

Course-Section: INDS 330 0101
 Title WAYS OF KNOWING
 Instructor: MCALPINE, STEVE
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 989
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	3	8	4.73	354/1639	4.74	4.74	4.27	4.28	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	191/1639	4.72	4.76	4.22	4.20	4.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	392/1397	4.51	4.86	4.28	4.26	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	347/1583	4.51	4.51	4.19	4.24	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	105/1532	4.83	4.18	4.01	4.05	4.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	146/1504	4.60	3.92	4.05	4.12	4.82	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	249/1612	4.65	4.25	4.16	4.12	4.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	928/1635	4.80	4.87	4.65	4.66	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	116/1579	4.84	4.67	4.08	4.07	4.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.81	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	546/1520	4.95	4.93	4.70	4.68	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	335/1517	4.72	4.74	4.27	4.23	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	276/1550	4.72	4.01	4.22	4.20	4.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	577/1295	4.55	4.48	3.94	3.95	4.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	369/1398	4.80	4.76	4.07	4.13	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	543/1391	4.80	4.95	4.30	4.35	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	224/1388	4.95	4.99	4.28	4.34	4.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	364/ 958	4.18	4.46	3.93	3.97	4.22	
Laboratory															
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.21	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.65	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: INDS 330 0201
 Title WAYS OF KNOWING
 Instructor: MCALPINE, STEVE
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 990
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	2	6	4.75	318/1639	4.74	4.74	4.27	4.28	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	393/1639	4.72	4.76	4.22	4.20	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	687/1397	4.51	4.86	4.28	4.26	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	640/1583	4.51	4.51	4.19	4.24	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	178/1532	4.83	4.18	4.01	4.05	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	514/1504	4.60	3.92	4.05	4.12	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	418/1612	4.65	4.25	4.16	4.12	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	706/1635	4.80	4.87	4.65	4.66	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	137/1579	4.84	4.67	4.08	4.07	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.81	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1520	4.95	4.93	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	347/1517	4.72	4.74	4.27	4.23	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	500/1550	4.72	4.01	4.22	4.20	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1295	4.55	4.48	3.94	3.95	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1398	4.80	4.76	4.07	4.13	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1391	4.80	4.95	4.30	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1388	4.95	4.99	4.28	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	411/ 958	4.18	4.46	3.93	3.97	4.14	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.04	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.50	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	47/ 82	4.50	4.50	4.52	4.59	4.50	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 78	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.60	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.65	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 82	5.00	5.00	4.16	4.08	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: INDS 330H 0101
 Title WAYS OF KNOWING
 Instructor: MCALPINE, STEVE
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 991
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.74	4.27	4.28	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.76	4.22	4.20	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.86	4.28	4.26	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.51	4.19	4.24	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1532	4.67	4.18	4.01	4.05	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	4.33	3.92	4.05	4.12	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1044/1612	4.67	4.25	4.16	4.12	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.87	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.67	4.08	4.07	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.81	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.93	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.74	4.27	4.23	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1550	4.67	4.01	4.22	4.20	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1295	5.00	4.48	3.94	3.95	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: INDS 330H 0201
 Title WAYS OF KNOWING
 Instructor: MCALPINE, STEVE (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 992
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	2	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.74	4.27	4.28	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.76	4.22	4.20	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.86	4.28	4.26	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.51	4.19	4.24	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	335/1532	4.67	4.18	4.01	4.05	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	824/1504	4.33	3.92	4.05	4.12	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1612	4.67	4.25	4.16	4.12	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.87	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.67	4.08	4.07	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.81	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.93	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.74	4.27	4.23	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1550	4.67	4.01	4.22	4.20	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1295	5.00	4.48	3.94	3.95	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.76	4.07	4.13	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.95	4.30	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.99	4.28	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	201/ 958	4.50	4.46	3.93	3.97	4.50	

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	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	2
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: INDS 330H 0201
 Title WAYS OF KNOWING
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 993
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.74	4.27	4.28	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.76	4.22	4.20	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.86	4.28	4.26	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.51	4.19	4.24	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	335/1532	4.67	4.18	4.01	4.05	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	824/1504	4.33	3.92	4.05	4.12	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1612	4.67	4.25	4.16	4.12	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.87	4.65	4.66	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.76	4.07	4.13	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.95	4.30	4.35	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.99	4.28	4.34	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	201/ 958	4.50	4.46	3.93	3.97	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: INDS 480 0101
 Title INDS: CAPSTONE PRJCT S
 Instructor: LANOUE, PATRICI (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 994
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	4	3	4.25	890/1639	4.54	4.74	4.27	4.42	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	722/1639	4.60	4.76	4.22	4.29	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1397	5.00	4.86	4.28	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	761/1583	4.14	4.51	4.19	4.31	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	469/1532	3.49	4.18	4.01	4.07	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1051/1504	3.28	3.92	4.05	4.20	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1198/1612	3.74	4.25	4.16	4.18	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1045/1635	4.81	4.87	4.65	4.72	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	6	1	4.00	889/1579	4.17	4.67	4.08	4.21	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	1094/1518	4.43	4.81	4.43	4.51	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	622/1520	4.84	4.93	4.70	4.75	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	886/1517	4.50	4.74	4.27	4.34	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	1077/1550	3.17	4.01	4.22	4.24	3.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	2	2	2	1	3.29	1089/1295	3.29	4.48	3.94	4.01	3.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	625/1398	4.63	4.76	4.07	4.23	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.95	4.30	4.48	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.99	4.28	4.50	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	411/ 958	4.57	4.46	3.93	4.24	4.14	

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	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	8
			P 0		Non-major
			I 0		1
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: INDS 480 0101
 Title INDS: CAPSTONE PRJCT S
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 995
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	4	3	4.25	890/1639	4.54	4.74	4.27	4.42	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	722/1639	4.60	4.76	4.22	4.29	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1397	5.00	4.86	4.28	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	761/1583	4.14	4.51	4.19	4.31	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	469/1532	3.49	4.18	4.01	4.07	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1051/1504	3.28	3.92	4.05	4.20	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1198/1612	3.74	4.25	4.16	4.18	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1045/1635	4.81	4.87	4.65	4.72	4.63	
Lecture															
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	1518/1550	3.17	4.01	4.22	4.24	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	625/1398	4.63	4.76	4.07	4.23	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.95	4.30	4.48	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.99	4.28	4.50	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	411/ 958	4.57	4.46	3.93	4.24	4.14	

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 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	8
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 1
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	5
			? 0		

Course-Section: INDS 480 0201
 Title INDS: CAPSTONE PRJCT S
 Instructor: DONATO, PAUL (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 996
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	5	4.83	231/1639	4.54	4.74	4.27	4.42	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	177/1639	4.60	4.76	4.22	4.29	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.86	4.28	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1010/1583	4.14	4.51	4.19	4.31	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	1491/1532	3.49	4.18	4.01	4.07	2.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	1445/1504	3.28	3.92	4.05	4.20	2.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1360/1612	3.74	4.25	4.16	4.18	3.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1635	4.81	4.87	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	569/1579	4.17	4.67	4.08	4.21	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	684/1518	4.43	4.81	4.43	4.51	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	802/1520	4.84	4.93	4.70	4.75	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	299/1517	4.50	4.74	4.27	4.34	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1550	3.17	4.01	4.22	4.24	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1398	4.63	4.76	4.07	4.23	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.95	4.30	4.48	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.99	4.28	4.50	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 958	4.57	4.46	3.93	4.24	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.83	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.50	4.52	4.49	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.59	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.16	4.02	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: INDS 480 0201
 Title INDS: CAPSTONE PRJCT S
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 997
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	5	4.83	231/1639	4.54	4.74	4.27	4.42	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	177/1639	4.60	4.76	4.22	4.29	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.86	4.28	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1010/1583	4.14	4.51	4.19	4.31	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	1491/1532	3.49	4.18	4.01	4.07	2.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	1445/1504	3.28	3.92	4.05	4.20	2.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1360/1612	3.74	4.25	4.16	4.18	3.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1635	4.81	4.87	4.65	4.72	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1398	4.63	4.76	4.07	4.23	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.95	4.30	4.48	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.99	4.28	4.50	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 958	4.57	4.46	3.93	4.24	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.83	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.50	4.52	4.49	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.59	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.16	4.02	****	

Frequency Distribution

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