Course-Section: AMST 100 0101

Title IDEAS/IMAGES:AMER CULT

Instructor: BRYAN, KATHY

Enrollment: 40
Questionnaires: 30

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 34 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	3	8	19	4.53	595/1576	4.23	4.41	4.30	4.11	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	6	20	4.59	502/1576	4.48	4.45	4.27	4.18	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	21	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	406/1342	4.51	4.51	4.32	4.19	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	6	20	4.47	579/1520	4.37	4.50	4.25	4.09	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	10	17	4.43	468/1465	4.34	4.44	4.12	4.02	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	7	20	4.57	353/1434	4.34	4.44	4.14	3.94	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	5	5	18	4.46	592/1547	4.32	4.34	4.19	4.10	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	23	6	4.17	1386/1574	4.46	4.41	4.64	4.59	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	8	16	4.48	422/1554	4.28	4.38	4.10	4.01	4.48
Lecture														
<ol> <li>Were the instructor's lectures well prepared</li> </ol>	1	0	0	0	0	8	21	4.72	568/1488	4.55	4.66	4.47	4.41	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	27	4.93	390/1493		4.87	4.73	4.65	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	23	4.76	339/1486		4.63	4.32	4.26	4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	23	4.76	378/1489		4.61	4.32	4.22	4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	4	5	19	4.54	293/1277	4.16	4.18	4.03	3.91	4.54
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	543/1279	4.41	4.67	4.17	3.96	4.41
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	401/1270	4.65	4.76	4.35	4.09	4.76
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	299/1269	4.71	4.77	4.35	4.09	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	14	8	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	221/ 878	4.54	4.28	4.05	3.91	4.50

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	13	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	1	Major	5
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	29	Non-major	25
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 100 0201

Title IDEAS/IMAGES:AMER CULT

Instructor: CRASE, KIRSTEN

Enrollment: 40 Questionnaires: 29

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 35 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	e e		Tnet	tructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NΑ	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
׫«» «														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	1	4	12	10	3.93	1213/1576	4.23	4.41	4.30	4.11	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	7	17	4.38	798/1576	4.48	4.45	4.27	4.18	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	6	17	4.34	761/1342	4.51	4.51	4.32	4.19	4.34
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	9	14	4.28	837/1520	4.37	4.50	4.25	4.09	4.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	6	6	15	4.25	647/1465	4.34	4.44	4.12	4.02	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	7	9	12	4.10	836/1434	4.34	4.44	4.14	3.94	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	6	5	15	4.18	916/1547	4.32	4.34	4.19	4.10	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	22	4.76	758/1574	4.46	4.41	4.64	4.59	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	4	15	8	4.07	886/1554	4.28	4.38	4.10	4.01	4.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	11	13		1018/1488	4.55	4.66	4.47	4.41	4.37
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	7	18		1133/1493	4.76	4.87	4.73	4.65	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	4	8	14	4.30	929/1486	4.53	4.63	4.32	4.26	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	3	8	13	4.07	1080/1489	4.42	4.61	4.32	4.22	4.07
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	3	1	4	5	10	3.78	869/1277	4.16	4.18	4.03	3.91	3.78
_,														
Discussion	1 /	0	0	0	1	7	7	4 40	FF4/1070	1 11	1 67	1 17	2 06	4 40
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	•	0 1	1	7	7 10	4.40	554/1279	4.41	4.67	4.17	3.96	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14		0		0	4		4.53	612/1270	4.65	4.76	4.35	4.09	4.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	626/1269	4.71	4.77	4.35	4.09	4.53
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	193/ 878	4.54	4.28	4.05	3.91	4.58
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	1	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.15	****
		-		-	-	_	_		,					
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.44	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.89	4.69	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	4.56	4.64	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.53	4.61	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 375	****	4.53	4.01	3.78	****
Field Work						_								
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	3.64	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	1 11	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28 27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	$4.44 \\ 4.71$	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.50	****/ 35	****	****	4.83	4.71	****
	27 27	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.67		****
<ol> <li>Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful</li> <li>Were there enough proctors for all the students</li> </ol>	27	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 382	****	****	4.78	4.65 3.86	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	Τ	U	U	U	Т	U	4.00	/ 382			4.08	3.80	

Course-Section: AMST 100 0201

Title IDEAS/IMAGES:AMER CULT

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 29

CRASE, KIRSTEN 40

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 35 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	20	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	1	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	28	Non-major	27
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	1	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 200 0101

MULTICULTURAL AMERICA

Title BHALLA, TAMARA

Instructor:

Enrollment: 39 Questionnaires: 23

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2009

Page 36 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	2	3	4	12	4.24	976/1576	4.04	4.41	4.30	4.35	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	4	7	8	4.00	1138/1576	3.92	4.45	4.27	4.32	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	1	1	7	10	4.20	879/1342	4.24	4.51	4.32	4.41	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	4	2	4	10	4.00	1041/1520	4.12	4.50	4.25	4.26	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	5	13	4.43	483/1465	4.36	4.44	4.12	4.09	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	5	4	11	4.19	748/1434	4.00	4.44	4.14	4.06	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	8	4	8	3.90	1145/1547	4.11	4.34	4.19	4.22	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	1	0	1	18	1	3.86	1529/1574	3.96	4.41	4.64	4.62	3.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	5	6	5	3.88	1074/1554	3.96	4.38	4.10	4.05	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	2	9	8		1176/1488	4.15	4.66	4.47	4.44	4.15
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	1	3	15		1125/1493	4.69	4.87	4.73	4.75	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	4	7	8		1069/1486		4.63	4.32	4.29	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	696/1489	4.27	4.61	4.32	4.31	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	2	2	3	4	6	3.59	983/1277	3.65	4.18	4.03	4.01	3.59
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	312/1279	4.61	4.67	4.17	4.14	4.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	605/1270	4.53	4.76	4.17	4.14	4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	559/1269	4.65	4.75	4.35	4.30	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	2	4	o 5	4.27	355/1269			4.05	3.92	4.27
4. Were special techniques successiui	12	U	U	U	۷	4	5	4.27	333/ 0/0	4.14	4.20	4.05	3.94	4.2/
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.44	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.65	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.44	4.72	4.78	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.89	4.69	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 72	****	4.56	4.64	4.83	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.53	4.61	4.80	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 375	****	4.53	4.01	4.21	****
Field Work	0.1	0	0	•	_	_	0	F 00	***** / 50	****	als als als als	4 40	4 54	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 52	***	****	4.48	4.74	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	***	****	4.40	4.71	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.69	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.43	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 382	****	****	4.08	4.39	****
The second control of the second seco		Ü	_	-	Ü	•	_	00	, 552					

Course-Section: AMST 200 0101

Title MULTICULTURAL AMERICA

Instructor: BHALLA, TAMARA

Enrollment: 39
Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 36 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	В	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3	-		_	
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 200 0201 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County MULTICULTURAL AMERICA

