

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	FYS 101T 01
Title:	Discussing Classics
Instructor:	Irvine,David E

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	19
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	0	3	5	5	3.93	1261/1560	3.93	3.91	4.35	4.17	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	982/1559	4.21	3.84	4.31	4.25	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	8	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	967/1371	4.17	3.88	4.38	4.27	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	4	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	408/1519	4.63	3.93	4.27	4.13	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	0	2	9	4.38	573/1452	4.38	3.97	4.18	4.04	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	6	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	889/1430	4.00	3.95	4.16	3.98	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	2	1	2	2	0	6	3.73	1296/1539	3.73	3.67	4.23	4.18	3.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	1051/1560	4.50	4.59	4.64	4.57	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	209/1545	4.71	4.02	4.14	4.07	4.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1496	****	4.07	4.49	4.43	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1498	****	4.77	4.75	4.67	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1496	****	3.93	4.37	4.31	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1494	****	4.08	4.37	4.28	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1352	****	4.05	4.12	3.98	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	0	12	4.47	508/1248	4.47	4.34	4.23	3.95	4.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	542/1250	4.60	4.46	4.39	4.13	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	306/1239	4.87	4.50	4.45	4.18	4.87

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	FYS 101T 01
Title:	Discussing Classics
Instructor:	Irvine,David E

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	19
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	2	0	3	10	4.40	311/906	4.40	4.13	4.13	3.98	4.40

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
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 3	Under-grad 16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		Non-major 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives 3	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 8		

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	FYS 102G 01
Title:	Sexuality, Health & Hum
Instructor:	Lottes,Ilsa L

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	19
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	1	4	11	4.28	958/1560	4.28	3.91	4.35	4.17	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	8	5	3.94	1221/1559	3.94	3.84	4.31	4.25	3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	1	5	7	3.72	1231/1371	3.72	3.88	4.38	4.27	3.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	3	5	7	3.94	1130/1519	3.94	3.93	4.27	4.13	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	14	4.67	272/1452	4.67	3.97	4.18	4.04	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	11	4.39	578/1430	4.39	3.95	4.16	3.98	4.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	1	1	6	8	4.12	1007/1539	4.12	3.67	4.23	4.18	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	17	4.89	502/1560	4.89	4.59	4.64	4.57	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	3	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	733/1545	4.25	4.02	4.14	4.07	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	6	4	6	3.78	1382/1496	3.78	4.07	4.49	4.43	3.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	615/1498	4.89	4.77	4.75	4.67	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	5	8	4.11	1114/1496	4.11	3.93	4.37	4.31	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	5	8	4.17	1062/1494	4.17	4.08	4.37	4.28	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	3	2	4	0	7	3.38	1212/1352	3.38	4.05	4.12	3.98	3.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	4	2	6	4.00	822/1248	4.00	4.34	4.23	3.95	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	2	2	3	6	4.00	945/1250	4.00	4.46	4.39	4.13	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	444/1239	4.77	4.50	4.45	4.18	4.77
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	491/906	4.08	4.13	4.13	3.98	4.08

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	FYS 102G 01
Title:	Sexuality, Health & Hum
Instructor:	Lottes,Ilsa L

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	19
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	27/64	4.88	4.41	4.44	4.50	4.88
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	2	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	40/58	4.17	4.05	4.37	4.32	4.17
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	4	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/52	****	4.22	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	2	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	32/66	4.67	4.57	4.41	4.53	4.67
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	1	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	32/63	4.29	4.02	4.09	4.17	4.29

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 2	General 7	Under-grad 18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		Non-major 2
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 6	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 1		

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	FYS 102K 01
Title:	Passive-Aggressive Behav
Instructor:	Freiberg, Karen

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	19
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	6	10	4.63	514/1560	4.63	3.91	4.35	4.17	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	384/1559	4.69	3.84	4.31	4.25	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	233/1371	4.83	3.88	4.38	4.27	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	274/1519	4.73	3.93	4.27	4.13	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	620/1452	4.33	3.97	4.18	4.04	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	519/1430	4.44	3.95	4.16	3.98	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	321/1539	4.69	3.67	4.23	4.18	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	15	1	4.06	1422/1560	4.06	4.59	4.64	4.57	4.06
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	304/1545	4.62	4.02	4.14	4.07	4.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	384/1496	4.81	4.07	4.49	4.43	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	389/1498	4.94	4.77	4.75	4.67	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	280/1496	4.81	3.93	4.37	4.31	4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	317/1494	4.81	4.08	4.37	4.28	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	504/1352	4.38	4.05	4.12	3.98	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	227/1248	4.80	4.34	4.23	3.95	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1250	5.00	4.46	4.39	4.13	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	279/1239	4.89	4.50	4.45	4.18	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/906	5.00	4.13	4.13	3.98	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	FYS 102K 01
Title:	Passive-Aggressive Behav
Instructor:	Freiberg, Karen

