

Course-Section: HONR 211 0101  
 Title GREAT BOOKS SEMINAR II  
 Instructor: SPITZ, ELLEN  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 861  
 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	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.24	4.27	4.26	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	751/1503	4.33	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.32	4.28	4.27	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	270/1453	4.67	4.22	4.21	4.20	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.08	4.00	3.90	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	782/1365	4.00	4.11	4.08	4.00	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1222/1485	3.67	4.20	4.16	4.15	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1221/1504	4.33	4.68	4.69	4.68	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	211/1483	4.67	4.07	4.06	4.02	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	572/1425	4.67	4.41	4.41	4.40	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.29	4.25	4.22	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.34	4.26	4.24	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.12	4.00	3.98	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.39	4.24	4.23	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.34	4.25	4.21	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HONR 220 0101  
 Title HONORS LEADERSHIP SEMI  
 Instructor: KORN, MARCELLA  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 862  
 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	1	8	4.89	146/1504	4.89	4.24	4.27	4.26	4.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	1052/1503	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	832/1290	4.20	4.32	4.28	4.27	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	0	6	4.22	810/1453	4.22	4.22	4.21	4.20	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	283/1421	4.56	4.08	4.00	3.90	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	129/1365	4.78	4.11	4.08	4.00	4.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	795/1485	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.15	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	850/1483	4.00	4.07	4.06	4.02	4.00
-----														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	1057/1425	4.22	4.41	4.41	4.40	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	1106/1418	3.89	4.29	4.25	4.22	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	806/1416	4.33	4.34	4.26	4.24	4.33
-----														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.12	4.00	3.98	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	450/1303	4.67	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.34	4.25	4.21	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	387/ 758	4.00	4.05	4.01	3.89	4.00
-----														
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	65/ 76	4.14	4.60	4.61	4.22	4.14
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	33/ 70	4.71	4.54	4.35	4.30	4.71
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	37/ 67	4.50	4.32	4.34	4.50	4.50
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	44/ 76	4.57	4.41	4.44	4.21	4.57
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	2	1	1	3	3.71	55/ 73	3.71	4.17	4.17	4.24	3.71

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 1		
56-83	2	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	1
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	6

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

Course-Section: HONR 300A 0101  
 Title UTOPIAN AND DYSTOPIAN  
 Instructor: GLASSER, JOEL  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 863  
 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	1	8	4.89	146/1504	4.89	4.24	4.27	4.27	4.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	1052/1503	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.22	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	588/1290	4.44	4.32	4.28	4.31	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	680/1453	4.33	4.22	4.21	4.23	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.08	4.00	4.01	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	0	5	4.25	581/1365	4.25	4.11	4.08	4.08	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	0	3	3	3.67	1222/1485	3.67	4.20	4.16	4.17	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	173/1483	4.71	4.07	4.06	4.08	4.71
-----														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	853/1425	4.44	4.41	4.41	4.43	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	378/1418	4.67	4.29	4.25	4.26	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	296/1416	4.78	4.34	4.26	4.27	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	213/1199	4.60	3.95	3.97	4.02	4.60
-----														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.12	4.00	4.09	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	450/1303	4.67	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	741/1299	4.33	4.34	4.25	4.30	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	243/ 758	4.40	4.05	4.01	4.00	4.40
-----														
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4.60	4.61	4.84	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4.41	4.44	4.51	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	36/ 73	4.33	4.17	4.17	4.25	4.33

