

Course-Section: EDUC 304 0101
 Title TCHNG PROB SOLVNG:ECE
 Instructor: FRYER, MARY G.
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 593
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	4	2	6	3	3.24	1588/1674	3.24	4.39	4.27	4.26	3.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	2	2	7	2	3.06	1603/1674	3.06	4.33	4.23	4.21	3.06	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	1	6	5	3.69	1366/1609	3.69	4.39	4.22	4.27	3.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	0	4	5	4	3.44	1274/1585	3.44	4.05	3.96	3.95	3.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	3	3	6	3.56	1262/1535	3.56	4.35	4.08	4.15	3.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	2	2	10	4.00	1097/1651	4.00	4.35	4.18	4.16	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	3	3	4	0	2.75	1599/1656	2.75	4.26	4.07	4.07	2.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	3	5	1	5	3.40	1499/1586	3.40	4.47	4.43	4.42	3.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	960/1585	4.73	4.81	4.69	4.66	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	4	2	1	5	3.07	1498/1582	3.07	4.40	4.26	4.26	3.07	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	6	0	5	3.27	1442/1575	3.27	4.28	4.27	4.25	3.27	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	4	4	4	1	3.00	1217/1380	3.00	3.84	3.94	4.01	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	251/1520	4.73	4.43	4.01	4.09	4.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	313/1515	4.82	4.60	4.24	4.32	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	346/1511	4.82	4.67	4.27	4.34	4.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	186/ 994	4.56	4.31	3.94	3.96	4.56	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.45	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 77	****	4.12	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.35	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.85	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 49	****	4.05	4.27	3.27	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 13	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3	
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D 0	Under-grad 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Non-major 1
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 1	Electives 0
					Other 16

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 310 0101
 Title INQUIRY INTO EDUCATION
 Instructor: DANNA, S
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 594
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	485/1674	4.17	4.39	4.27	4.26	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	460/1674	4.30	4.33	4.23	4.21	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	262/1423	4.73	4.44	4.27	4.27	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	173/1609	4.56	4.39	4.22	4.27	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	612/1585	3.67	4.05	3.96	3.95	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	283/1535	4.36	4.35	4.08	4.15	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	393/1651	4.40	4.35	4.18	4.16	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1135/1673	4.56	4.83	4.69	4.68	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	794/1656	4.17	4.26	4.07	4.07	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	753/1586	4.32	4.47	4.43	4.42	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	811/1585	4.90	4.81	4.69	4.66	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	525/1582	4.36	4.40	4.26	4.26	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	579/1575	4.25	4.28	4.27	4.25	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	902/1380	3.61	3.84	3.94	4.01	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	191/1520	4.50	4.43	4.01	4.09	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1515	4.85	4.60	4.24	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	358/1511	4.86	4.67	4.27	4.34	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	205/ 994	4.34	4.31	3.94	3.96	4.50	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	33/ 76	4.62	4.45	3.98	4.03	4.50	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	21/ 77	4.28	4.12	3.93	3.70	4.50	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 53	4.35	4.35	4.45	3.87	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	11/ 48	4.34	3.85	4.12	3.67	4.75	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	26/ 49	4.36	4.05	4.27	3.27	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 310 0201
 Title INQUIRY INTO EDUCATION
 Instructor: NORTH-COLEMAN,
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 595
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	10	6	3.95	1259/1674	4.17	4.39	4.27	4.26	3.95	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	12	4.40	737/1674	4.30	4.33	4.23	4.21	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	335/1423	4.73	4.44	4.27	4.27	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	222/1609	4.56	4.39	4.22	4.27	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	8	8	4.15	652/1585	3.67	4.05	3.96	3.95	4.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	5	11	4.30	608/1535	4.36	4.35	4.08	4.15	4.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	3	3	12	4.37	727/1651	4.40	4.35	4.18	4.16	4.37	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	12	4.60	1135/1673	4.56	4.83	4.69	4.68	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	641/1656	4.17	4.26	4.07	4.07	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	805/1586	4.32	4.47	4.43	4.42	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	567/1585	4.90	4.81	4.69	4.66	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	9	9	4.42	748/1582	4.36	4.40	4.26	4.26	4.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	8	9	4.25	958/1575	4.25	4.28	4.27	4.25	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	303/1380	3.61	3.84	3.94	4.01	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	431/1520	4.50	4.43	4.01	4.09	4.47	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	0	15	4.76	372/1515	4.85	4.60	4.24	4.32	4.76	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	146/1511	4.86	4.67	4.27	4.34	4.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	278/ 994	4.34	4.31	3.94	3.96	4.41	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.33	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.38	4.19	4.24	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.44	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.43	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.91	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	31/ 76	4.62	4.45	3.98	4.03	4.60	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	26/ 77	4.28	4.12	3.93	3.70	4.40	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 53	4.35	4.35	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 48	4.34	3.85	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 49	4.36	4.05	4.27	3.27	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 15	Required for Majors 0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B 3	Graduate 0
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	Under-grad 20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D 0	Non-major 2
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 0
				P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				I 0	
				? 0	Other 19

Course-Section: EDUC 310 0301
 Title INQUIRY INTO EDUCATION
 Instructor: Gaurin, Adell
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 596
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	1	11	6	3.95	1259/1674	4.17	4.39	4.27	4.26	3.95	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	12	4	3.90	1271/1674	4.30	4.33	4.23	4.21	3.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	18	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1423	4.73	4.44	4.27	4.27	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	7	9	4.14	985/1609	4.56	4.39	4.22	4.27	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	7	4	2	3	2.65	1534/1585	3.67	4.05	3.96	3.95	2.65	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	9	8	4.19	737/1535	4.36	4.35	4.08	4.15	4.19	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	9	9	4.24	889/1651	4.40	4.35	4.18	4.16	4.24	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	10	4.48	1235/1673	4.56	4.83	4.69	4.68	4.48	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	4	13	4	4.00	955/1656	4.17	4.26	4.07	4.07	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	6	9	4	3.80	1400/1586	4.32	4.47	4.43	4.42	3.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1585	4.90	4.81	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	5	9	6	4.05	1104/1582	4.36	4.40	4.26	4.26	4.05	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	4	10	5	3.90	1216/1575	4.25	4.28	4.27	4.25	3.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	4	3	0	4	1	2.58	1313/1380	3.61	3.84	3.94	4.01	2.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	7	8	4.22	673/1520	4.50	4.43	4.01	4.09	4.22	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	360/1515	4.85	4.60	4.24	4.32	4.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	323/1511	4.86	4.67	4.27	4.34	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	4	8	6	4.11	438/ 994	4.34	4.31	3.94	3.96	4.11	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.33	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.38	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.61	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.56	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.20	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.44	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 101	****	4.43	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 99	****	4.39	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.38	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	25/ 76	4.62	4.45	3.98	4.03	4.75	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	2	2	7	5	3.94	40/ 77	4.28	4.12	3.93	3.70	3.94	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	6	0	1	4	2	3	3.70	47/ 53	4.35	4.35	4.45	3.87	3.70	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	3	0	2	2	4	5	3.92	30/ 48	4.34	3.85	4.12	3.67	3.92	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	7	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	30/ 49	4.36	4.05	4.27	3.27	4.22	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 61	****	4.54	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 52	****	4.59	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 50	****	4.73	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 35	****	4.96	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 31	****	4.59	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: EDUC 310 0301
 Title INQUIRY INTO EDUCATION
 Instructor: Gaurin, Adell
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 596
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	14	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 311 0101
 Title PSYC FOUNDATION OF EDU
 Instructor: WILLIAMS, VICKI
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 597
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	3	6	5	3.93	1284/1674	4.28	4.39	4.27	4.26	3.93	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	6	5	3.93	1233/1674	4.39	4.33	4.23	4.21	3.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	4	6	3.93	1079/1423	4.36	4.44	4.27	4.27	3.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	1	5	7	4.07	1055/1609	4.32	4.39	4.22	4.27	4.07	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	5	4	1	2.87	1497/1585	3.54	4.05	3.96	3.95	2.87	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	655/1535	4.40	4.35	4.08	4.15	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	768/1651	4.54	4.35	4.18	4.16	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	987/1673	4.66	4.83	4.69	4.68	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	0	2	8	2	3.77	1230/1656	4.15	4.26	4.07	4.07	3.77	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	1	5	8	4.27	1136/1586	4.55	4.47	4.43	4.42	4.27	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	1309/1585	4.64	4.81	4.69	4.66	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	6	6	4.13	1052/1582	4.51	4.40	4.26	4.26	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	3	4	6	3.80	1264/1575	4.22	4.28	4.27	4.25	3.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	594/1380	4.38	3.84	3.94	4.01	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	2	6	2	3.38	1230/1520	4.04	4.43	4.01	4.09	3.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	1002/1515	4.41	4.60	4.24	4.32	4.08	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	845/1511	4.62	4.67	4.27	4.34	4.31	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	1	1	4	3	4	3.62	695/ 994	4.21	4.31	3.94	3.96	3.62	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	4.45	3.98	4.03	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	4.54	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.59	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.73	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.96	4.36	3.29	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 16	Non-major 4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 11		
				? 0			

Course-Section: EDUC 311 0201
 Title PSYC FOUNDATION OF EDU
 Instructor: WILLIAMS, VICKI
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 598
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	445/1674	4.28	4.39	4.27	4.26	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	184/1674	4.39	4.33	4.23	4.21	4.84	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	226/1423	4.36	4.44	4.27	4.27	4.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	408/1609	4.32	4.39	4.22	4.27	4.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	7	9	4.21	593/1585	3.54	4.05	3.96	3.95	4.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	355/1535	4.40	4.35	4.08	4.15	4.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	254/1651	4.54	4.35	4.18	4.16	4.74	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	1155/1673	4.66	4.83	4.69	4.68	4.58	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	359/1656	4.15	4.26	4.07	4.07	4.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	354/1586	4.55	4.47	4.43	4.42	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	615/1585	4.64	4.81	4.69	4.66	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	170/1582	4.51	4.40	4.26	4.26	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	523/1575	4.22	4.28	4.27	4.25	4.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	1	1	13	4.63	227/1380	4.38	3.84	3.94	4.01	4.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	281/1520	4.04	4.43	4.01	4.09	4.69	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	384/1515	4.41	4.60	4.24	4.32	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	171/1511	4.62	4.67	4.27	4.34	4.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	93/ 994	4.21	4.31	3.94	3.96	4.81	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.44	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.43	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.39	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.38	4.14	3.48	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 17	Required for Majors	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 1
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 0
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	17
			? 1		

Course-Section: EDUC 312 0101
 Title ANALYSIS OF TCHNG & LR
 Instructor: WILLIAMS, VICKI
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 599
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	829/1674	4.40	4.39	4.27	4.26	4.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	495/1674	4.47	4.33	4.23	4.21	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	262/1423	4.69	4.44	4.27	4.27	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	490/1609	4.28	4.39	4.22	4.27	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	2	8	4.07	722/1585	3.36	4.05	3.96	3.95	4.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	310/1535	4.37	4.35	4.08	4.15	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	3	10	4.50	524/1651	3.77	4.35	4.18	4.16	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	915/1673	4.93	4.83	4.69	4.68	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	871/1656	4.21	4.26	4.07	4.07	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	784/1586	4.54	4.47	4.43	4.42	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	853/1585	4.84	4.81	4.69	4.66	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	366/1582	4.56	4.40	4.26	4.26	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	867/1575	4.48	4.28	4.27	4.25	4.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	2	4	5	3.85	838/1380	3.53	3.84	3.94	4.01	3.85	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	645/1520	4.42	4.43	4.01	4.09	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	629/1515	4.67	4.60	4.24	4.32	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	278/1511	4.71	4.67	4.27	4.34	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	302/ 994	4.22	4.31	3.94	3.96	4.38	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 1
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 13
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 1		

Course-Section: EDUC 312 0201
 Title ANALYSIS OF TCHNG & LR
 Instructor: SCHAFFER, EUGEN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 600
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	751/1674	4.40	4.39	4.27	4.26	4.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	721/1674	4.47	4.33	4.23	4.21	4.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	376/1423	4.69	4.44	4.27	4.27	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	963/1609	4.28	4.39	4.22	4.27	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	4	0	3	3.00	1440/1585	3.36	4.05	3.96	3.95	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	643/1535	4.37	4.35	4.08	4.15	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	0	5	2	2	3.40	1485/1651	3.77	4.35	4.18	4.16	3.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1673	4.93	4.83	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	7	1	4.00	955/1656	4.21	4.26	4.07	4.07	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	858/1586	4.54	4.47	4.43	4.42	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	567/1585	4.84	4.81	4.69	4.66	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	777/1582	4.56	4.40	4.26	4.26	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	579/1575	4.48	4.28	4.27	4.25	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	1	3	3	1	3.22	1170/1380	3.53	3.84	3.94	4.01	3.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	397/1520	4.42	4.43	4.01	4.09	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	384/1515	4.67	4.60	4.24	4.32	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	544/1511	4.71	4.67	4.27	4.34	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	420/ 994	4.22	4.31	3.94	3.96	4.14	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	9
			? 0		

