

Course-Section: INDS 330 0101
 Title WAYS OF KNOWING
 Instructor: MCALPINE, STEVE
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1017
 FEB 11, 2009
 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 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 4.60 | 510/1649 | 4.08 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.27 | 4.60 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 4.67 | 362/1648 | 4.40 | 4.53 | 4.23 | 4.18 | 4.67 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 13 | 4.80 | 233/1375 | 4.49 | 4.68 | 4.27 | 4.22 | 4.80 | | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 4.73 | 254/1595 | 4.49 | 4.63 | 4.20 | 4.21 | 4.73 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 11 | 4.47 | 410/1533 | 3.83 | 4.23 | 4.04 | 4.05 | 4.47 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 4.60 | 310/1512 | 4.27 | 4.47 | 4.10 | 4.11 | 4.60 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 4.53 | 469/1623 | 4.37 | 4.42 | 4.16 | 4.08 | 4.53 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 5.00 | 1/1646 | 4.97 | 4.95 | 4.69 | 4.67 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 4.46 | 428/1621 | 4.00 | 4.24 | 4.06 | 4.02 | 4.46 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 4.87 | 301/1568 | 4.43 | 4.61 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.87 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 5.00 | 1/1572 | 4.75 | 4.87 | 4.70 | 4.64 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 4.87 | 206/1564 | 4.28 | 4.57 | 4.28 | 4.25 | 4.87 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 4.67 | 512/1559 | 4.05 | 4.43 | 4.29 | 4.23 | 4.67 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 4.50 | 303/1352 | 4.00 | 4.11 | 3.98 | 3.97 | 4.50 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 4.67 | 326/1384 | 4.33 | 4.67 | 4.08 | 4.11 | 4.67 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 4.56 | 578/1382 | 4.51 | 4.76 | 4.29 | 4.37 | 4.56 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 4.56 | 616/1368 | 4.41 | 4.72 | 4.30 | 4.39 | 4.56 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 4.44 | 249/ 948 | 3.94 | 4.33 | 3.95 | 4.00 | 4.44 | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 555 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 4.22 | **** | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/ 288 | 3.50 | 3.88 | 3.68 | 3.58 | **** | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 312 | **** | **** | 3.68 | 3.60 | **** | |

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 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | B 6 | | Graduate |
| 56-83 | 4 | 2.00-2.99 | C 1 | General | 1 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | D 0 | | Under-grad 15 |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | F 0 | Electives | 1 |
| | | | P 0 | | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 13 |
| | | | ? 0 | | |

Course-Section: INDS 330 0201
 Title WAYS OF KNOWING
 Instructor: PACE VETTER, LI
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1018
 FEB 11, 2009
 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 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 3.56 | 1481/1649 | 4.08 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.27 | 3.56 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 8 | 4.13 | 1043/1648 | 4.40 | 4.53 | 4.23 | 4.18 | 4.13 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 4 | 4.19 | 862/1375 | 4.49 | 4.68 | 4.27 | 4.22 | 4.19 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 4.25 | 818/1595 | 4.49 | 4.63 | 4.20 | 4.21 | 4.25 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 3.19 | 1392/1533 | 3.83 | 4.23 | 4.04 | 4.05 | 3.19 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 3.94 | 980/1512 | 4.27 | 4.47 | 4.10 | 4.11 | 3.94 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 4.20 | 883/1623 | 4.37 | 4.42 | 4.16 | 4.08 | 4.20 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 4.94 | 465/1646 | 4.97 | 4.95 | 4.69 | 4.67 | 4.94 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 4 | 2 | 3.53 | 1332/1621 | 4.00 | 4.24 | 4.06 | 4.02 | 3.53 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 4.00 | 1279/1568 | 4.43 | 4.61 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.00 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 9 | 4.50 | 1241/1572 | 4.75 | 4.87 | 4.70 | 4.64 | 4.50 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 3 | 3.69 | 1328/1564 | 4.28 | 4.57 | 4.28 | 4.25 | 3.69 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3.44 | 1396/1559 | 4.05 | 4.43 | 4.29 | 4.23 | 3.44 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3.50 | 1049/1352 | 4.00 | 4.11 | 3.98 | 3.97 | 3.50 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 4.00 | 795/1384 | 4.33 | 4.67 | 4.08 | 4.11 | 4.00 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 4.45 | 666/1382 | 4.51 | 4.76 | 4.29 | 4.37 | 4.45 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 4.27 | 832/1368 | 4.41 | 4.72 | 4.30 | 4.39 | 4.27 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 5 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 3.44 | 727/ 948 | 3.94 | 4.33 | 3.95 | 4.00 | 3.44 | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 555 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 4.22 | **** | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4.25 | 65/ 88 | 4.25 | 4.71 | 4.54 | 4.63 | 4.25 | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3.75 | 78/ 85 | 3.75 | 4.39 | 4.47 | 4.55 | 3.75 | |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 12 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2.75 | 80/ 81 | 2.75 | 4.17 | 4.43 | 4.30 | 2.75 | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 12 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3.25 | 87/ 92 | 3.25 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 4.46 | 3.25 | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3.50 | 190/ 288 | 3.50 | 3.88 | 3.68 | 3.58 | 3.50 | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | A | 7 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 12 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 6 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 4 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 0 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 16 | Non-major | 4 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 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 | 15 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: INDS 430A 0101
 Title GREENWAY DESIGNS SE
 Instructor: LANOUE, PATRICI
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1019
 FEB 11, 2009
 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 | 2 | 6 | 4.56 | 577/1649 | 4.56 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.50 | 4.56 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 4.44 | 643/1648 | 4.44 | 4.53 | 4.23 | 4.36 | 4.44 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/1375 | **** | 4.68 | 4.27 | 4.48 | **** | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 4.75 | 236/1595 | 4.75 | 4.63 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.75 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1533 | 5.00 | 4.23 | 4.04 | 4.14 | 5.00 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4.33 | 595/1512 | 4.33 | 4.47 | 4.10 | 4.26 | 4.33 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 4.44 | 581/1623 | 4.44 | 4.42 | 4.16 | 4.27 | 4.44 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1646 | 5.00 | 4.95 | 4.69 | 4.71 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4.57 | 313/1621 | 4.57 | 4.24 | 4.06 | 4.24 | 4.57 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 4.63 | 699/1568 | 4.63 | 4.61 | 4.43 | 4.54 | 4.63 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1572 | 5.00 | 4.87 | 4.70 | 4.79 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 4.75 | 342/1564 | 4.75 | 4.57 | 4.28 | 4.40 | 4.75 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 4.63 | 561/1559 | 4.63 | 4.43 | 4.29 | 4.41 | 4.63 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4.00 | 690/1352 | 4.00 | 4.11 | 3.98 | 4.07 | 4.00 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | 165/1384 | 4.88 | 4.67 | 4.08 | 4.35 | 4.88 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1382 | 5.00 | 4.76 | 4.29 | 4.56 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 4.75 | 426/1368 | 4.75 | 4.72 | 4.30 | 4.58 | 4.75 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 4.75 | 122/ 948 | 4.75 | 4.33 | 3.95 | 4.31 | 4.75 | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 8 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 243 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 4.61 | **** | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 555 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 4.41 | **** | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | 31/ 88 | 4.88 | 4.71 | 4.54 | 4.66 | 4.88 | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 4.75 | 31/ 85 | 4.75 | 4.39 | 4.47 | 4.54 | 4.75 | |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 4.75 | 30/ 81 | 4.75 | 4.17 | 4.43 | 4.57 | 4.75 | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 4.75 | 28/ 92 | 4.75 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 4.44 | 4.75 | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4.13 | 78/ 288 | 4.13 | 3.88 | 3.68 | 3.71 | 4.13 | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 52 | **** | **** | 4.06 | 4.86 | **** | |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 48 | **** | **** | 4.09 | 4.42 | **** | |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 39 | **** | **** | 4.47 | 4.52 | **** | |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 39 | **** | **** | 4.38 | 4.59 | **** | |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 312 | **** | **** | 3.68 | 3.95 | **** | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 53 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 4.64 | **** | |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 30 | **** | **** | 4.16 | 4.24 | **** | |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 41 | **** | **** | 4.43 | 4.84 | **** | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 110 | **** | **** | 3.99 | 4.22 | **** | |

Course-Section: INDS 430A 0101
 Title GREENWAY DESIGNS SE
 Instructor: LANOUE, PATRICI
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1019
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|---|---------------------|------|---|---|-----------|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 5 | Required for Majors | 1 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 8 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 3 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 1 | General | 1 | Under-grad | 9 | Non-major | 1 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | 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 | 6 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: INDS 480 0101
 Title INDS: CAPSTONE PRJCT S
 Instructor: SCOTT, JAMES L
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1020
