

Course Section: EDUC 304 0101  
 Title TCHNG PROB SOLVNG:ECE  
 Instructor: FRYER, MARY G.  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 553  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	5	4.18	1001/1669	4.18	4.32	4.23	4.28	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	2	6	4.09	1042/1666	4.09	4.26	4.19	4.20	4.09	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	280/1421	4.75	4.52	4.24	4.25	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	455/1617	4.55	4.38	4.15	4.22	4.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	939/1555	3.90	4.05	4.00	4.03	3.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	453/1543	4.45	4.29	4.06	4.14	4.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	112/1647	4.91	4.29	4.12	4.14	4.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	713/1668	4.91	4.81	4.67	4.68	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	830/1605	4.13	4.17	4.07	4.09	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	993/1514	4.36	4.43	4.39	4.46	4.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	760/1551	4.82	4.76	4.66	4.70	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	765/1503	4.36	4.31	4.24	4.28	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	0	6	4.00	1069/1506	4.00	4.27	4.26	4.30	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	587/1311	4.00	3.85	3.85	3.97	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	445/1490	4.50	4.47	4.05	4.11	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	237/1502	4.90	4.68	4.26	4.28	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	500/1489	4.70	4.64	4.29	4.35	4.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	217/1006	4.56	4.33	4.00	4.10	4.56	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.86	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.86	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	5.00	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	5.00	4.35	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.27	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.54	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.98	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.33	3.49	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1	
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C 0	General 0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	Under-grad 11
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Non-major 11
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Electives 0
					Other 10

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

Course Section: EDUC 310 0101  
 Title INQUIRY INTO EDUCATION  
 Instructor: DANNA, S  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 554  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	0	3	12	4.41	719/1669	4.21	4.32	4.23	4.28	4.41	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	461/1666	4.34	4.26	4.19	4.20	4.59	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	511/1421	4.56	4.52	4.24	4.25	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	539/1617	4.40	4.38	4.15	4.22	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	3	10	4.25	558/1555	3.95	4.05	4.00	4.03	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	1	12	4.56	334/1543	4.42	4.29	4.06	4.14	4.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	0	3	11	4.44	600/1647	4.22	4.29	4.12	4.14	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1668	4.68	4.81	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	713/1605	4.30	4.17	4.07	4.09	4.23	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	923/1514	4.24	4.43	4.39	4.46	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	788/1551	4.82	4.76	4.66	4.70	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	800/1503	4.17	4.31	4.24	4.28	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	3	9	4.20	958/1506	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.30	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	2	2	0	8	3.92	676/1311	3.81	3.85	3.85	3.97	3.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	289/1490	4.63	4.47	4.05	4.11	4.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	326/1502	4.74	4.68	4.26	4.28	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	280/1489	4.92	4.64	4.29	4.35	4.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	292/1006	4.21	4.33	4.00	4.10	4.43	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 58	4.61	4.27	4.22	4.29	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	25/ 52	4.00	4.19	4.06	3.59	4.38	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	2	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 39	4.46	4.54	4.39	3.82	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	2	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	19/ 40	3.82	3.98	3.97	3.34	4.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	2	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	20/ 30	3.95	4.00	4.33	3.49	4.17	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course Section: EDUC 310 0201  
 Title INQUIRY INTO EDUCATION  
 Instructor: GAURIN, ADELL  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 555  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	4	8	8	4.00	1173/1669	4.21	4.32	4.23	4.28	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	7	9	4.09	1042/1666	4.34	4.26	4.19	4.20	4.09	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/1421	4.56	4.52	4.24	4.25	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	8	10	4.33	717/1617	4.40	4.38	4.15	4.22	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	8	4	6	3.65	1141/1555	3.95	4.05	4.00	4.03	3.65	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	6	11	4.29	628/1543	4.42	4.29	4.06	4.14	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	3	8	7	4.00	1043/1647	4.22	4.29	4.12	4.14	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	13	7	4.35	1313/1668	4.68	4.81	4.67	4.68	4.35	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	2	8	9	4.37	551/1605	4.30	4.17	4.07	4.09	4.37	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	5	9	6	4.05	1185/1514	4.24	4.43	4.39	4.46	4.05	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	650/1551	4.82	4.76	4.66	4.70	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	6	5	8	4.00	1066/1503	4.17	4.31	4.24	4.28	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	7	9	4.25	909/1506	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.30	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	2	1	4	3	7	3.71	818/1311	3.81	3.85	3.85	3.97	3.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	433/1490	4.63	4.47	4.05	4.11	4.53	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	486/1502	4.74	4.68	4.26	4.28	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	168/1489	4.92	4.64	4.29	4.35	4.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	1	1	3	4	8	4.00	479/1006	4.21	4.33	4.00	4.10	4.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	3	5	10	4.21	35/ 58	4.61	4.27	4.22	4.29	4.21	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	1	3	3	7	5	3.63	38/ 52	4.00	4.19	4.06	3.59	3.63	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	5	0	2	2	5	5	3.93	29/ 39	4.46	4.54	4.39	3.82	3.93	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	2	1	2	4	5	5	3.65	25/ 40	3.82	3.98	3.97	3.34	3.65	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	8	0	1	2	7	1	3.73	23/ 30	3.95	4.00	4.33	3.49	3.73	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
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	21				
				?	0						

Course Section: EDUC 311 0101  
 Title PSYC FOUNDATION OF EDU  
 Instructor: WILLIAMS, VICKI  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 556  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	13	4.61	463/1669	4.47	4.32	4.23	4.28	4.61	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	218/1666	4.58	4.26	4.19	4.20	4.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	392/1421	4.67	4.52	4.24	4.25	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	253/1617	4.61	4.38	4.15	4.22	4.72	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	2	14	4.50	340/1555	4.31	4.05	4.00	4.03	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	15	4.72	202/1543	4.50	4.29	4.06	4.14	4.72	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	150/1647	4.53	4.29	4.12	4.14	4.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	844/1668	4.64	4.81	4.67	4.68	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	350/1605	4.45	4.17	4.07	4.09	4.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	240/1514	4.77	4.43	4.39	4.46	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	760/1551	4.85	4.76	4.66	4.70	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	210/1503	4.73	4.31	4.24	4.28	4.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	446/1506	4.62	4.27	4.26	4.30	4.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	1	2	2	10	4.19	489/1311	4.45	3.85	3.85	3.97	4.19	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	113/1490	4.73	4.47	4.05	4.11	4.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	296/1502	4.66	4.68	4.26	4.28	4.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	422/1489	4.75	4.64	4.29	4.35	4.77	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	317/1006	4.39	4.33	4.00	4.10	4.38	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 226	****	4.86	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.86	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	5.00	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 223	****	5.00	4.35	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	4.25	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	3.65	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	3.77	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	4.04	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	4.44	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.27	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.54	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	3.98	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: EDUC 311 0101  
 Title PSYC FOUNDATION OF EDU  
 Instructor: WILLIAMS, VICKI  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 556  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	14	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course Section: EDUC 311 0201  
 Title PSYC FOUNDATION OF EDU  
 Instructor: WILLIAMS, VICKI  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 557  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	3	0	0	1	1	7	9	4.33	816/1669	4.47	4.32	4.23	4.28	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	715/1666	4.58	4.26	4.19	4.20	4.39	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	392/1421	4.67	4.52	4.24	4.25	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	496/1617	4.61	4.38	4.15	4.22	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	1	1	6	8	4.12	698/1555	4.31	4.05	4.00	4.03	4.12	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	5	3	10	4.28	638/1543	4.50	4.29	4.06	4.14	4.28	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	2	7	8	4.22	896/1647	4.53	4.29	4.12	4.14	4.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	1240/1668	4.64	4.81	4.67	4.68	4.44	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	538/1605	4.45	4.17	4.07	4.09	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	584/1514	4.77	4.43	4.39	4.46	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	567/1551	4.85	4.76	4.66	4.70	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	412/1503	4.73	4.31	4.24	4.28	4.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	5	12	4.56	594/1506	4.62	4.27	4.26	4.30	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	158/1311	4.45	3.85	3.85	3.97	4.72	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	428/1490	4.73	4.47	4.05	4.11	4.53	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	0	5	9	4.47	680/1502	4.66	4.68	4.26	4.28	4.47	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	456/1489	4.75	4.64	4.29	4.35	4.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	1	2	2	10	4.40	307/1006	4.39	4.33	4.00	4.10	4.40	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	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	16				
				?	0						

Course Section: EDUC 312 0101  
 Title ANALYSIS OF TCHNG & LR  
 Instructor: WILLIAMS, VICKI  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 558  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	13	4.87	159/1669	4.90	4.32	4.23	4.28	4.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	293/1666	4.76	4.26	4.19	4.20	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	217/1421	4.90	4.52	4.24	4.25	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	91/1617	4.80	4.38	4.15	4.22	4.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	5	1	6	3.92	905/1555	3.73	4.05	4.00	4.03	3.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	157/1543	4.73	4.29	4.06	4.14	4.79	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	185/1647	4.59	4.29	4.12	4.14	4.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	4	4.29	1364/1668	4.24	4.81	4.67	4.68	4.29	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	239/1605	4.70	4.17	4.07	4.09	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	257/1514	4.83	4.43	4.39	4.46	4.87	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1551	4.90	4.76	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	88/1503	4.80	4.31	4.24	4.28	4.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	286/1506	4.83	4.27	4.26	4.30	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	189/1311	4.29	3.85	3.85	3.97	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	380/1490	4.71	4.47	4.05	4.11	4.62	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	459/1502	4.70	4.68	4.26	4.28	4.69	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	422/1489	4.73	4.64	4.29	4.35	4.77	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	235/1006	4.44	4.33	4.00	4.10	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.86	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.86	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	5.00	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	5.00	4.35	4.27	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	65/ 112	4.50	4.25	4.38	4.53	4.50	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.65	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 92	****	3.77	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	36/ 105	4.75	4.04	4.20	4.45	4.75	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 98	5.00	4.44	3.95	4.15	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.27	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.54	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.98	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: EDUC 312 0101  
 Title ANALYSIS OF TCHNG & LR  
 Instructor: WILLIAMS, VICKI  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 558  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	1						

Course Section: EDUC 312 0201  
 Title ANALYSIS OF TCHNG & LR  
 Instructor: SMITH JR, MURDU  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 559  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	14	4.93	89/1669	4.90	4.32	4.23	4.28	4.93	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	181/1666	4.76	4.26	4.19	4.20	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	4.90	4.52	4.24	4.25	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	323/1617	4.80	4.38	4.15	4.22	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	3	3	0	6	3.54	1212/1555	3.73	4.05	4.00	4.03	3.54	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	250/1543	4.73	4.29	4.06	4.14	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	1	11	4.40	651/1647	4.59	4.29	4.12	4.14	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	3	4.20	1418/1668	4.24	4.81	4.67	4.68	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	188/1605	4.70	4.17	4.07	4.09	4.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	360/1514	4.83	4.43	4.39	4.46	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	788/1551	4.90	4.76	4.66	4.70	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	386/1503	4.80	4.31	4.24	4.28	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	212/1506	4.83	4.27	4.26	4.30	4.87	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	1	4	1	5	3.91	699/1311	4.29	3.85	3.85	3.97	3.91	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	214/1490	4.71	4.47	4.05	4.11	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	459/1502	4.70	4.68	4.26	4.28	4.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	500/1489	4.73	4.64	4.29	4.35	4.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	1	1	0	6	4.38	322/1006	4.44	4.33	4.00	4.10	4.38	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	4.50	4.25	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.65	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.77	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	4.75	4.04	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	5.00	4.44	3.95	4.15	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	0	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	11
			? 0		

Course Section: EDUC 315 0101  
 Title TCHNG ENGLISH:SEC SCHO  
 Instructor: NORTH-COLEMAN,  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 560  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	3	0	3.50	1480/1669	3.50	4.32	4.23	4.28	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	881/1666	4.25	4.26	4.19	4.20	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1357/1421	3.00	4.52	4.24	4.25	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	801/1617	4.25	4.38	4.15	4.22	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1490/1555	2.75	4.05	4.00	4.03	2.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1138/1543	3.75	4.29	4.06	4.14	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	213/1647	4.75	4.29	4.12	4.14	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1530/1668	4.00	4.81	4.67	4.68	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1210/1605	3.75	4.17	4.07	4.09	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	584/1514	4.67	4.43	4.39	4.46	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.76	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	386/1503	4.67	4.31	4.24	4.28	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	471/1506	4.67	4.27	4.26	4.30	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	189/1311	4.67	3.85	3.85	3.97	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	340/1490	4.67	4.47	4.05	4.11	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	486/1502	4.67	4.68	4.26	4.28	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	532/1489	4.67	4.64	4.29	4.35	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	923/1006	3.00	4.33	4.00	4.10	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 2		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 317 0101  
 Title PROC & ACQUIS READ  
 Instructor: YOUNG, PATRICIA  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 561  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	2	2	4	4.00	1173/1669	4.00	4.32	4.23	4.28	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	4	2	3.67	1387/1666	3.67	4.26	4.19	4.20	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	969/1421	4.00	4.52	4.24	4.25	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	831/1617	4.22	4.38	4.15	4.22	4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	584/1555	4.22	4.05	4.00	4.03	4.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1043/1543	3.88	4.29	4.06	4.14	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	583/1647	4.44	4.29	4.12	4.14	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	1068/1668	4.67	4.81	4.67	4.68	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	1357/1605	3.50	4.17	4.07	4.09	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	1160/1514	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.46	4.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	1284/1551	4.38	4.76	4.66	4.70	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	996/1503	4.13	4.31	4.24	4.28	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	1	3	3.63	1292/1506	3.63	4.27	4.26	4.30	3.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	4	3	1	3.63	875/1311	3.63	3.85	3.85	3.97	3.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1062/1490	3.71	4.47	4.05	4.11	3.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	818/1502	4.33	4.68	4.26	4.28	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1038/1489	4.00	4.64	4.29	4.35	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	407/1006	4.20	4.33	4.00	4.10	4.20	