Course-Section: EDUC 312 0201
 Title ANALYSIS OF TCHNG & LR
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 601
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	751/1674	4.40	4.39	4.27	4.26	4.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	721/1674	4.47	4.33	4.23	4.21	4.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	376/1423	4.69	4.44	4.27	4.27	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	963/1609	4.28	4.39	4.22	4.27	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	4	0	3	3.00	1440/1585	3.36	4.05	3.96	3.95	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	643/1535	4.37	4.35	4.08	4.15	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	0	5	2	2	3.40	1485/1651	3.77	4.35	4.18	4.16	3.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1673	4.93	4.83	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	381/1656	4.21	4.26	4.07	4.07	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1586	4.54	4.47	4.43	4.42	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1585	4.84	4.81	4.69	4.66	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1582	4.56	4.40	4.26	4.26	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1575	4.48	4.28	4.27	4.25	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1380	3.53	3.84	3.94	4.01	3.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	397/1520	4.42	4.43	4.01	4.09	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	384/1515	4.67	4.60	4.24	4.32	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	544/1511	4.71	4.67	4.27	4.34	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	420/ 994	4.22	4.31	3.94	3.96	4.14	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	9
			? 0		

Course-Section: EDUC 315 0101
 Title TCHNG ENGLISH:SEC SCHO
 Instructor: NORTH-COLEMAN,
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 602
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1583/1674	3.25	4.39	4.27	4.26	3.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1370/1674	3.75	4.33	4.23	4.21	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1094/1609	4.00	4.39	4.22	4.27	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1049/1585	3.75	4.05	3.96	3.95	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1147/1535	3.75	4.35	4.08	4.15	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1324/1651	3.75	4.35	4.18	4.16	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	958/1673	4.75	4.83	4.69	4.68	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.26	4.07	4.07	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	858/1586	4.50	4.47	4.43	4.42	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	632/1582	4.50	4.40	4.26	4.26	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1138/1575	4.00	4.28	4.27	4.25	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	666/1380	4.00	3.84	3.94	4.01	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	645/1520	4.25	4.43	4.01	4.09	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.60	4.24	4.32	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.34	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	811/ 994	3.33	4.31	3.94	3.96	3.33

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 317 0101
 Title PROC & ACQUIS READ
 Instructor: Young, Patricia
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 603
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1196/1674	4.00	4.39	4.27	4.26	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	931/1674	4.25	4.33	4.23	4.21	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	771/1423	4.33	4.44	4.27	4.27	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	645/1609	4.40	4.39	4.22	4.27	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	413/1585	4.40	4.05	3.96	3.95	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	508/1535	4.40	4.35	4.08	4.15	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	673/1651	4.40	4.35	4.18	4.16	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	4	0	3.40	1654/1673	3.40	4.83	4.69	4.68	3.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1377/1656	3.50	4.26	4.07	4.07	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	389/1586	4.80	4.47	4.43	4.42	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	811/1585	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.66	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	246/1582	4.80	4.40	4.26	4.26	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	819/1575	4.40	4.28	4.27	4.25	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	241/1380	4.60	3.84	3.94	4.01	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.43	4.01	4.09	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.60	4.24	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	205/ 994	4.50	4.31	3.94	3.96	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 318 0101
 Title INSTRUCTION OF READING
 Instructor: TILLES, ALYSON
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 604
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	233/1674	4.82	4.39	4.27	4.26	4.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	303/1674	4.73	4.33	4.23	4.21	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1423	****	4.44	4.27	4.27	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	443/1609	4.55	4.39	4.22	4.27	4.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	769/1585	4.00	4.05	3.96	3.95	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	548/1535	4.36	4.35	4.08	4.15	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	361/1651	4.64	4.35	4.18	4.16	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	352/1656	4.55	4.26	4.07	4.07	4.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	214/1586	4.91	4.47	4.43	4.42	4.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.40	4.26	4.26	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	171/1575	4.91	4.28	4.27	4.25	4.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	603/1380	4.13	3.84	3.94	4.01	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	134/1520	4.91	4.43	4.01	4.09	4.91	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	313/1515	4.82	4.60	4.24	4.32	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	346/1511	4.82	4.67	4.27	4.34	4.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	167/ 994	4.60	4.31	3.94	3.96	4.60	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	41/ 76	4.00	4.45	3.98	4.03	4.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	1	0	2	0	6	4.11	36/ 77	4.11	4.12	3.93	3.70	4.11	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	4	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	50/ 53	3.00	4.35	4.45	3.87	3.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	6	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	35/ 48	3.67	3.85	4.12	3.67	3.67	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	****	4.05	4.27	3.27	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 11
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 0		

Course-Section: EDUC 319 0101
 Title ASSESS READING
 Instructor: CANTOR, RONNI
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 605
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	2	4	1	3.20	1595/1674	3.20	4.39	4.27	4.26	3.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	5	0	2	3.10	1599/1674	3.10	4.33	4.23	4.21	3.10	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	2	4	3.70	1192/1423	3.70	4.44	4.27	4.27	3.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	2	3	3.50	1452/1609	3.50	4.39	4.22	4.27	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	3	0	1	2.20	1570/1585	2.20	4.05	3.96	3.95	2.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	3	1	3.30	1366/1535	3.30	4.35	4.08	4.15	3.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	1020/1651	4.11	4.35	4.18	4.16	4.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	1383/1673	4.30	4.83	4.69	4.68	4.30	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	2	6	0	1	3.00	1540/1656	3.00	4.26	4.07	4.07	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	3	3	3.80	1400/1586	3.80	4.47	4.43	4.42	3.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	1225/1585	4.50	4.81	4.69	4.66	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	2	3	2	3.40	1442/1582	3.40	4.40	4.26	4.26	3.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	1	4	1	3.00	1487/1575	3.00	4.28	4.27	4.25	3.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	3	2	0	0	0	1.40	1375/1380	1.40	3.84	3.94	4.01	1.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	1	3	3.50	1169/1520	3.50	4.43	4.01	4.09	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	4	0	1	2	3	3.00	1420/1515	3.00	4.60	4.24	4.32	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	4	0	1	1	4	3.10	1405/1511	3.10	4.67	4.27	4.34	3.10	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	1	3	2	2	1	2.89	925/ 994	2.89	4.31	3.94	3.96	2.89	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	41/ 76	4.00	4.45	3.98	4.03	4.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	73/ 77	2.67	4.12	3.93	3.70	2.67	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	1	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 53	****	4.35	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 48	****	3.85	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 49	****	4.05	4.27	3.27	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 0		

Course-Section: EDUC 320 0101
 Title TEACH MATH IN ELEM SCH
 Instructor: KINACH, BARBARA
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 606
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	4	1	3	3.27	1578/1674	3.27	4.39	4.27	4.26	3.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	3	3	2	0	2.36	1666/1674	2.36	4.33	4.23	4.21	2.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1423	****	4.44	4.27	4.27	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	1	2	2	2.82	1587/1609	2.82	4.39	4.22	4.27	2.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	6	1	2	3.30	1344/1585	3.30	4.05	3.96	3.95	3.30	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	1	2	2	2.90	1470/1535	2.90	4.35	4.08	4.15	2.90	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	6	2	2	0	1	1.91	1647/1651	1.91	4.35	4.18	4.16	1.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	1001/1673	4.73	4.83	4.69	4.68	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	3	4	3	0	1	2.27	1635/1656	2.27	4.26	4.07	4.07	2.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	3	0	0	0	2.00	1579/1586	2.00	4.47	4.43	4.42	2.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	1578/1582	2.00	4.40	4.26	4.26	2.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	2	0	0	0	1.67	1572/1575	1.67	4.28	4.27	4.25	1.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	1	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1380	****	3.84	3.94	4.01	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	1	3	1	2	2.64	1459/1520	2.64	4.43	4.01	4.09	2.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	2	2	4	1	2	2.91	1445/1515	2.91	4.60	4.24	4.32	2.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	2	4	1	3	3.27	1366/1511	3.27	4.67	4.27	4.34	3.27	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	1	1	3	1	2	3.25	835/ 994	3.25	4.31	3.94	3.96	3.25	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	5	2	1	2.91	66/ 76	2.91	4.45	3.98	4.03	2.91	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	3	3	2	3	0	2.45	75/ 77	2.45	4.12	3.93	3.70	2.45	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	6	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	49/ 53	3.40	4.35	4.45	3.87	3.40	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	2	3	2	3	0	1	2.33	48/ 48	2.33	3.85	4.12	3.67	2.33	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	7	1	0	3	0	0	2.50	46/ 49	2.50	4.05	4.27	3.27	2.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 11
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 1	Other	9
			? 3		

Course-Section: EDUC 322 0101
 Title MATH IN SECONDARY SCHO
 Instructor: KINACH, BARBARA
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 607
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.39	4.27	4.26	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.33	4.23	4.21	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.39	4.22	4.27	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.05	3.96	3.95	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.35	4.08	4.15	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.35	4.18	4.16	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.26	4.07	4.07	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.43	4.01	4.09	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.60	4.24	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	4.31	3.94	3.96	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4.45	3.98	4.03	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 77	5.00	4.12	3.93	3.70	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 324 0101
 Title PROCESS SEM IN ECE-M/S
 Instructor: BELL, DEBORAH A
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 608
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	1	12	4.71	342/1674	4.71	4.39	4.27	4.26	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	6	7	4.36	803/1674	4.36	4.33	4.23	4.21	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1423	****	4.44	4.27	4.27	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	262/1609	4.71	4.39	4.22	4.27	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	879/1585	3.92	4.05	3.96	3.95	3.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	192/1535	4.73	4.35	4.08	4.15	4.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	741/1651	4.36	4.35	4.18	4.16	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	719/1656	4.25	4.26	4.07	4.07	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	214/1586	4.90	4.47	4.43	4.42	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	567/1585	4.90	4.81	4.69	4.66	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	152/1582	4.90	4.40	4.26	4.26	4.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.28	4.27	4.25	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	866/1380	3.80	3.84	3.94	4.01	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	134/1520	4.90	4.43	4.01	4.09	4.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.60	4.24	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	160/ 994	4.63	4.31	3.94	3.96	4.63	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 12	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 0		

Course-Section: EDUC 330 0101
 Title TCHNG SCIENCE:ELEM SCH
 Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 609
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.39	4.27	4.26	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.33	4.23	4.21	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.44	4.27	4.27	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.39	4.22	4.27	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	224/1585	4.67	4.05	3.96	3.95	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.35	4.08	4.15	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.35	4.18	4.16	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.26	4.07	4.07	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.47	4.43	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.40	4.26	4.26	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.28	4.27	4.25	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	303/1380	4.50	3.84	3.94	4.01	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.43	4.01	4.09	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.60	4.24	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	4.31	3.94	3.96	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 331 0101
 Title SOCIAL STUDIES:ELEM SC
 Instructor: FITZHUGH, WILLI
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 610
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	367/1674	4.70	4.39	4.27	4.26	4.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	338/1674	4.70	4.33	4.23	4.21	4.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.44	4.27	4.27	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	282/1609	4.70	4.39	4.22	4.27	4.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	1	6	3.90	907/1585	3.90	4.05	3.96	3.95	3.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	283/1535	4.60	4.35	4.08	4.15	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	0	7	4.20	934/1651	4.20	4.35	4.18	4.16	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	706/1673	4.90	4.83	4.69	4.68	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	2	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	719/1656	4.25	4.26	4.07	4.07	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	858/1586	4.50	4.47	4.43	4.42	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	313/1582	4.75	4.40	4.26	4.26	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	692/1575	4.50	4.28	4.27	4.25	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	1	0	6	4.25	489/1380	4.25	3.84	3.94	4.01	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	173/1520	4.83	4.43	4.01	4.09	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	289/1515	4.83	4.60	4.24	4.32	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	148/ 994	4.67	4.31	3.94	3.96	4.67	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.45	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.12	3.93	3.70	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 0		

