	1294/1549	3.79	4.42	4.31	4.25	3.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	2	2	3	5	3.50	1379/1546	3.50	4.34	4.32	4.30	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	803/1384	4.08	4.38	4.10	4.07	4.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	970/1378	4.00	4.47	4.29	4.25	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	1039/1378	3.92	4.30	4.31	4.26	3.92
4. Were special techniques successful	9	9	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 904	****	4.15	4.03	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 87	****	4.67	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 79	****	4.60	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 75	****	4.50	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 79	****	4.57	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 80	****	3.68	3.97	4.30	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HONR 300A 0101  
 Title THE HERO AND THE QUEST  
 Instructor: GLASSER, JOEL  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 975  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	2	2	2	6	7	3.74	1453/1670	3.74	4.26	4.31	4.24	3.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	3	3	6	6	3.68	1443/1666	3.68	3.84	4.27	4.18	3.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	9	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	997/1406	4.10	3.92	4.32	4.22	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	3	2	4	3	7	3.47	1462/1615	3.47	3.91	4.24	4.18	3.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	5	10	4.33	559/1566	4.33	4.27	4.07	4.04	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	6	4	6	3.78	1140/1528	3.78	4.03	4.12	4.07	3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	6	2	5	5	3.50	1460/1650	3.50	3.50	4.22	4.12	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	405/1667	4.94	4.82	4.67	4.67	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	3	3	2	8	2	3.17	1517/1626	3.17	4.09	4.11	4.06	3.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	796/1559	4.59	4.51	4.46	4.40	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	1066/1560	4.69	4.86	4.72	4.67	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	4	4	7	4.06	1120/1549	4.06	4.42	4.31	4.25	4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	6	3	6	3.81	1268/1546	3.81	4.34	4.32	4.24	3.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	7	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	834/1323	3.89	4.30	4.00	3.99	3.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	5	1	0	2	2	2.50	1333/1384	2.50	4.38	4.10	4.12	2.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	4	0	2	2	2	2.80	1334/1378	2.80	4.47	4.29	4.30	2.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	6	0	3	0	1	2.00	1363/1378	2.00	4.30	4.31	4.33	2.00
4. Were special techniques successful	12	9	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 904	****	4.15	4.03	4.03	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 87	****	4.67	4.65	4.30	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 79	****	4.57	4.45	3.68	****

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	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	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	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HONR 300B 0101  
 Title PERFORMANCE  
 Instructor: KREIZENBECK, AL  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 976  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	4	4	4.22	1027/1670	4.22	4.26	4.31	4.24	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	2	2	3.56	1493/1666	3.56	3.84	4.27	4.18	3.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1406	****	3.92	4.32	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	3	2	1	3.43	1486/1615	3.43	3.91	4.24	4.18	3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	4	1	2	3.50	1285/1566	3.50	4.27	4.07	4.04	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	6	1	1	3.22	1407/1528	3.22	4.03	4.12	4.07	3.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	3	0	3	3.50	1460/1650	3.50	3.50	4.22	4.12	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.82	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	2	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1172/1626	3.86	4.09	4.11	4.06	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1092/1559	4.33	4.51	4.46	4.40	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	900/1549	4.33	4.42	4.31	4.25	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	919/1546	4.33	4.34	4.32	4.24	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.30	4.00	3.99	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.38	4.10	4.12	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.47	4.29	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.30	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	671/ 904	3.67	4.15	4.03	4.03	3.67
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	1	0	2	0	1	4	4.00	74/ 87	4.00	4.67	4.65	4.30	4.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	2	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	68/ 79	4.17	4.60	4.64	4.53	4.17
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	58/ 75	4.00	4.50	4.57	4.50	4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	60/ 79	4.14	4.57	4.45	3.68	4.14
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	3	0	3	0	1	2.43	75/ 80	2.43	3.68	3.97	3.76	2.43
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 1	Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	Major 0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	0	D 0	General 0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Under-grad 9
					Non-major 9
					Electives 0
					#### - Means there are not enough

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	9	
?	1			

Course-Section: HONR 300C 0101  
 Title ETHICS AND PUBLIC POLI  
 Instructor: STACEY, SIMON  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 977  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	2	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	611/1670	4.55	4.26	4.31	4.24	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	6	10	4.30	908/1666	4.30	3.84	4.27	4.18	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	16	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1406	****	3.92	4.32	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	7	10	4.35	750/1615	4.35	3.91	4.24	4.18	4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	9	10	4.35	540/1566	4.35	4.27	4.07	4.04	4.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	7	9	4.25	706/1528	4.25	4.03	4.12	4.07	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	3	5	6	6	3.75	1359/1650	3.75	3.50	4.22	4.12	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	405/1667	4.95	4.82	4.67	4.67	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	231/1626	4.72	4.09	4.11	4.06	4.72
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	435/1559	4.80	4.51	4.46	4.40	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	417/1560	4.93	4.86	4.72	4.67	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	294/1549	4.80	4.42	4.31	4.25	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	3	11	4.53	679/1546	4.53	4.34	4.32	4.24	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	10	4	0	0	0	1	1.80	****/1323	****	4.30	4.00	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.38	4.10	4.12	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.47	4.29	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	333/1378	4.86	4.30	4.31	4.33	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	8	7	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	461/ 904	4.00	4.15	4.03	4.03	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 87	5.00	4.67	4.65	4.30	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	1	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	51/ 79	4.63	4.60	4.64	4.53	4.63
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	3	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	48/ 75	4.50	4.50	4.57	4.50	4.50
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	38/ 79	4.67	4.57	4.45	3.68	4.67
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	4	1	4	4.00	37/ 80	4.00	3.68	3.97	3.76	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	18	Required for Majors		1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	1							
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	1	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	16	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		17				
				?	0							

Course-Section: HONR 300D 0101  
 Title AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP  
 Instructor: VAUGHAN, GEOFFR  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 978  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	518/1670	4.64	4.26	4.31	4.24	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	1199/1666	4.00	3.84	4.27	4.18	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	1083/1615	4.00	3.91	4.24	4.18	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	389/1566	4.50	4.27	4.07	4.04	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	504/1528	4.44	4.03	4.12	4.07	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	1	3	3	1	3.22	1548/1650	3.22	3.50	4.22	4.12	3.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.82	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.09	4.11	4.06	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	673/1559	4.67	4.51	4.46	4.40	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1090/1560	4.67	4.86	4.72	4.67	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	488/1549	4.67	4.42	4.31	4.25	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	310/1546	4.83	4.34	4.32	4.24	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	5	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1323	****	4.30	4.00	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.38	4.10	4.12	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.47	4.29	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.30	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	373/ 904	4.25	4.15	4.03	4.03	4.25
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.67	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.60	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.50	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.57	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 80	****	3.68	3.97	3.76	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	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	7				
				?	1						