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	19
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/64	5.00	4.41	4.44	4.50	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	22/58	4.88	4.05	4.37	4.32	4.88
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	2	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	25/52	4.83	4.22	4.41	4.33	4.83
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/66	5.00	4.57	4.41	4.53	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/63	5.00	4.02	4.09	4.17	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	16	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	2						

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	FYS 102M 01
Title:	Handling Conflict Constr
Instructor:	Small,Sue E

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	2	3	6	4.36	852/1560	4.36	3.91	4.35	4.17	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	453/1559	4.64	3.84	4.31	4.25	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	1066/1371	4.00	3.88	4.38	4.27	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	284/1519	4.73	3.93	4.27	4.13	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	494/1452	4.45	3.97	4.18	4.04	4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	228/1430	4.70	3.95	4.16	3.98	4.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	185/1539	4.82	3.67	4.23	4.18	4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	3	4.27	1278/1560	4.27	4.59	4.64	4.57	4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	294/1545	4.63	4.02	4.14	4.07	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	228/1496	4.91	4.07	4.49	4.43	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1498	5.00	4.77	4.75	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	160/1496	4.91	3.93	4.37	4.31	4.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	317/1494	4.82	4.08	4.37	4.28	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	80/1352	4.90	4.05	4.12	3.98	4.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1248	5.00	4.34	4.23	3.95	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1250	5.00	4.46	4.39	4.13	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	252/1239	4.91	4.50	4.45	4.18	4.91
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	136/906	4.73	4.13	4.13	3.98	4.73

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	FYS 102M 01
Title:	Handling Conflict Constr
Instructor:	Small,Sue E

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/64	5.00	4.41	4.44	4.50	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/58	5.00	4.05	4.37	4.32	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/52	5.00	4.22	4.41	4.33	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/66	5.00	4.57	4.41	4.53	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	24/63	4.67	4.02	4.09	4.17	4.67
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.61	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	FYS 103B 01
Title:	Paradigms & Paradoxes
Instructor:	Liebman,Joel F

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	1	3	7	4.08	1153/1560	4.08	3.91	4.35	4.17	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	942/1559	4.25	3.84	4.31	4.25	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	634/1371	4.50	3.88	4.38	4.27	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	408/1519	4.63	3.93	4.27	4.13	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	0	0	4	2	3.86	1088/1452	3.86	3.97	4.18	4.04	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	840/1430	4.08	3.95	4.16	3.98	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	3	4	3	3.58	1363/1539	3.58	3.67	4.23	4.18	3.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	622/1560	4.83	4.59	4.64	4.57	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	7	1	3.90	1099/1545	3.90	4.02	4.14	4.07	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	3	8	4.42	995/1496	4.42	4.07	4.49	4.43	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	500/1498	4.92	4.77	4.75	4.67	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	6	4	4.00	1175/1496	4.00	3.93	4.37	4.31	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	5	6	4.25	993/1494	4.25	4.08	4.37	4.28	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	353/1352	4.50	4.05	4.12	3.98	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	470/1248	4.50	4.34	4.23	3.95	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	381/1250	4.75	4.46	4.39	4.13	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	458/1239	4.75	4.50	4.45	4.18	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	449/906	4.17	4.13	4.13	3.98	4.17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	FYS 103B 01
Title:	Paradigms & Paradoxes
Instructor:	Liebman,Joel F

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/214	****	4.00	4.31	4.30	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	35/64	4.75	4.41	4.44	4.50	4.75
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/58	****	4.05	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/52	****	4.22	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/66	5.00	4.57	4.41	4.53	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/63	5.00	4.02	4.09	4.17	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/26	****	****	3.89	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/25	****	****	4.01	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.61	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	FYS 103B 01
Title:	Paradigms & Paradoxes
Instructor:	Liebman,Joel F

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 3	Under-grad 13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Non-major 9
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 5	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 3		

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	FYS 103C 01
Title:	Issues In Biotechnology
Instructor:	Craig,Nessly C