Course-Section: EDUC 332 0101
 Title SCIENCE:SECONDARY SCHO
 Instructor: SEILER, GALE
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 611
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1196/1674	4.00	4.39	4.27	4.26	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	578/1674	4.50	4.33	4.23	4.21	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1016/1423	4.00	4.44	4.27	4.27	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.39	4.22	4.27	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1440/1585	3.00	4.05	3.96	3.95	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	373/1535	4.50	4.35	4.08	4.15	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1442/1651	3.50	4.35	4.18	4.16	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.26	4.07	4.07	5.00	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	858/1586	4.50	4.47	4.43	4.42	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.40	4.26	4.26	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.28	4.27	4.25	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	666/1380	4.00	3.84	3.94	4.01	4.00	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.43	4.01	4.09	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.60	4.24	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	474/ 994	4.00	4.31	3.94	3.96	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 333 0101
 Title SOCIAL STUDIES:SEC SCH
 Instructor: STAFF
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 612
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	607/1674	4.50	4.39	4.27	4.26	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	578/1674	4.50	4.33	4.23	4.21	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	376/1423	4.67	4.44	4.27	4.27	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	1007/1609	4.13	4.39	4.22	4.27	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	936/1585	3.88	4.05	3.96	3.95	3.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	807/1535	4.13	4.35	4.08	4.15	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	1097/1651	4.00	4.35	4.18	4.16	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	381/1656	4.50	4.26	4.07	4.07	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	784/1586	4.57	4.47	4.43	4.42	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	1002/1585	4.71	4.81	4.69	4.66	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	217/1582	4.83	4.40	4.26	4.26	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	692/1575	4.50	4.28	4.27	4.25	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	426/1380	4.33	3.84	3.94	4.01	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	338/1520	4.60	4.43	4.01	4.09	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	543/1515	4.60	4.60	4.24	4.32	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	358/1511	4.80	4.67	4.27	4.34	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	287/ 994	4.40	4.31	3.94	3.96	4.40	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 335 0101
 Title TEACH FORGN LANG SEC S
 Instructor: SCHWARTZ, ANA-M
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 613
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.39	4.27	4.26	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.33	4.23	4.21	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.44	4.27	4.27	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.39	4.22	4.27	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.05	3.96	3.95	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.35	4.08	4.15	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.35	4.18	4.16	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.68	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.47	4.43	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.40	4.26	4.26	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.28	4.27	4.25	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	5.00	3.84	3.94	4.01	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.43	4.01	4.09	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.60	4.24	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	4.31	3.94	3.96	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 350 0101
 Title LANG, LIT, & INT. DEV
 Instructor: SCULLY, PAT
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 614
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	89/1674	4.94	4.39	4.27	4.26	4.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	199/1674	4.82	4.33	4.23	4.21	4.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	181/1423	4.83	4.44	4.27	4.27	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	136/1609	4.88	4.39	4.22	4.27	4.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	60/1585	4.94	4.05	3.96	3.95	4.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	105/1535	4.88	4.35	4.08	4.15	4.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	231/1651	4.75	4.35	4.18	4.16	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	149/1656	4.80	4.26	4.07	4.07	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	431/1586	4.79	4.47	4.43	4.42	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	453/1585	4.93	4.81	4.69	4.66	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	272/1582	4.79	4.40	4.26	4.26	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	137/1575	4.93	4.28	4.27	4.25	4.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	200/1380	4.67	3.84	3.94	4.01	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	185/1520	4.82	4.43	4.01	4.09	4.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	207/1515	4.91	4.60	4.24	4.32	4.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	93/ 994	4.82	4.31	3.94	3.96	4.82	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		Under-grad 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	16
			? 0		

Course-Section: EDUC 352 0101
 Title PROCESS SEM ECE-MEDIA
 Instructor: COSTELLO, MARGA
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 615
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	406/1674	4.67	4.39	4.27	4.26	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.33	4.23	4.21	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.44	4.27	4.27	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.39	4.22	4.27	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	413/1585	4.40	4.05	3.96	3.95	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	169/1535	4.75	4.35	4.08	4.15	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.35	4.18	4.16	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	887/1673	4.80	4.83	4.69	4.68	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	149/1656	4.80	4.26	4.07	4.07	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	663/1586	4.67	4.47	4.43	4.42	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	438/1582	4.67	4.40	4.26	4.26	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	495/1575	4.67	4.28	4.27	4.25	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	567/1380	4.17	3.84	3.94	4.01	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	572/1520	4.33	4.43	4.01	4.09	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.60	4.24	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	95/ 994	4.80	4.31	3.94	3.96	4.80	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 388 0101
 Title INCLUSION & INSTRUCTIO
 Instructor: BERGE, NANCY B
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 616
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	570/1674	4.53	4.39	4.27	4.26	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	641/1674	4.47	4.33	4.23	4.21	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.44	4.27	4.27	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	408/1609	4.57	4.39	4.22	4.27	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	593/1585	4.21	4.05	3.96	3.95	4.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	283/1535	4.60	4.35	4.08	4.15	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	393/1651	4.60	4.35	4.18	4.16	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	719/1656	4.25	4.26	4.07	4.07	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	663/1586	4.67	4.47	4.43	4.42	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	397/1585	4.93	4.81	4.69	4.66	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	525/1582	4.60	4.40	4.26	4.26	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	1	11	4.40	819/1575	4.40	4.28	4.27	4.25	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	5	2	7	4.14	585/1380	4.14	3.84	3.94	4.01	4.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	2	10	4.33	572/1520	4.33	4.43	4.01	4.09	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	483/1515	4.67	4.60	4.24	4.32	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	507/1511	4.67	4.67	4.27	4.34	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	163/ 994	4.62	4.31	3.94	3.96	4.62	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 76	****	4.45	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 77	****	4.12	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.35	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.85	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 49	****	4.05	4.27	3.27	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 14	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	15
			? 0		

Course-Section: EDUC 403 0101
 Title ELEM INTRNSHP SEMINAR
 Instructor: BOURNE, BARBARA
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 617
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	854/1674	4.33	4.39	4.27	4.42	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1146/1674	4.00	4.33	4.23	4.31	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	743/1609	4.33	4.39	4.22	4.30	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1207/1535	3.67	4.35	4.08	4.18	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1072/1673	4.67	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1297/1656	3.67	4.26	4.07	4.19	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1300/1586	4.00	4.47	4.43	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1472/1585	4.00	4.81	4.69	4.76	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.43	4.01	4.18	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.60	4.24	4.40	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.45	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	4.31	3.94	4.19	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 404 0101
 Title INTERNSHIP SEM:ECE
 Instructor: SCULLY, PAT
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 618
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	768/1674	4.40	4.39	4.27	4.42	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	338/1674	4.70	4.33	4.23	4.31	4.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1423	****	4.44	4.27	4.34	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	173/1609	4.80	4.39	4.22	4.30	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	3	5	4.00	769/1585	4.00	4.05	3.96	4.01	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	283/1535	4.60	4.35	4.08	4.18	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	116/1651	4.90	4.35	4.18	4.23	4.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	706/1673	4.90	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	106/1656	4.90	4.26	4.07	4.19	4.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	249/1586	4.89	4.47	4.43	4.46	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.40	4.26	4.31	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	327/1575	4.78	4.28	4.27	4.35	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1160/1380	3.25	3.84	3.94	4.04	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	151/1520	4.88	4.43	4.01	4.18	4.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.60	4.24	4.40	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.45	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	89/ 994	4.83	4.31	3.94	4.19	4.83	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		Under-grad 10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	8
			? 0		

Course-Section: EDUC 408 0101
 Title SCNDRY INTRNSHP SEMINA
 Instructor: OLIVA, LINDA M.
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 619
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	1671/1674	2.00	4.39	4.27	4.42	2.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	1674/1674	1.00	4.33	4.23	4.31	1.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1557/1609	3.00	4.39	4.22	4.30	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	1583/1585	1.00	4.05	3.96	4.01	1.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	1524/1535	2.00	4.35	4.08	4.18	2.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1097/1651	4.00	4.35	4.18	4.23	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1540/1656	3.00	4.26	4.07	4.19	3.00	

Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	89/ 103	3.50	4.44	4.41	4.42	3.50	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	100/ 101	3.00	4.43	4.48	4.65	3.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	70/ 99	4.00	4.39	4.39	4.57	4.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	4.38	4.14	4.46	5.00	

Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4.45	3.98	4.86	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	63/ 77	3.00	4.12	3.93	4.24	3.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	29/ 53	4.50	4.35	4.45	4.86	4.50	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	43/ 48	3.00	3.85	4.12	4.13	3.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	44/ 49	3.00	4.05	4.27	4.48	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 410 0101
 Title READ CONTNT AREA I
 Instructor: COWAN, CHARISSE
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 620
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.39	4.27	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.33	4.23	4.31	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.44	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.39	4.22	4.30	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.05	3.96	4.01	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.35	4.08	4.18	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.35	4.18	4.23	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.47	4.43	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.40	4.26	4.31	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.28	4.27	4.35	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	5.00	3.84	3.94	4.04	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.43	4.01	4.18	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.60	4.24	4.40	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.45	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	4.31	3.94	4.19	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 411 0101
 Title READ CONTNT AREA II
 Instructor: COWAN, CHARISSE
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 621
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.39	4.27	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.33	4.23	4.31	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.39	4.22	4.30	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	326/1585	4.50	4.05	3.96	4.01	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.35	4.08	4.18	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.35	4.18	4.23	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.26	4.07	4.19	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.47	4.43	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.40	4.26	4.31	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.28	4.27	4.35	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	5.00	3.84	3.94	4.04	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.43	4.01	4.18	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.60	4.24	4.40	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.45	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 415 0101
 Title MATERIALS TCH READ
 Instructor: Young, Patricia
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 622
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	954/1674	4.25	4.39	4.27	4.42	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	270/1674	4.75	4.33	4.23	4.31	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1016/1423	4.00	4.44	4.27	4.34	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	222/1609	4.75	4.39	4.22	4.30	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1049/1585	3.75	4.05	3.96	4.01	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	870/1535	4.00	4.35	4.08	4.18	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	524/1651	4.50	4.35	4.18	4.23	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1420/1673	4.25	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.26	4.07	4.19	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	858/1586	4.50	4.47	4.43	4.46	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	632/1582	4.50	4.40	4.26	4.31	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	958/1575	4.25	4.28	4.27	4.35	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	666/1380	4.00	3.84	3.94	4.04	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	229/1520	4.75	4.43	4.01	4.18	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	629/1515	4.50	4.60	4.24	4.40	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	642/1511	4.50	4.67	4.27	4.45	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	322/ 994	4.33	4.31	3.94	4.19	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 424 0101
 Title ISSUES IN EC CURRICULU
 Instructor: SMALL, SUE ELLE
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 623
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	768/1674	4.40	4.39	4.27	4.42	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	870/1674	4.30	4.33	4.23	4.31	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1423	****	4.44	4.27	4.34	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	892/1609	4.22	4.39	4.22	4.30	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	442/1585	4.38	4.05	3.96	4.01	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	5	3	4.11	817/1535	4.11	4.35	4.08	4.18	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	866/1651	4.25	4.35	4.18	4.23	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	1072/1673	4.67	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	522/1656	4.40	4.26	4.07	4.19	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	805/1586	4.56	4.47	4.43	4.46	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	1071/1585	4.67	4.81	4.69	4.76	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	719/1582	4.44	4.40	4.26	4.31	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	768/1575	4.44	4.28	4.27	4.35	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	0	1	1	3	3.43	1082/1380	3.43	3.84	3.94	4.04	3.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	645/1520	4.25	4.43	4.01	4.18	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	384/1515	4.75	4.60	4.24	4.40	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	414/1511	4.75	4.67	4.27	4.45	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	432/ 994	4.13	4.31	3.94	4.19	4.13
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.44	4.41	4.42	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 471 0101
 Title PRIN OF TRAINING AND D
 Instructor: Story, Virginia
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 624
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	406/1674	4.67	4.39	4.27	4.42	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	737/1674	4.40	4.33	4.23	4.31	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	9	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	181/1423	4.83	4.44	4.27	4.34	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	455/1609	4.53	4.39	4.22	4.30	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	1	1	2	0	3	8	4.07	722/1585	4.07	4.05	3.96	4.01	4.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	346/1535	4.53	4.35	4.08	4.18	4.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	484/1651	4.53	4.35	4.18	4.23	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	494/1673	4.93	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	381/1656	4.50	4.26	4.07	4.19	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	784/1586	4.57	4.47	4.43	4.46	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	1094/1585	4.64	4.81	4.69	4.76	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	632/1582	4.50	4.40	4.26	4.31	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	932/1575	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.35	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	284/1380	4.54	3.84	3.94	4.04	4.54	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	777/1520	4.10	4.43	4.01	4.18	4.10	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	707/1515	4.44	4.60	4.24	4.40	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	602/1511	4.56	4.67	4.27	4.45	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	148/ 994	4.67	4.31	3.94	4.19	4.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.44	4.41	4.42	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.43	4.48	4.65	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.39	4.39	4.57	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.38	4.14	4.46	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 0		