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | | | | Instructor Mean | Instructor Rank | Course Mean | Dept Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|---|------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.67 | 433/1649 | 4.69 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.50 | 4.67 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 195/1648 | 4.70 | 4.53 | 4.23 | 4.36 | 4.83 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1375 | 4.88 | 4.68 | 4.27 | 4.48 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 174/1595 | 4.70 | 4.63 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.83 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 4.33 | 545/1533 | 4.24 | 4.23 | 4.04 | 4.14 | 4.33 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 142/1512 | 4.75 | 4.47 | 4.10 | 4.26 | 4.83 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.50 | 502/1623 | 4.46 | 4.42 | 4.16 | 4.27 | 4.50 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 782/1646 | 4.92 | 4.95 | 4.69 | 4.71 | 4.83 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4.25 | 687/1621 | 4.32 | 4.24 | 4.06 | 4.24 | 4.25 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 344/1568 | 4.77 | 4.61 | 4.43 | 4.54 | 4.83 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 765/1572 | 4.92 | 4.87 | 4.70 | 4.79 | 4.83 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.67 | 473/1564 | 4.76 | 4.57 | 4.28 | 4.40 | 4.67 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 284/1559 | 4.70 | 4.43 | 4.29 | 4.41 | 4.83 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | 690/1352 | 4.29 | 4.11 | 3.98 | 4.07 | 4.00 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 201/1384 | 4.90 | 4.67 | 4.08 | 4.35 | 4.80 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 342/1382 | 4.90 | 4.76 | 4.29 | 4.56 | 4.80 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1368 | 5.00 | 4.72 | 4.30 | 4.58 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | 342/ 948 | 4.50 | 4.33 | 3.95 | 4.31 | 4.25 | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 555 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 4.41 | **** | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/ 88 | 5.00 | 4.71 | 4.54 | 4.66 | 5.00 | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 38/ 85 | 4.67 | 4.39 | 4.47 | 4.54 | 4.67 | |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/ 81 | 5.00 | 4.17 | 4.43 | 4.57 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/ 92 | 5.00 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 4.44 | 5.00 | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | 83/ 288 | 4.00 | 3.88 | 3.68 | 3.71 | 4.00 | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 312 | **** | **** | 3.68 | 3.95 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: INDS 480 0201
 Title INDS: CAPSTONE PRJCT S
 Instructor: MCALPINE, STEVE
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1021
 FEB 11, 2009
 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 | 0 | 6 | 4.71 | 372/1649 | 4.69 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.50 | 4.71 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 4.57 | 475/1648 | 4.70 | 4.53 | 4.23 | 4.36 | 4.57 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 296/1375 | 4.88 | 4.68 | 4.27 | 4.48 | 4.75 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4.57 | 417/1595 | 4.70 | 4.63 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.57 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.14 | 718/1533 | 4.24 | 4.23 | 4.04 | 4.14 | 4.14 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 4.67 | 263/1512 | 4.75 | 4.47 | 4.10 | 4.26 | 4.67 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 4.43 | 608/1623 | 4.46 | 4.42 | 4.16 | 4.27 | 4.43 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1646 | 4.92 | 4.95 | 4.69 | 4.71 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.40 | 511/1621 | 4.32 | 4.24 | 4.06 | 4.24 | 4.40 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 554/1568 | 4.77 | 4.61 | 4.43 | 4.54 | 4.71 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1572 | 4.92 | 4.87 | 4.70 | 4.79 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 216/1564 | 4.76 | 4.57 | 4.28 | 4.40 | 4.86 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4.57 | 618/1559 | 4.70 | 4.43 | 4.29 | 4.41 | 4.57 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4.57 | 263/1352 | 4.29 | 4.11 | 3.98 | 4.07 | 4.57 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1384 | 4.90 | 4.67 | 4.08 | 4.35 | 5.00 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1382 | 4.90 | 4.76 | 4.29 | 4.56 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1368 | 5.00 | 4.72 | 4.30 | 4.58 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 122/ 948 | 4.50 | 4.33 | 3.95 | 4.31 | 4.75 | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 88 | 5.00 | 4.71 | 4.54 | 4.66 | **** | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 85 | 4.67 | 4.39 | 4.47 | 4.54 | **** | |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 81 | 5.00 | 4.17 | 4.43 | 4.57 | **** | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 92 | 5.00 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 4.44 | **** | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 288 | 4.00 | 3.88 | 3.68 | 3.71 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | A 5 | Required for Majors | 0 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | B 1 | | Graduate 0 |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | C 0 | General | 0 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | D 0 | | Under-grad 7 |
| 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 | | |