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	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 9
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 318 0101  
 Title INSTRUCTION OF READING  
 Instructor: SHELTON, NANCY  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 562  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	1/1669	5.00	4.32	4.23	4.28	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	359/1666	4.67	4.26	4.19	4.20	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.52	4.24	4.25	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	323/1617	4.67	4.38	4.15	4.22	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1555	5.00	4.05	4.00	4.03	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	250/1543	4.67	4.29	4.06	4.14	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1043/1647	4.00	4.29	4.12	4.14	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1329/1668	4.33	4.81	4.67	4.68	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	239/1605	4.67	4.17	4.07	4.09	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	584/1514	4.67	4.43	4.39	4.46	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.76	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	386/1503	4.67	4.31	4.24	4.28	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	471/1506	4.67	4.27	4.26	4.30	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	587/1311	4.00	3.85	3.85	3.97	4.00	

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	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	3
84-150	2	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	3				
				?	1						

Course Section: EDUC 319 0101  
 Title ASSESS READING  
 Instructor: SHELTON, NANCY  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 563  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	4	1	2	0	2.71	1632/1669	2.71	4.32	4.23	4.28	2.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	3	0	0	2.14	1657/1666	2.14	4.26	4.19	4.20	2.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	2	2	0	2.57	1586/1617	2.57	4.38	4.15	4.22	2.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	2	0	2.57	1516/1555	2.57	4.05	4.00	4.03	2.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	3	1	0	2.71	1492/1543	2.71	4.29	4.06	4.14	2.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	5	1	0	1	0	1.57	1635/1647	1.57	4.29	4.12	4.14	1.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1530/1668	4.00	4.81	4.67	4.68	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	3	0	2	0	0	1.80	1596/1605	1.80	4.17	4.07	4.09	1.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	1	2	0	3.00	1457/1514	3.00	4.43	4.39	4.46	3.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	788/1551	4.80	4.76	4.66	4.70	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	1481/1503	2.25	4.31	4.24	4.28	2.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	0	1	1	2.60	1447/1506	2.60	4.27	4.26	4.30	2.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	1269/1311	2.00	3.85	3.85	3.97	2.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1003/1490	3.80	4.47	4.05	4.11	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	1013/1502	4.00	4.68	4.26	4.28	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	2	2	0	1	3.00	1398/1489	3.00	4.64	4.29	4.35	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	873/1006	3.25	4.33	4.00	4.10	3.25	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	51/ 58	3.00	4.27	4.22	4.29	3.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	50/ 52	1.67	4.19	4.06	3.59	1.67	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	37/ 39	3.00	4.54	4.39	3.82	3.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	37/ 40	2.50	3.98	3.97	3.34	2.50	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	30/ 30	1.67	4.00	4.33	3.49	1.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	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	7	Non-major	7
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	1						

Course Section: EDUC 320 0101  
 Title TEACH MATH IN ELEM SCH  
 Instructor: KINACH, BARBARA  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 564  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	4	4.80	207/1669	4.80	4.32	4.23	4.28	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	439/1666	4.60	4.26	4.19	4.20	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	557/1421	4.50	4.52	4.24	4.25	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	161/1617	4.80	4.38	4.15	4.22	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	773/1555	4.00	4.05	4.00	4.03	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	516/1543	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.14	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	651/1647	4.40	4.29	4.12	4.14	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1125/1668	4.60	4.81	4.67	4.68	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	690/1605	4.25	4.17	4.07	4.09	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	360/1514	4.80	4.43	4.39	4.46	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	788/1551	4.80	4.76	4.66	4.70	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	719/1503	4.40	4.31	4.24	4.28	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	286/1506	4.80	4.27	4.26	4.30	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1311	5.00	3.85	3.85	3.97	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	214/1490	4.80	4.47	4.05	4.11	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	754/1502	4.40	4.68	4.26	4.28	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	953/1489	4.20	4.64	4.29	4.35	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	143/1006	4.75	4.33	4.00	4.10	4.75	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	38/ 58	4.00	4.27	4.22	4.29	4.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.19	4.06	3.59	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.54	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.98	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.33	3.49	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 2	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	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 5
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	5

Course Section: EDUC 322 0101  
 Title MATH IN SECONDARY SCHO  
 Instructor: KINACH, BARBARA  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 565  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	0	1	0	3	4.50	590/1669	4.50	4.32	4.23	4.28	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	881/1666	4.25	4.26	4.19	4.20	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	496/1617	4.50	4.38	4.15	4.22	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	1359/1555	3.25	4.05	4.00	4.03	3.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	659/1543	4.25	4.29	4.06	4.14	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1496/1647	3.25	4.29	4.12	4.14	3.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.81	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	690/1605	4.25	4.17	4.07	4.09	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	445/1490	4.50	4.47	4.05	4.11	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.68	4.26	4.28	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1191/1489	3.75	4.64	4.29	4.35	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	235/1006	4.50	4.33	4.00	4.10	4.50

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
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Under-grad 4
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	4
			? 0		

Course Section: EDUC 324 0101  
 Title: PROCESS SEM IN ECE-M/S  
 Instructor: BELL, DEBORAH A  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 566  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	4	4.80	207/1669	4.80	4.32	4.23	4.28	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	439/1666	4.60	4.26	4.19	4.20	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1421	****	4.52	4.24	4.25	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	394/1617	4.60	4.38	4.15	4.22	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	1482/1555	2.80	4.05	4.00	4.03	2.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	723/1543	4.20	4.29	4.06	4.14	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	367/1647	4.60	4.29	4.12	4.14	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.81	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	373/1605	4.50	4.17	4.07	4.09	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	360/1514	4.80	4.43	4.39	4.46	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.76	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	464/1503	4.60	4.31	4.24	4.28	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	286/1506	4.80	4.27	4.26	4.30	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	445/1311	4.25	3.85	3.85	3.97	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	389/1490	4.60	4.47	4.05	4.11	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	336/1502	4.80	4.68	4.26	4.28	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	378/1489	4.80	4.64	4.29	4.35	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	143/1006	4.75	4.33	4.00	4.10	4.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.86	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.86	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	5.00	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	5.00	4.35	4.27	****	

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	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	5
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 330 0101  
 Title TCHNG SCIENCE:ELEM SCH  
 Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 567  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	1	0	2	4	4.29	876/1669	4.29	4.32	4.23	4.28	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	1353/1666	3.71	4.26	4.19	4.20	3.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1421	****	4.52	4.24	4.25	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1029/1617	4.00	4.38	4.15	4.22	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	996/1555	3.83	4.05	4.00	4.03	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	1076/1543	3.83	4.29	4.06	4.14	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	4	1	1	3.50	1393/1647	3.50	4.29	4.12	4.14	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1329/1668	4.33	4.81	4.67	4.68	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	918/1605	4.00	4.17	4.07	4.09	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	535/1490	4.43	4.47	4.05	4.11	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	286/1502	4.86	4.68	4.26	4.28	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	329/1489	4.86	4.64	4.29	4.35	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	479/1006	4.00	4.33	4.00	4.10	4.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.27	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.54	4.39	3.82	****	

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	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		8
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	7

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

Course Section: EDUC 331 0101  
 Title SOCIAL STUDIES:ELEM SC  
 Instructor: FITZHUGH, WILLI (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 568  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	1/1669	5.00	4.32	4.23	4.28	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.26	4.19	4.20	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.52	4.24	4.25	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.38	4.15	4.22	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1555	5.00	4.05	4.00	4.03	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1543	5.00	4.29	4.06	4.14	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1647	5.00	4.29	4.12	4.14	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.81	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1605	5.00	4.17	4.07	4.09	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.43	4.39	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.76	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.31	4.24	4.28	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.27	4.26	4.30	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	389/1311	4.33	3.85	3.85	3.97	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.47	4.05	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.68	4.26	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.64	4.29	4.35	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1006	5.00	4.33	4.00	4.10	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	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	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: (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 569  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.32	4.23	4.28	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.26	4.19	4.20	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.52	4.24	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.38	4.15	4.22	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1555	5.00	4.05	4.00	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1543	5.00	4.29	4.06	4.14	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1647	5.00	4.29	4.12	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.81	4.67	4.68	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.47	4.05	4.11	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.68	4.26	4.28	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.64	4.29	4.35	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1006	5.00	4.33	4.00	4.10	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
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Under-grad 3
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	3
			? 0		

Course Section: EDUC 332 0101  
 Title SCIENCE:SECONDARY SCHO  
 Instructor: SEILER, GALE  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 570  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	0	3.00	1596/1669	3.00	4.32	4.23	4.28	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	4.26	4.19	4.20	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1301/1617	3.67	4.38	4.15	4.22	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	1539/1555	2.33	4.05	4.00	4.03	2.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	895/1543	4.00	4.29	4.06	4.14	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1474/1647	3.33	4.29	4.12	4.14	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.81	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	918/1605	4.00	4.17	4.07	4.09	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1199/1514	4.00	4.43	4.39	4.46	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1304/1551	4.33	4.76	4.66	4.70	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1066/1503	4.00	4.31	4.24	4.28	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1069/1506	4.00	4.27	4.26	4.30	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	1269/1311	2.00	3.85	3.85	3.97	2.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	849/1490	4.00	4.47	4.05	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.68	4.26	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.64	4.29	4.35	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	479/1006	4.00	4.33	4.00	4.10	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	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	2				
			? 0						

Course Section: EDUC 333 0101  
 Title SOCIAL STUDIES:SEC SCH  
 Instructor: JAKOVICS, KIMBE  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 571  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	8	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.32	4.23	4.28	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.26	4.19	4.20	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.52	4.24	4.25	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	128/1617	4.88	4.38	4.15	4.22	4.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	171/1555	4.75	4.05	4.00	4.03	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	180/1543	4.75	4.29	4.06	4.14	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	345/1647	4.63	4.29	4.12	4.14	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1106/1668	4.63	4.81	4.67	4.68	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	111/1605	4.88	4.17	4.07	4.09	4.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.43	4.39	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.76	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	154/1503	4.88	4.31	4.24	4.28	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.27	4.26	4.30	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	483/1311	4.20	3.85	3.85	3.97	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.47	4.05	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.68	4.26	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	329/1489	4.86	4.64	4.29	4.35	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1006	5.00	4.33	4.00	4.10	5.00	

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	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		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	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	8
			? 0		

Course Section: EDUC 335 0101  
 Title TEACH FORGN LANG SEC S  
 Instructor: SCHWARTZ, ANA-M  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 572  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	478/1669	4.60	4.32	4.23	4.28	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	181/1666	4.80	4.26	4.19	4.20	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	217/1421	4.80	4.52	4.24	4.25	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	161/1617	4.80	4.38	4.15	4.22	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	141/1555	4.80	4.05	4.00	4.03	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	516/1543	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.14	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	367/1647	4.60	4.29	4.12	4.14	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.81	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	918/1605	4.00	4.17	4.07	4.09	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	360/1514	4.80	4.43	4.39	4.46	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	788/1551	4.80	4.76	4.66	4.70	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	719/1503	4.40	4.31	4.24	4.28	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	770/1506	4.40	4.27	4.26	4.30	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	764/1311	3.80	3.85	3.85	3.97	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	389/1490	4.60	4.47	4.05	4.11	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.68	4.26	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	378/1489	4.80	4.64	4.29	4.35	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	479/1006	4.00	4.33	4.00	4.10	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 3		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	5
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		

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

Course Section: EDUC 350 0101  
 Title LANG, LIT, & INT. DEV  
 Instructor: SCULLY, PAT  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 573  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	5	4.50	590/1669	4.50	4.32	4.23	4.28	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	359/1666	4.67	4.26	4.19	4.20	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	****	4.52	4.24	4.25	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	323/1617	4.67	4.38	4.15	4.22	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	611/1555	4.20	4.05	4.00	4.03	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	390/1543	4.50	4.29	4.06	4.14	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	112/1647	4.90	4.29	4.12	4.14	4.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	1190/1668	4.50	4.81	4.67	4.68	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	210/1605	4.70	4.17	4.07	4.09	4.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	360/1514	4.80	4.43	4.39	4.46	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.76	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	464/1503	4.60	4.31	4.24	4.28	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	164/1506	4.90	4.27	4.26	4.30	4.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	1	3	1	1	3.00	1115/1311	3.00	3.85	3.85	3.97	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	162/1490	4.88	4.47	4.05	4.11	4.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.68	4.26	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.64	4.29	4.35	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	381/1006	4.25	4.33	4.00	4.10	4.25	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.27	4.22	4.29	****	