Course-Section: EDUC 501 8720
 Title USING TECH SCIENCE/MAT
 Instructor: Flowers, Connie (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 625
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	186/1674	4.87	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	215/1674	4.80	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	238/1423	4.78	4.44	4.27	4.28	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	262/1609	4.71	4.39	4.22	4.34	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	121/1585	4.83	4.05	3.96	4.23	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	4	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	101/1535	4.89	4.35	4.08	4.27	4.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	382/1651	4.62	4.35	4.18	4.32	4.62	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	5	6	1	3.67	1297/1656	4.24	4.26	4.07	4.15	4.24	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	1	5	7	4.13	1230/1586	4.41	4.47	4.43	4.50	4.41	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	1071/1585	4.83	4.81	4.69	4.79	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	5	9	4.47	690/1582	4.65	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	2	1	10	4.13	1070/1575	4.57	4.28	4.27	4.30	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	284/1380	4.77	3.84	3.94	3.85	4.77	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	156/1520	4.87	4.43	4.01	4.19	4.87	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	483/1515	4.67	4.60	4.24	4.47	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	289/1511	4.87	4.67	4.27	4.49	4.87	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	1	0	1	1	10	4.46	237/ 994	4.46	4.31	3.94	4.07	4.46	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	1	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	59/ 265	4.67	4.33	4.23	4.51	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	49/ 278	4.70	4.38	4.19	4.42	4.70	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	71/ 260	4.78	4.61	4.46	4.67	4.78	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	35/ 259	4.90	4.56	4.33	4.66	4.90	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	3	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	53/ 233	4.67	4.20	4.20	4.53	4.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	2	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 103	5.00	4.44	4.41	4.56	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	2	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	63/ 101	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.62	4.43	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	3	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 95	5.00	4.50	4.31	4.43	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	37/ 99	4.78	4.39	4.39	4.54	4.78	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	42/ 97	4.38	4.38	4.14	4.26	4.38	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	29/ 76	4.67	4.45	3.98	4.20	4.67	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	24/ 77	4.44	4.12	3.93	4.31	4.44	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	1	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	26/ 53	4.63	4.35	4.45	4.64	4.63	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	1	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	11/ 48	4.75	3.85	4.12	4.35	4.75	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	2	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	23/ 49	4.67	4.05	4.27	4.46	4.67	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	24/ 61	4.60	4.54	4.09	4.46	4.60	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	2	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	18/ 52	4.88	4.59	4.26	4.59	4.88	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	23/ 50	4.80	4.73	4.44	4.64	4.80	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	2	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	16/ 35	4.88	4.96	4.36	4.84	4.88	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	2	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	14/ 31	4.86	4.59	4.34	4.64	4.86	

Course-Section: EDUC 501 8720
 Title USING TECH SCIENCE/MAT
 Instructor: Flowers, Connie (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 625
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	6	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 501 8720
 Title USING TECH SCIENCE/MAT
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 626
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	186/1674	4.87	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	215/1674	4.80	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	238/1423	4.78	4.44	4.27	4.28	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	262/1609	4.71	4.39	4.22	4.34	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	121/1585	4.83	4.05	3.96	4.23	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	4	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	101/1535	4.89	4.35	4.08	4.27	4.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	382/1651	4.62	4.35	4.18	4.32	4.62	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	144/1656	4.24	4.26	4.07	4.15	4.24	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	618/1586	4.41	4.47	4.43	4.50	4.41	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1585	4.83	4.81	4.69	4.79	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	217/1582	4.65	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1575	4.57	4.28	4.27	4.30	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1380	4.77	3.84	3.94	3.85	4.77	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	156/1520	4.87	4.43	4.01	4.19	4.87	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	483/1515	4.67	4.60	4.24	4.47	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	289/1511	4.87	4.67	4.27	4.49	4.87	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	1	0	1	1	10	4.46	237/ 994	4.46	4.31	3.94	4.07	4.46	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	1	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	59/ 265	4.67	4.33	4.23	4.51	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	49/ 278	4.70	4.38	4.19	4.42	4.70	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	71/ 260	4.78	4.61	4.46	4.67	4.78	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	35/ 259	4.90	4.56	4.33	4.66	4.90	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	3	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	53/ 233	4.67	4.20	4.20	4.53	4.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	2	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 103	5.00	4.44	4.41	4.56	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	2	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	63/ 101	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.62	4.43	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	3	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 95	5.00	4.50	4.31	4.43	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	37/ 99	4.78	4.39	4.39	4.54	4.78	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	42/ 97	4.38	4.38	4.14	4.26	4.38	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	29/ 76	4.67	4.45	3.98	4.20	4.67	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	24/ 77	4.44	4.12	3.93	4.31	4.44	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	1	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	26/ 53	4.63	4.35	4.45	4.64	4.63	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	1	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	11/ 48	4.75	3.85	4.12	4.35	4.75	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	2	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	23/ 49	4.67	4.05	4.27	4.46	4.67	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	24/ 61	4.60	4.54	4.09	4.46	4.60	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	2	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	18/ 52	4.88	4.59	4.26	4.59	4.88	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	23/ 50	4.80	4.73	4.44	4.64	4.80	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	2	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	16/ 35	4.88	4.96	4.36	4.84	4.88	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	2	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	14/ 31	4.86	4.59	4.34	4.64	4.86	

Course-Section: EDUC 501 8720
 Title USING TECH SCIENCE/MAT
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 626
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 6 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 10 Non-major 16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 11	
			? 0		

Course-Section: EDUC 502 8720
 Title ACTIVE SCI/MATH CLASSR
 Instructor: GLICK, FRAN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 627
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1424/1674	3.71	4.39	4.27	4.44	3.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	2	1	3.57	1465/1674	3.57	4.33	4.23	4.34	3.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1268/1423	3.50	4.44	4.27	4.28	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	1	2	3.14	1541/1609	3.14	4.39	4.22	4.34	3.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	3	0	1	2.83	1502/1585	2.83	4.05	3.96	4.23	2.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	3	0	1	2.43	1515/1535	2.43	4.35	4.08	4.27	2.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	1	2	2	0	2.83	1593/1651	2.83	4.35	4.18	4.32	2.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	796/1673	4.86	4.83	4.69	4.78	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	2	2	2	1	3.29	1462/1656	3.29	4.26	4.07	4.15	3.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	3	1	1	2	3.29	1518/1586	3.39	4.47	4.43	4.50	3.39	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1533/1585	4.11	4.81	4.69	4.79	4.11	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	3	2	0	2.86	1536/1582	2.68	4.40	4.26	4.33	2.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	1	1	2	3.00	1487/1575	3.00	4.28	4.27	4.30	3.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	2	1	1	3	3.71	930/1380	3.86	3.84	3.94	3.85	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	1	3	0	3.00	1353/1520	3.00	4.43	4.01	4.19	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	4	2	0	3.00	1420/1515	3.00	4.60	4.24	4.47	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	1296/1511	3.57	4.67	4.27	4.49	3.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	474/ 994	4.00	4.31	3.94	4.07	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	178/ 265	4.00	4.33	4.23	4.51	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	223/ 278	3.75	4.38	4.19	4.42	3.75	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	190/ 260	4.25	4.61	4.46	4.67	4.25	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	191/ 259	4.00	4.56	4.33	4.66	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	214/ 233	3.33	4.20	4.20	4.53	3.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	96/ 103	3.00	4.44	4.41	4.56	3.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	72/ 101	4.00	4.43	4.48	4.62	4.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	86/ 95	3.33	4.50	4.31	4.43	3.33	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	97/ 99	2.67	4.39	4.39	4.54	2.67	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	88/ 97	3.00	4.38	4.14	4.26	3.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	50/ 76	3.50	4.45	3.98	4.20	3.50	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	50/ 77	3.50	4.12	3.93	4.31	3.50	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.35	4.45	4.64	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.85	4.12	4.35	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	4.05	4.27	4.46	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	50/ 61	3.33	4.54	4.09	4.46	3.33	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	40/ 52	3.50	4.59	4.26	4.59	3.50	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	36/ 50	4.00	4.73	4.44	4.64	4.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.96	4.36	4.84	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	25/ 31	3.50	4.59	4.34	4.64	3.50	

Course-Section: EDUC 502 8720
 Title ACTIVE SCI/MATH CLASSR
 Instructor: GLICK, FRAN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 627
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 502 8720
 Title ACTIVE SCI/MATH CLASSR
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 628
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1424/1674	3.71	4.39	4.27	4.44	3.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	2	1	3.57	1465/1674	3.57	4.33	4.23	4.34	3.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1268/1423	3.50	4.44	4.27	4.28	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	1	2	3.14	1541/1609	3.14	4.39	4.22	4.34	3.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	3	0	1	2.83	1502/1585	2.83	4.05	3.96	4.23	2.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	3	0	1	2.43	1515/1535	2.43	4.35	4.08	4.27	2.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	1	2	2	0	2.83	1593/1651	2.83	4.35	4.18	4.32	2.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	796/1673	4.86	4.83	4.69	4.78	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1656	3.29	4.26	4.07	4.15	3.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1480/1586	3.39	4.47	4.43	4.50	3.39	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1225/1585	4.11	4.81	4.69	4.79	4.11	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1564/1582	2.68	4.40	4.26	4.33	2.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1487/1575	3.00	4.28	4.27	4.30	3.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	666/1380	3.86	3.84	3.94	3.85	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	1	3	0	3.00	1353/1520	3.00	4.43	4.01	4.19	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	4	2	0	3.00	1420/1515	3.00	4.60	4.24	4.47	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	1296/1511	3.57	4.67	4.27	4.49	3.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	474/ 994	4.00	4.31	3.94	4.07	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	178/ 265	4.00	4.33	4.23	4.51	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	223/ 278	3.75	4.38	4.19	4.42	3.75	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	190/ 260	4.25	4.61	4.46	4.67	4.25	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	191/ 259	4.00	4.56	4.33	4.66	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	214/ 233	3.33	4.20	4.20	4.53	3.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	96/ 103	3.00	4.44	4.41	4.56	3.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	72/ 101	4.00	4.43	4.48	4.62	4.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	86/ 95	3.33	4.50	4.31	4.43	3.33	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	97/ 99	2.67	4.39	4.39	4.54	2.67	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	88/ 97	3.00	4.38	4.14	4.26	3.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	50/ 76	3.50	4.45	3.98	4.20	3.50	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	50/ 77	3.50	4.12	3.93	4.31	3.50	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.35	4.45	4.64	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.85	4.12	4.35	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	4.05	4.27	4.46	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	50/ 61	3.33	4.54	4.09	4.46	3.33	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	40/ 52	3.50	4.59	4.26	4.59	3.50	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	36/ 50	4.00	4.73	4.44	4.64	4.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.96	4.36	4.84	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	25/ 31	3.50	4.59	4.34	4.64	3.50	

Course-Section: EDUC 502 8720
 Title ACTIVE SCI/MATH CLASSR
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 628
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 601 0101
 Title HUMAN LEARNING/COGNITI
 Instructor: Olia, Nezhat
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 629
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	2	4	11	4	3.36	1555/1674	3.36	4.39	4.27	4.44	3.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	4	7	5	6	3.28	1571/1674	3.28	4.33	4.23	4.34	3.28	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	18	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1016/1423	4.00	4.44	4.27	4.28	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	4	2	5	6	7	3.42	1480/1609	3.42	4.39	4.22	4.34	3.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	8	5	10	3.96	838/1585	3.96	4.05	3.96	4.23	3.96	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	5	6	9	3.91	1006/1535	3.91	4.35	4.08	4.27	3.91	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	6	4	3	10	3.63	1394/1651	3.63	4.35	4.18	4.32	3.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	635/1673	4.92	4.83	4.69	4.78	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	2	7	7	2	3.25	1474/1656	3.25	4.26	4.07	4.15	3.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	3	5	5	2	5	3.05	1535/1586	3.05	4.47	4.43	4.50	3.05	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	3	8	10	4.33	1354/1585	4.33	4.81	4.69	4.79	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	5	5	2	5	4	2.90	1530/1582	2.90	4.40	4.26	4.33	2.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	7	4	3	2	6	2.82	1526/1575	2.82	4.28	4.27	4.30	2.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	12	3	0	2	1	4	3.30	1142/1380	3.30	3.84	3.94	3.85	3.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	4	8	10	4.27	626/1520	4.27	4.43	4.01	4.19	4.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	2	6	13	4.41	759/1515	4.41	4.60	4.24	4.47	4.41	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	1	2	3	13	4.30	845/1511	4.30	4.67	4.27	4.49	4.30	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	307/ 994	4.37	4.31	3.94	4.07	4.37	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 265	****	4.33	4.23	4.51	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 278	****	4.38	4.19	4.42	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.61	4.46	4.67	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.56	4.33	4.66	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.20	4.20	4.53	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.44	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 101	****	4.43	4.48	4.62	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 99	****	4.39	4.39	4.54	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 97	****	4.38	4.14	4.26	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/ 76	****	4.45	3.98	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 77	****	4.12	3.93	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.35	4.45	4.64	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.85	4.12	4.35	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	4.05	4.27	4.46	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 61	****	4.54	4.09	4.46	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	4.59	4.26	4.59	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 50	****	4.73	4.44	4.64	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.96	4.36	4.84	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.59	4.34	4.64	****	