Instructor: BHALLA, TAMARA Spring 2009

Enrollment: 38 Questionnaires: 30

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 37

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

								eque:					tructor	Course	_			
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1 Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	-	m this course	0	0	3	1	6	8	12	3 83	1299/1576	4.04	4 41	4.30	4.35	3.83
		ctor make clear			0	0	2	3	5	8	12		1275/1576		4.45	4.27	4.32	3.83
		uestions reflec		1 5	1	0	0	3	1		15	4.28	819/1342		4.51	4.32	4.41	4.28
	_	uations reflect		1 3	0	1	1	1	5		17					4.25	4.26	4.24
				what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	6	18	4.30			4.44	4.12	4.09	4.30
	-	-		o what you learned	0	0	1	3	6	11	9	3.80	1063/1434	4.00	4.44	4.14	4.06	3.80
		g system clearl		-	1	0	1	1	3	7	17	4.31			4.34	4.19	4.22	4.31
	-	was class canc			0	0	0	0	2	24	4	4.07	1438/1574	3.96	4.41	4.64	4.62	4.07
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	2	2	0	3	11	10	4.04	908/1554	3.96	4.38	4.10	4.05	4.04
		T	_															
1 Wara +	ho inatra	Lectur actor's lecture		nronarod	2	0	1	4	0	0	15	1 11	1181/1488	/ 1E	4.66	4.47	1 11	4.14
		ctor seem inter			2	0	0	1	0	3	24	4.79	849/1493		4.87	4.73	4.75	4.79
				xplained clearly	2	0		2	3	9	12		1139/1486		4.63	4.32	4.29	3.96
		es contribute t			2		2	2	4	5	15		1102/1489	4.03	4.61	4.32		4.04
				our understanding	3		3	0	5	9	7		923/1277			4.03		3.71
J. 214 44		2 000111114400 011	ilalioc j	our unacrocanariig			3	Ü	J		•	3.71	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	3.03	1.10	1.05	1.01	3.71
		Discus																
				what you learned	9	0	0	0	3			4.52	- ,			4.17		4.52
				d to participate	9	-	0	0	5			4.52			4.76	4.35		4.52
		_		d open discussion	9	0	0	0			17		,		4.77	4.35	4.29	4.67
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful		9	3	0	1	5	5	7	4.00	464/ 878	4.14	4.28	4.05	3.92	4.00
				Frequ	ency	7 Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A 8		Red	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	9	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	3
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 13		~		,				-	1	1 ^	^			0.5
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 3		Ger	nera	1				5	Under-g	rad 3	0	Non-	major	27
56-83 84-150	2 1	2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	3 2	C 3 D 1									_		•		-	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 3			nera ecti					5 1	Under-g #### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	

Course-Section: AMST 290 0101 University of Maryland Title APPROACH IN AMER STUDI

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 38

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	16		-
Questionnaires:	11	Student Cours	e Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor:

BRYAN, KATHY

							Fre	equei	ncies	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1 Did vo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	457/1576	4.60	4.41	4.30	4.35	4.64
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	313/1576	4.65	4.45	4.27	4.32	4.73
		uestions reflec		_	1	8	0	0	0	0	2		****/1342	****	4.51	4.32	4.41	****
		uations reflect			0	1	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	197/1520	4.83	4.50	4.25	4.26	4.80
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	284/1465	4.75	4.44	4.12	4.09	4.64
	_	-		o what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	323/1434	4.66	4.44	4.14	4.06	4.60
		g system clearl		-	0	0	1	2	2	2	4		1329/1547	4.19	4.34	4.19	4.22	3.55
		was class cand			0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	957/1574	4.57	4.41	4.64	4.62	4.64
	-			hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	363/1554		4.38	4.10		4.55
J. 11011 110	ara you	ming cricool venebb	ŭ	Ü	ŭ	ŭ	ŭ		Ů	1.55	303, 1331	1.05	1.50	1.10	1.05	1.55		
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	4	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	786/1488	4.64	4.66	4.47	4.44	4.57
2. Did th	re the instructor's lectures well prepared I the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1493	4.93	4.87	4.73	4.75	5.00
						0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	792/1486	4.64	4.63	4.32	4.29	4.43
		es contribute t			4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	434/1489	4.71	4.61	4.32	4.31	4.71
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	4	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	623/1277	4.21	4.18	4.03	4.01	4.14
		-	_	_														
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	219/1279	4.90	4.67	4.17	4.14	4.80
2. Were a	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	355/1270	4.90	4.76	4.35	4.30	4.80
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	584/1269	4.80	4.77	4.35	4.29	4.60
4. Were s	pecial to	echniques succe	ssful		6	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	367/ 878	4.63	4.28	4.05	3.92	4.25
				Frequ	lency	/ Dis	tribu	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	S			Туј	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Re	 quire		or Ma	aior		2	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	7
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В 6		100	-1011	J. A. L.	C_ 1.10	~ ) • • •		~	Gradact	_	•	114 ) (	-	,
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 1		Ger	nera:	l				0	Under-g	rad 1	.1	Non-	major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D 0								-					5	-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ectiv	zes.				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
oraa.	Ü	3.33 1.00	_	P 0								-	respons				_	,
				I 0		O+1	her					9	10050110		91			
				2 0		00.						-						

Course-Section: AMST 290 0201 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County APPROACH IN AMER STUDI

?

0

Instructor: BRYAN, KATHY

Enrollment: 11 Questionnaires: 8

Spring 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 39

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

		Question	s		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		 Genera																
1 Did voi	u dain n	Genera ew insights,ski	_	m this course	1	0	0	Ω	1	1	5	4.57	541/1576	4.60	4.41	4.30	4.35	4.57
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	515/1576		4.45	4.27	4.32	4.57
		uestions reflec			1	6	0	0	0	0	1		****/1342		4.51	4.32	4.41	****
		uations reflect			1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	167/1520	4.83	4.50	4.25	4.26	4.86
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	148/1465	4.75	4.44	4.12	4.09	4.86
				o what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	226/1434		4.44	4.14	4.06	4.71
		g system clearl		-	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	167/1547	4.19	4.34	4.19	4.22	4.83
		was class canc			1	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1079/1574	4.57	4.41	4.64	4.62	4.50
	-			hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	222/1554	4.63	4.38	4.10	4.05	4.71
		Lectur																
1. Were th	he instr	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	589/1488	4.64	4.66	4.47	4.44	4.71		
	re the instructor's lectures well prepared d the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	,		4.87	4.73	4.75	4.86
				xplained clearly	1 1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86			4.63	4.32	4.29	4.86
		es contribute t			1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	434/1489		4.61	4.32	4.31	4.71
				our understanding	1	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	506/1277		4.18	4.03	4.01	
		Discus	gion															
1 Did al:	ace diec			what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1279	4.90	4.67	4.17	4.14	5.00
				d to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1270	4.90	4.76	4.35	4.30	5.00
				d open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1269	4.80	4.77	4.35	4.29	5.00
		echniques succe		a open arbeabbion	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 878		4.28	4.05	3.92	5.00
				E		- D-1	lb		_									
				Frequ	iency	DIS	CLID	1010	.1									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	;
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Re	 quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	 3	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r •	6
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В 1			-			_						3 -		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0													-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	ſh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her					6						

Course-Section: AMST 310 0101

GENDER AND INEQUALITY

Title TAYLOR, DABRINA

Instructor:

Enrollment: 40 Questionnaires: 30

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 40 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

				Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC:	Level	Sect
	Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
	General														
1.	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	7	19	4.43	742/1576	4.57	4.41	4.30	4.30	4.43
2.	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	8	17	4.37	811/1576	4.33	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.37
3.	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	263/1342	4.68	4.51	4.32	4.30	4.79
4.	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	5	22	4.69	320/1520	4.68	4.50	4.25	4.25	4.69
5.	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	23	4.70	244/1465	4.60	4.44	4.12	4.09	4.70
6.	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	7	21	4.60	323/1434	4.63	4.44	4.14	4.15	4.60
7.	Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	10	17	4.47	592/1547	4.43	4.34	4.19	4.21	4.47
8.	How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	25	4.83	606/1574	4.87	4.41	4.64	4.61	4.83
9.	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	12	12	4.38	558/1554	4.34	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.38
	Lecture														
	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	5	21		652/1488	4.79	4.66	4.47	4.47	4.68
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	223/1493	4.98	4.87	4.73	4.70	4.97
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	9	18	4.55	619/1486	4.72	4.63	4.32	4.32	4.55
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	6	21	4.59	602/1489	4.46	4.61	4.32	4.34	4.59
5.	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	84/1277	4.74	4.18	4.03	4.11	4.93
	Discussion			•		_	_			004/4050	4 00			4 00	
	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	1	3	15	4.60	381/1279	4.80	4.67	4.17	4.20	4.60
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	0	0	19	4.85	307/1270	4.87	4.76	4.35	4.42	4.85
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	167/1269	4.98	4.77	4.35	4.41	4.95
4.	Were special techniques successful	10	6	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	350/ 878	4.58	4.28	4.05	4.09	4.29
	Laboratory														
1	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.24	****
	Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.23	4.24	****
	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 229	****	****	4.55	4.32	****
	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.46	****
	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 379	****	****	4.29	4.17	****
٦.	were requirements for lab reports creatry specified	20	U	U	U	U	U		3.00	/ 3/3			1.20	7.1/	
	Seminar														
1.	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.44	4.72	4.67	****
	Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.89	4.69	4.69	****
	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 72	****	4.56	4.64	4.53	****
	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.53	4.61	4.22	****
	Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.53	4.01	4.12	****
	Field Work														
1.	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****
2.	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****
3.	Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****
	To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
5.	Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.23	****
	Self Paced														
	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****
	Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****
	Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****
	Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****
5.	Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	4.24	****