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	1	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 387 0101  
 Title TUTORING AND LITERACY  
 Instructor: TAYLOR, JOBY B  
 Enrollment: 0  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 574  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	5	4.83	183/1669	4.83	4.32	4.23	4.28	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	359/1666	4.67	4.26	4.19	4.20	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.52	4.24	4.25	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	146/1617	4.83	4.38	4.15	4.22	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1555	5.00	4.05	4.00	4.03	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	250/1543	4.67	4.29	4.06	4.14	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	481/1647	4.50	4.29	4.12	4.14	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.81	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	298/1605	4.60	4.17	4.07	4.09	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	679/1514	4.60	4.43	4.39	4.46	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.76	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	464/1503	4.60	4.31	4.24	4.28	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.27	4.26	4.30	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1115/1311	3.00	3.85	3.85	3.97	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.47	4.05	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	393/1502	4.75	4.68	4.26	4.28	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.64	4.29	4.35	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	479/1006	4.00	4.33	4.00	4.10	4.00	

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	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	3
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		6
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	0

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

Course Section: EDUC 388 0101  
 Title INCLUSION & INSTRUCTIO  
 Instructor: BERGE, NANCY B  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 575  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	1	10	5	4.06	1138/1669	4.06	4.32	4.23	4.28	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	676/1666	4.41	4.26	4.19	4.20	4.41	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	197/1421	4.83	4.52	4.24	4.25	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	539/1617	4.47	4.38	4.15	4.22	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	5	8	4.12	698/1555	4.12	4.05	4.00	4.03	4.12	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	316/1543	4.59	4.29	4.06	4.14	4.59	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	697/1647	4.38	4.29	4.12	4.14	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.81	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	11	0	3.79	1187/1605	3.79	4.17	4.07	4.09	3.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	6	9	4.44	908/1514	4.44	4.43	4.39	4.46	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	760/1551	4.81	4.76	4.66	4.70	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	528/1503	4.53	4.31	4.24	4.28	4.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	585/1506	4.56	4.27	4.26	4.30	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	357/1311	4.38	3.85	3.85	3.97	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	340/1490	4.67	4.47	4.05	4.11	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	558/1502	4.58	4.68	4.26	4.28	4.58	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	532/1489	4.67	4.64	4.29	4.35	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	1	0	1	5	4	4.00	479/1006	4.00	4.33	4.00	4.10	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: EDUC 403 0101  
 Title ELEM INTRNSHP SEMINAR  
 Instructor: BOURNE, BARBARA  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 576  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	705/1669	4.43	4.32	4.23	4.39	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	472/1666	4.57	4.26	4.19	4.22	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	466/1421	4.60	4.52	4.24	4.38	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	496/1617	4.50	4.38	4.15	4.22	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	1	3.57	1192/1555	3.57	4.05	4.00	4.08	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	895/1543	4.00	4.29	4.06	4.18	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	617/1647	4.43	4.29	4.12	4.14	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	807/1668	4.86	4.81	4.67	4.70	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	298/1605	4.60	4.17	4.07	4.16	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	715/1514	4.57	4.43	4.39	4.45	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	650/1551	4.86	4.76	4.66	4.73	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	323/1503	4.71	4.31	4.24	4.27	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	744/1506	4.43	4.27	4.26	4.29	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	791/1311	3.75	3.85	3.85	3.88	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	667/1490	4.29	4.47	4.05	4.26	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	567/1502	4.57	4.68	4.26	4.46	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	329/1489	4.86	4.64	4.29	4.52	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	810/1006	3.40	4.33	4.00	4.21	3.40	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 112	5.00	4.25	4.38	4.74	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.65	4.36	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.77	4.22	4.48	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 105	5.00	4.04	4.20	4.27	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.44	3.95	3.86	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	31/ 58	4.50	4.27	4.22	3.94	4.50	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	23/ 52	4.50	4.19	4.06	3.80	4.50	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	26/ 39	4.00	4.54	4.39	3.78	4.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	3.98	3.97	3.81	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	21/ 30	4.00	4.00	4.33	4.50	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course Section: EDUC 404 0101  
 Title: INTERNSHIP SEM:ECE  
 Instructor: SMALL, SUSAN  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 577  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	7	9	4.56	522/1669	4.56	4.32	4.23	4.39	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	966/1666	4.19	4.26	4.19	4.22	4.19	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1421	****	4.52	4.24	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	414/1617	4.58	4.38	4.15	4.22	4.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	558/1555	4.25	4.05	4.00	4.08	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	250/1543	4.67	4.29	4.06	4.18	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	1002/1647	4.08	4.29	4.12	4.14	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	807/1668	4.86	4.81	4.67	4.70	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	9	0	3.90	1092/1605	3.90	4.17	4.07	4.16	3.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	392/1514	4.79	4.43	4.39	4.45	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.76	4.66	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	412/1503	4.64	4.31	4.24	4.27	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	642/1506	4.50	4.27	4.26	4.29	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	0	0	4	1	4	4.00	587/1311	4.00	3.85	3.85	3.88	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	214/1490	4.80	4.47	4.05	4.26	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	237/1502	4.90	4.68	4.26	4.46	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.64	4.29	4.52	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	453/1006	4.11	4.33	4.00	4.21	4.11	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.86	4.20	4.61	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.86	4.19	4.40	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	5.00	4.50	4.39	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	5.00	4.35	4.56	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.20	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	65/ 112	4.50	4.25	4.38	4.74	4.50	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.65	4.36	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.77	4.22	4.48	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	72/ 105	4.00	4.04	4.20	4.27	4.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 98	****	4.44	3.95	3.86	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.27	4.22	3.94	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	3.80	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	4.54	4.39	3.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 40	****	3.98	3.97	3.81	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.33	4.50	****	

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 0	Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 0
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	5	D 0	Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Non-major 16
				Electives	0
#### - Means there are not enough					

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	14	
?	1			

Course Section: EDUC 411 0101  
 Title: READ CONTNT AREA II  
 Instructor: NORTH-COLEMAN,  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 578  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	8	1	5	3.50	1480/1669	3.50	4.32	4.23	4.39	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	4	6	3.88	1257/1666	3.88	4.26	4.19	4.22	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	814/1421	4.25	4.52	4.24	4.38	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	946/1617	4.13	4.38	4.15	4.22	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	4	4	1	5	3.19	1389/1555	3.19	4.05	4.00	4.08	3.19	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	6	2	6	3.75	1138/1543	3.75	4.29	4.06	4.18	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	6	1	7	3.81	1241/1647	3.81	4.29	4.12	4.14	3.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	1170/1668	4.53	4.81	4.67	4.70	4.53	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	6	2	2	3.33	1428/1605	3.33	4.17	4.07	4.16	3.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	1160/1514	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.45	4.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	1193/1551	4.50	4.76	4.66	4.73	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	4	3	7	3.94	1137/1503	3.94	4.31	4.24	4.27	3.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	7	2	4	3.31	1365/1506	3.31	4.27	4.26	4.29	3.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	2	3	3	6	3.73	801/1311	3.73	3.85	3.85	3.88	3.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	4	1	5	3.43	1202/1490	3.43	4.47	4.05	4.26	3.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	800/1502	4.36	4.68	4.26	4.46	4.36	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	846/1489	4.36	4.64	4.29	4.52	4.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	2	2	2	4	3.80	643/1006	3.80	4.33	4.00	4.21	3.80	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	4.86	4.19	4.40	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 13	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	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 16
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 415 0101  
 Title MATERIALS TCH READ  
 Instructor: YOUNG, PATRICIA  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 579  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	6	2	2	3.60	1437/1669	3.60	4.32	4.23	4.39	3.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	3	4	3.90	1235/1666	3.90	4.26	4.19	4.22	3.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	1222/1421	3.50	4.52	4.24	4.38	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	3	4	3.80	1224/1617	3.80	4.38	4.15	4.22	3.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	1	3	3	3.40	1303/1555	3.40	4.05	4.00	4.08	3.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	895/1543	4.00	4.29	4.06	4.18	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	759/1647	4.33	4.29	4.12	4.14	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	713/1668	4.90	4.81	4.67	4.70	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	918/1605	4.00	4.17	4.07	4.16	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	537/1514	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.45	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	986/1551	4.70	4.76	4.66	4.73	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	719/1503	4.40	4.31	4.24	4.27	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1174/1506	3.90	4.27	4.26	4.29	3.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	525/1311	4.13	3.85	3.85	3.88	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	979/1490	3.86	4.47	4.05	4.26	3.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	729/1502	4.43	4.68	4.26	4.46	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	986/1489	4.14	4.64	4.29	4.52	4.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	729/1006	3.60	4.33	4.00	4.21	3.60	

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	1	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	2	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 424 0101  
 Title ISSUES IN EC CURRICULU  
 Instructor: SMALL, SUSAN  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 580  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	0	7	7	4.50	590/1669	4.50	4.32	4.23	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	4	3.93	1206/1666	3.93	4.26	4.19	4.22	3.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1421	****	4.52	4.24	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	424/1617	4.57	4.38	4.15	4.22	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	5	5	3.86	980/1555	3.86	4.05	4.00	4.08	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	562/1543	4.36	4.29	4.06	4.18	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	3	4	4	3.57	1365/1647	3.57	4.29	4.12	4.14	3.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	570/1668	4.93	4.81	4.67	4.70	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	9	0	3.90	1092/1605	3.90	4.17	4.07	4.16	3.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	663/1514	4.62	4.43	4.39	4.45	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.76	4.66	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	347/1503	4.69	4.31	4.24	4.27	4.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	340/1506	4.77	4.27	4.26	4.29	4.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	731/1311	3.86	3.85	3.85	3.88	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	162/1490	4.88	4.47	4.05	4.26	4.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	266/1502	4.88	4.68	4.26	4.46	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.64	4.29	4.52	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	436/1006	4.14	4.33	4.00	4.21	4.14	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.86	4.20	4.61	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.86	4.19	4.40	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	5.00	4.50	4.39	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	5.00	4.35	4.56	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.20	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.25	4.38	4.74	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.65	4.36	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	3.77	4.22	4.48	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 105	****	4.04	4.20	4.27	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	4.44	3.95	3.86	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.27	4.22	3.94	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	3.80	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 39	****	4.54	4.39	3.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 40	****	3.98	3.97	3.81	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.33	4.50	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0	Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	6	D 0	Under-grad 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Non-major 14
Electives 0					
#### - Means there are not enough					

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	13	
?	1			

Course Section: EDUC 471 8050  
 Title PRIN OF TRAINING AND D  
 Instructor: STORY, VIRGINIA  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 581  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	389/1669	4.67	4.32	4.23	4.39	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	359/1666	4.67	4.26	4.19	4.22	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1421	****	4.52	4.24	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	323/1617	4.67	4.38	4.15	4.22	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	301/1555	4.56	4.05	4.00	4.08	4.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	783/1543	4.14	4.29	4.06	4.18	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	617/1647	4.43	4.29	4.12	4.14	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	939/1668	4.78	4.81	4.67	4.70	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	278/1605	4.63	4.17	4.07	4.16	4.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.43	4.39	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.76	4.66	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	254/1503	4.78	4.31	4.24	4.27	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	471/1506	4.67	4.27	4.26	4.29	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	131/1311	4.78	3.85	3.85	3.88	4.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	192/1490	4.83	4.47	4.05	4.26	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.68	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.64	4.29	4.52	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1006	5.00	4.33	4.00	4.21	5.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.86	4.19	4.40	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.25	4.38	4.74	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.65	4.36	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.77	4.22	4.48	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.04	4.20	4.27	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.44	3.95	3.86	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	4.27	4.22	3.94	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	3.80	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.54	4.39	3.78	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.33	4.50	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.92	****	

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	1	1.00-1.99	1	B 1	Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	Under-grad 9
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	Major 0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Non-major 9
				P 0	Electives 0

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

I	0	Other	8
?	0		



Course Section: EDUC 602 0201  
 Title INSTRUCTIONAL SYS DEV  
 Instructor: SMITH JR, MURDU  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 583  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	0	7	4.20	988/1669	4.20	4.32	4.23	4.35	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	549/1666	4.50	4.26	4.19	4.19	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1421	****	4.52	4.24	4.33	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	288/1617	4.70	4.38	4.15	4.24	4.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	709/1555	4.10	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	832/1543	4.10	4.29	4.06	4.27	4.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	167/1647	4.80	4.29	4.12	4.15	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	1274/1668	4.40	4.81	4.67	4.83	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	918/1605	4.00	4.17	4.07	4.13	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	799/1514	4.50	4.43	4.39	4.37	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	512/1551	4.90	4.76	4.66	4.72	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	154/1503	4.88	4.31	4.24	4.22	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	718/1506	4.44	4.27	4.26	4.24	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	389/1311	4.33	3.85	3.85	3.89	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	445/1490	4.50	4.47	4.05	4.18	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	632/1502	4.50	4.68	4.26	4.46	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	596/1489	4.60	4.64	4.29	4.44	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	360/1006	4.30	4.33	4.00	4.11	4.30	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.86	4.19	4.41	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.25	4.38	4.39	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	3.65	4.36	4.38	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.77	4.22	4.36	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.04	4.20	4.23	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.44	3.95	3.93	****	
Field Work															
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	4.57	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	3.98	3.97	4.31	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.33	4.55	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.45	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.40	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.61	****	

