

Course-Section: INDS 330 0101
 Title WAYS OF KNOW:JOUR THR
 Instructor: SPITZ, ELLEN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 920
 JUN 26, 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	1	3	9	4.62	482/1522	4.62	4.78	4.30	4.34	4.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	4	1	3	3.08	1475/1522	3.08	3.77	4.26	4.25	3.08	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1285	****	4.60	4.30	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	5	2	3	3.23	1384/1476	3.23	3.96	4.22	4.26	3.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	205/1412	4.69	4.61	4.06	4.03	4.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	623/1381	4.23	4.37	4.08	4.13	4.23	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	5	3	5	0	0	2.00	1485/1500	2.00	3.02	4.18	4.13	2.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	784/1517	4.77	4.71	4.65	4.62	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	3	3	3	0	2.64	1471/1497	3.27	3.76	4.11	4.13	3.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	1159/1440	4.22	4.46	4.45	4.46	4.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	1060/1448	4.67	4.74	4.71	4.71	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	965/1436	4.26	4.42	4.29	4.30	4.26	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	1036/1432	4.20	4.47	4.29	4.29	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	2	1	3	5	4.00	606/1221	4.28	4.27	3.93	3.94	4.28	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	170/1280	4.83	4.89	4.10	4.14	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	205/1277	4.92	4.88	4.34	4.38	4.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	2	2	3	5	3.92	951/1269	3.92	4.40	4.31	4.39	3.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	287/ 854	4.33	4.27	4.02	4.00	4.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	57/ 79	4.50	4.58	4.58	4.53	4.50	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	1	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	59/ 77	4.00	3.78	4.52	4.30	4.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	4.00	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	41/ 78	4.67	4.61	4.45	4.34	4.67	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	4	1	1	0	0	1.50	77/ 80	1.50	2.42	4.11	3.33	1.50	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.75	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	13	Non-major	5
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	11	
?	1			

Course-Section: INDS 330 0101
 Title WAYS OF KNOW:JOUR THR
 Instructor: MCALPINE, STEVE (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 921
 JUN 26, 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	1	3	9	4.62	482/1522	4.62	4.78	4.30	4.34	4.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	4	1	3	3.08	1475/1522	3.08	3.77	4.26	4.25	3.08	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1285	****	4.60	4.30	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	5	2	3	3.23	1384/1476	3.23	3.96	4.22	4.26	3.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	205/1412	4.69	4.61	4.06	4.03	4.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	623/1381	4.23	4.37	4.08	4.13	4.23	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	5	3	5	0	0	2.00	1485/1500	2.00	3.02	4.18	4.13	2.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	784/1517	4.77	4.71	4.65	4.62	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	1	6	2	3.90	1034/1497	3.27	3.76	4.11	4.13	3.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	961/1440	4.22	4.46	4.45	4.46	4.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	916/1448	4.67	4.74	4.71	4.71	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	762/1436	4.26	4.42	4.29	4.30	4.26	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	758/1432	4.20	4.47	4.29	4.29	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	246/1221	4.28	4.27	3.93	3.94	4.28	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	170/1280	4.83	4.89	4.10	4.14	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	205/1277	4.92	4.88	4.34	4.38	4.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	2	2	3	5	3.92	951/1269	3.92	4.40	4.31	4.39	3.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	287/ 854	4.33	4.27	4.02	4.00	4.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	57/ 79	4.50	4.58	4.58	4.53	4.50	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	1	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	59/ 77	4.00	3.78	4.52	4.30	4.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	4.00	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	41/ 78	4.67	4.61	4.45	4.34	4.67	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	4	1	1	0	0	1.50	77/ 80	1.50	2.42	4.11	3.33	1.50	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.75	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	13	Non-major	5
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	11	
?	1			

Course-Section: INDS 430 0101
 Title INTERDIS SEMINAR/HONOR
 Instructor: DONATO, PAUL
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 922
 JUN 26, 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	9	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.78	4.30	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	639/1522	4.44	3.77	4.26	4.34	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	602/1285	4.44	4.60	4.30	4.42	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	357/1476	4.63	3.96	4.22	4.31	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	393/1412	4.44	4.61	4.06	4.11	4.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	470/1381	4.38	4.37	4.08	4.21	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	809/1500	4.22	3.02	4.18	4.25	4.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1037/1517	4.56	4.71	4.65	4.71	4.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	573/1497	4.33	3.76	4.11	4.21	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	604/1440	4.67	4.46	4.45	4.52	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	821/1448	4.78	4.74	4.71	4.75	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	672/1436	4.44	4.42	4.29	4.32	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	327/1432	4.78	4.47	4.29	4.34	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1221	****	4.27	3.93	4.04	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.89	4.10	4.28	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	470/1277	4.67	4.88	4.34	4.50	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	361/1269	4.78	4.40	4.31	4.49	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	380/ 854	4.17	4.27	4.02	4.31	4.17	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	44/ 79	4.75	4.58	4.58	4.67	4.75	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	1	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	72/ 77	3.33	3.78	4.52	4.60	3.33	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	54/ 65	4.00	4.00	4.49	4.65	4.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	49/ 78	4.50	4.61	4.45	4.58	4.50	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	43/ 80	4.25	2.42	4.11	4.14	4.25	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: INDS 480 0101
 Title INDS: CAPSTONE PRJCT S
 Instructor: LANOUE, PATRICI
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 923
 JUN 26, 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	197/1522	4.88	4.78	4.30	4.42	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	545/1522	4.50	3.77	4.26	4.34	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	278/1285	4.75	4.60	4.30	4.42	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	226/1476	4.75	3.96	4.22	4.31	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	265/1412	4.63	4.61	4.06	4.11	4.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	233/1381	4.63	4.37	4.08	4.21	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	1105/1500	3.88	3.02	4.18	4.25	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	802/1517	4.75	4.71	4.65	4.71	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	756/1497	4.17	3.76	4.11	4.21	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	532/1440	4.71	4.46	4.45	4.52	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	629/1448	4.86	4.74	4.71	4.75	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	357/1436	4.71	4.42	4.29	4.32	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	394/1432	4.71	4.47	4.29	4.34	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	461/1221	4.25	4.27	3.93	4.04	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	151/1280	4.88	4.89	4.10	4.28	4.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.88	4.34	4.50	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.40	4.31	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	330/ 854	4.25	4.27	4.02	4.31	4.25	

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 1		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	8
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 0		