Course-Section: AMST 310 0101

Title GENDER AND INEQUALITY

Instructor: TAYLOR, DABRINA

Enrollment: 40
Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 40 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	6	Under-grad	30	Non-major	25
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8	-		-	
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 310 8620 University of Maryland Title GENDER AND INEQUALITY Baltimore County

Instructor: TAYLOR, DABRINA Spring 2009

Enrollment: 11

Questionnaires: 10

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 41

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

		Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	7	4.70	373/1576	4.57	4.41	4.30	4.30	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	891/1576	4.33	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	510/1342	4.68	4.51	4.32	4.30	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	339/1520	4.68	4.50	4.25	4.25	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	366/1465	4.60	4.44	4.12	4.09	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	270/1434	4.63	4.44	4.14	4.15	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	690/1547	4.43	4.34	4.19	4.21	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	469/1574	4.87	4.41	4.64	4.61	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	682/1554	4.34	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	248/1488	4.79	4.66	4.47	4.47	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1493	4.98	4.87	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	191/1486	4.72	4.63	4.32	4.32	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	888/1489	4.46	4.61	4.32	4.34	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	283/1277	4.74	4.18	4.03	4.11	4.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5.00	1/1279	4.80	4.67	4.17	4.20	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	٥	4.89	279/1270	4.87	4.76	4.35	4.42	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1269	4.98	4.77	4.35	4.41	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	119/ 878	4.58	4.77	4.05	4.09	4.88
i. Here special econniques successful	_		J	J	J	_	,	1.00	110, 070	1.50	1.20	1.03	1.09	1.00

Credits E	redits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	10	Non-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				2	1						

Course-Section: AMST 320 0101

Title TV IN AMERICAN CULTURE

Instructor: HUMMEL, MICHAEL

Enrollment: 40
Questionnaires: 24

HUMMEL, MICHAEL Spring 2009

Page 42 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Frequencies			3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	3	8	13	4.42	772/1576	4.42	4.41	4.30	4.30	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	17	4.54	555/1576	4.58	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	18	4.71	357/1342			4.32	4.30	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	18	4.63	376/1520	4.63	4.50	4.25	4.25	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	2	8	10	3.96	919/1465	4.06	4.44	4.12	4.09	3.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	7	12	4.29	636/1434		4.44	4.14	4.15	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	8	14	4.50	527/1547		4.34	4.19	4.21	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	10	11		1063/1574		4.41	4.64	4.61	4.52
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	672/1554	4.37	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	708/1488	4.70	4.66	4.47	4.47	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	3	16		1133/1493	4.75	4.87	4.73	4.70	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	545/1486	4.67		4.32	4.32	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	500/1489	4.73		4.32		4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	132/1277			4.03	4.11	
1000 10														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	244/1279	4.73	4.67	4.17	4.20	4.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1270	4.92	4.76	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1269	4.94	4.77	4.35	4.41	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	15	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	164/ 878	4.58	4.28	4.05	4.09	4.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.24	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.23	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.16	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.17	****
J. Were requirements for lab reports crearry specified	23	U	U	U	U	U	_	3.00	/ 3/2			1.20	1.1/	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.44	4.72	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.89	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.56	4.64	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.53	4.61	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.53	4.01	4.12	****
Self Paced		•		6	•	_		F 00		4.4	4.4.1.	4	4 00	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24 ****/ 35	****	****	4.83	4.89	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	, 33	****	****	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	U	U	U	0	Τ	5.00	****/ 382	^^^	^^^	4.08	4.24	

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1	3	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	В	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	8	Under-grad	24	Non-major	17
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 8 .

Course-Section: AMST 320 0201 University of Maryland Title TV IN AMERICAN CULTURE

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Instructor: HUMMEL, MICHAEL Enrollment: 41 Questionnaires: 37

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 43

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

			0			Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3 4 5					ructor	Course	_		Level				
			Question	ns		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
			Genera	al															
1.	Did you	ı gain ne	w insights,sk:	ills fr	om this course	0	0	0	2	3	9	23	4.43	742/1576	4.42	4.41	4.30	4.30	4.43
2. 1	Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	r the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	2	10	25	4.62	448/1576	4.58	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.62
3. 1	Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	ct the	expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	7	27	4.74	310/1342	4.73	4.51	4.32	4.30	4.74
4.	Did oth	ner evalu	ations reflect	t the e	xpected goals	0	1	0	1	1	8	26	4.64	367/1520	4.63	4.50	4.25	4.25	4.64
5.	Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	bute to	what you learned	0	0	0	4	6	7	20	4.16	738/1465	4.06	4.44	4.12	4.09	4.16
6.	Did wri	itten ass	signments conti	ribute '	to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	12	20	4.35	574/1434	4.32	4.44	4.14	4.15	4.35
7.	Was the	e grading	g system clear:	ly expla	ained	0	0	0	1	4	10	22	4.43	641/1547	4.47	4.34	4.19	4.21	4.43
8.	How mar	ny times	was class cand	celled		0	0	0	0	0	14	23	4.62	972/1574	4.57	4.41	4.64	4.61	4.62
9. 1	How wou	ıld you g	grade the over	all tea	ching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	2	11	14	4.44	477/1554	4.37	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.44
			Lectu																
1.	Were th	ne instru	prepared	4	0	0	0	1	6	26	4.76	505/1488	4.70	4.66	4.47	4.47	4.76		
2. 1	Did the	e instruc	in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	1	30	4.91	557/1493	4.75	4.87	4.73	4.70	4.91		
3. 1	Was led	cture mat	erial presente	ed and	explained clearly	5	0	0	0	2	5	25	4.72	393/1486	4.67	4.63	4.32	4.32	4.72
4.	Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	to what	you learned	4	0	0	0	2	3	28	4.79	336/1489	4.73	4.61	4.32	4.34	4.79
5.	Did aud	diovisual	l techniques en	nhance	your understanding	8	0	0	0	3	5	21	4.62	243/1277	4.71	4.18	4.03	4.11	4.62
			Discus	ssion															
1.	Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	bute to	what you learned	12	0	0	0	2	4	19	4.68	327/1279	4.73	4.67	4.17	4.20	4.68
2. 1	Were al	ll studer	nts actively en	ncourage	ed to participate	12	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	317/1270	4.92	4.76	4.35	4.42	4.84
3. 1	Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair a	nd open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	299/1269	4.94	4.77	4.35	4.41	4.88
4. 1	Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	essful		12	5	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	221/ 878	4.58	4.28	4.05	4.09	4.50
			Frequ	uency	Dis	trib	ution	n											
Cre	dits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Δ	Expected Grades				Re:	ason	c c			Ту	ne			Majors	2
	Ec																	a jois	
	-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 23	Required for Majors 8						8	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	3	
	-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В 11							_		3	, .	_			
56	-83	8	2.00-2.99	10	C 1		Gei	nerai	L			1	.8	Under-a	rad 3	7	Non-	-maior	34

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	23	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	10	C	1	General	18	Under-grad	37	Non-major	34
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4	-			
				2	1						

Course-Section: AMST 325 0101

Title STUDIES IN POPULAR CUL

Instructor: KING, PAULA

Enrollment: 36
Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 44 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	0	2	3	22	4.61	500/1576	4.61	4.41	4.30	4.30	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	21	4.75	279/1576	4.75	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	23	4.79	263/1342	4.79	4.51	4.32	4.30	4.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	22	4.75	249/1520	4.75	4.50	4.25	4.25	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	22	4.81	169/1465	4.81	4.44	4.12	4.09	4.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	21	4.67	270/1434	4.67	4.44	4.14	4.15	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	7	20	4.74	249/1547	4.74	4.34	4.19	4.21	4.74
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	22	4.81	645/1574	4.81	4.41	4.64	4.61	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	187/1554	4.76	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.76
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	248/1488	4.91	4.66	4.47	4.47	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	279/1493	4.95	4.87	4.73	4.70	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	325/1486	4.76	4.63	4.32	4.32	4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	240/1489	4.86	4.61	4.32	4.34	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	154/1277	4.76	4.18	4.03	4.11	4.76
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	118/1279	4.93	4.67	4.17	4.20	4.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	182/1270	4.93	4.76	4.35	4.42	4.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	194/1269	4.93	4.77	4.35	4.41	4.93
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	210/ 878	4.53	4.28	4.05	4.09	4.53

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	15						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General		Under-grad	28	Non-major	22
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Spring 2009

Page 45 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	34			
Questionnaires:	22	Student Cours	e Evaluation	Questionnaire

I

?

0

0

Course-Section: AMST 350 0101

CRITICAL DECADES

CAMPBELL, DUNCA

Title

Instructor:

					Frequencies			s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1 Did vo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	_	om this course	1	0	1	Λ	1	9	10	4.29	916/1576	4.29	4.41	4.30	4.30	4.29
_	_	ctor make clear			2	0	0	1	3	7	9	4.20	996/1576	4.20	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.20
		uestions reflec			1	4	0	1	2	3	11	4.41	696/1342		4.51	4.32	4.30	4.41
	_	uations reflect		1 3	1	0	0	1	2	7	11	4.33	768/1520		4.50	4.25	4.25	4.33
				what you learned	1	0	0	2	4	4	11	4.14	758/1465		4.44	4.12	4.09	4.14
	_	-		to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	7	10	4.24	704/1434		4.44	4.14	4.15	4.24
		g system clearl		-	1	0	0	2	3	5	11	4.19	900/1547	4.19	4.34	4.19	4.21	4.19
		was class canc		ilica	3	1	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	813/1574		4.41	4.64	4.61	
				hing effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	10	8	4.25	712/1554		4.38	4.10		4.25
J. HOW WO	Lecture			ming effectiveness	2	U	U	1		10	O	1.23	/12/1354	1.23	1.30	1.10	4.00	1.23
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	3	0	0	1	0	6	12	4.53	846/1488	4.53	4.66	4.47	4.47	4.53
2. Did th	the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	1	0	0	2	15	4.67	1053/1493	4.67	4.87	4.73	4.70	4.67
3. Was le	as lecture material presented and explained clear					0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	596/1486	4.58	4.63	4.32	4.32	4.58
4. Did th	las recture material presented and explained clear.					0	1	0	1	5	12	4.42	789/1489	4.42	4.61	4.32	4.34	4.42
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	3	2	3	1	6	1	6	3.35	1080/1277	3.35	4.18	4.03	4.11	3.35
		- ·																
ו הנת ו		Discus			7	0	1	0	2	_	7	1 12	751 /1070	1 12	1 67	1 17	4.20	1 12
				what you learned	7	-	0	0	2	5	10	4.13	751/1279 505/1270	4.13	4.67 4.76	4.17	4.42	4.13
				ed to participate	7	0	0	0	0	5			,					
		ctor encourage echniques succe		nd open discussion	7 7	0 8	0	1	1 3	2	12 1	4.73 3.43	467/1269 735/ 878	4.73	4.77	4.35	4.41	4.73
4. were s	special to	echniques succe	SSIUI		/	8	U	1	3	2	Τ	3.43	/35/ 8/8	3.43	4.28	4.05	4.09	3.43
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arnod	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Po	agan	<b>a</b>			Път	no.			Majors	
CTECTICS F	ariieu			Expedied Grades					ason				Ту:	 he			ajuls	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	5	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	2
28-55										-						_		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 0		Gei	nera	1			1	.2	Under-g	rad 2	22	Non-	-major	20
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	<sub>J</sub> h
	P 0			P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nifican	nt	
P U						1						•	_		_			

Other

0

Course-Section: AMST 355 0101

Title SPEC TOPIC:CULTURAL PL

Instructor: LOVIGLIO, JASON

Enrollment: 70
Questionnaires: 41

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 46 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	4	7	30	4.63	457/1576	4.63	4.41	4.30	4.30	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	15	18	4.22	978/1576	4.22	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	28	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	583/1342	4.50	4.51	4.32	4.30	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	4	10	23	4.51	499/1520	4.51	4.50	4.25	4.25	4.51
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	9	29	4.63	284/1465	4.63	4.44	4.12	4.09	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learn	ed 0	0	0	1	5	13	22	4.37	564/1434	4.37	4.44	4.14	4.15	4.37
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	7	12	19	4.15	939/1547	4.15	4.34	4.19	4.21	4.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	36	4.90	469/1574	4.90	4.41	4.64	4.61	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivene	ss 7	0	0	0	1	9	24	4.68	255/1554	4.68	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	15	22	4.47	907/1488	4.48	4.66	4.47	4.47	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	38	4.97	167/1493	4.97	4.87	4.73	4.70	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly		0	0	0	3	12	24	4.54		4.54	4.63	4.32	4.32	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	5	8	26	4.54	,	4.54	4.61			4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandin	g 2	1	1	0	1	8	28	4.63	236/1277	4.63	4.18	4.03	4.11	4.63
Discussion	0	0	0	1	0	_	0.4	1 61	201/1070	4 61	4 67	4 1 7	4 00	4 61
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	2	6	24	4.61	381/1279	4.61	4.67	4.17	4.20	4.61
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	1	5	26	4.67	505/1270	4.67	4.76	4.35	4.42	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussio		0	0	1	1	4	27	4.73	479/1269	4.73	4.77	4.35	4.41	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	8	23	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	****/ 878	***	4.28	4.05	4.09	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	40	0	0	0	1	0	0	3 00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.24	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background informati		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activitie		0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	40	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.16	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	40	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.17	****
o. Note requirements for the reports ordary specified		Ü	Ū	ŭ	Ū	_	Ū	1.00	, 3.3			1120		
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	4.44	4.72	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attentio	n 39	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.89	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 72	****	4.56	4.64	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.53	4.61	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	39	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 375	****	4.53	4.01	4.12	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	40	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.23	****
- 10 - 1														
Self Paced	2.0	^	^	•	-	-	^	2 50	****	المنابع المالية		4 60	4 00	
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	40	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 382	****	^ ^ * *	4.08	4.24	^ ^ * *

Course-Section: AMST 355 0101

Title SPEC TOPIC:CULTURAL PL

Instructor: LOVIGLIO, JASON

Enrollment: 70
Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 46
JUL 2, 2009
Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E					Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	 А	22	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	8	C	5	General	19	Under-grad	41	Non-major	38
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	6	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: AMST 356 0101

Title SPEC TOPICS:COMM/DIVER

Instructor: KING, PAULA

Enrollment: 20

Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 47 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	7	9	4.47	682/1576	4.47	4.41	4.30	4.30	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	743/1576	4.41	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	1	2	2	4	3.70	1155/1342	3.70	4.51	4.32	4.30	3.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	0	7	7	4.33	768/1520	4.33	4.50	4.25	4.25	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	3	4	6	3.69	1152/1465	3.69	4.44	4.12	4.09	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	287/1434	4.64	4.44	4.14	4.15	4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	3	1	3	8	3.88	1167/1547	3.88	4.34	4.19	4.21	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	547/1574	4.87	4.41	4.64	4.61	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	463/1554	4.45	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	774/1488	4.58	4.66	4.47	4.47	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	501/1493	4.92	4.87	4.73	4.70	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	339/1486	4.75	4.63	4.32	4.32	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	602/1489	4.58	4.61	4.32	4.34	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	1	1	1	4	2	3.56	997/1277	3.56	4.18	4.03	4.11	3.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	169/1279	4.91	4.67	4.17	4.20	4.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	260/1270	4.91	4.76	4.35	4.42	4.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	375/1269	4.82	4.77	4.35	4.41	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	116/ 878	4.91	4.28	4.05	4.09	4.91
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	Ο	0	1	5 00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.23	***
Frequ	iency	Dist	crib	utio	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A :	 10	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	В	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	7	Under-grad	17	Non-major	12
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4	_			
				2 0							

Course-Section: AMST 357A 0101

THEORIES: MEDIA/CULTUR

Title MOFFITT, KIMBER

Instructor: Enrollment:

21 Questionnaires: 18

## Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 48 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fre	quer	cies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	277/1576	4.78	4.41	4.30	4.30	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	201/1576	4.83	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1		4.83	221/1342	4.83	4.51	4.32	4.30	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5		4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.50		4.25	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5		4.61		4.61		4.12	4.09	4.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	4		4.33	594/1434	4.33	4.44	4.14	4.15	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2		4.56	469/1547	4.56	4.34		4.21	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	5	10	3		1525/1574	3.89	4.41	4.64	4.61	3.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	331/1554	4.58	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.58
Lecture														
<ol> <li>Were the instructor's lectures well prepared</li> </ol>	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	355/1488	4.83	4.66	4.47	4.47	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	334/1493	4.94	4.87	4.73	4.70	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	241/1486	4.83	4.63	4.32	4.32	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	274/1489	4.83	4.61	4.32	4.34	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	187/1277	4.71	4.18	4.03	4.11	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	335/1279	4.67	4.67	4.17	4.20	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	412/1270	4.75	4.76	4.35	4.42	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	444/1269	4.75	4.77	4.35	4.41	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	221/ 878	4.50	4.28	4.05	4.09	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.24	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.16	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.17	****
J. Were requirements for tab reports creatry specified	Τ,	O	U	U		U	U	3.00	/ 3/3			1.20	1.1/	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 85	****	4.44	4.72	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.89	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 72	****	4.56	4.64	4.53	****
	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 80	****	4.53		4.22	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	1	•	•		,	****		4.61		****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	U	U	U	Τ	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	* * * * *	4.53	4.01	4.12	^ ^ ^ ^
Field Work														
	1 77	0	^	0	^	-	0	4 00	**** / FO	****	****	4 40	4 27	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52			4.48	4.37	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.23	****
Self Paced			_		_									
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	4.24	****

Course-Section: AMST 357A 0101

Title THEORIES: MEDIA/CULTUR

Instructor:

MOFFITT, KIMBER

Enrollment:

21 Questionnaires: 18 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 48 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	4	Under-grad	18	Non-major	17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	-		_	
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 357B 0101 SPORTS AND MEDIA MOFFITT, KIMBER

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 24

37

University of Maryland Page 49 Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

		Fre	equer	ncie	S		Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
4	0	0	0	2	4	1 2	4 50	637/1576	1 11	1 11	4 20	4 20	4.50
	-	-	-	-	_								4.53
2	-	-	-		-								4.50
		-	_	_	-								4.50
	-	-	-	7	7								4.42
 	-	-	-		7								4.42
l 5		-	-	-	,								4.53
2	-	-	-	0				,					
. 0		-	-	0		_		, -					
, 9	1	U	U	U	ь	8	4.5/	339/1554	4.3/	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.57
7	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	694/1488	4.48	4.66	4.47	4.47	4.65
8	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1493	4.84	4.87	4.73	4.70	5.00
8	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	201/1486	4.79	4.63	4.32	4.32	4.88
8	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	297/1489	4.71	4.61	4.32	4.34	4.81
9	1	1	0	0	3	10	4.50	309/1277	4.36	4.18	4.03	4.11	4.50
	0	0	•	•		0	4 60	210/1050	4 66	4 60	4 1 1	4 00	4 60
		-		0	_	-		- ,					4.69
													4.85
				-	_								
11	0	Τ	Ü	3	4	5	3.92	538/ 878	3.71	4.28	4.05	4.09	3.92
uency	, Dis	tribu	ıtior	1									
			Das		_			m				M = = = = =	
; . – – – –					S 				pe 			Majors	
	Re	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	4	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	3
	Ge	neral	L				4	Under-g	rad 2	4	Non-	major	21
	El	ectiv	res				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
							7	respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
	4 5 4 4 5 5 5 4 5 7 8 8 8 9	4 0 5 0 4 0 4 0 5 0 0 5 0 0 5 0 0 5 0 0 5 0 0 5 0 0 6 5 0 0 6 5 0 0 6 5 0 0 6 0 0 1 1 1 0 0 1 1 1 0 0 1 1 1 0 0 1 1 1 0 0 1 1 1 0 0 1 1 1 0 0 1 1 1 0	NR NA 1  4 0 0  5 0 0  4 0 0  5 0 0  4 0 0  5 0 0  5 0 0  4 0 0  5 0 0  7 0 0  8 0 0  8 0 0  8 0 0  8 0 0  9 1 1  11 0 0  11 0 0  11 0 1  quency Distributes  Require	NR NA	NR NA	4 0 0 0 3 4 5 0 0 0 2 5 4 0 0 1 1 5 4 0 0 0 1 5 5 0 0 0 2 7 6 5 0 0 0 0 2 7 5 0 0 0 0 2 7 5 0 0 0 0 9 4 0 0 0 8 10 7 0 0 0 0 6 7 0 0 0 0 6 8 0 0 0 0 0 2 8 0 0 0 0 2 8 0 0 0 1 1 9 1 1 0 0 3  11 0 0 0 0 4 11 0 0 0 0 3 11 0 1 0 3 4  quency Distribution  Reasons  Required for Major  General	A 0 0 0 3 4 13 5 0 0 0 0 2 5 12 4 0 0 1 1 5 13 4 0 0 0 0 2 7 10 1 5 0 0 0 0 2 7 10 1 5 0 0 0 0 2 7 10 1 5 0 0 0 0 7 12 5 0 0 0 0 0 7 12 5 0 0 0 0 0 9 10 4 0 0 0 8 10 2 9 1 0 0 0 6 8  7 0 0 0 0 6 8  7 0 0 0 0 6 11 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 14 9 1 1 0 0 3 10  11 0 0 0 0 4 9 11 0 0 0 0 4 9 11 0 0 0 0 3 11 11 0 1 0 3 4 5  quency Distribution  Reasons  Required for Majors  General	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean  4 0 0 0 3 4 13 4.50 5 0 0 0 2 5 12 4.53 4 0 0 1 1 5 13 4.50 4 0 0 0 1 5 14 4.65 5 0 0 0 0 2 7 10 4.42 5 0 0 0 0 7 12 4.63 5 0 0 0 0 7 12 4.63 5 0 0 0 0 7 12 4.63 5 0 0 0 0 8 10 2 3.70 8 9 1 0 0 0 6 8 4.57  7 0 0 0 0 6 8 10 2 3.70 8 9 1 0 0 0 6 8 4.57  7 0 0 0 0 0 6 11 4.65 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 8 0 0 0 0 2 14 4.88 8 0 0 0 1 1 14 4.81 9 1 1 0 0 3 10 4.50  11 0 0 0 0 4 9 4.69 11 0 0 0 0 2 11 4.85 10 0 0 0 0 3 11 4.79 11 0 1 0 3 4 5 3.92  quency Distribution  Reasons  Required for Majors 4  General 4	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank  4 0 0 0 3 4 13 4.50 637/1576 5 0 0 0 0 2 5 12 4.53 581/1576 4 0 0 1 1 5 13 4.50 583/1342 4 0 0 0 1 5 14 4.65 348/1520 5 0 0 0 0 2 7 10 4.42 483/1465 5 0 0 0 0 7 12 4.63 296/1434 5 0 0 0 0 7 12 4.63 296/1434 5 0 0 0 0 9 10 4.53 503/1547 4 0 0 0 8 10 2 3.70 1543/1574 5 9 1 0 0 0 6 8 4.57 339/1554  7 0 0 0 0 0 6 8 4.57 339/1554  7 0 0 0 0 0 6 11 4.65 694/1488 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 5.00 1/1493 8 0 0 0 0 2 14 4.88 201/1486 8 0 0 0 0 1 1 14 4.81 297/1489 9 1 1 0 0 0 3 10 4.50 309/1277  11 0 0 0 0 4 9 4.69 312/1279 11 0 0 0 0 4 9 4.69 312/1279 11 0 0 0 0 3 11 4.79 409/1269 11 0 1 0 3 4 5 3.92 538/ 878  quency Distribution  Required for Majors 4 Graduate  General 4 Under-graduate  General 4 Under-graduate  General 4 Under-graduate	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean  4 0 0 0 3 4 13 4.50 637/1576 4.44 5 0 0 0 0 2 5 12 4.53 581/1576 4.46 4 0 0 1 1 5 13 4.50 583/1342 4.31 4 0 0 0 1 5 14 4.65 348/1520 4.57 5 0 0 0 0 2 7 10 4.42 483/1465 4.32 6 5 0 0 0 0 7 12 4.63 296/1434 4.59 5 0 0 0 0 0 9 10 4.53 503/1547 4.43 4 0 0 0 8 10 2 3.70 1543/1574 3.57 5 9 1 0 0 0 6 8 4.57 339/1554 4.37  7 0 0 0 0 6 8 4.57 339/1554 4.37  7 0 0 0 0 0 6 11 4.65 694/1488 4.48 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 5.00 1/1493 4.84 8 0 0 0 0 2 14 4.88 201/1486 4.79 8 0 0 0 1 1 1 4 4.81 297/1489 4.71 9 1 1 0 0 0 3 10 4.50 309/1277 4.36  11 0 0 0 0 0 4 9 4.69 312/1279 4.66 11 0 0 0 0 0 2 11 4.85 317/1270 4.65 10 0 0 0 0 3 11 4.79 409/1269 4.30 11 0 1 0 3 4 5 3.92 538/ 878 3.71  quency Distribution  Required for Majors 4 Graduate  General 4 Under-grad 2	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean  4 0 0 0 0 3 4 13 4.50 637/1576 4.44 4.41 5 0 0 0 0 2 5 12 4.53 581/1576 4.46 4.45 4 0 0 1 1 5 13 4.50 583/1342 4.31 4.51 4 0 0 0 1 5 14 4.65 348/1520 4.57 4.50 5 0 0 0 0 2 7 10 4.42 483/1465 4.32 4.44 5 0 0 0 0 7 12 4.63 296/1434 4.59 4.44 5 0 0 0 0 0 9 10 4.53 503/1547 4.43 4.34 5 0 0 0 0 0 8 10 2 3.70 1543/1574 3.57 4.41 6 9 1 0 0 0 6 8 4.57 339/1554 4.37 4.38  7 0 0 0 0 0 6 8 4.57 339/1554 4.37 4.38  7 0 0 0 0 0 6 11 4.65 694/1488 4.48 4.66 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 5.00 1/1493 4.84 4.87 8 0 0 0 0 0 2 14 4.88 201/1486 4.79 4.63 8 0 0 0 0 1 1 14 4.81 297/1489 4.71 4.61 9 1 1 0 0 0 3 10 4.50 309/1277 4.36 4.18  11 0 0 0 0 4 9 4.69 312/1279 4.66 4.67 11 0 0 0 0 3 11 4.79 409/1269 4.30 4.77 11 0 1 0 3 4 5 3.92 538/ 878 3.71 4.28  quency Distribution  Required for Majors 4 Graduate 0  General 4 Under-grad 24	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean  4 0 0 0 0 3 4 13 4.50 637/1576 4.44 4.41 4.30  5 0 0 0 0 2 5 12 4.53 581/1576 4.46 4.45 4.27  4 0 0 1 1 5 13 4.50 583/1342 4.31 4.51 4.32  4 0 0 0 1 5 14 4.65 348/1520 4.57 4.50 4.25  5 0 0 0 0 2 7 10 4.42 483/1465 4.32 4.44 4.12  5 0 0 0 0 7 12 4.63 296/1434 4.59 4.44 4.14  5 0 0 0 0 9 10 4.53 503/1547 4.43 4.34 4.19  4 0 0 0 8 10 2 3.70 1543/1574 3.57 4.41 4.64  5 9 1 0 0 0 6 8 4.57 339/1554 4.37 4.38 4.10  7 0 0 0 0 6 8 4.57 339/1554 4.37 4.38 4.10  7 0 0 0 0 0 16 5.00 1/1493 4.84 4.87 4.73  8 0 0 0 0 1 1 14 4.81 297/1489 4.71 4.61 4.32  9 1 1 0 0 3 10 4.50 309/1277 4.36 4.18 4.03  11 0 0 0 0 4 9 4.69 312/1279 4.66 4.67 4.17  11 0 0 0 0 0 2 11 4.85 317/1270 4.65 4.76 4.35  10 0 0 0 0 3 11 4.79 409/1269 4.30 4.77 4.35  11 0 1 0 3 4 5 3.92 538/878 3.71 4.28 4.05  quency Distribution  General 4 Under-grad 24 Non-	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean  4 0 0 0 3 4 13 4.50 637/1576 4.44 4.41 4.30 4.30 5 0 0 0 0 2 5 12 4.53 581/1576 4.46 4.45 4.27 4.28 4 0 0 1 1 5 13 4.50 583/1342 4.31 4.51 4.32 4.30 4 0 0 0 1 5 14 4.65 348/1520 4.57 4.50 4.25 4.25 5 0 0 0 0 2 7 10 4.42 483/1465 4.32 4.44 4.12 4.09 6 5 0 0 0 0 7 12 4.63 296/1434 4.59 4.44 4.12 4.09 6 5 0 0 0 0 9 10 4.53 503/1547 4.43 4.34 4.19 4.21 4 0 0 0 0 8 10 2 3.70 1543/1574 3.57 4.41 4.64 4.61 6 9 1 0 0 0 6 8 4.57 339/1554 4.37 4.38 4.10 4.09  7 0 0 0 0 6 8 4.57 339/1554 4.37 4.38 4.10 4.09  7 0 0 0 0 0 6 11 4.65 694/1488 4.48 4.66 4.47 4.47 8 0 0 0 0 0 16 5.00 1/1493 4.84 4.87 4.73 4.70 8 0 0 0 0 1 1 14 4.81 297/1489 4.71 4.61 4.32 4.34 9 1 1 0 0 0 3 10 4.50 309/1277 4.36 4.18 4.03 4.11  11 0 0 0 0 4 9 4.69 312/1279 4.66 4.67 4.17 4.20 11 0 0 0 0 0 2 11 4.85 317/1270 4.65 4.76 4.35 4.42 10 0 0 0 0 3 11 4.79 409/1269 4.30 4.77 4.35 4.41 11 0 1 0 3 4 5 3.92 538/878 3.71 4.28 4.05 4.09  Required for Majors 4 Graduate 0 Major  Required for Majors 4 Graduate 0 Major

Course-Section: AMST 357B 0201 University of Maryland SPORTS AND MEDIA MOFFITT, KIMBER

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 50

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: Enrollment: 35 Questionnaires: 18

Title

	Ouestions							_	ncies		_		ructor		_	UMBC		
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did vo	nı gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	om this course	0	0	0	0	4	3	11	4.39	808/1576	4.44	4.41	4.30	4.30	4.39
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	2	1	3	12	4.39	785/1576		4.45	4.27	4.28	4.39
		uestions reflec		1 3	0	0	1	1	3	3	10	4.11	931/1342		4.51	4.32	4.30	4.11
	_	uations reflect		1 3	0	0	0	0	4	1	13	4.50	511/1520		4.50	4.25	4.25	4.50
				what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	8	8	4.22	678/1465		4.44	4.12	4.09	4.22
	-	_		o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	8	10	4.56	360/1434		4.44	4.14	4.15	4.56
		g system clearl		-	0	0	1	1	0	5	11	4.33	755/1547		4.34	4.19	4.21	4.33
		was class cand			0	0	1	1	7	7	2	3.44	1560/1574		4.41	4.64	4.61	3.44
				ching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	805/1554	4.37	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.17
	-	_		3														
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	1064/1488	4.48	4.66	4.47	4.47	4.31
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	1029/1493	4.84	4.87	4.73	4.70	4.69
3. Was le	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearl						0	0	0	4	10	4.71	393/1486	4.79	4.63	4.32	4.32	4.71
4. Did th	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	1	1	1	12	4.60	579/1489	4.71	4.61	4.32	4.34	4.60
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	4	0	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	569/1277	4.36	4.18	4.03	4.11	4.21
		Discus																
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	358/1279	4.66	4.67	4.17	4.20	4.64
				ed to participate	7	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	686/1270	4.65	4.76	4.35	4.42	4.45
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	7	0	2	1	0	2	6	3.82	1015/1269			4.35	4.41	3.82
4. Were s	pecial to	echniques succe	ssful		7	3	0	2	2	2	2	3.50	709/ 878	3.71	4.28	4.05	4.09	3.50
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	'arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Pe:	asons	2			Ty	ne			Majors	•
										, 								, . – – – – –
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	2	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 10														
56-83	56-83 3 2.00-2.99 4 C 1						nera	1				8	Under-g	rad 1	.8	Non-	major	18
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	jh
				P 0									respons	es to k	e sign	nifican	ıt	
	I 0											5						

Course-Section: AMST 388 0101

Title LANDSCAPE & CULTURE

Instructor: ORSER, EDWARD W

Enrollment: 35
Questionnaires: 29

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 51 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Questions							equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Ran		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
2. Did the	e instructo	Genera insights,ski or make clear	lls from the expe	cted goals	0	0	0	1 0	1 3	7 5	20 21	4.59 4.62	527/1 448/1	576	4.59 4.62	4.41 4.45	4.30	4.30 4.28	4.59 4.62
	_	stions reflections reflect	_	_	0	0	0	0 1	1 1	4 8	24 19	4.79 4.55	251/1 453/1		4.79 4.55	4.51	4.32	4.30 4.25	4.79 4.55
			_	at you learned	0	0	0	1	3	3	22	4.59	316/1		4.59	4.44	4.12	4.09	4.59
6. Did wr	itten assig	nments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	9	16	4.43	498/1	434	4.43	4.44	4.14	4.15	4.43
		system clearl		ed	0	0	0	0	2	8	19	4.59	434/1		4.59	4.34	4.19	4.21	4.59
	-	as class canc			1	0	0	0	1	5	22	4.75	758/1		4.75	4.41	4.64	4.61	4.75
9. How wor	uld you gra	ade the overa	ll teachi	ng effectiveness	3	0	1	0	2	13	10	4.19	772/1	.554	4.19	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.19
		Lectur																	
		or's lecture			0	0	0	0	2	6	21	4.66	680/1		4.66	4.66	4.47	4.47	4.66
		or seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	223/1		4.97	4.87	4.73	4.70	4.97
				lained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	9 6	18	4.55	619/1		4.55	4.63	4.32	4.32	4.55
		contribute t		u learned r understanding	0 1	0	1	4	3	5	19 16	4.45 4.18	766/1 600/1		4.45 4.18	4.61 4.18	4.32	4.34 4.11	4.45 4.18
5. DIG au	ulovisual (	eciniques en	nance you	ir understanding	1	U	U	4	3	5	10	4.10	600/1	_	4.10	4.10	4.03	4.11	4.10
		Discus																	
		at you learned	10 10	0	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	532/1		4.42	4.67	4.17	4.20	4.42		
	Were all students actively encouraged to participat Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussi							0	2	0	17	4.79	378/1		4.79	4.76	4.35	4.42	4.79
		or encourage Iniques succe		open discussion	10 10	0 2	0 1	0	2 4	1 5	16 7	4.74	467/1 464/		4.74	4.77 4.28	4.35	4.41	4.74
4. were s	pecial teci	miques succe	SSIUI		10	۷	Т	U	4	Э	/	4.00	404/	8/8	4.00	4.28	4.05	4.09	4.00
		Labora	-																
		ease understa	_		28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00		234	****	****	4.23	4.24	****
_	_	_	_	ound information lab activities	28 28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	240	****	****	4.35	4.32	****
3. Were no	ecessary illa	iteriais avai	Table Ior	Tab activities	40	U	U	U	U	U		5.00	,	229			4.51	4.40	
		Semina																	
				nnounced theme	28	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/	85	****	4.44	4.72	4.67	****
				idual attention	28	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/	79	***	4.89	4.69	4.69	****
				at you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	⊥ 1		****/ ****/	72 80	****	4.56	4.64	4.53	****
_		contribute grading mad	_	ou learned	28 28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/		****	4.53	4.61	4.22	****
		J J		<b>D</b>			1						,						
		Frequ	iency	Dist	tribi	utior	n												
Credits Ea	Expected Grades				Rea	asons					Тур	pe			Majors				
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 10							ed fo	or Ma	 jor	 s	7	Grad	luate	 e	0	Majo	r r	1
28-55																	=		
56-83							nera:	l.			1	.0	Unde	er-gr	cad 2	19	Non-	major	28
84-150																			
Grad.							ecti	ves				0			Means t			_	h
	P 0										-	0	resp	onse	es to b	e sign	ufican	ıt	
				I 0 ? 1		Uti	her				1	.0							
		: 1																	

Course-Section: AMST 391 0101

Title STUDIES IN AMERICAN CU

Instructor: CAMPBELL, DUNCA

Enrollment: 33
Questionnaires: 17

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 52 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionna	aire
--------------------------------------	------

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	1	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	882/1576	4.31	4.41	4.30	4.30	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	528/1576	4.56	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	683/1342	4.43	4.51	4.32	4.30	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	631/1520	4.44	4.50	4.25	4.25	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	137/1465	4.88	4.44	4.12	4.09	4.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	554/1434	4.38	4.44	4.14	4.15	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	641/1547	4.44	4.34	4.19	4.21	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	645/1574	4.81	4.41	4.64	4.61	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	532/1554	4.40	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	173/1488	4.94	4.66	4.47	4.47	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	784/1493	4.81	4.87	4.73	4.70	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	339/1486	4.75	4.63	4.32	4.32	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	136/1489	4.94	4.61	4.32	4.34	4.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	660/1277	4.08	4.18	4.03	4.11	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	381/1279	4.60	4.67	4.17	4.20	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	559/1270	4.60	4.76	4.35	4.42	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	194/1269	4.93	4.77	4.35	4.41	4.93
4. Were special techniques successful	4	7	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	4.28	4.05	4.09	4.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	1	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	2	В	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	17	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 392 0101

Title STUDIES IN AMER SOCIET

Instructor: ORSER, EDWARD W

Enrollment: 40

ORSER, EDWARD W Spring 2009

Page 53 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	31	Student Cours	e Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	3	11		4.45	712/1576		4.41	4.30		4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	9	19	4.48	638/1576	4.48	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	7	22	4.70	369/1342	4.70	4.51	4.32	4.30	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	10	19	4.60	395/1520	4.60	4.50	4.25	4.25	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	5	23	4.72	225/1465	4.72	4.44	4.12	4.09	4.72
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	8	19	4.55	360/1434	4.55	4.44	4.14	4.15	4.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	5	6	16	4.24	849/1547	4.24	4.34	4.19	4.21	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	17	12		1262/1574		4.41		4.61	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	1	17	9	4.18	794/1554	4.18	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	25	4.86	324/1488	4.86	4.66	4.47	4.47	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	25	4.86	683/1493	4.86	4.87	4.73	4.70	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	9	17	4.54	642/1486	4.54	4.63	4.32	4.32	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	6	21	4.68	487/1489	4.68	4.61	4.32	4.34	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	4	13	10	4.14	623/1277			4.03	4.11	
J. Dia addiovisual techniques childree your understanding	5	O	O	_	1	13	10	1.11	023/12//	1.11	1.10	1.05	1.11	1.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	432/1279	4.52	4.67	4.17	4.20	4.52
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	505/1270	4.67	4.76	4.35	4.42	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	332/1269	4.86	4.77	4.35	4.41	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	2	2	4	4	7	3.63	679/ 878	3.63	4.28	4.05	4.09	3.63
Seminar		_				_	_							
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.44	4.72	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.89	4.69	4.69	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 72	****	4.56	4.64	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80	****	4.53	4.61	4.22	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.53	4.01	4.12	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****
. Did study questions make clear the expected goal		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****
. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful		0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****
. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful		0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30 30	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 382	****	****	4.08	4.24	****
		-	-	-	-	-			,				· -	
Exact	0000	Diat	i b	.+	_									

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	31	Non-major	19
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	26				
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: AMST 410 0101 University of Maryland

Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Title SEMINAR: CMTY & DIVERSI Balti
Instructor: BHALLA, TAMARA Sp

4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned

5. Were criteria for grading made clear

Enrollment: 10
Ouestionnaires: 10

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 1 0 2 7 4.50 637/1576 4.50 4.41 4.30 4.46 4.50 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 2 2 6 4.40 759/1576 4.40 4.45 4.27 4.35 4.40 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 3 0 0 1 1 5 4.57 510/1342 4.57 4.51 4.32 4.46 4.57 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 3 6 4.50 511/1520 4.50 4.50 4.25 4.38 4.50 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 2 7 4.60 304/1465 4.60 4.44 4.12 4.22 4.60 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 2 1 7 4.50 398/1434 4.50 4.44 4.14 4.30 4.507. Was the grading system clearly explained  $0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 4.00 \quad 1041/1547 \quad 4.00 \quad 4.34 \quad 4.19 \quad 4.24 \quad 4.00$ 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 7 3 4.30 1288/1574 4.30 4.41 4.64 4.69 4.30 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 1 0 0 4 3 4.00 924/1554 4.00 4.38 4.10 4.24 4.00 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 3 6 4.67 666/1488 4.67 4.66 4.47 4.55 4.67 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 2 7 4.78 868/1493 4.78 4.87 4.73 4.80 4.78 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 1 2 6 4.56 619/1486 4.56 4.63 4.32 4.41 4.56 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 1 2 5 4.50 696/1489 4.50 4.61 4.32 4.38 4.50 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 0 2 2 5 4.33 463/1277 4.33 4.18 4.03 4.04 4.33 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 184/1279 4.88 4.67 4.17 4.31 4.88 288/1270 4.88 4.76 4.35 4.53 4.88 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 310/1269 4.88 4.77 4.35 4.55 4.88 4. Were special techniques successful 2 0 0 0 2 2 4 4.25 367/878 4.25 4.28 4.05 4.33 4.25 Seminar 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 85 \*\*\*\* 4.44 4.72 4.77 \*\*\*\* 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 9 0 0 0 0 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 9 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\* 79 \*\*\*\* 4.89 4.69 4.69 \*\*\*\* 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 72 \*\*\*\* 4.56 4.64 4.64 \*\*\*\*

#### Frequency Distribution

9 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\* / 80 \*\*\*\* 4.53 4.61 4.52 \*\*\*\*

9 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 375 \*\*\*\* 4.53 4.01 3.90 \*\*\*\*

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	2	General	4	Under-grad	10	Non-major	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0	Electives		responses to	be sic	nificant	
				I	0	Other	4	_			
				2	_						

Course-Section: AMST 490 0101 Title SENIOR SEMINAR

Instructor: LOVIGLIO, JASON

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 10

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 55 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	;		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	5	3	3.90	1241/1576	4.20	4.41	4.30	4.46	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	759/1576	4.32	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	925/1342	4.13	4.51	4.32	4.46	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	921/1520	4.35	4.50	4.25	4.38	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	513/1465	4.20		4.12	4.22	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	625/1434	4.40	4.44	4.14	4.30	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4		4.40	690/1547	4.20	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	1424/1574	4.18	4.41		4.69	4.10
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	623/1554	4.50	4.38	4.10	4.24	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	589/1488	4.86	4.66	4.47	4.55	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.87	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3		4.57	596/1486	4.79		4.32	4.41	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	789/1489	4.71	4.61	4.32	4.38	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	943/1277			4.03	4.04	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	335/1279	4.83	4.67	4.17	4.31	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	505/1270	4.83	4.76	4.35	4.53	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	773/1269	4.67	4.77	4.35	4.55	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	2	1	-	4.17	415/ 878	4.58		4.05		4.17
1. Were special ecciniques successful	-	O	O	O	2	_	3	1.1,	1137 070	1.50	1.20	1.05	1.33	1.1,
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.28	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.45	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.70	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.56	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.19	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 85	4.50	4.44	4.72	4.77	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.89	4.69	4.69	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	44/ 72	4.58	4.56	4.64	4.64	4.67
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1		4.67	40/ 80	4.46	4.53	4.61		4.67
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	146/ 375	4.46	4.53	4.01	3.90	4.67
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.70	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.30	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.34	****
. Did conferences help you carry out field activities		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	***	****	4.03	3.97	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	3.88	****

Course-Section: AMST 490 0101
Title SENIOR SEMINAR
Instructor: LOVIGLIO, JASON
Enrollment: 14

Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 55 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Title SENIOR SEMINAR Instructor: MCDERMOTT, PAT Enrollment: 5

Page 56 Course-Section: AMST 490 0201 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	4	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

				_	ncies	5	_		ructor	Course	_	UMBC		Sect
Questions	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	2	4.50	637/1576	4.20	4.41	4.30	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	939/1576	4.32	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	511/1520	4.35	4.50	4.25	4.38	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	850/1465	4.20	4.44	4.12	4.22	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	398/1434	4.40	4.44	4.14	4.30	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1041/1547	4.20	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1324/1574	4.18	4.41	4.64	4.69	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	263/1554	4.50	4.38	4.10	4.24	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	4.86	4.66	4.47	4.55	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1493	5.00	4.87	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	4.79	4.63	4.32	4.41	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1489	4.71	4.61	4.32	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1149/1277	3.33	4.18	4.03	4.04	3.00
Discussion					_	_								
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1279	4.83	4.67	4.17	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	4.83	4.76	4.35	4.53	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	4.67	4.77	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 878	4.58	4.28	4.05	4.33	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	76/ 85	4.50	4.44	4.72	4.77	4.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention		0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.44	4.72	4.77	5.00
	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	1/ /9 47/ 72	4.58	4.89	4.69		
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	66/ 80	4.58	4.50	4.64	4.64 4.52	4.50 4.25
	0	0	0	1	U	Τ	_		,					
5. Were criteria for grading made clear			U	Т	U	0	3	4.25	176/ 375	4.46	4.53	4.01	3.90	4.25
Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	ı									

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

Course-Section: AMST 610 0101 University of Maryland Title MULTICULT IDENTITY Baltimore County Instructor: MCDERMOTT, PAT Spring 2009

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 7

9

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2009

Page 57

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

:	Student	Course	${\tt Evaluation}$	Questionnaire

				-	ncies				ructor	Course	_		Level	
Questions	NR 	NA	1	2	3 	4	5 	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Me
General														
Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	916/1576	4.29	4.41	4.30	4.43	4.
Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	324/1576	4.71	4.45	4.27	4.32	4.
Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.51	4.32	4.38	5
Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	648/1520	4.43	4.50	4.25	4.36	4
Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	264/1465	4.67	4.44	4.12	4.25	4
Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	270/1434	4.67	4.44	4.14	4.35	4
Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.34	4.19	4.24	5
How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.00	4.41	4.64	4.75	4
How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	222/1554	4.71	4.38	4.10	4.18	4
Lecture														
Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.66	4.47	4.52	
Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.87	4.73	4.80	
Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	241/1486	4.83	4.63	4.32	4.37	
Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	274/1489	4.83	4.61	4.32	4.38	
Discussion														
Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	532/1279	4.43	4.67	4.17	4.34	
Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	458/1270	4.71	4.76	4.35	4.53	
Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.77	4.35	4.55	
Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	688/ 878	3.60	4.28	4.05	4.11	
Seminar														
Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	74/ 85	4.33	4.44	4.72	4.79	
Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	52/ 79	4.67	4.89	4.69	4.77	
Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	47/ 72	4.50	4.56	4.64	4.70	
Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	40/ 80	4.67	4.53	4.61	4.70	4
Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	146/ 375	4.67	4.53	4.01	4.10	•
Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	oe			Majors	3

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