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 4	Graduate 6
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	Major 3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0	General 0
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Under-grad 4
				P 0	Non-major 7
					Electives 0
					#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

I	0	Other	9
?	0		

Course Section: EDUC 602T 8010  
 Title  
 Instructor: HODELL, CHARLES  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 584  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	4	3	12	4.42	705/1669	4.42	4.32	4.23	4.35	4.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	332/1666	4.68	4.26	4.19	4.19	4.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	392/1421	4.67	4.52	4.24	4.33	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	370/1617	4.63	4.38	4.15	4.24	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	369/1555	4.47	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	2	13	4.56	344/1543	4.56	4.29	4.06	4.27	4.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	145/1647	4.84	4.29	4.12	4.15	4.84	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	18	1	4.05	1503/1668	4.05	4.81	4.67	4.83	4.05	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	2	9	5	4.19	769/1605	4.19	4.17	4.07	4.13	4.19	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	715/1514	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.37	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	825/1551	4.79	4.76	4.66	4.72	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	360/1503	4.68	4.31	4.24	4.22	4.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	5	11	4.26	901/1506	4.26	4.27	4.26	4.24	4.26	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	6	4	7	3.94	654/1311	3.94	3.85	3.85	3.89	3.94	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	6	11	4.37	594/1490	4.37	4.47	4.05	4.18	4.37	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	1	3	13	4.56	586/1502	4.56	4.68	4.26	4.46	4.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	2	0	1	16	4.63	564/1489	4.63	4.64	4.29	4.44	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	1	0	2	4	8	4.20	407/1006	4.20	4.33	4.00	4.11	4.20	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.86	4.20	4.47	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 233	****	4.86	4.19	4.41	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.25	4.38	4.39	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.65	4.36	4.38	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.77	4.22	4.36	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 105	****	4.04	4.20	4.23	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	4.44	3.95	3.93	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	4.27	4.22	4.53	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	4.57	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.54	4.39	4.90	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	3.98	3.97	4.31	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.33	4.55	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.45	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.40	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.61	****	

Course Section: EDUC 602T 8010  
 Title  
 Instructor: HODELL, CHARLES  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 584  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	7	A	17	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	10	Major	17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	0						

Course Section: EDUC 605 8010  
 Title THE ADULT LEARNER  
 Instructor: RAUDENBUSH, LIN  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 585  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	8	5.00	1/1669	4.97	4.32	4.23	4.35	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	243/1666	4.84	4.26	4.19	4.19	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.52	4.24	4.33	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	219/1617	4.74	4.38	4.15	4.24	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1555	4.97	4.05	4.00	4.07	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1543	4.90	4.29	4.06	4.27	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	128/1647	4.85	4.29	4.12	4.15	4.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.81	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	127/1605	4.78	4.17	4.07	4.13	4.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	240/1514	4.69	4.43	4.39	4.37	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1551	4.96	4.76	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	154/1503	4.92	4.31	4.24	4.22	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1506	4.93	4.27	4.26	4.24	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	731/1311	4.49	3.85	3.85	3.89	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1490	4.91	4.47	4.05	4.18	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	266/1502	4.93	4.68	4.26	4.46	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1489	4.90	4.64	4.29	4.44	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	159/1006	4.87	4.33	4.00	4.11	4.71	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 4	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		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 3	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	8
			? 0		

Course Section: EDUC 605 8030  
 Title THE ADULT LEARNER  
 Instructor: WILLIAMS, GREGO  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 586  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	9	5.00	1/1669	4.97	4.32	4.23	4.35	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	218/1666	4.84	4.26	4.19	4.19	4.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1421	5.00	4.52	4.24	4.33	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	323/1617	4.74	4.38	4.15	4.24	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1555	4.97	4.05	4.00	4.07	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	111/1543	4.90	4.29	4.06	4.27	4.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	123/1647	4.85	4.29	4.12	4.15	4.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.81	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	157/1605	4.78	4.17	4.07	4.13	4.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	715/1514	4.69	4.43	4.39	4.37	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	567/1551	4.96	4.76	4.66	4.72	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	144/1503	4.92	4.31	4.24	4.22	4.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	200/1506	4.93	4.27	4.26	4.24	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	86/1311	4.49	3.85	3.85	3.89	4.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1490	4.91	4.47	4.05	4.18	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1502	4.93	4.68	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	299/1489	4.90	4.64	4.29	4.44	4.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1006	4.87	4.33	4.00	4.11	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: EDUC 605 8031  
 Title THE ADULT LEARNER  
 Instructor: WILLIAMS, GREGO  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 587  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	10	4.91	128/1669	4.97	4.32	4.23	4.35	4.91	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1666	4.84	4.26	4.19	4.19	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.52	4.24	4.33	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	156/1617	4.74	4.38	4.15	4.24	4.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	100/1555	4.97	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	142/1543	4.90	4.29	4.06	4.27	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	167/1647	4.85	4.29	4.12	4.15	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.81	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	188/1605	4.78	4.17	4.07	4.13	4.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	631/1514	4.69	4.43	4.39	4.37	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1551	4.96	4.76	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1503	4.92	4.31	4.24	4.22	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	164/1506	4.93	4.27	4.26	4.24	4.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	158/1311	4.49	3.85	3.85	3.89	4.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	289/1490	4.91	4.47	4.05	4.18	4.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	237/1502	4.93	4.68	4.26	4.46	4.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	368/1489	4.90	4.64	4.29	4.44	4.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	98/1006	4.87	4.33	4.00	4.11	4.91	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	11	0.00-0.99 3	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		Graduate 0
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.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 0		

Course Section: EDUC 607 0101  
 Title PROCESSES & ACQ READIN  
 Instructor: YOUNG, PATRICIA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 588  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	1	4.00	1173/1669	4.00	4.32	4.23	4.35	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1527/1666	3.33	4.26	4.19	4.19	3.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	969/1421	4.00	4.52	4.24	4.33	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1301/1617	3.67	4.38	4.15	4.24	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	225/1555	4.67	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	895/1543	4.00	4.29	4.06	4.27	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1321/1647	3.67	4.29	4.12	4.15	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.81	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1605/1605	1.00	4.17	4.07	4.13	1.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1457/1514	4.00	4.43	4.39	4.37	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1304/1551	4.33	4.76	4.66	4.72	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1277/1503	3.67	4.31	4.24	4.22	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1403/1506	4.00	4.27	4.26	4.24	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	587/1311	4.00	3.85	3.85	3.89	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.47	4.05	4.18	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.68	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1038/1489	4.00	4.64	4.29	4.44	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	479/1006	4.00	4.33	4.00	4.11	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	98/ 112	3.00	4.25	4.38	4.39	3.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	91/ 97	3.00	3.65	4.36	4.38	3.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	77/ 92	3.00	3.77	4.22	4.36	3.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	92/ 105	3.00	4.04	4.20	4.23	3.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 98	5.00	4.44	3.95	3.93	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	2	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	2
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				
				?	0						

Course Section: EDUC 607 0101  
 Title PROCESSES & ACQ READIN  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 589  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	1	4.00	1173/1669	4.00	4.32	4.23	4.35	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1527/1666	3.33	4.26	4.19	4.19	3.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	969/1421	4.00	4.52	4.24	4.33	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1301/1617	3.67	4.38	4.15	4.24	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	225/1555	4.67	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	895/1543	4.00	4.29	4.06	4.27	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1321/1647	3.67	4.29	4.12	4.15	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.81	4.67	4.83	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1514	4.00	4.43	4.39	4.37	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	4.00	4.27	4.26	4.24	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.47	4.05	4.18	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.68	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1038/1489	4.00	4.64	4.29	4.44	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	479/1006	4.00	4.33	4.00	4.11	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	98/ 112	3.00	4.25	4.38	4.39	3.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	91/ 97	3.00	3.65	4.36	4.38	3.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	77/ 92	3.00	3.77	4.22	4.36	3.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	92/ 105	3.00	4.04	4.20	4.23	3.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 98	5.00	4.44	3.95	3.93	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	Graduate	2	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	2				
			? 0						

Course Section: EDUC 608 0101  
 Title INSTRUCT READING  
 Instructor: SHELTON, NANCY  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 590  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	8	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.32	4.23	4.35	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	126/1666	4.88	4.26	4.19	4.19	4.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	392/1421	4.67	4.52	4.24	4.33	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	265/1617	4.71	4.38	4.15	4.24	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	418/1555	4.43	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	123/1543	4.86	4.29	4.06	4.27	4.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	302/1647	4.67	4.29	4.12	4.15	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	844/1668	4.83	4.81	4.67	4.83	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	119/1605	4.86	4.17	4.07	4.13	4.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	308/1514	4.83	4.43	4.39	4.37	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.76	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.31	4.24	4.22	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.27	4.26	4.24	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	333/1311	4.40	3.85	3.85	3.89	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	177/1490	4.86	4.47	4.05	4.18	4.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	438/1502	4.71	4.68	4.26	4.46	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	329/1489	4.86	4.64	4.29	4.44	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1006	5.00	4.33	4.00	4.11	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.27	4.22	4.53	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	4.57	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	3.98	3.97	4.31	****	

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		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	5

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

Course Section: EDUC 615 0101  
 Title MATERIALS TEACH READ  
 Instructor: YOUNG, PATRICIA  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 591  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	4	1	0	3.00	1596/1669	3.00	4.32	4.23	4.35	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	1527/1666	3.33	4.26	4.19	4.19	3.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1421	****	4.52	4.24	4.33	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	1569/1617	2.80	4.38	4.15	4.24	2.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	2	0	1	2.83	1478/1555	2.83	4.05	4.00	4.07	2.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	2	0	3.17	1372/1543	3.17	4.29	4.06	4.27	3.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	3.00	1526/1647	3.00	4.29	4.12	4.15	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.81	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	3	0	0	2.40	1568/1605	2.40	4.17	4.07	4.13	2.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1352/1514	3.67	4.43	4.39	4.37	3.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1509/1551	3.33	4.76	4.66	4.72	3.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	3	1	0	2.83	1444/1503	2.83	4.31	4.24	4.22	2.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	1361/1506	3.33	4.27	4.26	4.24	3.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	1027/1311	3.33	3.85	3.85	3.89	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	3.00	1328/1490	3.00	4.47	4.05	4.18	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1253/1502	3.67	4.68	4.26	4.46	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	4	1	0	3.00	1398/1489	3.00	4.64	4.29	4.44	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	967/1006	2.50	4.33	4.00	4.11	2.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 226	****	4.86	4.20	4.47	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.86	4.19	4.41	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	5.00	4.50	4.65	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 223	****	5.00	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.39	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	3.65	4.36	4.38	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	3.77	4.22	4.36	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	4.04	4.20	4.23	****	
Field Work															
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	4.57	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.54	4.39	4.90	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	3.98	3.97	4.31	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.33	4.55	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.45	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.40	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.61	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.60	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	

Course Section: EDUC 615 0101  
 Title MATERIALS TEACH READ  
 Instructor: YOUNG, PATRICIA  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 591  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: EDUC 621 0101  
 Title INST STRAT/INTEG ECE C  
 Instructor: FRYER, MARY G.  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 592  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	876/1669	4.29	4.32	4.23	4.35	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	841/1666	4.29	4.26	4.19	4.19	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	899/1617	4.17	4.38	4.15	4.24	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	665/1555	4.14	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	490/1543	4.43	4.29	4.06	4.27	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	250/1647	4.71	4.29	4.12	4.15	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.81	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1148/1605	3.83	4.17	4.07	4.13	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1199/1514	4.00	4.43	4.39	4.37	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1028/1551	4.67	4.76	4.66	4.72	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	1	1	3.50	1330/1503	3.50	4.31	4.24	4.22	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	1	1	3.17	1389/1506	3.17	4.27	4.26	4.24	3.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	587/1311	4.00	3.85	3.85	3.89	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	558/1490	4.40	4.47	4.05	4.18	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	754/1502	4.40	4.68	4.26	4.46	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	800/1489	4.40	4.64	4.29	4.44	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	643/1006	3.80	4.33	4.00	4.11	3.80	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.27	4.22	4.53	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	4.57	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.54	4.39	4.90	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.98	3.97	4.31	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.33	4.55	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	4	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	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	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	6				
				?	0						