Course-Section: EDUC 601 0101
 Title HUMAN LEARNING/COGNITI
 Instructor: Olia, Nezhat
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 629
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	A	20	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	15	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	10	Non-major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	15	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 602 0101
 Title INSTRUCTIONAL SYS DEV
 Instructor: WILLIAMS, VICKI
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 630
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	954/1674	4.46	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1576/1674	3.96	4.33	4.23	4.34	3.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1517/1609	3.96	4.39	4.22	4.34	3.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	2.25	1565/1585	3.46	4.05	3.96	4.23	2.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1435/1535	4.00	4.35	4.08	4.27	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	524/1651	4.75	4.35	4.18	4.32	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1203/1673	4.75	4.83	4.69	4.78	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1237/1656	4.38	4.26	4.07	4.15	3.75	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.47	4.43	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.40	4.26	4.33	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	1445/1575	4.13	4.28	4.27	4.30	3.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	902/1380	4.38	3.84	3.94	3.85	3.75	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1092/1520	4.33	4.43	4.01	4.19	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.60	4.24	4.47	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	4.31	3.94	4.07	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 602 0201
 Title INSTRUCTIONAL SYS DEV
 Instructor: SCHAFFER, EUGEN
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 631
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	406/1674	4.46	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	379/1674	3.96	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	312/1609	3.96	4.39	4.22	4.34	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	224/1585	3.46	4.05	3.96	4.23	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1535	4.00	4.35	4.08	4.27	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1651	4.75	4.35	4.18	4.32	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1673	4.75	4.83	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1656	4.38	4.26	4.07	4.15	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.47	4.43	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.40	4.26	4.33	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1575	4.13	4.28	4.27	4.30	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1380	4.38	3.84	3.94	3.85	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	4.33	4.43	4.01	4.19	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.60	4.24	4.47	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	4.31	3.94	4.07	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 103	5.00	4.44	4.41	4.56	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 101	5.00	4.43	4.48	4.62	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 95	5.00	4.50	4.31	4.43	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 99	5.00	4.39	4.39	4.54	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	4.38	4.14	4.26	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 602T 8010
 Title
 Instructor: HODELL, CHARLES
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 632
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	7	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	243/1674	4.80	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.33	4.23	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1423	****	4.44	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	1	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	131/1609	4.89	4.39	4.22	4.34	4.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	154/1585	4.78	4.05	3.96	4.23	4.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	3	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	119/1535	4.83	4.35	4.08	4.27	4.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	127/1651	4.89	4.35	4.18	4.32	4.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	742/1673	4.89	4.83	4.69	4.78	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	493/1656	4.43	4.26	4.07	4.15	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	214/1586	4.90	4.47	4.43	4.50	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	152/1582	4.90	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	171/1575	4.90	4.28	4.27	4.30	4.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	1	0	0	4	4	4.11	612/1380	4.11	3.84	3.94	3.85	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	397/1520	4.50	4.43	4.01	4.19	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	453/1515	4.70	4.60	4.24	4.47	4.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	507/1511	4.67	4.67	4.27	4.49	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	254/ 994	4.44	4.31	3.94	4.07	4.44	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	4.38	4.19	4.42	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 5
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	6
			? 0		

Course-Section: EDUC 605 8010
 Title THE ADULT LEARNER
 Instructor: RAUDENBUSH, LIN
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 633
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	195/1674	4.86	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	176/1674	4.86	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	575/1423	4.50	4.44	4.27	4.28	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	262/1609	4.71	4.39	4.22	4.34	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	191/1585	4.71	4.05	3.96	4.23	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	310/1535	4.57	4.35	4.08	4.27	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	330/1651	4.67	4.35	4.18	4.32	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	615/1656	4.33	4.26	4.07	4.15	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.47	4.43	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	199/1582	4.86	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	225/1575	4.86	4.28	4.27	4.30	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	3	2	1	3.43	1082/1380	3.43	3.84	3.94	3.85	3.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.43	4.01	4.19	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.60	4.24	4.47	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	301/1511	4.86	4.67	4.27	4.49	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	131/ 994	4.71	4.31	3.94	4.07	4.71	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 607 0101
 Title PROCESSES & ACQ READIN
 Instructor: Young, Patricia
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 634
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	2	2	4	1	3.44	1531/1674	3.44	4.39	4.27	4.44	3.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	6	1	1	3.22	1580/1674	3.22	4.33	4.23	4.34	3.22	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	3	3	2	0	2.88	1389/1423	2.88	4.44	4.27	4.28	2.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	5	1	1	3.11	1548/1609	3.11	4.39	4.22	4.34	3.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	1049/1585	3.75	4.05	3.96	4.23	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	4	2	1	1	2.88	1475/1535	2.88	4.35	4.08	4.27	2.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	1517/1651	3.29	4.35	4.18	4.32	3.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	1420/1673	4.25	4.83	4.69	4.78	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	5	1	1	3.00	1540/1656	3.00	4.26	4.07	4.15	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	3	3	0	1	2.44	1575/1586	2.44	4.47	4.43	4.50	2.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	3	1	1	4	3.67	1539/1585	3.67	4.81	4.69	4.79	3.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	4	2	1	1	2.67	1557/1582	2.67	4.40	4.26	4.33	2.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	0	4	0	1	2.33	1556/1575	2.33	4.28	4.27	4.30	2.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	2	3	0	2	2	2.89	1272/1380	2.89	3.84	3.94	3.85	2.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	955/1520	3.86	4.43	4.01	4.19	3.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	971/1515	4.14	4.60	4.24	4.47	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1296/1511	3.57	4.67	4.27	4.49	3.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	2	2	1	1	3.17	857/ 994	3.17	4.31	3.94	4.07	3.17	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	4.45	3.98	4.20	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 61	****	4.54	4.09	4.46	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 608 0101
 Title INSTRUCT READING
 Instructor: TILLES, ALYSON
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 635
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	445/1674	4.64	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	303/1674	4.73	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.44	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	121/1609	4.91	4.39	4.22	4.34	4.91	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	326/1585	4.50	4.05	3.96	4.23	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	215/1535	4.70	4.35	4.08	4.27	4.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	393/1651	4.60	4.35	4.18	4.32	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	742/1673	4.89	4.83	4.69	4.78	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	185/1656	4.75	4.26	4.07	4.15	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.47	4.43	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	152/1582	4.91	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	171/1575	4.91	4.28	4.27	4.30	4.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	612/1380	4.11	3.84	3.94	3.85	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	134/1520	4.90	4.43	4.01	4.19	4.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	207/1515	4.90	4.60	4.24	4.47	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	107/ 994	4.78	4.31	3.94	4.07	4.78	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	4.38	4.19	4.42	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	20/ 76	4.88	4.45	3.98	4.20	4.88	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	20/ 77	4.75	4.12	3.93	4.31	4.75	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	1	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	27/ 53	4.57	4.35	4.45	4.64	4.57	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	1	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	22/ 48	4.43	3.85	4.12	4.35	4.43	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	2	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	26/ 49	4.50	4.05	4.27	4.46	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 0
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	
					Other 10

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 610 8010
 Title INST TECH DESIGN/DEV
 Instructor: WALSH, GREGORY
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 636
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	214/1674	4.83	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	379/1674	4.67	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1423	****	4.44	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	930/1609	4.20	4.39	4.22	4.34	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	6	2	3.58	1175/1585	3.58	4.05	3.96	4.23	3.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	373/1535	4.50	4.35	4.08	4.27	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	2	8	4.25	866/1651	4.25	4.35	4.18	4.32	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	635/1673	4.92	4.83	4.69	4.78	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	7	3	4.09	900/1656	4.09	4.26	4.07	4.15	4.09	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	663/1586	4.67	4.47	4.43	4.50	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	510/1585	4.92	4.81	4.69	4.79	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	438/1582	4.67	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	246/1575	4.83	4.28	4.27	4.30	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	71/1380	4.92	3.84	3.94	3.85	4.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	454/1520	4.45	4.43	4.01	4.19	4.45	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	513/1515	4.64	4.60	4.24	4.47	4.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	447/1511	4.73	4.67	4.27	4.49	4.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	432/ 994	4.13	4.31	3.94	4.07	4.13	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.33	4.23	4.51	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 278	****	4.38	4.19	4.42	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 260	****	4.61	4.46	4.67	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.56	4.33	4.66	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.20	4.20	4.53	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 103	5.00	4.44	4.41	4.56	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	51/ 101	4.67	4.43	4.48	4.62	4.67	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 99	5.00	4.39	4.39	4.54	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	4.38	4.14	4.26	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	4.54	4.09	4.46	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.59	4.26	4.59	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	4.73	4.44	4.64	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.96	4.36	4.84	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.59	4.34	4.64	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2	Graduate 4
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	Under-grad 8
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	9	F 0	Non-major 2
				Electives	0
#### - Means there are not enough					

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	7	
?	0			

Course-Section: EDUC 615 0101
 Title MATERIALS TEACH READ
 Instructor: Young, Patricia
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 637
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	4	5	5	3.81	1378/1674	3.81	4.39	4.27	4.44	3.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	7	3	3.75	1370/1674	3.75	4.33	4.23	4.34	3.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	1121/1423	3.88	4.44	4.27	4.28	3.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	6	6	4.06	1055/1609	4.06	4.39	4.22	4.34	4.06	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	5	4	5	3.69	1107/1585	3.69	4.05	3.96	4.23	3.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	1	8	4	3.81	1101/1535	3.81	4.35	4.08	4.27	3.81	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	7	8	4.38	713/1651	4.38	4.35	4.18	4.32	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	10	5	4.25	1420/1673	4.25	4.83	4.69	4.78	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	3	2	5	2	3.31	1455/1656	3.31	4.26	4.07	4.15	3.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	4	7	3	3.69	1436/1586	3.69	4.47	4.43	4.50	3.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	1367/1585	4.31	4.81	4.69	4.79	4.31	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	3	3	5	4	3.50	1406/1582	3.50	4.40	4.26	4.33	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	4	3	4	4	3.38	1411/1575	3.38	4.28	4.27	4.30	3.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	2	2	3	2	7	3.63	986/1380	3.63	3.84	3.94	3.85	3.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	6	4	4	3.67	1092/1520	3.67	4.43	4.01	4.19	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	3	2	6	4	3.73	1221/1515	3.73	4.60	4.24	4.47	3.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	3	4	3	4	3.40	1333/1511	3.40	4.67	4.27	4.49	3.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	0	2	4	2	2	3.40	784/ 994	3.40	4.31	3.94	4.07	3.40	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.45	3.98	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.12	3.93	4.31	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 48	****	3.85	4.12	4.35	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	4.05	4.27	4.46	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	7	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 620 8010
 Title MULTI-MEDIA PROJECT MG
 Instructor: AHMAD, RAFI E
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 638
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	916/1674	4.29	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	705/1674	4.43	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1016/1423	4.00	4.44	4.27	4.28	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	614/1609	4.43	4.39	4.22	4.34	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	4	2	3.86	956/1585	3.86	4.05	3.96	4.23	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1110/1535	3.80	4.35	4.08	4.27	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	643/1651	4.43	4.35	4.18	4.32	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	796/1673	4.86	4.83	4.69	4.78	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.26	4.07	4.15	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	301/1586	4.86	4.47	4.43	4.50	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	1002/1585	4.71	4.81	4.69	4.79	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	199/1582	4.86	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	932/1575	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.30	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	463/1380	4.29	3.84	3.94	3.85	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	489/1520	4.43	4.43	4.01	4.19	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	432/1515	4.71	4.60	4.24	4.47	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	586/1511	4.57	4.67	4.27	4.49	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	638/ 994	3.75	4.31	3.94	4.07	3.75	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 621 0101
 Title INST STRAT/INTEG ECE C
 Instructor: FRYER, MARY G.
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 639
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	954/1674	4.25	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1146/1674	4.00	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.44	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	222/1609	4.75	4.39	4.22	4.34	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1049/1585	3.75	4.05	3.96	4.23	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	169/1535	4.75	4.35	4.08	4.27	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	866/1651	4.25	4.35	4.18	4.32	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.26	4.07	4.15	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	858/1586	4.50	4.47	4.43	4.50	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	917/1585	4.75	4.81	4.69	4.79	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	935/1582	4.25	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1289/1575	3.75	4.28	4.27	4.30	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1036/1380	3.50	3.84	3.94	3.85	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1252/1520	3.33	4.43	4.01	4.19	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.60	4.24	4.47	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	816/1511	4.33	4.67	4.27	4.49	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	811/ 994	3.33	4.31	3.94	4.07	3.33	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	41/ 76	4.00	4.45	3.98	4.20	4.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	50/ 77	3.50	4.12	3.93	4.31	3.50	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	41/ 53	4.00	4.35	4.45	4.64	4.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	47/ 48	2.50	3.85	4.12	4.35	2.50	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	49/ 49	1.50	4.05	4.27	4.46	1.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 622 0101
 Title INSTRUC STRGY ELEM MAT
 Instructor: KINACH, BARBARA
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 640
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	1	3	2	3.44	1531/1674	3.44	4.39	4.27	4.44	3.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	1	3	0	1	2.38	1665/1674	2.38	4.33	4.23	4.34	2.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1405/1423	2.67	4.44	4.27	4.28	2.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	2	2	1	0	2.00	1607/1609	2.00	4.39	4.22	4.34	2.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	3	2	2	3.22	1376/1585	3.22	4.05	3.96	4.23	3.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	2	0	2.78	1490/1535	2.78	4.35	4.08	4.27	2.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	5	1	2	1	0	1.89	1647/1651	1.89	4.35	4.18	4.32	1.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1169/1673	4.56	4.83	4.69	4.78	4.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	4	3	0	3.13	1519/1656	3.13	4.26	4.07	4.15	3.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	1579/1586	2.00	4.47	4.43	4.50	2.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1552/1585	3.50	4.81	4.69	4.79	3.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	1580/1582	1.67	4.40	4.26	4.33	1.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	1556/1575	2.33	4.28	4.27	4.30	2.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1160/1380	3.25	3.84	3.94	3.85	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	1	1	3.00	1353/1520	3.00	4.43	4.01	4.19	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	2	1	2	0	3	3.13	1409/1515	3.13	4.60	4.24	4.47	3.13	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	2	2	1	0	3	3.00	1420/1511	3.00	4.67	4.27	4.49	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	1	2	2	0	2	3.00	881/ 994	3.00	4.31	3.94	4.07	3.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 278	****	4.38	4.19	4.42	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 260	****	4.61	4.46	4.67	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	52/ 76	3.40	4.45	3.98	4.20	3.40	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	1	4	1	0	3.00	63/ 77	3.00	4.12	3.93	4.31	3.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	2	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	47/ 53	3.67	4.35	4.45	4.64	3.67	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	1	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	33/ 48	3.75	3.85	4.12	4.35	3.75	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	2	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	45/ 49	2.67	4.05	4.27	4.46	2.67	