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	5	1	4	2	2	2.64	1552/1560	2.64	3.91	4.35	4.17	2.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	8	1	3	2	0	1.93	1557/1559	1.93	3.84	4.31	4.25	1.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	4	3	2	3.00	1350/1371	3.00	3.88	4.38	4.27	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	6	3	1	1	1	2.00	1514/1519	2.00	3.93	4.27	4.13	2.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	4	1	0	1	1	2.14	1449/1452	2.14	3.97	4.18	4.04	2.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	2	3	2	2	2.57	1419/1430	2.57	3.95	4.16	3.98	2.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	6	2	1	1	0	1.70	1537/1539	1.70	3.67	4.23	4.18	1.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	363/1560	4.93	4.59	4.64	4.57	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	3	3	2	1	1	2.40	1526/1545	2.40	4.02	4.14	4.07	2.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	3	1	2	1	1	2.50	1487/1496	2.50	4.07	4.49	4.43	2.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	1239/1498	4.50	4.77	4.75	4.67	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	4	2	2	2	0	2.20	1492/1496	2.20	3.93	4.37	4.31	2.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	4	1	1	3	1	2.60	1478/1494	2.60	4.08	4.37	4.28	2.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	6	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1277/1352	3.00	4.05	4.12	3.98	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	4	0	4	3.50	1079/1248	3.50	4.34	4.23	3.95	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	1018/1250	3.90	4.46	4.39	4.13	3.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	4	1	0	0	5	3.10	1216/1239	3.10	4.50	4.45	4.18	3.10
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	852/906	3.00	4.13	4.13	3.98	3.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	FYS 103C 01
Title:	Issues In Biotechnology
Instructor:	Craig,Nessly C

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/214	****	4.00	4.31	4.30	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	1	3	0	0	1	1	2.40	63/64	2.40	4.41	4.44	4.50	2.40
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	1	3	2	0	0	2.17	57/58	2.17	4.05	4.37	4.32	2.17
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	3	1	2	0	2.83	50/52	2.83	4.22	4.41	4.33	2.83
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	2	0	2	3.17	63/66	3.17	4.57	4.41	4.53	3.17
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	5	1	0	0	0	1.17	63/63	1.17	4.02	4.09	4.17	1.17
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	FYS 1030 01
Title:	Microbes, Humans, and Hi
Instructor:	Schreier,Susan

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	2	6	4	2	3.43	1492/1560	3.43	3.91	4.35	4.17	3.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	7	1	3	3.21	1507/1559	3.21	3.84	4.31	4.25	3.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	1	5	4	1	2.93	1360/1371	2.93	3.88	4.38	4.27	2.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	3	4	3	1	2.85	1505/1519	2.85	3.93	4.27	4.13	2.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	1034/1452	3.92	3.97	4.18	4.04	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	6	5	2	3.50	1244/1430	3.50	3.95	4.16	3.98	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	4	5	1	3.07	1468/1539	3.07	3.67	4.23	4.18	3.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	919/1560	4.64	4.59	4.64	4.57	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	4	4	1	3.67	1264/1545	3.67	4.02	4.14	4.07	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	7	3	4.00	1281/1496	4.00	4.07	4.49	4.43	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	1328/1498	4.38	4.77	4.75	4.67	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	7	3	3	3.57	1362/1496	3.57	3.93	4.37	4.31	3.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	6	3	3.86	1256/1494	3.86	4.08	4.37	4.28	3.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	716/1352	4.17	4.05	4.12	3.98	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	798/1248	4.08	4.34	4.23	3.95	4.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	2	1	4	5	4.00	945/1250	4.00	4.46	4.39	4.13	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	861/1239	4.25	4.50	4.45	4.18	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	1	3	4	1	3.56	759/906	3.56	4.13	4.13	3.98	3.56

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	FYS 1030 01
Title:	Microbes, Humans, and Hi
Instructor:	Schreier,Susan

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	179/206	3.75	3.75	4.25	4.15	3.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	169/214	4.00	4.00	4.31	4.30	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	167/204	4.25	4.25	4.52	4.54	4.25
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	152/207	4.25	4.25	4.44	4.50	4.25
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/199	****	****	4.27	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/64	****	4.41	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/58	****	4.05	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/52	****	4.22	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/66	****	4.57	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/63	****	4.02	4.09	4.17	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	FYS 1030 01
Title:	Microbes, Humans, and Hi
Instructor:	Schreier,Susan

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	3.64	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	10	Under-grad	14	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						