Course Section: EDUC 622 0101  
 Title INSTRUC STRGY ELEM MAT  
 Instructor: KINACH, BARBARA  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 593  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	5	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.32	4.23	4.35	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.26	4.19	4.19	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1421	****	4.52	4.24	4.33	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	161/1617	4.80	4.38	4.15	4.24	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	262/1555	4.60	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	298/1543	4.60	4.29	4.06	4.27	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	367/1647	4.60	4.29	4.12	4.15	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1125/1668	4.60	4.81	4.67	4.83	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1605	5.00	4.17	4.07	4.13	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.43	4.39	4.37	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.76	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	220/1503	4.80	4.31	4.24	4.22	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.27	4.26	4.24	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	333/1311	4.40	3.85	3.85	3.89	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	214/1490	4.80	4.47	4.05	4.18	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.68	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.64	4.29	4.44	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	344/1006	4.33	4.33	4.00	4.11	4.33	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	53/ 58	2.50	4.27	4.22	4.53	2.50	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	29/ 52	4.00	4.19	4.06	4.57	4.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	4.54	4.39	4.90	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.33	4.55	****	

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	Graduate	3	Major	3
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	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course Section: EDUC 623 0101  
 Title INSTRUC STRTGY TEACH S  
 Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 594  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	5	4	4.18	1001/1669	4.18	4.32	4.23	4.35	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	6	2	3.73	1348/1666	3.73	4.26	4.19	4.19	3.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	814/1421	4.25	4.52	4.24	4.33	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	4	3	3.73	1268/1617	3.73	4.38	4.15	4.24	3.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	6	3	3.91	939/1555	3.91	4.05	4.00	4.07	3.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	5	3	3.73	1160/1543	3.73	4.29	4.06	4.27	3.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	1161/1647	3.91	4.29	4.12	4.15	3.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	713/1668	4.91	4.81	4.67	4.83	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	7	1	4.00	918/1605	4.00	4.17	4.07	4.13	4.00	
-----															
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	675/1490	4.27	4.47	4.05	4.18	4.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	790/1502	4.36	4.68	4.26	4.46	4.36	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	742/1489	4.45	4.64	4.29	4.44	4.45	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	479/1006	4.00	4.33	4.00	4.11	4.00	

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	3	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course Section: EDUC 625 0101  
 Title TEACH READ WRIT ESL I  
 Instructor: SHIN, SARAH  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 595  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	15	4.70	345/1669	4.70	4.32	4.23	4.35	4.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	332/1666	4.68	4.26	4.19	4.19	4.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	8	11	4.58	493/1421	4.58	4.52	4.24	4.33	4.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	253/1617	4.72	4.38	4.15	4.24	4.72	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	183/1555	4.74	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.74	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	157/1543	4.79	4.29	4.06	4.27	4.79	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	401/1647	4.58	4.29	4.12	4.15	4.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	428/1668	4.95	4.81	4.67	4.83	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	201/1605	4.71	4.17	4.07	4.13	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	473/1514	4.74	4.43	4.39	4.37	4.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.76	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	386/1503	4.67	4.31	4.24	4.22	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	237/1506	4.84	4.27	4.26	4.24	4.84	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	365/1311	4.37	3.85	3.85	3.89	4.37	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	232/1490	4.79	4.47	4.05	4.18	4.79	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	296/1502	4.84	4.68	4.26	4.46	4.84	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	338/1489	4.84	4.64	4.29	4.44	4.84	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	171/1006	4.68	4.33	4.00	4.11	4.68	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	4.27	4.22	4.53	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	4.57	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.54	4.39	4.90	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	3.98	3.97	4.31	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	11	0.00-0.99 3	A 16	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 4 Major 20
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 16 Non-major 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 17	
			? 0		

Course Section: EDUC 627 0101  
 Title INS STRAT FL SEC SCH  
 Instructor: SCHWARTZ, ANA-M (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 596  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	0	1	3.67	1409/1669	3.67	4.32	4.23	4.35	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1387/1666	3.67	4.26	4.19	4.19	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	969/1421	4.00	4.52	4.24	4.33	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1301/1617	3.67	4.38	4.15	4.24	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	1427/1555	3.00	4.05	4.00	4.07	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	895/1543	4.00	4.29	4.06	4.27	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	1571/1647	2.67	4.29	4.12	4.15	2.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.81	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	918/1605	3.50	4.17	4.07	4.13	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	799/1514	3.75	4.43	4.39	4.37	3.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1304/1551	4.33	4.76	4.66	4.72	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1330/1503	2.25	4.31	4.24	4.22	2.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1319/1506	3.25	4.27	4.26	4.24	3.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1311	3.50	3.85	3.85	3.89	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	849/1490	4.00	4.47	4.05	4.18	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.68	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.64	4.29	4.44	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	235/1006	4.50	4.33	4.00	4.11	4.50	

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

Course Section: EDUC 627 0101  
 Title INS STRAT FL SEC SCH  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 597  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	0	1	3.67	1409/1669	3.67	4.32	4.23	4.35	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1387/1666	3.67	4.26	4.19	4.19	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	969/1421	4.00	4.52	4.24	4.33	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1301/1617	3.67	4.38	4.15	4.24	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	1427/1555	3.00	4.05	4.00	4.07	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	895/1543	4.00	4.29	4.06	4.27	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	1571/1647	2.67	4.29	4.12	4.15	2.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.81	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1501/1605	3.50	4.17	4.07	4.13	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1457/1514	3.75	4.43	4.39	4.37	3.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1503/1503	2.25	4.31	4.24	4.22	2.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1403/1506	3.25	4.27	4.26	4.24	3.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1269/1311	3.50	3.85	3.85	3.89	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	849/1490	4.00	4.47	4.05	4.18	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.68	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.64	4.29	4.44	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	235/1006	4.50	4.33	4.00	4.11	4.50	

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

Course Section: EDUC 628 0101  
 Title INST STRAT:TCHG SEC MA  
 Instructor: KINACH, BARBARA  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 598  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.32	4.23	4.35	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.26	4.19	4.19	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.38	4.15	4.24	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	340/1555	4.50	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1543	5.00	4.29	4.06	4.27	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	481/1647	4.50	4.29	4.12	4.15	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.81	4.67	4.83	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	918/1605	4.00	4.17	4.07	4.13	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.47	4.05	4.18	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.68	4.26	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	684/1489	4.50	4.64	4.29	4.44	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1006	5.00	4.33	4.00	4.11	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	1	Major	2
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	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Course Section: EDUC 629 0101  
 Title INST STRAT:TCHNG SEC S  
 Instructor: SEILER, GALE  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 599  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	2	6	4.40	734/1669	4.40	4.32	4.23	4.35	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	4.26	4.19	4.19	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	****	4.52	4.24	4.33	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	1240/1617	3.78	4.38	4.15	4.24	3.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	4	2	3.60	1178/1555	3.60	4.05	4.00	4.07	3.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	723/1543	4.20	4.29	4.06	4.27	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	2	3	1	3.00	1526/1647	3.00	4.29	4.12	4.15	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.81	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	690/1605	4.25	4.17	4.07	4.13	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	584/1514	4.67	4.43	4.39	4.37	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.76	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	464/1503	4.60	4.31	4.24	4.22	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	718/1506	4.44	4.27	4.26	4.24	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	2	1	2	1	2	3.00	1115/1311	3.00	3.85	3.85	3.89	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	445/1490	4.50	4.47	4.05	4.18	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	540/1502	4.60	4.68	4.26	4.46	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.64	4.29	4.44	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	694/1006	3.67	4.33	4.00	4.11	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 226	****	4.86	4.20	4.47	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	4.86	4.19	4.41	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.25	4.38	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	4.04	4.20	4.23	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 98	****	4.44	3.95	3.93	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.27	4.22	4.53	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	4.57	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	4.54	4.39	4.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.33	4.55	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 6
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		4
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	9

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

Course Section: EDUC 632 0101  
 Title INST STRAT:TCHG SEC EN  
 Instructor: NORTH-COLEMAN,  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 600  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	914/1669	4.25	4.32	4.23	4.35	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	881/1666	4.25	4.26	4.19	4.19	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.52	4.24	4.33	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	219/1617	4.75	4.38	4.15	4.24	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	340/1555	4.50	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	390/1543	4.50	4.29	4.06	4.27	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	213/1647	4.75	4.29	4.12	4.15	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1190/1668	4.50	4.81	4.67	4.83	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	591/1605	4.33	4.17	4.07	4.13	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	441/1514	4.75	4.43	4.39	4.37	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	1193/1551	4.50	4.76	4.66	4.72	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	556/1503	4.50	4.31	4.24	4.22	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	642/1506	4.50	4.27	4.26	4.24	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	445/1311	4.25	3.85	3.85	3.89	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	692/1490	4.25	4.47	4.05	4.18	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	632/1502	4.50	4.68	4.26	4.46	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	920/1489	4.25	4.64	4.29	4.44	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	235/1006	4.50	4.33	4.00	4.11	4.50	

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 1		Graduate 2
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 2
Grad.	2	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 636 0101  
 Title ESL/FOR LANG TEST & EV  
 Instructor: NELSON, JOHN E.  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 601  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	13	4.71	331/1669	4.71	4.32	4.23	4.35	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	306/1666	4.71	4.26	4.19	4.19	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	344/1421	4.71	4.52	4.24	4.33	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	347/1617	4.65	4.38	4.15	4.24	4.65	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	369/1555	4.47	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	172/1543	4.76	4.29	4.06	4.27	4.76	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	156/1647	4.82	4.29	4.12	4.15	4.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.81	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	350/1605	4.54	4.17	4.07	4.13	4.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	240/1514	4.88	4.43	4.39	4.37	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	760/1551	4.81	4.76	4.66	4.72	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	360/1503	4.69	4.31	4.24	4.22	4.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	200/1506	4.88	4.27	4.26	4.24	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	3	1	2	4	6	3.56	909/1311	3.56	3.85	3.85	3.89	3.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	261/1490	4.75	4.47	4.05	4.18	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	393/1502	4.75	4.68	4.26	4.46	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	5	10	4.50	684/1489	4.50	4.64	4.29	4.44	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	192/1006	4.63	4.33	4.00	4.11	4.63	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.45	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.40	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.61	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.60	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 8	Major 16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 4	Under-grad 9	Non-major 1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 11		
				? 0			

Course Section: EDUC 642 0101  
 Title ECE MATH/SCI PROCESSES  
 Instructor: BELL, DEBORAH A  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 602  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	1	4.50	590/1669	4.50	4.32	4.23	4.35	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	4.26	4.19	4.19	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	496/1617	4.50	4.38	4.15	4.24	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1427/1555	3.00	4.05	4.00	4.07	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1543	5.00	4.29	4.06	4.27	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1647	5.00	4.29	4.12	4.15	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.81	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	373/1605	4.50	4.17	4.07	4.13	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.43	4.39	4.37	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.76	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1066/1503	4.00	4.31	4.24	4.22	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	642/1506	4.50	4.27	4.26	4.24	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	939/1311	3.50	3.85	3.85	3.89	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.47	4.05	4.18	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.68	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.64	4.29	4.44	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1006	5.00	4.33	4.00	4.11	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: EDUC 644 0101  
 Title LING/ESOL EDUCATORS  
 Instructor: SHIN, SARAH  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 603  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	6	5	4.08	1124/1669	4.08	4.32	4.23	4.35	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	6	4	3.92	1206/1666	3.92	4.26	4.19	4.19	3.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	2	5	3	3.46	1244/1421	3.46	4.52	4.24	4.33	3.46	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	1029/1617	4.00	4.38	4.15	4.24	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	575/1555	4.23	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	735/1543	4.18	4.29	4.06	4.27	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	682/1647	4.38	4.29	4.12	4.15	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	844/1668	4.83	4.81	4.67	4.83	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	551/1605	4.36	4.17	4.07	4.13	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	974/1514	4.38	4.43	4.39	4.37	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	1223/1551	4.46	4.76	4.66	4.72	4.46	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	835/1503	4.31	4.31	4.24	4.22	4.31	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	1038/1506	4.08	4.27	4.26	4.24	4.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	5	6	2	3.77	785/1311	3.77	3.85	3.85	3.89	3.77	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	956/1490	3.90	4.47	4.05	4.18	3.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	1	0	4	4	3.90	1117/1502	3.90	4.68	4.26	4.46	3.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	0	6	3	4.00	1038/1489	4.00	4.64	4.29	4.44	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	1	2	4	1	3.63	717/1006	3.63	4.33	4.00	4.11	3.63	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		Graduate 8
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.	8	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 0		