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	4	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 623 0101
 Title INSTRUC STRTGY TEACH S
 Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 641
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	148/1674	4.90	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	215/1674	4.80	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	376/1423	4.67	4.44	4.27	4.28	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	173/1609	4.80	4.39	4.22	4.34	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	204/1585	4.70	4.05	3.96	4.23	4.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	94/1535	4.90	4.35	4.08	4.27	4.90	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	175/1651	4.80	4.35	4.18	4.32	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	1135/1673	4.60	4.83	4.69	4.78	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	136/1656	4.83	4.26	4.07	4.15	4.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	336/1586	4.83	4.47	4.43	4.50	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.40	4.26	4.33	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	246/1575	4.83	4.28	4.27	4.30	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	379/1380	4.40	3.84	3.94	3.85	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	191/1520	4.80	4.43	4.01	4.19	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	207/1515	4.90	4.60	4.24	4.47	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	244/1511	4.90	4.67	4.27	4.49	4.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	4.31	3.94	4.07	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.45	3.98	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.12	3.93	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.35	4.45	4.64	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.85	4.12	4.35	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	3	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 625 0101
 Title TEACH READ WRIT ESL I
 Instructor: SHIN, SARAH
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 642
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	5	15	4.57	521/1674	4.57	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	2	16	4.52	554/1674	4.52	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.52	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	2	2	14	4.47	611/1423	4.47	4.44	4.27	4.28	4.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	2	16	4.52	466/1609	4.52	4.39	4.22	4.34	4.52	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	136/1585	4.81	4.05	3.96	4.23	4.81	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	5	13	4.38	528/1535	4.38	4.35	4.08	4.27	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	2	4	12	4.10	1037/1651	4.10	4.35	4.18	4.32	4.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	140/1656	4.82	4.26	4.07	4.15	4.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	3	17	4.67	663/1586	4.67	4.47	4.43	4.50	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	0	19	4.81	811/1585	4.81	4.81	4.69	4.79	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	2	18	4.71	366/1582	4.71	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	5	15	4.57	612/1575	4.57	4.28	4.27	4.30	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	1	1	2	15	4.29	463/1380	4.29	3.84	3.94	3.85	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	7	11	4.29	616/1520	4.29	4.43	4.01	4.19	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	2	0	1	1	17	4.48	668/1515	4.48	4.60	4.24	4.47	4.48	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	1	0	19	4.71	458/1511	4.71	4.67	4.27	4.49	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	1	0	2	5	11	4.32	332/ 994	4.32	4.31	3.94	4.07	4.32	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99 1	A 16	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		Graduate 10
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Under-grad 11
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00 13	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	19
			? 0		

Course-Section: EDUC 627 0101
 Title INS STRAT FL SEC SCH
 Instructor: SCHWARTZ, ANA-M
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 643
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	916/1674	4.29	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	894/1674	4.29	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1140/1423	3.83	4.44	4.27	4.28	3.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	985/1609	4.14	4.39	4.22	4.34	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	1352/1585	3.29	4.05	3.96	4.23	3.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	481/1535	4.43	4.35	4.08	4.27	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1097/1651	4.00	4.35	4.18	4.32	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	3.86	1162/1656	3.86	4.26	4.07	4.15	3.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	581/1586	4.71	4.47	4.43	4.50	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	1002/1585	4.71	4.81	4.69	4.79	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1326/1582	3.71	4.40	4.26	4.33	3.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1240/1575	3.86	4.28	4.27	4.30	3.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	585/1380	4.14	3.84	3.94	3.85	4.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1059/1520	3.71	4.43	4.01	4.19	3.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	1	0	4	1	3.43	1333/1515	3.43	4.60	4.24	4.47	3.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1050/1511	4.00	4.67	4.27	4.49	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	2	1	2	2	0	2.57	959/ 994	2.57	4.31	3.94	4.07	2.57	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.44	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.43	4.48	4.62	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 99	****	4.39	4.39	4.54	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.38	4.14	4.26	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.45	3.98	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	4.12	3.93	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.35	4.45	4.64	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	3.85	4.12	4.35	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	4.05	4.27	4.46	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	4.54	4.09	4.46	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.59	4.26	4.59	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.73	4.44	4.64	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 35	****	4.96	4.36	4.84	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

I	0	Other	5
?	0		

Course-Section: EDUC 628 0101
 Title INST STRAT:TCHG SEC MA
 Instructor: KINACH, BARBARA
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 644
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.39	4.27	4.44	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.33	4.23	4.34	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1094/1609	4.00	4.39	4.22	4.34	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.05	3.96	4.23	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	870/1535	4.00	4.35	4.08	4.27	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.35	4.18	4.32	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.26	4.07	4.15	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.43	4.01	4.19	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.60	4.24	4.47	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	4.31	3.94	4.07	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4.45	3.98	4.20	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 77	5.00	4.12	3.93	4.31	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	41/ 53	4.00	4.35	4.45	4.64	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 629 0101
 Title INST STRAT:TCHNG SEC S
 Instructor: SEILER, GALE
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 645
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.39	4.27	4.44	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.33	4.23	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1423	****	4.44	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.39	4.22	4.34	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	121/1585	4.83	4.05	3.96	4.23	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	112/1535	4.86	4.35	4.08	4.27	4.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	145/1651	4.86	4.35	4.18	4.32	4.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.26	4.07	4.15	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.47	4.43	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.40	4.26	4.33	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.28	4.27	4.30	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	167/1380	4.71	3.84	3.94	3.85	4.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.43	4.01	4.19	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.60	4.24	4.47	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	148/ 994	4.67	4.31	3.94	4.07	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 636 0101
 Title ESL/FOR LANG TEST & EV
 Instructor: NELSON, JOHN E.
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 646
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	15	4.63	445/1674	4.63	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	352/1674	4.68	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	4	13	4.47	611/1423	4.47	4.44	4.27	4.28	4.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	242/1609	4.74	4.39	4.22	4.34	4.74	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	4	2	11	4.05	735/1585	4.05	4.05	3.96	4.23	4.05	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	116/1535	4.84	4.35	4.08	4.27	4.84	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	16	4.68	309/1651	4.68	4.35	4.18	4.32	4.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	274/1656	4.64	4.26	4.07	4.15	4.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	128/1586	4.95	4.47	4.43	4.50	4.95	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	591/1585	4.89	4.81	4.69	4.79	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	409/1582	4.68	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	612/1575	4.58	4.28	4.27	4.30	4.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	3	4	7	3	3.32	1137/1380	3.32	3.84	3.94	3.85	3.32	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	5	10	4.32	589/1520	4.32	4.43	4.01	4.19	4.32	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	798/1515	4.37	4.60	4.24	4.47	4.37	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	2	3	13	4.42	729/1511	4.42	4.67	4.27	4.49	4.42	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	1	4	7	7	4.05	459/ 994	4.05	4.31	3.94	4.07	4.05	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99 0	A 16	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		Graduate 7
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00 13	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 0		

Course-Section: EDUC 640 8010
 Title: PROG CBT/WBT MATERIALS
 Instructor: KELLERMAN, PAUL
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 647
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	367/1674	4.70	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	338/1674	4.70	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	7	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1423	****	4.44	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	353/1609	4.63	4.39	4.22	4.34	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	557/1585	4.25	4.05	3.96	4.23	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	454/1535	4.44	4.35	4.08	4.27	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	768/1651	4.33	4.35	4.18	4.32	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	706/1673	4.90	4.83	4.69	4.78	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.26	4.07	4.15	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	389/1586	4.80	4.47	4.43	4.50	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	567/1585	4.90	4.81	4.69	4.79	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	632/1582	4.50	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	453/1575	4.70	4.28	4.27	4.30	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	114/1380	4.80	3.84	3.94	3.85	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	598/1520	4.30	4.43	4.01	4.19	4.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	759/1515	4.40	4.60	4.24	4.47	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	358/1511	4.80	4.67	4.27	4.49	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	9	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 994	****	4.31	3.94	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	132/ 265	4.33	4.33	4.23	4.51	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 278	5.00	4.38	4.19	4.42	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 260	5.00	4.61	4.46	4.67	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 259	5.00	4.56	4.33	4.66	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 233	5.00	4.20	4.20	4.53	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.44	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.43	4.48	4.62	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.39	4.39	4.54	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.38	4.14	4.26	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.45	3.98	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 77	****	4.12	3.93	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 53	****	4.35	4.45	4.64	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.85	4.12	4.35	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	4.05	4.27	4.46	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.54	4.09	4.46	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.59	4.26	4.59	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.73	4.44	4.64	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.96	4.36	4.84	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	4.59	4.34	4.64	****	

Course-Section: EDUC 640 8010
 Title: PROG CBT/WBT MATERIALS
 Instructor: KELLERMAN, PAUL
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 647
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	11	Non-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 642 0101
 Title ECE MATH/SCI PROCESSES
 Instructor: BELL, DEBORAH A
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 648
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	195/1674	4.86	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	894/1674	4.29	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1423	****	4.44	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	985/1609	4.14	4.39	4.22	4.34	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	0	0	2	1	2.67	1532/1585	2.67	4.05	3.96	4.23	2.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	112/1535	4.86	4.35	4.08	4.27	4.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1258/1651	3.86	4.35	4.18	4.32	3.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	522/1656	4.40	4.26	4.07	4.15	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	753/1586	4.60	4.47	4.43	4.50	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	525/1582	4.60	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1138/1575	4.00	4.28	4.27	4.30	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1380	****	3.84	3.94	3.85	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	700/1520	4.20	4.43	4.01	4.19	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.60	4.24	4.47	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	205/ 994	4.50	4.31	3.94	4.07	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 645 0101
 Title QUANT RESEARCH MTHDS I
 Instructor: Olia, Nezhat
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 649
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	607/1674	4.50	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	578/1674	4.50	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	262/1423	4.75	4.44	4.27	4.28	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	222/1609	4.75	4.39	4.22	4.34	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	167/1585	4.75	4.05	3.96	4.23	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	169/1535	4.75	4.35	4.08	4.27	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	524/1651	4.50	4.35	4.18	4.32	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	522/1656	4.40	4.26	4.07	4.15	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	858/1586	4.50	4.47	4.43	4.50	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	640/1585	4.88	4.81	4.69	4.79	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	808/1582	4.38	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	692/1575	4.50	4.28	4.27	4.30	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	666/1380	4.00	3.84	3.94	3.85	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	810/1520	4.00	4.43	4.01	4.19	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1024/1515	4.00	4.60	4.24	4.47	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1050/1511	4.00	4.67	4.27	4.49	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 994	****	4.31	3.94	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		Graduate 3
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		Under-grad 5
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	8
			? 0		

