

Course Section: INDS 430A 0101
 Title GLOBAL SOCIETY: PROSPE
 Instructor: DONATO, PAUL
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1056
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	1	7	4.88	151/1669	4.88	4.64	4.23	4.39	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	412/1666	4.63	4.30	4.19	4.22	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1078/1421	3.88	4.18	4.24	4.38	3.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	612/1617	4.43	4.34	4.15	4.22	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	112/1555	4.88	4.19	4.00	4.08	4.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	282/1543	4.63	4.22	4.06	4.18	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	481/1647	4.50	4.12	4.12	4.14	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	965/1668	4.75	4.76	4.67	4.70	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	127/1605	4.83	4.32	4.07	4.16	4.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	505/1514	4.71	4.62	4.39	4.45	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.91	4.66	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	491/1503	4.57	4.46	4.24	4.27	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	575/1506	4.57	4.35	4.26	4.29	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	1195/1311	2.75	3.50	3.85	3.88	2.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	298/1490	4.71	4.90	4.05	4.26	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	438/1502	4.71	4.68	4.26	4.46	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	329/1489	4.86	4.63	4.29	4.52	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	178/1006	4.67	4.42	4.00	4.21	4.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.50	4.38	4.74	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.00	4.22	4.48	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.50	4.20	4.27	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	3.50	3.95	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: INDS 430B 0101
 Title THE BUSINESS OF MEDICI
 Instructor: YAGER, STACEY
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1057
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	11	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.64	4.23	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	1042/1666	4.09	4.30	4.19	4.22	4.09	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1421	****	4.18	4.24	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	496/1617	4.50	4.34	4.15	4.22	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	773/1555	4.00	4.19	4.00	4.08	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	819/1543	4.11	4.22	4.06	4.18	4.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	896/1647	4.22	4.12	4.12	4.14	4.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1157/1668	4.56	4.76	4.67	4.70	4.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	538/1605	4.38	4.32	4.07	4.16	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	223/1514	4.89	4.62	4.39	4.45	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	843/1551	4.78	4.91	4.66	4.73	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	386/1503	4.67	4.46	4.24	4.27	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.35	4.26	4.29	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	90/1311	4.88	3.50	3.85	3.88	4.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.90	4.05	4.26	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.68	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.63	4.29	4.52	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	199/1006	4.60	4.42	4.00	4.21	4.60	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.50	4.38	4.74	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	11
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	8
			? 0		

Course Section: INDS 480 0101
 Title INDS: CAPSTONE PRJCT S
 Instructor: LANOUE, PATRICI
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1058
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	3	2	3	3.67	1409/1669	4.33	4.64	4.23	4.39	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	1	3.89	1250/1666	4.24	4.30	4.19	4.22	3.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1166/1421	4.33	4.18	4.24	4.38	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	3	3	3.78	1240/1617	4.22	4.34	4.15	4.22	3.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	963/1555	3.94	4.19	4.00	4.08	3.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1138/1543	4.07	4.22	4.06	4.18	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	1275/1647	3.88	4.12	4.12	4.14	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	965/1668	4.88	4.76	4.67	4.70	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	5	0	3.71	1241/1605	4.04	4.32	4.07	4.16	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	1064/1514	4.44	4.62	4.39	4.45	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	650/1551	4.93	4.91	4.66	4.73	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	1066/1503	4.30	4.46	4.24	4.27	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1392/1506	3.92	4.35	4.26	4.29	3.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	1227/1311	3.19	3.50	3.85	3.88	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1490	4.94	4.90	4.05	4.26	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	1013/1502	4.50	4.68	4.26	4.46	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	1223/1489	4.33	4.63	4.29	4.52	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1006	4.00	4.42	4.00	4.21	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	9
			P 0		Non-major
			I 0		1
			? 0		
				Other	6
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course Section: INDS 480 0201
 Title INDS: CAPSTONE PRJCT S
 Instructor: MCALPINE, STEVE
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1059
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	10	5.00	1/1669	4.33	4.64	4.23	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	439/1666	4.24	4.30	4.19	4.22	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	4.33	4.18	4.24	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	323/1617	4.22	4.34	4.15	4.22	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	773/1555	3.94	4.19	4.00	4.08	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	516/1543	4.07	4.22	4.06	4.18	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	1043/1647	3.88	4.12	4.12	4.14	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1668	4.88	4.76	4.67	4.70	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	538/1605	4.04	4.32	4.07	4.16	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	679/1514	4.44	4.62	4.39	4.45	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1551	4.93	4.91	4.66	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	464/1503	4.30	4.46	4.24	4.27	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	433/1506	3.92	4.35	4.26	4.29	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	3	0	5	3.89	712/1311	3.19	3.50	3.85	3.88	3.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	155/1490	4.94	4.90	4.05	4.26	4.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1502	4.50	4.68	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1489	4.33	4.63	4.29	4.52	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	479/1006	4.00	4.42	4.00	4.21	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	65/ 112	4.50	4.50	4.38	4.74	4.50	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	5.00	4.36	4.69	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	63/ 92	4.00	4.00	4.22	4.48	4.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	51/ 105	4.50	4.50	4.20	4.27	4.50	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	75/ 98	3.50	3.50	3.95	3.86	3.50	

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	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	8
			? 0		