Course Section: EDUC 650 0101  
 Title EDUC IN CULTURAL PERSP  
 Instructor: SEILER, GALE  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 604  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	0	4	7	4.64	433/1669	4.64	4.32	4.23	4.35	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	740/1666	4.36	4.26	4.19	4.19	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	746/1421	4.33	4.52	4.24	4.33	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	568/1617	4.45	4.38	4.15	4.24	4.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	622/1555	4.18	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.18	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	838/1543	4.09	4.29	4.06	4.27	4.09	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	435/1647	4.55	4.29	4.12	4.15	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	713/1668	4.91	4.81	4.67	4.83	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	538/1605	4.38	4.17	4.07	4.13	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	489/1514	4.73	4.43	4.39	4.37	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	760/1551	4.82	4.76	4.66	4.72	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	637/1503	4.45	4.31	4.24	4.22	4.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	2	7	4.27	892/1506	4.27	4.27	4.26	4.24	4.27	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	2	2	2	5	3.91	699/1311	3.91	3.85	3.85	3.89	3.91	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	422/1490	4.55	4.47	4.05	4.18	4.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	693/1502	4.45	4.68	4.26	4.46	4.45	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	368/1489	4.82	4.64	4.29	4.44	4.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	271/1006	4.45	4.33	4.00	4.11	4.45	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.86	4.20	4.47	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.86	4.19	4.41	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	5.00	4.50	4.65	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	5.00	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.39	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.25	4.38	4.39	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.65	4.36	4.38	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.77	4.22	4.36	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.04	4.20	4.23	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.44	3.95	3.93	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.27	4.22	4.53	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	4.57	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.54	4.39	4.90	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.98	3.97	4.31	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.33	4.55	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.45	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.40	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.61	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.60	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	

Course Section: EDUC 650 0101  
 Title EDUC IN CULTURAL PERSP  
 Instructor: SEILER, GALE  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 604  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	1						

Course Section: EDUC 650E 0101  
 Title  
 Instructor: SMALL, SUSAN  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 605  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	1	0	0	1	3.50	1480/1669	3.50	4.32	4.23	4.35	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1636/1666	2.50	4.26	4.19	4.19	2.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.38	4.15	4.24	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	773/1555	4.00	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	390/1543	4.50	4.29	4.06	4.27	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1393/1647	3.50	4.29	4.12	4.15	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.81	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	918/1605	4.00	4.17	4.07	4.13	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.43	4.39	4.37	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.76	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	556/1503	4.50	4.31	4.24	4.22	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	642/1506	4.50	4.27	4.26	4.24	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.47	4.05	4.18	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.68	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.64	4.29	4.44	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1006	5.00	4.33	4.00	4.11	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 1		
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

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 606  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	1/1669	5.00	4.32	4.23	4.35	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	243/1666	4.75	4.26	4.19	4.19	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.38	4.15	4.24	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	340/1555	4.50	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1543	5.00	4.29	4.06	4.27	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1647	5.00	4.29	4.12	4.15	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1530/1668	4.00	4.81	4.67	4.83	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1605	5.00	4.17	4.07	4.13	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.43	4.39	4.37	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.76	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	277/1503	4.75	4.31	4.24	4.22	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.27	4.26	4.24	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1115/1311	3.00	3.85	3.85	3.89	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.47	4.05	4.18	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	632/1502	4.50	4.68	4.26	4.46	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.64	4.29	4.44	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	143/1006	4.75	4.33	4.00	4.11	4.75	

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 1
Grad.	3	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 659 0101  
 Title: READ CONTNT AREA II  
 Instructor: NORTH-COLEMAN,  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 607  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	5	2	4	3.54	1467/1669	3.54	4.32	4.23	4.35	3.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	2	3	5	3.62	1424/1666	3.62	4.26	4.19	4.19	3.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1421	****	4.52	4.24	4.33	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	1	7	4.00	1029/1617	4.00	4.38	4.15	4.24	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	3	4	3.54	1212/1555	3.54	4.05	4.00	4.07	3.54	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	4	5	3.85	1068/1543	3.85	4.29	4.06	4.27	3.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	1007/1647	4.08	4.29	4.12	4.15	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	952/1668	4.77	4.81	4.67	4.83	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	591/1605	4.33	4.17	4.07	4.13	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	703/1514	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.37	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	880/1551	4.75	4.76	4.66	4.72	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	1025/1503	4.08	4.31	4.24	4.22	4.08	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	2	2	5	3.67	1277/1506	3.67	4.27	4.26	4.24	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	414/1311	4.30	3.85	3.85	3.89	4.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	4	3	3.64	1102/1490	3.64	4.47	4.05	4.18	3.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	926/1502	4.18	4.68	4.26	4.46	4.18	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	960/1489	4.18	4.64	4.29	4.44	4.18	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	307/1006	4.40	4.33	4.00	4.11	4.40	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	4.25	4.38	4.39	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	3.65	4.36	4.38	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	3.77	4.22	4.36	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.04	4.20	4.23	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	4.44	3.95	3.93	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 58	****	4.27	4.22	4.53	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	4.57	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.54	4.39	4.90	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	3.98	3.97	4.31	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.33	4.55	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.45	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.40	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.61	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.60	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0	Under-grad 4
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Non-major 13
				Electives	0
#### - Means there are not enough					

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	12	
?	0			

Course Section: EDUC 663 0101  
 Title ELEM SOC STUD METH  
 Instructor: FITZHUGH, WILLI  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 608  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	1/1669	5.00	4.32	4.23	4.35	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	881/1666	4.25	4.26	4.19	4.19	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	969/1421	4.00	4.52	4.24	4.33	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	219/1617	4.75	4.38	4.15	4.24	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	340/1555	4.50	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	659/1543	4.25	4.29	4.06	4.27	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1043/1647	4.00	4.29	4.12	4.15	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.81	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	591/1605	4.33	4.17	4.07	4.13	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	584/1514	4.67	4.43	4.39	4.37	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.76	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	800/1503	4.33	4.31	4.24	4.22	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	838/1506	4.33	4.27	4.26	4.24	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	939/1311	3.50	3.85	3.85	3.89	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	849/1490	4.00	4.47	4.05	4.18	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.68	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.64	4.29	4.44	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	479/1006	4.00	4.33	4.00	4.11	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 3 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 1 Non-major 4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00 3	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: JAKOVICS, KIMBE  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 609  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	1	4.33	816/1669	4.33	4.32	4.23	4.35	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	359/1666	4.67	4.26	4.19	4.19	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	557/1421	4.50	4.52	4.24	4.33	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	717/1617	4.33	4.38	4.15	4.24	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	225/1555	4.67	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	250/1543	4.67	4.29	4.06	4.27	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	302/1647	4.67	4.29	4.12	4.15	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1190/1668	4.50	4.81	4.67	4.83	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	918/1605	4.00	4.17	4.07	4.13	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	584/1514	4.67	4.43	4.39	4.37	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1028/1551	4.67	4.76	4.66	4.72	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	386/1503	4.67	4.31	4.24	4.22	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	471/1506	4.67	4.27	4.26	4.24	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	587/1311	4.00	3.85	3.85	3.89	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.47	4.05	4.18	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.68	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.64	4.29	4.44	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1006	5.00	4.33	4.00	4.11	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	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 2
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	2
			? 0		

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

Course Section: EDUC 669 0101  
 Title ASSESS READING  
 Instructor: SHELTON, NANCY  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 610  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	10	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.32	4.23	4.35	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	439/1666	4.60	4.26	4.19	4.19	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1421	****	4.52	4.24	4.33	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	161/1617	4.80	4.38	4.15	4.24	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	262/1555	4.60	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1543	5.00	4.29	4.06	4.27	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	806/1647	4.30	4.29	4.12	4.15	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	901/1668	4.80	4.81	4.67	4.83	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1605	5.00	4.17	4.07	4.13	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	679/1514	4.60	4.43	4.39	4.37	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.76	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	220/1503	4.80	4.31	4.24	4.22	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.27	4.26	4.24	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	174/1311	4.70	3.85	3.85	3.89	4.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.47	4.05	4.18	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	370/1502	4.78	4.68	4.26	4.46	4.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	411/1489	4.78	4.64	4.29	4.44	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	105/1006	4.88	4.33	4.00	4.11	4.88	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	34/ 58	4.33	4.27	4.22	4.53	4.33	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	26/ 52	4.33	4.19	4.06	4.57	4.33	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	4.54	4.39	4.90	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	18/ 40	4.33	3.98	3.97	4.31	4.33	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	19/ 30	4.33	4.00	4.33	4.55	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 4
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 6
Grad.	4	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 678 0101  
 Title INST STRAT/DIV NEEDS  
 Instructor: BERGE, NANCY B  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 611  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	4	4.80	207/1669	4.80	4.32	4.23	4.35	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	181/1666	4.80	4.26	4.19	4.19	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	392/1421	4.67	4.52	4.24	4.33	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	394/1617	4.60	4.38	4.15	4.24	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	611/1555	4.20	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	516/1543	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.27	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	651/1647	4.40	4.29	4.12	4.15	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.81	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1357/1605	3.50	4.17	4.07	4.13	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	360/1514	4.80	4.43	4.39	4.37	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.76	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	220/1503	4.80	4.31	4.24	4.22	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	770/1506	4.40	4.27	4.26	4.24	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	333/1311	4.40	3.85	3.85	3.89	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	742/1490	4.20	4.47	4.05	4.18	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	754/1502	4.40	4.68	4.26	4.46	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	800/1489	4.40	4.64	4.29	4.44	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	407/1006	4.20	4.33	4.00	4.11	4.20	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 226	****	4.86	4.20	4.47	****	

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 1		Graduate 5
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 2
Grad.	5	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 681 8010  
 Title SURV OF INSTR TECH APP  
 Instructor: KELLERMAN, PAUL  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 612  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	0	1	1	5	4.57	511/1669	4.57	4.32	4.23	4.35	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	293/1666	4.71	4.26	4.19	4.19	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.52	4.24	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.38	4.15	4.24	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	128/1555	4.83	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	325/1543	4.57	4.29	4.06	4.27	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1647	5.00	4.29	4.12	4.15	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.81	4.67	4.83	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	139/1605	4.80	4.17	4.07	4.13	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	274/1514	4.86	4.43	4.39	4.37	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.76	4.66	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	686/1503	4.43	4.31	4.24	4.22	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	744/1506	4.43	4.27	4.26	4.24	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	163/1311	4.71	3.85	3.85	3.89	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	340/1490	4.67	4.47	4.05	4.18	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.68	4.26	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.64	4.29	4.44	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1006	5.00	4.33	4.00	4.11	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.86	4.20	4.47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.86	4.19	4.41	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	5.00	4.50	4.65	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	5.00	4.35	4.48	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.25	4.38	4.39	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.65	4.36	4.38	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.77	4.22	4.36	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.04	4.20	4.23	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.44	3.95	3.93	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.27	4.22	4.53	****

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	7	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	0	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course Section: EDUC 682 8010  
 Title INST TECH DESIGN/DEV  
 Instructor: MARKS, TODD  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 613  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	5	4.57	511/1669	4.57	4.32	4.23	4.35	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	662/1666	4.43	4.26	4.19	4.19	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	392/1421	4.67	4.52	4.24	4.33	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	424/1617	4.57	4.38	4.15	4.24	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	665/1555	4.14	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1101/1543	3.80	4.29	4.06	4.27	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	250/1647	4.71	4.29	4.12	4.15	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1068/1668	4.67	4.81	4.67	4.83	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	789/1605	4.17	4.17	4.07	4.13	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	1148/1514	4.14	4.43	4.39	4.37	4.14	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	650/1551	4.86	4.76	4.66	4.72	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	978/1503	4.14	4.31	4.24	4.22	4.14	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	995/1506	4.14	4.27	4.26	4.24	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	97/1311	4.86	3.85	3.85	3.89	4.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	535/1490	4.43	4.47	4.05	4.18	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	567/1502	4.57	4.68	4.26	4.46	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	478/1489	4.71	4.64	4.29	4.44	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1006	5.00	4.33	4.00	4.11	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course Section: EDUC 683 8010  
 Title MULTI-MEDIA PROJECT MG  
 Instructor: AHMAD, RAFI E  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 614  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	2	4.33	816/1669	4.33	4.32	4.23	4.35	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	157/1666	4.83	4.26	4.19	4.19	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	****	4.52	4.24	4.33	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	496/1617	4.50	4.38	4.15	4.24	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	773/1555	4.00	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	580/1543	4.33	4.29	4.06	4.27	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1647	5.00	4.29	4.12	4.15	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.81	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	499/1605	4.40	4.17	4.07	4.13	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	584/1514	4.67	4.43	4.39	4.37	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	705/1551	4.83	4.76	4.66	4.72	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	386/1503	4.67	4.31	4.24	4.22	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	838/1506	4.33	4.27	4.26	4.24	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	389/1311	4.33	3.85	3.85	3.89	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	445/1490	4.50	4.47	4.05	4.18	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	306/1502	4.83	4.68	4.26	4.46	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	348/1489	4.83	4.64	4.29	4.44	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	143/1006	4.75	4.33	4.00	4.11	4.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.86	4.20	4.47	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.86	4.19	4.41	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	5.00	4.50	4.65	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.25	4.38	4.39	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.65	4.36	4.38	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.77	4.22	4.36	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.04	4.20	4.23	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.44	3.95	3.93	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.27	4.22	4.53	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	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	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 5
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 688 0101  
 Title: METHODOLOGY TEACH ESL  
 Instructor: NELSON, JOHN E.  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 615  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	11	4.92	115/1669	4.78	4.32	4.23	4.35	4.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	157/1666	4.78	4.26	4.19	4.19	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	164/1421	4.89	4.52	4.24	4.33	4.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1617	4.83	4.38	4.15	4.24	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	277/1555	4.62	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	453/1543	4.34	4.29	4.06	4.27	4.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	389/1647	4.57	4.29	4.12	4.15	4.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.81	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	551/1605	4.43	4.17	4.07	4.13	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	170/1514	4.87	4.43	4.39	4.37	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1551	4.98	4.76	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	277/1503	4.72	4.31	4.24	4.22	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	147/1506	4.80	4.27	4.26	4.24	4.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	1	1	2	0	2	3.17	1084/1311	3.37	3.85	3.85	3.89	3.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	127/1490	4.70	4.47	4.05	4.18	4.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	213/1502	4.87	4.68	4.26	4.46	4.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	348/1489	4.87	4.64	4.29	4.44	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	372/1006	4.44	4.33	4.00	4.11	4.27	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 5	A 12	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		Graduate 7
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		Under-grad 5
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 0		

Course Section: EDUC 688 8720  
 Title: METHODOLOGY TEACH ESL  
 Instructor: SHIN, JOAN  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 616  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	1	6	15	4.64	433/1669	4.78	4.32	4.23	4.35	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	281/1666	4.78	4.26	4.19	4.19	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	18	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/1421	4.89	4.52	4.24	4.33	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	8	15	4.65	335/1617	4.83	4.38	4.15	4.24	4.65	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	8	15	4.65	231/1555	4.62	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.65	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	1	9	10	4.23	690/1543	4.34	4.29	4.06	4.27	4.23	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	3	1	18	4.57	412/1647	4.57	4.29	4.12	4.15	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.81	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	10	10	4.50	373/1605	4.43	4.17	4.07	4.13	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	325/1514	4.87	4.43	4.39	4.37	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	256/1551	4.98	4.76	4.66	4.72	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	347/1503	4.72	4.31	4.24	4.22	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	446/1506	4.80	4.27	4.26	4.24	4.68	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	1	3	5	4	6	3.58	904/1311	3.37	3.85	3.85	3.89	3.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	8	13	4.48	478/1490	4.70	4.47	4.05	4.18	4.48	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	316/1502	4.87	4.68	4.26	4.46	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	252/1489	4.87	4.64	4.29	4.44	4.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	199/1006	4.44	4.33	4.00	4.11	4.61	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.25	4.38	4.39	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.65	4.36	4.38	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.27	4.22	4.53	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	4.57	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.54	4.39	4.90	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.98	3.97	4.31	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.33	4.55	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.45	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.40	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.61	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.60	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	3	A	19	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	14	Major	22
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	12	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	14	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	23				
				?	0						

Course Section: EDUC 689C 8050  
 Title PROJECT MANAGEMENT  
 Instructor: PETSKA, DEBORAH  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 617  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	7	4.88	151/1669	4.88	4.32	4.23	4.35	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	727/1666	4.38	4.26	4.19	4.19	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	392/1421	4.67	4.52	4.24	4.33	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	370/1617	4.63	4.38	4.15	4.24	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	687/1555	4.13	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	390/1543	4.50	4.29	4.06	4.27	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	0	6	4.25	862/1647	4.25	4.29	4.12	4.15	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.81	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	591/1605	4.33	4.17	4.07	4.13	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	984/1514	4.38	4.43	4.39	4.37	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	594/1551	4.88	4.76	4.66	4.72	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	879/1503	4.25	4.31	4.24	4.22	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	521/1506	4.63	4.27	4.26	4.24	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	587/1311	4.00	3.85	3.85	3.89	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	261/1490	4.75	4.47	4.05	4.18	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	393/1502	4.75	4.68	4.26	4.46	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	309/1489	4.88	4.64	4.29	4.44	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	322/1006	4.38	4.33	4.00	4.11	4.38	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.86	4.20	4.47	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.86	4.19	4.41	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	5.00	4.50	4.65	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.25	4.38	4.39	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.65	4.36	4.38	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.77	4.22	4.36	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.04	4.20	4.23	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.44	3.95	3.93	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.27	4.22	4.53	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	4.57	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.45	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.40	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.61	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.60	****	

Course Section: EDUC 689C 8050  
 Title PROJECT MANAGEMENT  
 Instructor: PETSKA, DEBORAH  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 617  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	6	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	2	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course Section: EDUC 771 8720  
 Title RESEARCH DESIGNS IN ED  
 Instructor: FRICK, JERRI  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 618  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	4	9	4.47	647/1669	2.91	4.32	4.23	4.35	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	691/1666	3.02	4.26	4.19	4.19	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	466/1421	4.60	4.52	4.24	4.33	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	863/1617	3.10	4.38	4.15	4.24	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	665/1555	2.79	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	628/1543	2.99	4.29	4.06	4.27	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	828/1647	3.36	4.29	4.12	4.15	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1668	4.96	4.81	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	9	1	3.92	1074/1605	2.71	4.17	4.07	4.13	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	679/1514	3.15	4.43	4.39	4.37	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	358/1551	3.77	4.76	4.66	4.72	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	870/1503	2.88	4.31	4.24	4.22	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	958/1506	2.93	4.27	4.26	4.24	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	1	3	5	5	3.80	764/1311	2.69	3.85	3.85	3.89	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	6	6	4.07	824/1490	3.07	4.47	4.05	4.18	4.07	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	604/1502	3.68	4.68	4.26	4.46	4.53	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	596/1489	3.84	4.64	4.29	4.44	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	1	0	3	6	3	3.77	654/1006	3.27	4.33	4.00	4.11	3.77	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	1.90	3.65	4.36	4.38	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	2.36	3.77	4.22	4.36	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	2.00	4.04	4.20	4.23	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	2.64	4.44	3.95	3.93	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.27	4.22	4.53	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.54	4.39	4.90	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.98	3.97	4.31	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.33	4.55	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.45	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.40	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.61	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	6	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course Section: EDUC 771 8721  
 Title RESEARCH DESIGNS IN ED  
 Instructor: BANKS, SARAH  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 619  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	11	1	2	0	0	1.36	1668/1669	2.91	4.32	4.23	4.35	1.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	8	3	3	0	0	1.64	1665/1666	3.02	4.26	4.19	4.19	1.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1421	4.60	4.52	4.24	4.33	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	7	2	4	0	1	2.00	1610/1617	3.10	4.38	4.15	4.24	2.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	11	1	1	1	0	1.43	1555/1555	2.79	4.05	4.00	4.07	1.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	6	5	2	0	0	1.69	1540/1543	2.99	4.29	4.06	4.27	1.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	2	7	0	1	2.43	1595/1647	3.36	4.29	4.12	4.15	2.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	570/1668	4.96	4.81	4.67	4.83	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	4	4	0	0	0	1.50	1601/1605	2.71	4.17	4.07	4.13	1.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	7	4	1	1	0	1.69	1511/1514	3.15	4.43	4.39	4.37	1.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	3	4	3	1	2	2.62	1549/1551	3.77	4.76	4.66	4.72	2.62	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	9	1	1	1	0	1.50	1501/1503	2.88	4.31	4.24	4.22	1.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	7	4	0	0	1	1.67	1502/1506	2.93	4.27	4.26	4.24	1.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	5	1	0	1	0	1.57	1288/1311	2.69	3.85	3.85	3.89	1.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	5	3	2	2	0	2.08	1471/1490	3.07	4.47	4.05	4.18	2.08	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	6	3	2	1	2.83	1434/1502	3.68	4.68	4.26	4.46	2.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	2	3	3	2	3.08	1394/1489	3.84	4.64	4.29	4.44	3.08	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	2	1	4	1	1	2.78	954/1006	3.27	4.33	4.00	4.11	2.78	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	3	3	2	2	1	2.55	108/ 112	2.55	4.25	4.38	4.39	2.55	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	4	4	1	1	0	1.90	96/ 97	1.90	3.65	4.36	4.38	1.90	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	3	4	0	1	2.36	89/ 92	2.36	3.77	4.22	4.36	2.36	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	4	2	1	0	2.00	100/ 105	2.00	4.04	4.20	4.23	2.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	1	3	6	1	0	2.64	85/ 98	2.64	4.44	3.95	3.93	2.64	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.27	4.22	4.53	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	4.57	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.54	4.39	4.90	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	3.98	3.97	4.31	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.33	4.55	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.45	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.40	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.61	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	13	F	0
				P	0
				Required for Majors	0
				General	0
				Electives	0
				Graduate	5
				Under-grad	9
				Major	0
				Non-major	14
#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					

I	0	Other	13
?	5		

Course Section: EDUC 771S 2301  
 Title  
 Instructor: OLIVA, LINDA  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 620  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	4	3	3	2	2	2.64	1634/1669	2.64	4.32	4.23	4.35	2.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	3	4	3	4	0	2.57	1633/1666	2.57	4.26	4.19	4.19	2.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	11	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/1421	****	4.52	4.24	4.33	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	6	5	3	0	2.79	1571/1617	2.79	4.38	4.15	4.24	2.79	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	6	2	1	2	0	1.91	1550/1555	1.91	4.05	4.00	4.07	1.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	1	4	4	2	2.93	1446/1543	2.93	4.29	4.06	4.27	2.93	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	4	2	5	3	3.50	1393/1647	3.50	4.29	4.12	4.15	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	807/1668	4.86	4.81	4.67	4.83	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	6	5	1	0	2.46	1563/1605	2.46	4.17	4.07	4.13	2.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	4	4	5	0	2.93	1470/1514	2.93	4.43	4.39	4.37	2.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	1304/1551	4.33	4.76	4.66	4.72	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	5	6	1	1	2.85	1443/1503	2.85	4.31	4.24	4.22	2.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	6	3	1	1	2.36	1474/1506	2.36	4.27	4.26	4.24	2.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	3	0	4	6	0	3.00	1115/1311	3.00	3.85	3.85	3.89	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	5	5	0	1	2.46	1437/1490	2.46	4.47	4.05	4.18	2.46	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	7	1	4	3.62	1274/1502	3.62	4.68	4.26	4.46	3.62	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	3	5	1	4	3.46	1294/1489	3.46	4.64	4.29	4.44	3.46	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	759/1006	3.50	4.33	4.00	4.11	3.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 112	****	4.25	4.38	4.39	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	3.65	4.36	4.38	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.77	4.22	4.36	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.04	4.20	4.23	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	4.44	3.95	3.93	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	4.27	4.22	4.53	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	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 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 0
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Other 14
#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					

Course Section: EDUC 781 8020  
 Title TEACHER LEADERSHIP  
 Instructor: MURPHY, JOYCE A (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 1  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 621  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	0	3.00	1596/1669	3.75	4.32	4.23	4.35	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1578/1666	3.81	4.26	4.19	4.19	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1029/1617	4.34	4.38	4.15	4.24	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	773/1555	4.09	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1410/1543	3.75	4.29	4.06	4.27	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.81	4.67	4.83	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1457/1514	3.95	4.43	4.39	4.37	3.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1404/1551	4.73	4.76	4.66	4.72	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1066/1503	4.35	4.31	4.24	4.22	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1403/1506	3.93	4.27	4.26	4.24	3.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	587/1311	4.00	3.85	3.85	3.89	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	849/1490	4.44	4.47	4.05	4.18	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1502	4.97	4.68	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	4.97	4.64	4.29	4.44	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	479/1006	4.44	4.33	4.00	4.11	4.00	

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	1
28-55	1	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 781 8020  
 Title TEACHER LEADERSHIP  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 1  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 622  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	0	3.00	1596/1669	3.75	4.32	4.23	4.35	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1578/1666	3.81	4.26	4.19	4.19	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1029/1617	4.34	4.38	4.15	4.24	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	773/1555	4.09	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1410/1543	3.75	4.29	4.06	4.27	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.81	4.67	4.83	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1457/1514	3.95	4.43	4.39	4.37	3.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1551	4.73	4.76	4.66	4.72	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1066/1503	4.35	4.31	4.24	4.22	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1403/1506	3.93	4.27	4.26	4.24	3.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	587/1311	4.00	3.85	3.85	3.89	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	849/1490	4.44	4.47	4.05	4.18	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1502	4.97	4.68	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	4.97	4.64	4.29	4.44	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	479/1006	4.44	4.33	4.00	4.11	4.00	

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	1
28-55	1	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 781 8720  
 Title TEACHER LEADERSHIP  
 Instructor: MURPHY, JOYCE A (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 623  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	8	8	4.50	590/1669	3.75	4.32	4.23	4.35	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	412/1666	3.81	4.26	4.19	4.19	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1421	****	4.52	4.24	4.33	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	300/1617	4.34	4.38	4.15	4.24	4.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	9	6	4.19	622/1555	4.09	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.19	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	390/1543	3.75	4.29	4.06	4.27	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	3	7	4	4.07	1007/1647	4.07	4.29	4.12	4.15	4.07	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.81	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	373/1605	4.53	4.17	4.07	4.13	4.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	189/1514	3.95	4.43	4.39	4.37	4.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	512/1551	4.73	4.76	4.66	4.72	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	347/1503	4.35	4.31	4.24	4.22	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	286/1506	3.93	4.27	4.26	4.24	4.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	6	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1311	4.00	3.85	3.85	3.89	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	162/1490	4.44	4.47	4.05	4.18	4.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	166/1502	4.97	4.68	4.26	4.46	4.94	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	196/1489	4.97	4.64	4.29	4.44	4.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	105/1006	4.44	4.33	4.00	4.11	4.88	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 1	A 13	Required for Majors	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 0	Graduate	9
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0	Under-grad	Non-major 2
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	14
			? 0		