Course-Section: EDUC 650 0101
 Title EDUC IN CULTURAL PERSP
 Instructor: SEILER, GALE
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 650
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	2	13	4.53	582/1674	4.66	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	406/1674	4.62	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	9	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1423	4.67	4.44	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	167/1609	4.80	4.39	4.22	4.34	4.81	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	14	4.71	198/1585	4.65	4.05	3.96	4.23	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	301/1535	4.62	4.35	4.08	4.27	4.59	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	3	10	4.24	889/1651	4.48	4.35	4.18	4.32	4.24	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	944/1673	4.82	4.83	4.69	4.78	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	381/1656	4.67	4.26	4.07	4.15	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	266/1586	4.77	4.47	4.43	4.50	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	236/1582	4.77	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	268/1575	4.71	4.28	4.27	4.30	4.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	284/1380	4.20	3.84	3.94	3.85	4.54	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	107/1520	4.90	4.43	4.01	4.19	4.93	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1515	4.93	4.60	4.24	4.47	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	278/ 994	4.54	4.31	3.94	4.07	4.42	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.45	3.98	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 77	****	4.12	3.93	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.35	4.45	4.64	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.85	4.12	4.35	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 49	****	4.05	4.27	4.46	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	8	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	9	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 650 0201
 Title EDUC IN CULTURAL PERSP
 Instructor: SEILER, GALE
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 651
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	243/1674	4.66	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	460/1674	4.62	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	771/1423	4.67	4.44	4.27	4.28	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	192/1609	4.80	4.39	4.22	4.34	4.79	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	265/1585	4.65	4.05	3.96	4.23	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	253/1535	4.62	4.35	4.08	4.27	4.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	254/1651	4.48	4.35	4.18	4.32	4.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	778/1673	4.82	4.83	4.69	4.78	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	136/1656	4.67	4.26	4.07	4.15	4.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	663/1586	4.77	4.47	4.43	4.50	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	339/1582	4.77	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	12	4.60	579/1575	4.71	4.28	4.27	4.30	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	4	5	5	3.87	824/1380	4.20	3.84	3.94	3.85	3.87	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	156/1520	4.90	4.43	4.01	4.19	4.87	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	254/1515	4.93	4.60	4.24	4.47	4.87	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	148/ 994	4.54	4.31	3.94	4.07	4.67	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.45	3.98	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 77	****	4.12	3.93	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 53	****	4.35	4.45	4.64	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 48	****	3.85	4.12	4.35	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	4.05	4.27	4.46	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 6
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 9
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	9
			? 0		

Title

Baltimore County

JAN 21, 2006

Instructor: Small, Sue (Instr. A)

Fall 2005

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 8

Questionnaires: 4

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.39	4.27	4.44	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.33	4.23	4.34	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.39	4.22	4.34	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	167/1585	4.75	4.05	3.96	4.23	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.35	4.08	4.27	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.35	4.18	4.32	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1420/1673	4.25	4.83	4.69	4.78	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1656	4.88	4.26	4.07	4.15	4.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.47	4.43	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.40	4.26	4.33	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.28	4.27	4.30	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1377/1380	1.00	3.84	3.94	3.85	1.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.43	4.01	4.19	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	384/1515	4.75	4.60	4.24	4.47	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	4.31	3.94	4.07	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Title

Baltimore County

JAN 21, 2006

Instructor: SCULLY, PAT (Instr. B)

Fall 2005

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 8

Questionnaires: 4

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.39	4.27	4.44	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.33	4.23	4.34	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.39	4.22	4.34	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	167/1585	4.75	4.05	3.96	4.23	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.35	4.08	4.27	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.35	4.18	4.32	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1420/1673	4.25	4.83	4.69	4.78	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	185/1656	4.88	4.26	4.07	4.15	4.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.47	4.43	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.40	4.26	4.33	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.28	4.27	4.30	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1377/1380	1.00	3.84	3.94	3.85	1.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.43	4.01	4.19	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	384/1515	4.75	4.60	4.24	4.47	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	4.31	3.94	4.07	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 654 0101
 Title PROC & ACQUIS LANG & L
 Instructor: SCULLY, PAT
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 654
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.39	4.27	4.44	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.33	4.23	4.34	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.39	4.22	4.34	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.05	3.96	4.23	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.35	4.08	4.27	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.35	4.18	4.32	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.26	4.07	4.15	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.47	4.43	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.40	4.26	4.33	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	359/1575	4.75	4.28	4.27	4.30	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	1304/1380	2.67	3.84	3.94	3.85	2.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.43	4.01	4.19	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.60	4.24	4.47	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	4.31	3.94	4.07	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 663 0101
 Title ELEM SOC STUD METH
 Instructor: FITZHUGH, WILLI
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 655
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	735/1674	4.43	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	1043/1674	4.14	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1423	****	4.44	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	985/1609	4.14	4.39	4.22	4.34	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	769/1585	4.00	4.05	3.96	4.23	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	787/1535	4.14	4.35	4.08	4.27	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	1	1	2	3.14	1547/1651	3.14	4.35	4.18	4.32	3.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	1397/1673	4.29	4.83	4.69	4.78	4.29	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	381/1656	4.50	4.26	4.07	4.15	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	1074/1586	4.33	4.47	4.43	4.50	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1071/1585	4.67	4.81	4.69	4.79	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1129/1582	4.00	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1040/1575	4.17	4.28	4.27	4.30	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	1304/1380	2.67	3.84	3.94	3.85	2.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	0	4	3.86	955/1520	3.86	4.43	4.01	4.19	3.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	733/1515	4.43	4.60	4.24	4.47	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	458/1511	4.71	4.67	4.27	4.49	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	676/ 994	3.67	4.31	3.94	4.07	3.67	

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
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		Graduate 2
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Under-grad 5
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	4
			? 0		

Course-Section: EDUC 664 0101
 Title SEC SOC STUD METH
 Instructor: Jakovic, Kimber (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 656
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	607/1674	4.50	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	578/1674	4.50	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	575/1423	4.50	4.44	4.27	4.28	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	222/1609	4.75	4.39	4.22	4.34	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.05	3.96	4.23	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	169/1535	4.75	4.35	4.08	4.27	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.35	4.18	4.32	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	257/1656	4.92	4.26	4.07	4.15	4.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	496/1586	4.75	4.47	4.43	4.50	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.40	4.26	4.33	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	359/1575	4.75	4.28	4.27	4.30	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1217/1380	3.00	3.84	3.94	3.85	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	229/1520	4.75	4.43	4.01	4.19	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	384/1515	4.75	4.60	4.24	4.47	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	115/ 994	4.75	4.31	3.94	4.07	4.75	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4.45	3.98	4.20	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 77	5.00	4.12	3.93	4.31	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 53	5.00	4.35	4.45	4.64	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 49	5.00	4.05	4.27	4.46	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 61	5.00	4.54	4.09	4.46	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.59	4.26	4.59	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 50	5.00	4.73	4.44	4.64	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.96	4.36	4.84	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	4.59	4.34	4.64	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 664 0101
 Title SEC SOC STUD METH
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 657
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	607/1674	4.50	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	578/1674	4.50	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	575/1423	4.50	4.44	4.27	4.28	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	222/1609	4.75	4.39	4.22	4.34	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.05	3.96	4.23	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	169/1535	4.75	4.35	4.08	4.27	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.35	4.18	4.32	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1656	4.92	4.26	4.07	4.15	4.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	229/1520	4.75	4.43	4.01	4.19	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	384/1515	4.75	4.60	4.24	4.47	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	115/ 994	4.75	4.31	3.94	4.07	4.75	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4.45	3.98	4.20	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 77	5.00	4.12	3.93	4.31	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 53	5.00	4.35	4.45	4.64	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 49	5.00	4.05	4.27	4.46	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 61	5.00	4.54	4.09	4.46	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.59	4.26	4.59	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 50	5.00	4.73	4.44	4.64	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.96	4.36	4.84	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	4.59	4.34	4.64	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 664 0101
 Title SEC SOC STUD METH
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 658
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	607/1674	4.50	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	578/1674	4.50	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	575/1423	4.50	4.44	4.27	4.28	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	222/1609	4.75	4.39	4.22	4.34	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.05	3.96	4.23	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	169/1535	4.75	4.35	4.08	4.27	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.35	4.18	4.32	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1656	4.92	4.26	4.07	4.15	4.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	229/1520	4.75	4.43	4.01	4.19	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	384/1515	4.75	4.60	4.24	4.47	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	115/ 994	4.75	4.31	3.94	4.07	4.75	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4.45	3.98	4.20	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 77	5.00	4.12	3.93	4.31	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 53	5.00	4.35	4.45	4.64	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 49	5.00	4.05	4.27	4.46	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 61	5.00	4.54	4.09	4.46	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.59	4.26	4.59	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 50	5.00	4.73	4.44	4.64	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.96	4.36	4.84	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	4.59	4.34	4.64	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 664 0101
 Title SEC SOC STUD METH
 Instructor: (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 659
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	607/1674	4.50	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	578/1674	4.50	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	575/1423	4.50	4.44	4.27	4.28	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	222/1609	4.75	4.39	4.22	4.34	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.05	3.96	4.23	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	169/1535	4.75	4.35	4.08	4.27	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.35	4.18	4.32	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1656	4.92	4.26	4.07	4.15	4.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	229/1520	4.75	4.43	4.01	4.19	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	384/1515	4.75	4.60	4.24	4.47	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	115/ 994	4.75	4.31	3.94	4.07	4.75	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4.45	3.98	4.20	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 77	5.00	4.12	3.93	4.31	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 53	5.00	4.35	4.45	4.64	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 49	5.00	4.05	4.27	4.46	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 61	5.00	4.54	4.09	4.46	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.59	4.26	4.59	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 50	5.00	4.73	4.44	4.64	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.96	4.36	4.84	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	4.59	4.34	4.64	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 669 0101
 Title ASSESS READING
 Instructor: CANTOR, RONNI
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 660
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	2	9	4.29	916/1674	4.29	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	4	2	4	3.46	1515/1674	3.46	4.33	4.23	4.34	3.46	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	7	2	3	3.54	1262/1423	3.54	4.44	4.27	4.28	3.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	3	5	3.79	1299/1609	3.79	4.39	4.22	4.34	3.79	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	2	3	4	3.29	1352/1585	3.29	4.05	3.96	4.23	3.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	2	3	5	3.50	1295/1535	3.50	4.35	4.08	4.27	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	4	3	4	3.57	1414/1651	3.57	4.35	4.18	4.32	3.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	915/1673	4.79	4.83	4.69	4.78	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	5	5	2	3.54	1362/1656	3.54	4.26	4.07	4.15	3.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	1120/1586	4.29	4.47	4.43	4.50	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	0	13	4.71	1002/1585	4.71	4.81	4.69	4.79	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	5	1	7	3.93	1199/1582	3.93	4.40	4.26	4.33	3.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	1	8	4.07	1111/1575	4.07	4.28	4.27	4.30	4.07	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	1	3	3	0	1	2.63	1308/1380	2.63	3.84	3.94	3.85	2.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	5	4	3.83	967/1520	3.83	4.43	4.01	4.19	3.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	2	1	8	4.25	898/1515	4.25	4.60	4.24	4.47	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	2	1	8	4.25	896/1511	4.25	4.67	4.27	4.49	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	2	0	1	6	2	3.55	718/ 994	3.55	4.31	3.94	4.07	3.55	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	25/ 76	4.75	4.45	3.98	4.20	4.75	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	1	1	0	1	5	4.00	37/ 77	4.00	4.12	3.93	4.31	4.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	1	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	37/ 53	4.29	4.35	4.45	4.64	4.29	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	1	1	0	0	5	4.00	26/ 48	4.00	3.85	4.12	4.35	4.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	3	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	31/ 49	4.20	4.05	4.27	4.46	4.20	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	10	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	4	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

Course-Section: EDUC 678 0101
 Title INST STRAT/DIV NEEDS
 Instructor: BERGE, NANCY B
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 661
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	607/1674	4.50	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	460/1674	4.60	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	771/1423	4.33	4.44	4.27	4.28	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	202/1609	4.78	4.39	4.22	4.34	4.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	769/1585	4.00	4.05	3.96	4.23	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	737/1535	4.20	4.35	4.08	4.27	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	393/1651	4.60	4.35	4.18	4.32	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	561/1656	4.38	4.26	4.07	4.15	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	1074/1586	4.33	4.47	4.43	4.50	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	874/1585	4.78	4.81	4.69	4.79	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	850/1582	4.33	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	768/1575	4.44	4.28	4.27	4.30	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	0	5	2	3.88	817/1380	3.88	3.84	3.94	3.85	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	397/1520	4.50	4.43	4.01	4.19	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	543/1515	4.60	4.60	4.24	4.47	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	751/1511	4.40	4.67	4.27	4.49	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	167/ 994	4.60	4.31	3.94	4.07	4.60	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.45	3.98	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.12	3.93	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 53	****	4.35	4.45	4.64	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.85	4.12	4.35	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	4.05	4.27	4.46	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 7
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 3
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	9

Course-Section: EDUC 684 0101
 Title QUAL RSCH SCHLS & COMM
 Instructor: BICKEL, BEVERLY
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 662
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	671/1674	4.46	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	763/1674	4.38	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	262/1423	4.75	4.44	4.27	4.28	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	490/1609	4.50	4.39	4.22	4.34	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	575/1585	4.23	4.05	3.96	4.23	4.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	373/1535	4.50	4.35	4.08	4.27	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	7	4	4.00	1097/1651	4.00	4.35	4.18	4.32	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	465/1656	4.44	4.26	4.07	4.15	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	931/1586	4.45	4.47	4.43	4.50	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	1106/1585	4.64	4.81	4.69	4.79	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	914/1582	4.27	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	940/1575	4.27	4.28	4.27	4.30	4.27	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	0	0	4	3	4.00	666/1380	4.00	3.84	3.94	3.85	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	726/1520	4.17	4.43	4.01	4.19	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	960/1515	4.17	4.60	4.24	4.47	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	578/1511	4.58	4.67	4.27	4.49	4.58	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	1	1	6	2	3.90	568/ 994	3.90	4.31	3.94	4.07	3.90	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 103	****	4.44	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.43	4.48	4.62	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 99	****	4.39	4.39	4.54	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 97	****	4.38	4.14	4.26	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.45	3.98	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.12	3.93	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.35	4.45	4.64	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.85	4.12	4.35	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	4.05	4.27	4.46	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0	Under-grad 6
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Non-major 0
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Electives 1
					Other 8

