

Course-Section: SCIE 520S 2301  
 Title PHY CONC PRIN APPL II  
 Instructor: ROLAND, JONATHA  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1476  
 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	4	3	4.43	726/1639	4.43	4.31	4.27	4.42	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	650/1639	4.43	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	517/1397	4.50	4.51	4.28	4.37	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	572/1583	4.43	4.31	4.19	4.31	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	553/1532	4.29	4.07	4.01	4.10	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	585/1504	4.29	4.14	4.05	4.29	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	603/1612	4.43	4.13	4.16	4.27	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	943/1635	4.71	4.78	4.65	4.81	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	283/1579	4.60	4.13	4.08	4.17	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	529/1518	4.71	4.46	4.43	4.49	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.76	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	510/1517	4.57	4.43	4.27	4.32	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	742/1550	4.43	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	155/1295	4.71	4.31	3.94	3.95	4.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	494/1398	4.43	4.37	4.07	4.22	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	279/1391	4.86	4.60	4.30	4.47	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	276/1388	4.86	4.53	4.28	4.49	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	201/ 958	4.50	4.39	3.93	4.01	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	24/ 224	4.83	2.92	4.10	4.43	4.83	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	56/ 240	4.67	2.70	4.11	3.96	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 219	5.00	5.00	4.44	4.23	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 215	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.72	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	19/ 198	4.80	4.80	4.18	4.74	4.80	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.74	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.15	4.52	4.74	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.71	4.47	4.52	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.72	4.47	4.50	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.14	4.16	4.37	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.07	4.04	3.64	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.00	4.05	4.03	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	4.67	4.75	4.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	4.33	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.33	4.56	4.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.07	4.45	4.39	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.50	4.51	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	4.20	4.69	4.61	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.33	4.37	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	4.42	****	

Course-Section: SCIE 520S 2301  
 Title PHY CONC PRIN APPL II  
 Instructor: ROLAND, JONATHA  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1476  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SCIE 533 8720  
 Title CULT RESP INSTR IN SCI  
 Instructor: QUINN, J.  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1477  
 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	6	4.67	430/1639	4.67	4.31	4.27	4.42	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	142/1639	4.89	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1397	****	4.51	4.28	4.37	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	548/1583	4.44	4.31	4.19	4.31	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	5	0	3.44	1276/1532	3.44	4.07	4.01	4.10	3.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	4	0	3.44	1240/1504	3.44	4.14	4.05	4.29	3.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	965/1612	4.11	4.13	4.16	4.27	4.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.78	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	6	1	4.00	889/1579	4.00	4.13	4.08	4.17	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	416/1518	4.78	4.46	4.43	4.49	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	855/1520	4.78	4.76	4.70	4.79	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	674/1517	4.44	4.43	4.27	4.32	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	832/1550	4.33	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	0	5	2	3.88	753/1295	3.88	4.31	3.94	3.95	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	329/1398	4.67	4.37	4.07	4.22	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	248/1391	4.89	4.60	4.30	4.47	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	363/1388	4.78	4.53	4.28	4.49	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	111/ 958	4.78	4.39	3.93	4.01	4.78	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.74	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	4.15	4.52	4.74	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	4.71	4.47	4.52	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.72	4.47	4.50	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	4.14	4.16	4.37	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	4	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	5	Non-major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SCIE 539 8720  
 Title INQUIRY INTO PRACTICE  
 Instructor: MURDOCK, JOHN  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1478  
 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	3	1	2	3	0	2.56	1628/1639	2.56	4.31	4.27	4.42	2.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	3	0	2.89	1607/1639	2.89	4.37	4.22	4.26	2.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1397	****	4.51	4.28	4.37	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	1	2	3.11	1517/1583	3.11	4.31	4.19	4.31	3.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	3	0	0	2.40	1510/1532	2.40	4.07	4.01	4.10	2.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	4	2	1	3.25	1340/1504	3.25	4.14	4.05	4.29	3.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	1	1	2	2	3.13	1506/1612	3.13	4.13	4.16	4.27	3.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	855/1635	4.78	4.78	4.65	4.81	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	2	5	2	0	3.00	1477/1579	3.00	4.13	4.08	4.17	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	1	3	0	0	2.17	1510/1518	2.17	4.46	4.43	4.49	2.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	1	3	2	3.63	1482/1520	3.63	4.76	4.70	4.79	3.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	4	2	1	0	2.57	1497/1517	2.57	4.43	4.27	4.32	2.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	3	0	0	2.00	1518/1550	2.00	4.20	4.22	4.23	2.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1295	****	4.31	3.94	3.95	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	2	2	0	2.71	1336/1398	2.71	4.37	4.07	4.22	2.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	3	0	2	2	3.43	1241/1391	3.43	4.60	4.30	4.47	3.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	3	1	2	1	3.14	1297/1388	3.14	4.53	4.28	4.49	3.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	658/ 958	3.67	4.39	3.93	4.01	3.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	4.74	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 82	****	4.15	4.52	4.74	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 78	****	4.71	4.47	4.52	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 82	****	4.14	4.16	4.37	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	45/ 50	3.33	4.07	4.45	4.39	3.33	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	4.50	4.51	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	42/ 43	3.00	4.20	4.69	4.61	3.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	4.33	4.37	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	4.42	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 3	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 6	Non-major 9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 7		
				? 0			