Course Section: EDUC 781 8720  
 Title TEACHER LEADERSHIP  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 624  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	8	8	4.50	590/1669	3.75	4.32	4.23	4.35	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	412/1666	3.81	4.26	4.19	4.19	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1421	****	4.52	4.24	4.33	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	300/1617	4.34	4.38	4.15	4.24	4.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	9	6	4.19	622/1555	4.09	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.19	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	390/1543	3.75	4.29	4.06	4.27	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	3	7	4	4.07	1007/1647	4.07	4.29	4.12	4.15	4.07	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.81	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	328/1605	4.53	4.17	4.07	4.13	4.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	189/1514	3.95	4.43	4.39	4.37	4.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1551	4.73	4.76	4.66	4.72	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	347/1503	4.35	4.31	4.24	4.22	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	164/1506	3.93	4.27	4.26	4.24	4.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	5	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	587/1311	4.00	3.85	3.85	3.89	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	162/1490	4.44	4.47	4.05	4.18	4.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	166/1502	4.97	4.68	4.26	4.46	4.94	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	196/1489	4.97	4.64	4.29	4.44	4.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	105/1006	4.44	4.33	4.00	4.11	4.88	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 1	A 13	Required for Majors	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		Graduate 9
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Under-grad 7
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 0		

Course Section: EDUC 791P 0101  
 Title PRACT:SCH INST SYST DE  
 Instructor: MURPHY, JOYCE A  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 625  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	13	4.87	159/1669	4.87	4.32	4.23	4.35	4.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	268/1666	4.73	4.26	4.19	4.19	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	557/1421	4.50	4.52	4.24	4.33	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	394/1617	4.60	4.38	4.15	4.24	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	153/1555	4.79	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	226/1543	4.69	4.29	4.06	4.27	4.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	401/1647	4.57	4.29	4.12	4.15	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	570/1668	4.93	4.81	4.67	4.83	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	591/1605	4.33	4.17	4.07	4.13	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	170/1490	4.87	4.47	4.05	4.18	4.87	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	276/1502	4.87	4.68	4.26	4.46	4.87	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.64	4.29	4.44	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	108/1006	4.87	4.33	4.00	4.11	4.87	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 233	****	4.86	4.19	4.41	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	56/ 112	4.60	4.25	4.38	4.39	4.60	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	42/ 97	4.73	3.65	4.36	4.38	4.73	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	35/ 92	4.77	3.77	4.22	4.36	4.77	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	37/ 105	4.73	4.04	4.20	4.23	4.73	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	27/ 98	4.60	4.44	3.95	3.93	4.60	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	29/ 58	4.73	4.27	4.22	4.53	4.73	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	20/ 52	4.73	4.19	4.06	4.57	4.73	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	3	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	4.54	4.39	4.90	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	14/ 40	4.64	3.98	3.97	4.31	4.64	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	3	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	15/ 30	4.88	4.00	4.33	4.55	4.88	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.45	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.40	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.61	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.60	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 4	A 14	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	14

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

Course Section: EDUC 791S 0101  
 Title PRACT:SCH INST SYST DE  
 Instructor: ANAND, SUPREET  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 626  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	5	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.32	4.23	4.35	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	181/1666	4.80	4.26	4.19	4.19	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.38	4.15	4.24	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1555	5.00	4.05	4.00	4.07	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1543	5.00	4.29	4.06	4.27	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1647	5.00	4.29	4.12	4.15	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.81	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1605	5.00	4.17	4.07	4.13	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.43	4.39	4.37	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.76	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.31	4.24	4.22	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.27	4.26	4.24	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	939/1311	3.50	3.85	3.85	3.89	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.47	4.05	4.18	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.68	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.64	4.29	4.44	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1006	5.00	4.33	4.00	4.11	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 112	5.00	4.25	4.38	4.39	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.65	4.36	4.38	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 105	5.00	4.04	4.20	4.23	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.44	3.95	3.93	****	

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	Graduate 2	Major 5
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	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 792L 0101  
 Title  
 Instructor: STEIN, HOLLIS G  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 627  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	1	4.50	590/1669	4.50	4.32	4.23	4.35	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.26	4.19	4.19	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	496/1617	4.50	4.38	4.15	4.24	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1521/1555	2.50	4.05	4.00	4.07	2.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	390/1543	4.50	4.29	4.06	4.27	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	481/1647	4.50	4.29	4.12	4.15	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1190/1668	4.50	4.81	4.67	4.83	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	918/1605	4.00	4.17	4.07	4.13	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	799/1514	4.50	4.43	4.39	4.37	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.76	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1066/1503	4.00	4.31	4.24	4.22	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1458/1506	2.50	4.27	4.26	4.24	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1154/1490	3.50	4.47	4.05	4.18	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	632/1502	4.50	4.68	4.26	4.46	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1038/1489	4.00	4.64	4.29	4.44	4.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	4.27	4.22	4.53	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	29/ 52	4.00	4.19	4.06	4.57	4.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	4.54	4.39	4.90	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	26/ 40	3.50	3.98	3.97	4.31	3.50	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	17/ 30	4.50	4.00	4.33	4.55	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	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 792T 8030  
 Title ISD INTERNSHIP  
 Instructor: WILLIAMS, GREGO  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 628  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	478/1669	4.60	4.32	4.23	4.35	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	691/1666	4.40	4.26	4.19	4.19	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	557/1421	4.50	4.52	4.24	4.33	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	863/1617	4.20	4.38	4.15	4.24	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	516/1543	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.27	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	651/1647	4.40	4.29	4.12	4.15	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.81	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	139/1605	4.80	4.17	4.07	4.13	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1490	****	4.47	4.05	4.18	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1502	****	4.68	4.26	4.46	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1489	****	4.64	4.29	4.44	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	4.27	4.22	4.53	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.19	4.06	4.57	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	4.54	4.39	4.90	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	17/ 40	4.40	3.98	3.97	4.31	4.40	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 30	5.00	4.00	4.33	4.55	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: EDUC 793 0101  
 Title INTERNSHIP IN EDUCATIO  
 Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 629  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	1173/1669	4.00	4.32	4.23	4.35	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	549/1666	4.50	4.26	4.19	4.19	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1029/1617	4.00	4.38	4.15	4.24	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	340/1555	4.50	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	390/1543	4.50	4.29	4.06	4.27	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	481/1647	4.50	4.29	4.12	4.15	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.81	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	373/1605	4.50	4.17	4.07	4.13	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	799/1514	4.50	4.43	4.39	4.37	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1193/1551	4.50	4.76	4.66	4.72	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	556/1503	4.50	4.31	4.24	4.22	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	642/1506	4.50	4.27	4.26	4.24	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1227/1311	2.50	3.85	3.85	3.89	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.47	4.05	4.18	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.68	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.64	4.29	4.44	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	65/ 112	4.50	4.25	4.38	4.39	4.50	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	3.65	4.36	4.38	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	51/ 105	4.50	4.04	4.20	4.23	4.50	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 98	5.00	4.44	3.95	3.93	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	38/ 58	4.00	4.27	4.22	4.53	4.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	29/ 52	4.00	4.19	4.06	4.57	4.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	26/ 39	4.00	4.54	4.39	4.90	4.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	19/ 40	4.00	3.98	3.97	4.31	4.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	29/ 30	3.00	4.00	4.33	4.55	3.00	

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 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		
			? 1	Other	2

Course Section: EDUC 794 0101  
 Title ISD PROJECT SEMINAR  
 Instructor: KINERNEY, DONNA  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 630  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	7	4	4.08	1124/1669	4.08	4.32	4.23	4.35	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	6	1	3.62	1424/1666	3.62	4.26	4.19	4.19	3.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	969/1421	4.00	4.52	4.24	4.33	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	4	4.00	1029/1617	4.00	4.38	4.15	4.24	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1555	****	4.05	4.00	4.07	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	1019/1543	3.91	4.29	4.06	4.27	3.91	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	435/1647	4.55	4.29	4.12	4.15	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	844/1668	4.83	4.81	4.67	4.83	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	2	4	1	3.63	1299/1605	3.63	4.17	4.07	4.13	3.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1369/1514	3.60	4.43	4.39	4.37	3.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1270/1551	4.40	4.76	4.66	4.72	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	1210/1503	3.80	4.31	4.24	4.22	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1225/1506	3.80	4.27	4.26	4.24	3.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	890/1311	3.60	3.85	3.85	3.89	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	849/1490	4.00	4.47	4.05	4.18	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1301/1502	3.50	4.68	4.26	4.46	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	684/1489	4.50	4.64	4.29	4.44	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	759/1006	3.50	4.33	4.00	4.11	3.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	61/ 112	4.55	4.25	4.38	4.39	4.55	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	1	4	2	4	3.82	81/ 97	3.82	3.65	4.36	4.38	3.82	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	54/ 92	4.27	3.77	4.22	4.36	4.27	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	1	3	5	4.00	72/ 105	4.00	4.04	4.20	4.23	4.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	4	1	7	4.25	42/ 98	4.25	4.44	3.95	3.93	4.25	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.27	4.22	4.53	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	4.57	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.54	4.39	4.90	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	3.98	3.97	4.31	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.33	4.55	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.45	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.40	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.61	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.60	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	5	Major	13
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	12	
?	0			

Course Section: EDUC 794T 8030  
 Title ISD PROJECT SEMINAR  
 Instructor: WILLIAMS, GREGO  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 631  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	1	4	4.80	207/1669	4.80	4.32	4.23	4.35	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	439/1666	4.60	4.26	4.19	4.19	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	969/1421	4.00	4.52	4.24	4.33	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	641/1617	4.40	4.38	4.15	4.24	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	516/1543	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.27	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	651/1647	4.40	4.29	4.12	4.15	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.81	4.67	4.83	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	139/1605	4.80	4.17	4.07	4.13	4.80
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	4.27	4.22	4.53	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.19	4.06	4.57	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	4.54	4.39	4.90	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	13/ 40	4.80	3.98	3.97	4.31	4.80
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	16/ 30	4.75	4.00	4.33	4.55	4.75

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

Course Section: EDUC 795 0101  
 Title SEM STUDY TEACHING  
 Instructor: MURPHY, JOYCE  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 632  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	0	0	2	0	4.00	1173/1669	4.00	4.32	4.23	4.35	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	4.26	4.19	4.19	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	496/1617	4.50	4.38	4.15	4.24	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	773/1555	4.00	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1543	5.00	4.29	4.06	4.27	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	481/1647	4.50	4.29	4.12	4.15	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1190/1668	4.50	4.81	4.67	4.83	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	918/1605	4.00	4.17	4.07	4.13	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	65/ 112	4.50	4.25	4.38	4.39	4.50
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	3.65	4.36	4.38	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	3.77	4.22	4.36	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	72/ 105	4.00	4.04	4.20	4.23	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	28/ 98	4.50	4.44	3.95	3.93	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
-----										
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 1	Required for Majors 0	Graduate	0	Major	2	
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	0	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	2				
				? 0						

Course Section: EDUC 796 8010  
 Title HUMAN PERF TECH  
 Instructor: ERDMAN, CAROL B  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 633  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	5	4.71	318/1669	4.71	4.32	4.23	4.35	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	777/1666	4.33	4.26	4.19	4.19	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	493/1421	4.57	4.52	4.24	4.33	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	424/1617	4.57	4.38	4.15	4.24	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	195/1555	4.71	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	325/1543	4.57	4.29	4.06	4.27	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	617/1647	4.43	4.29	4.12	4.15	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	807/1668	4.86	4.81	4.67	4.83	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	239/1605	4.67	4.17	4.07	4.13	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	505/1514	4.71	4.43	4.39	4.37	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.76	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.31	4.24	4.22	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	407/1506	4.71	4.27	4.26	4.24	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	846/1311	3.67	3.85	3.85	3.89	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	405/1490	4.57	4.47	4.05	4.18	4.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	438/1502	4.71	4.68	4.26	4.46	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	329/1489	4.86	4.64	4.29	4.44	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	178/1006	4.67	4.33	4.00	4.11	4.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	65/ 112	4.50	4.25	4.38	4.39	4.50	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	93/ 97	2.75	3.65	4.36	4.38	2.75	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	63/ 92	4.00	3.77	4.22	4.36	4.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	51/ 105	4.50	4.04	4.20	4.23	4.50	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	46/ 98	4.00	4.44	3.95	3.93	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	2	Major	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	6	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	3				
				?	0						