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 688 0101
 Title: METHODOLOGY TEACH ESL
 Instructor: NELSON, JOHN E.
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 663
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	148/1674	4.90	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	138/1674	4.90	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.44	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.39	4.22	4.34	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	204/1585	4.70	4.05	3.96	4.23	4.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	94/1535	4.90	4.35	4.08	4.27	4.90	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.35	4.18	4.32	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	257/1656	4.67	4.26	4.07	4.15	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	214/1586	4.90	4.47	4.43	4.50	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	152/1582	4.90	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	192/1575	4.89	4.28	4.27	4.30	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	2	2	2	0	2.71	1298/1380	2.71	3.84	3.94	3.85	2.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	134/1520	4.90	4.43	4.01	4.19	4.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	207/1515	4.90	4.60	4.24	4.47	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	244/1511	4.90	4.67	4.27	4.49	4.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	167/ 994	4.60	4.31	3.94	4.07	4.60	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 2	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		Graduate 6
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		Under-grad 4
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	8
			? 0		

Course-Section: EDUC 689T 8010
 Title ISSUES/TRENDS INSTL TE
 Instructor: WALSH, GREGORY
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 664
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	485/1674	4.60	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1001/1674	4.20	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1423	****	4.44	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	645/1609	4.40	4.39	4.22	4.34	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	167/1585	4.75	4.05	3.96	4.23	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	283/1535	4.60	4.35	4.08	4.27	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	673/1651	4.40	4.35	4.18	4.32	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	522/1656	4.40	4.26	4.07	4.15	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	389/1586	4.80	4.47	4.43	4.50	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	525/1582	4.60	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	279/1575	4.80	4.28	4.27	4.30	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	114/1380	4.80	3.84	3.94	3.85	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	191/1520	4.80	4.43	4.01	4.19	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.60	4.24	4.47	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	474/ 994	4.00	4.31	3.94	4.07	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 771 0101
 Title RESEARCH DESIGNS IN ED
 Instructor: OLIVA, LINDA M.
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 665
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	607/1674	3.97	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1370/1674	3.38	4.33	4.23	4.34	3.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	771/1423	4.33	4.44	4.27	4.28	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	490/1609	3.92	4.39	4.22	4.34	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1121/1585	3.46	4.05	3.96	4.23	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	373/1535	4.08	4.35	4.08	4.27	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1651	4.61	4.35	4.18	4.32	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	615/1656	3.95	4.26	4.07	4.15	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	858/1586	4.03	4.47	4.43	4.50	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1129/1582	3.72	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1289/1575	3.21	4.28	4.27	4.30	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1036/1380	3.42	3.84	3.94	3.85	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	1434/1520	2.99	4.43	4.01	4.19	2.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1209/1515	3.65	4.60	4.24	4.47	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	896/1511	4.07	4.67	4.27	4.49	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	835/ 994	3.21	4.31	3.94	4.07	3.25	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 771 8720
 Title RESEARCH DESIGNS IN ED
 Instructor: OLIVA, LINDA M.
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 666
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	1	2	3	3.44	1531/1674	3.97	4.39	4.27	4.44	3.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	3	1	2	3.00	1608/1674	3.38	4.33	4.23	4.34	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	2	3	2	3.33	1500/1609	3.92	4.39	4.22	4.34	3.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	1	2	2	3.25	1364/1585	3.46	4.05	3.96	4.23	3.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	2	4	3.67	1207/1535	4.08	4.35	4.08	4.27	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	901/1651	4.61	4.35	4.18	4.32	4.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	6	0	3.57	1344/1656	3.95	4.26	4.07	4.15	3.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	4	1	3	3.56	1470/1586	4.03	4.47	4.43	4.50	3.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	2	3	2	3.44	1427/1582	3.72	4.40	4.26	4.33	3.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	2	2	1	2.67	1538/1575	3.21	4.28	4.27	4.30	2.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	4	3	1	3.33	1127/1380	3.42	3.84	3.94	3.85	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	1	3	2	3.22	1295/1520	2.99	4.43	4.01	4.19	3.22	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	1	2	2	3	3.56	1288/1515	3.65	4.60	4.24	4.47	3.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	2	0	0	6	3.89	1150/1511	4.07	4.67	4.27	4.49	3.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	857/ 994	3.21	4.31	3.94	4.07	3.17	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		Graduate 4
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		Under-grad 5
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 0		

Course-Section: EDUC 791P 0101
 Title PRACT: SCH INST SYST DE
 Instructor: MURPHY, JOYCE A
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 667
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	2	4	10	4.50	607/1674	4.50	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	578/1674	4.50	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1423	****	4.44	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	353/1609	4.63	4.39	4.22	4.34	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	1	9	4.20	612/1585	4.20	4.05	3.96	4.23	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	7	7	4.27	655/1535	4.27	4.35	4.08	4.27	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	4	7	4.13	998/1651	4.13	4.35	4.18	4.32	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	494/1673	4.93	4.83	4.69	4.78	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	680/1656	4.29	4.26	4.07	4.15	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1586	****	4.47	4.43	4.50	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1585	****	4.81	4.69	4.79	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1582	****	4.40	4.26	4.33	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1575	****	4.28	4.27	4.30	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	1	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	666/1380	4.00	3.84	3.94	3.85	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	10	4.38	537/1520	4.38	4.43	4.01	4.19	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	242/1515	4.88	4.60	4.24	4.47	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	148/ 994	4.67	4.31	3.94	4.07	4.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	53/ 103	4.60	4.44	4.41	4.56	4.60	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	1	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	55/ 101	4.50	4.43	4.48	4.62	4.50	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	0	5	7	4.38	51/ 95	4.38	4.50	4.31	4.43	4.38	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	48/ 99	4.60	4.39	4.39	4.54	4.60	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	4	4	7	4.20	48/ 97	4.20	4.38	4.14	4.26	4.20	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	20/ 76	4.87	4.45	3.98	4.20	4.87	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	23/ 77	4.47	4.12	3.93	4.31	4.47	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	7	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	26/ 53	4.63	4.35	4.45	4.64	4.63	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	4	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	23/ 48	4.36	3.85	4.12	4.35	4.36	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	5	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	29/ 49	4.40	4.05	4.27	4.46	4.40	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 61	****	4.54	4.09	4.46	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.59	4.26	4.59	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	4.73	4.44	4.64	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.96	4.36	4.84	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A 11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	9	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0						

I	0	Other	14
?	1		

Course-Section: EDUC 791S 0101
 Title PRACT:SCH INST SYST DE
 Instructor: SHIN, SARAH
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 668
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	607/1674	4.50	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.33	4.23	4.34	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1094/1609	4.00	4.39	4.22	4.34	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.05	3.96	4.23	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.35	4.08	4.27	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.35	4.18	4.32	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.26	4.07	4.15	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.47	4.43	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	632/1582	4.50	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.28	4.27	4.30	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	303/1380	4.50	3.84	3.94	3.85	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.43	4.01	4.19	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.60	4.24	4.47	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	474/ 994	4.00	4.31	3.94	4.07	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 792C 8720
 Title CAPSTONE SEMINAR
 Instructor: JEFFERSON, CHER
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 669
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1196/1674	4.00	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	578/1674	4.25	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1423	****	4.44	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	157/1609	4.17	4.39	4.22	4.34	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	612/1585	3.60	4.05	3.96	4.23	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	119/1535	4.67	4.35	4.08	4.27	4.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1651	4.25	4.35	4.18	4.32	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.26	4.07	4.15	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1586	4.50	4.47	4.43	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1585	4.75	4.81	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	438/1582	4.33	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1010/1575	3.85	4.28	4.27	4.30	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1380	4.00	3.84	3.94	3.85	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	397/1520	4.75	4.43	4.01	4.19	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1515	4.75	4.60	4.24	4.47	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1511	4.75	4.67	4.27	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	205/ 994	4.25	4.31	3.94	4.07	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 792C 8721
 Title CAPSTONE SEMINAR
 Instructor: JEFFERSON, CHER
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 670
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1196/1674	4.00	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1146/1674	4.25	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1452/1609	4.17	4.39	4.22	4.34	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1440/1585	3.60	4.05	3.96	4.23	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	373/1535	4.67	4.35	4.08	4.27	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1442/1651	4.25	4.35	4.18	4.32	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.26	4.07	4.15	4.00	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1300/1586	4.50	4.47	4.43	4.50	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1225/1585	4.75	4.81	4.69	4.79	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1129/1582	4.33	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1367/1575	3.85	4.28	4.27	4.30	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	666/1380	4.00	3.84	3.94	3.85	4.00	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	4.75	4.43	4.01	4.19	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	629/1515	4.75	4.60	4.24	4.47	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	642/1511	4.75	4.67	4.27	4.49	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	474/ 994	4.25	4.31	3.94	4.07	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 792L 0101
 Title
 Instructor: STEIN, HOLLIS G
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 671
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	1075/1674	4.14	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	314/1674	4.71	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	490/1609	4.50	4.39	4.22	4.34	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1049/1585	3.75	4.05	3.96	4.23	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	631/1535	4.29	4.35	4.08	4.27	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	432/1651	4.57	4.35	4.18	4.32	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	719/1656	4.25	4.26	4.07	4.15	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	663/1586	4.67	4.47	4.43	4.50	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	438/1582	4.67	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	886/1575	4.33	4.28	4.27	4.30	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	489/1380	4.25	3.84	3.94	3.85	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	572/1520	4.33	4.43	4.01	4.19	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	289/1515	4.83	4.60	4.24	4.47	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	474/ 994	4.00	4.31	3.94	4.07	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	36/ 103	4.86	4.44	4.41	4.56	4.86	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 101	5.00	4.43	4.48	4.62	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	42/ 95	4.60	4.50	4.31	4.43	4.60	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 99	5.00	4.39	4.39	4.54	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	2	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	29/ 97	4.80	4.38	4.14	4.26	4.80	

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	5	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 794 0101
 Title ISD PROJECT SEMINAR
 Instructor: KINERNEY, DONNA
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 672
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.39	4.27	4.44	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.33	4.23	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1423	****	4.44	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	490/1609	4.50	4.39	4.22	4.34	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1585	****	4.05	3.96	4.23	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.35	4.08	4.27	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.35	4.18	4.32	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.26	4.07	4.15	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1586	****	4.47	4.43	4.50	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1585	****	4.81	4.69	4.79	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1582	****	4.40	4.26	4.33	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1575	****	4.28	4.27	4.30	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1036/1380	3.50	3.84	3.94	3.85	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1520	****	4.43	4.01	4.19	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1515	****	4.60	4.24	4.47	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1511	****	4.67	4.27	4.49	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	****	4.31	3.94	4.07	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	37/ 103	4.83	4.44	4.41	4.56	4.83	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	51/ 101	4.67	4.43	4.48	4.62	4.67	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	32/ 95	4.83	4.50	4.31	4.43	4.83	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	34/ 99	4.83	4.39	4.39	4.54	4.83	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	4.38	4.14	4.26	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 795 0101
 Title SEM STUDY TEACHING
 Instructor: SCHAFFER, EUGEN
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 673
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.39	4.27	4.44	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.33	4.23	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.44	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.39	4.22	4.34	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.05	3.96	4.23	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.35	4.08	4.27	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	381/1656	4.50	4.26	4.07	4.15	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.47	4.43	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.40	4.26	4.33	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.28	4.27	4.30	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.43	4.01	4.19	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.60	4.24	4.47	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.49	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 103	5.00	4.44	4.41	4.56	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 101	5.00	4.43	4.48	4.62	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 95	5.00	4.50	4.31	4.43	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 99	5.00	4.39	4.39	4.54	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 61	5.00	4.54	4.09	4.46	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 50	5.00	4.73	4.44	4.64	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 798 0101
 Title
 Instructor: Bourne, B.
 Enrollment: 0
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 9
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1628/1674	****	3.99	4.27	4.07	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1146/1674	****	4.11	4.23	4.16	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1423	****	4.51	4.27	4.16	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1609	****	3.97	4.22	4.05	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1121/1585	****	3.78	3.96	3.88	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	870/1535	****	4.03	4.08	3.89	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	1623/1651	****	3.77	4.18	4.10	2.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1072/1673	****	4.58	4.69	4.67	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	955/1656	****	4.07	4.07	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1586	****	4.34	4.43	4.37	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	****	4.73	4.69	4.60	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1504/1582	****	4.17	4.26	4.17	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	810/1520	****	3.57	4.01	3.76	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1515	****	3.72	4.24	3.97	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1511	****	3.92	4.27	4.00	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	977/ 994	****	3.96	3.94	3.73	2.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant