

Course-Section: INDS 330 01
 Title Ways Of Knowing
 Instructor: McAlpine, Steven
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 882
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	0	2	14	4.88	179/1447	4.62	4.51	4.31	4.32	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	187/1447	4.50	4.54	4.27	4.23	4.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	222/1241	4.59	4.58	4.33	4.33	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	114/1402	4.62	4.57	4.24	4.24	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	265/1358	4.31	4.41	4.11	4.10	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	91/1316	4.66	4.56	4.14	4.13	4.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	5	10	4.50	459/1427	4.43	4.32	4.19	4.15	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.98	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	296/1434	4.19	4.23	4.10	4.09	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1387	4.82	4.70	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1387	4.77	4.76	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	405/1386	4.53	4.59	4.32	4.30	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	111/1380	4.61	4.51	4.32	4.32	4.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	1	13	4.63	211/1193	4.59	4.65	4.02	4.05	4.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	203/1172	4.89	4.78	4.15	4.24	4.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	329/1182	4.72	4.78	4.35	4.42	4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	243/1170	4.94	4.81	4.38	4.49	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	2	0	0	2	3	3.57	637/ 800	3.59	4.06	4.06	4.12	3.57

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	14
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 8	Graduate	0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	0
			? 0		

Course-Section: INDS 330 02
 Title Ways Of Knowing
 Instructor: Vetter, Lisa Pac
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 883
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	761/1447	4.62	4.51	4.31	4.32	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	920/1447	4.50	4.54	4.27	4.23	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	692/1241	4.59	4.58	4.33	4.33	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	655/1402	4.62	4.57	4.24	4.24	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	799/1358	4.31	4.41	4.11	4.10	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	444/1316	4.66	4.56	4.14	4.13	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	644/1427	4.43	4.32	4.19	4.15	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.98	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	2	6	2	3.82	1045/1434	4.19	4.23	4.10	4.09	3.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	611/1387	4.82	4.70	4.46	4.44	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	1107/1387	4.77	4.76	4.73	4.71	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	784/1386	4.53	4.59	4.32	4.30	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	868/1380	4.61	4.51	4.32	4.32	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	256/1193	4.59	4.65	4.02	4.05	4.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1172	4.89	4.78	4.15	4.24	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	430/1182	4.72	4.78	4.35	4.42	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1170	4.94	4.81	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	630/ 800	3.59	4.06	4.06	4.12	3.60
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors		8	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	2							
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General		2	Under-grad	12	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	0							

Course-Section: INDS 430 01
 Title Interdis Seminar
 Instructor: Lanoue, Patricia
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 884
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	2	0	1	11	4.50	585/1447	4.50	4.51	4.31	4.43	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	292/1447	4.71	4.54	4.27	4.31	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	478/1241	4.57	4.58	4.33	4.41	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	259/1402	4.71	4.57	4.24	4.34	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	251/1358	4.64	4.41	4.11	4.15	4.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	322/1316	4.57	4.56	4.14	4.27	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	568/1427	4.43	4.32	4.19	4.20	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	388/1447	4.93	4.98	4.69	4.72	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	158/1434	4.75	4.23	4.10	4.17	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	337/1387	4.82	4.70	4.46	4.48	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.76	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	241/1386	4.82	4.59	4.32	4.34	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	261/1380	4.82	4.51	4.32	4.34	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	131/1193	4.75	4.65	4.02	4.00	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	163/1172	4.83	4.78	4.15	4.25	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.78	4.35	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.81	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.06	4.06	4.19	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 66	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.87	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 62	5.00	5.00	4.56	4.80	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	16/ 58	4.91	4.91	4.41	4.59	4.91
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	18/ 65	4.91	4.91	4.42	4.55	4.91
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	17/ 64	4.73	4.73	4.09	4.43	4.73

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 1						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 1						

Course-Section: INDS 480 01
 Title Inds: Capstone Prjct S
 Instructor: Jones,James Bra
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 885
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	5	4	4.30	820/1447	4.30	4.51	4.31	4.43	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	619/1447	4.44	4.54	4.27	4.31	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1241	****	4.58	4.33	4.41	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	685/1402	4.33	4.57	4.24	4.34	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	485/1358	4.38	4.41	4.11	4.15	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	549/1316	4.33	4.56	4.14	4.27	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	971/1427	4.00	4.32	4.19	4.20	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.98	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1052/1434	3.80	4.23	4.10	4.17	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	970/1387	4.33	4.70	4.46	4.48	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	1143/1387	4.50	4.76	4.73	4.76	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	607/1386	4.50	4.59	4.32	4.34	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	1030/1380	4.00	4.51	4.32	4.34	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	186/1193	4.67	4.65	4.02	4.00	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	377/1172	4.50	4.78	4.15	4.25	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	430/1182	4.67	4.78	4.35	4.49	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	710/1170	4.33	4.81	4.38	4.51	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 800	****	4.06	4.06	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0	Major 10	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3				
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General	0	Under-grad 10	Non-major 0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	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 1	Other	0		
				? 0				