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HONR 300B 0101  
 Title SHKSPRE BEYOND COMEDY  
 Instructor: OSHEROW, MICHEL  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 864  
 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	1	13	4.93	105/1504	4.93	4.24	4.27	4.27	4.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	722/1503	4.36	4.22	4.20	4.22	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	691/1290	4.36	4.32	4.28	4.31	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	222/1453	4.71	4.22	4.21	4.23	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	139/1421	4.79	4.08	4.00	4.01	4.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	297/1365	4.50	4.11	4.08	4.08	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	7	5	4.14	890/1485	4.14	4.20	4.16	4.17	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	999/1504	4.64	4.68	4.69	4.65	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	250/1483	4.62	4.07	4.06	4.08	4.62
-----														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	492/1425	4.71	4.41	4.41	4.43	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	402/1418	4.64	4.29	4.25	4.26	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	282/1416	4.79	4.34	4.26	4.27	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	1	2	1	5	3.80	795/1199	3.80	3.95	3.97	4.02	3.80
-----														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.12	4.00	4.09	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.39	4.24	4.27	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	182/1299	4.92	4.34	4.25	4.30	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	185/ 758	4.50	4.05	4.01	4.00	4.50
-----														
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4.60	4.61	4.84	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 70	5.00	4.54	4.35	4.24	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	1	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	48/ 67	4.17	4.32	4.34	3.98	4.17
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	39/ 76	4.67	4.41	4.44	4.51	4.67
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	44/ 73	4.00	4.17	4.17	4.25	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	14	Non-major	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	1						

Course-Section: HONR 300C 0101  
 Title GENERAL HONORS SEMINAR  
 Instructor: MASON, RICHARD  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 865  
 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	1	2	2	8	4.31	826/1504	4.31	4.24	4.27	4.27	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	1164/1503	3.85	4.22	4.20	4.22	3.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	661/1290	4.38	4.32	4.28	4.31	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	3	0	1	7	4.09	952/1453	4.09	4.22	4.21	4.23	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	2	7	4.15	633/1421	4.15	4.08	4.00	4.01	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	603/1365	4.23	4.11	4.08	4.08	4.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	705/1485	4.31	4.20	4.16	4.17	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	1121/1504	4.46	4.68	4.69	4.65	4.46
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	793/1483	4.10	4.07	4.06	4.08	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	920/1425	4.38	4.41	4.41	4.43	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	539/1418	4.54	4.29	4.25	4.26	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	209/1416	4.85	4.34	4.26	4.27	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1199	5.00	3.95	3.97	4.02	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	444/1312	4.43	4.12	4.00	4.09	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	401/1303	4.71	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	523/1299	4.57	4.34	4.25	4.30	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	4.05	4.01	4.00	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.51	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	13	Non-major	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HONR 300D 0101  
 Title ARAB-ISRAELI CONFLICT  
 Instructor: FREEDMAN, ROBER  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 866  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	1	5	4.57	455/1504	4.57	4.24	4.27	4.27	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	954/1503	4.14	4.22	4.20	4.22	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	440/1290	4.57	4.32	4.28	4.31	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	270/1453	4.67	4.22	4.21	4.23	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	182/1421	4.71	4.08	4.00	4.01	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	297/1365	4.50	4.11	4.08	4.08	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	380/1485	4.57	4.20	4.16	4.17	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1207/1483	3.57	4.07	4.06	4.08	3.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	255/1425	4.86	4.41	4.41	4.43	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	158/1418	4.86	4.29	4.25	4.26	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	380/1416	4.71	4.34	4.26	4.27	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1199	5.00	3.95	3.97	4.02	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	651/1312	4.17	4.12	4.00	4.09	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	563/1303	4.50	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.34	4.25	4.30	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	1 Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	1 Under-grad 7 Non-major 2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	5
			? 0		

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

Course-Section: HONR 390A 0101  
 Title  
 Instructor: MCKUSICK, JAMES  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 867  
 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	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.24	4.27	4.27	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	312/1503	4.67	4.22	4.20	4.22	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.22	4.21	4.23	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	212/1421	4.67	4.08	4.00	4.01	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	187/1365	4.67	4.11	4.08	4.08	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1222/1485	3.67	4.20	4.16	4.17	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1221/1504	4.33	4.68	4.69	4.65	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	543/1483	4.33	4.07	4.06	4.08	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.41	4.41	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	578/1418	4.50	4.29	4.25	4.26	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.34	4.26	4.27	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	636/1199	4.00	3.95	3.97	4.02	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.12	4.00	4.09	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.39	4.24	4.27	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	445/1299	4.67	4.34	4.25	4.30	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	273/ 758	4.33	4.05	4.01	4.00	4.33
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	3.98	4.43	4.52	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	40/ 56	4.00	4.12	4.23	4.13	4.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	4.61	4.44	4.47	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

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