

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0101
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: DUNNIGAN, BRIAN
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 742
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	3	12	4.32	878/1674	3.72	4.01	4.27	4.07	4.32	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	5	13	4.53	554/1674	4.14	4.08	4.23	4.16	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1423	4.12	4.22	4.27	4.16	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	466/1609	4.21	4.24	4.22	4.05	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	126/1585	3.66	3.99	3.96	3.88	4.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	1	13	4.50	373/1535	4.19	4.24	4.08	3.89	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	419/1651	3.99	3.90	4.18	4.10	4.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1673	4.31	4.45	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	185/1656	4.02	4.02	4.07	3.96	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	560/1586	4.24	4.18	4.43	4.37	4.72	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	340/1585	4.68	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	217/1582	4.20	4.19	4.26	4.17	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	440/1575	4.06	4.11	4.27	4.17	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	12	1	0	3	2	0	3.00	1217/1380	3.55	3.58	3.94	3.78	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	4	1	7	4.25	645/1520	3.88	4.12	4.01	3.76	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	603/1515	4.31	4.43	4.24	3.97	4.54	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	685/1511	4.39	4.43	4.27	4.00	4.46	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	2	1	2	1	1	2.71	950/ 994	3.73	3.95	3.94	3.73	2.71	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	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	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0201
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: BROFMAN, MARGAR
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 743
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	3	1	5	0	2.67	1656/1674	3.72	4.01	4.27	4.07	2.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	5	2	3.58	1460/1674	4.14	4.08	4.23	4.16	3.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	1	1	2	4	3.50	1268/1423	4.12	4.22	4.27	4.16	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	1042/1609	4.21	4.24	4.22	4.05	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	3	1	3	3.09	1424/1585	3.66	3.99	3.96	3.88	3.09	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	4	1	1	6	3.75	1147/1535	4.19	4.24	4.08	3.89	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	3	3	3	3.42	1480/1651	3.99	3.90	4.18	4.10	3.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	635/1673	4.31	4.45	4.69	4.67	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	2	1	7	0	3.27	1466/1656	4.02	4.02	4.07	3.96	3.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	3	0	3	5	3.67	1442/1586	4.24	4.18	4.43	4.37	3.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	1397/1585	4.68	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.25	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	4	2	3	3.33	1457/1582	4.20	4.19	4.26	4.17	3.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	0	2	3	3	3.08	1476/1575	4.06	4.11	4.27	4.17	3.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	1359/1380	3.55	3.58	3.94	3.78	2.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	3	3	1	3.11	1330/1520	3.88	4.12	4.01	3.76	3.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	3	3	0	2	2.89	1447/1515	4.31	4.43	4.24	3.97	2.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	2	3	1	2	3.11	1402/1511	4.39	4.43	4.27	4.00	3.11	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	614/ 994	3.73	3.95	3.94	3.73	3.80	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 278	****	4.50	4.19	3.97	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 103	****	4.38	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 101	****	4.49	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 95	****	4.14	4.31	3.99	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 97	****	4.21	4.14	3.69	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0301
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: SAWYERS, SETH A
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 744
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	6	8	4.05	1155/1674	3.72	4.01	4.27	4.07	4.05	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	83/1674	4.14	4.08	4.23	4.16	4.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1423	4.12	4.22	4.27	4.16	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	242/1609	4.21	4.24	4.22	4.05	4.74	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	3	3	2	2	6	3.31	1339/1585	3.66	3.99	3.96	3.88	3.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	161/1535	4.19	4.24	4.08	3.89	4.76	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	265/1651	3.99	3.90	4.18	4.10	4.72	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	17	1	4.06	1545/1673	4.31	4.45	4.69	4.67	4.06	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	11	2	4.15	838/1656	4.02	4.02	4.07	3.96	4.15	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	128/1586	4.24	4.18	4.43	4.37	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	615/1585	4.68	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	217/1582	4.20	4.19	4.26	4.17	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	327/1575	4.06	4.11	4.27	4.17	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	810/1380	3.55	3.58	3.94	3.78	3.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	206/1520	3.88	4.12	4.01	3.76	4.79	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	348/1515	4.31	4.43	4.24	3.97	4.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	301/1511	4.39	4.43	4.27	4.00	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	148/ 994	3.73	3.95	3.94	3.73	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 3	A 5	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 19 Non-major 19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 3	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0401
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: SIMON, BARBARA
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 745
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	5	3	4	3.64	1459/1674	3.72	4.01	4.27	4.07	3.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	1035/1674	4.14	4.08	4.23	4.16	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	10	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1423	4.12	4.22	4.27	4.16	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	5	8	4.43	614/1609	4.21	4.24	4.22	4.05	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	4	2	3	1	2.62	1538/1585	3.66	3.99	3.96	3.88	2.62	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	4	4	5	3.86	1066/1535	4.19	4.24	4.08	3.89	3.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	4	5	3	3.57	1414/1651	3.99	3.90	4.18	4.10	3.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	11	1	3.93	1612/1673	4.31	4.45	4.69	4.67	3.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	6	2	3	3.58	1339/1656	4.02	4.02	4.07	3.96	3.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	1004/1586	4.24	4.18	4.43	4.37	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	1225/1585	4.68	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	1129/1582	4.20	4.19	4.26	4.17	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	2	3	4	3.82	1259/1575	4.06	4.11	4.27	4.17	3.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	2	0	3	0	3	3.25	1160/1380	3.55	3.58	3.94	3.78	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	810/1520	3.88	4.12	4.01	3.76	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	707/1515	4.31	4.43	4.24	3.97	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	707/1511	4.39	4.43	4.27	4.00	4.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	254/ 994	3.73	3.95	3.94	3.73	4.44	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 15 Non-major 15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 4	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0501
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: TERHORST, RAYMO
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 746
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	6	8	3.95	1259/1674	3.72	4.01	4.27	4.07	3.95	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	270/1674	4.14	4.08	4.23	4.16	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	431/1423	4.12	4.22	4.27	4.16	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	3	15	4.68	292/1609	4.21	4.24	4.22	4.05	4.68	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	1	7	7	3.65	1128/1585	3.66	3.99	3.96	3.88	3.65	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	17	4.75	169/1535	4.19	4.24	4.08	3.89	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	18	4.80	175/1651	3.99	3.90	4.18	4.10	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	887/1673	4.31	4.45	4.69	4.67	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	331/1656	4.02	4.02	4.07	3.96	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	1	18	4.80	389/1586	4.24	4.18	4.43	4.37	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	1	18	4.80	811/1585	4.68	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	199/1582	4.20	4.19	4.26	4.17	4.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	2	15	4.45	768/1575	4.06	4.11	4.27	4.17	4.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	603/1380	3.55	3.58	3.94	3.78	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	2	1	3	7	3.93	901/1520	3.88	4.12	4.01	3.76	3.93	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	348/1515	4.31	4.43	4.24	3.97	4.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	458/1511	4.39	4.43	4.27	4.00	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	148/ 994	3.73	3.95	3.94	3.73	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 16	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 7	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 20 Non-major 20
84-150	2	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 2	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0601
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: FINDLAY, JOANNE
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 747
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	5	5	6	3.78	1398/1674	3.72	4.01	4.27	4.07	3.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	5	6	3.83	1319/1674	4.14	4.08	4.23	4.16	3.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	894/1423	4.12	4.22	4.27	4.16	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	5	8	4.00	1094/1609	4.21	4.24	4.22	4.05	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	4	9	4.00	769/1585	3.66	3.99	3.96	3.88	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	7	7	4.24	691/1535	4.19	4.24	4.08	3.89	4.24	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	6	2	9	4.06	1064/1651	3.99	3.90	4.18	4.10	4.06	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	3	9	5	1	3.22	1660/1673	4.31	4.45	4.69	4.67	3.22	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	680/1656	4.02	4.02	4.07	3.96	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	3	2	5	6	3.88	1379/1586	4.24	4.18	4.43	4.37	3.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	1047/1585	4.68	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	2	10	4.31	871/1582	4.20	4.19	4.26	4.17	4.31	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	7	6	4.13	1080/1575	4.06	4.11	4.27	4.17	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	13	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1380	3.55	3.58	3.94	3.78	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	512/1520	3.88	4.12	4.01	3.76	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	0	2	12	4.60	543/1515	4.31	4.43	4.24	3.97	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	458/1511	4.39	4.43	4.27	4.00	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	691/ 994	3.73	3.95	3.94	3.73	3.63	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99 1	A 8	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 1	B 5		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 2	General 1	Under-grad 18 Non-major 18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	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 8	
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0701
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: PUTZEL, DIANE M
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 748
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	11	6	4.11	1115/1674	3.72	4.01	4.27	4.07	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	625/1674	4.14	4.08	4.23	4.16	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1423	4.12	4.22	4.27	4.16	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	9	4.37	701/1609	4.21	4.24	4.22	4.05	4.37	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	8	7	4.16	652/1585	3.66	3.99	3.96	3.88	4.16	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	184/1535	4.19	4.24	4.08	3.89	4.74	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	8	10	4.42	643/1651	3.99	3.90	4.18	4.10	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	6	4.32	1375/1673	4.31	4.45	4.69	4.67	4.32	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	149/1656	4.02	4.02	4.07	3.96	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	128/1586	4.24	4.18	4.43	4.37	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1585	4.68	4.68	4.69	4.60	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	353/1582	4.20	4.19	4.26	4.17	4.72	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	495/1575	4.06	4.11	4.27	4.17	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	3	7	6	4.06	644/1380	3.55	3.58	3.94	3.78	4.06	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	8	10	4.47	431/1520	3.88	4.12	4.01	3.76	4.47	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	513/1515	4.31	4.43	4.24	3.97	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	586/1511	4.39	4.43	4.27	4.00	4.58	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	1	0	10	3	4.07	453/ 994	3.73	3.95	3.94	3.73	4.07	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	****	4.00	4.23	3.97	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0901
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: FINDLAY, JOANNE
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 749
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	1	6	8	3.89	1328/1674	3.72	4.01	4.27	4.07	3.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	12	4.42	705/1674	4.14	4.08	4.23	4.16	4.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	828/1423	4.12	4.22	4.27	4.16	4.27	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	3	3	11	4.28	825/1609	4.21	4.24	4.22	4.05	4.28	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	4	3	9	3.79	1023/1585	3.66	3.99	3.96	3.88	3.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	2	4	10	4.17	767/1535	4.19	4.24	4.08	3.89	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	5	9	4.16	977/1651	3.99	3.90	4.18	4.10	4.16	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	4	1	13	1	3.58	1650/1673	4.31	4.45	4.69	4.67	3.58	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	588/1656	4.02	4.02	4.07	3.96	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	4	12	4.50	858/1586	4.24	4.18	4.43	4.37	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	1	15	4.67	1071/1585	4.68	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	3	13	4.56	578/1582	4.20	4.19	4.26	4.17	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	0	3	13	4.50	692/1575	4.06	4.11	4.27	4.17	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	2	0	2	0	8	4.00	666/1380	3.55	3.58	3.94	3.78	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	0	1	8	4.27	626/1520	3.88	4.12	4.01	3.76	4.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	313/1515	4.31	4.43	4.24	3.97	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	244/1511	4.39	4.43	4.27	4.00	4.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	1	1	3	0	5	3.70	662/ 994	3.73	3.95	3.94	3.73	3.70	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 265	****	4.00	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 278	****	4.50	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.33	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.42	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.58	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 103	****	4.38	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 101	****	4.49	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 95	****	4.14	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 99	****	4.34	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 97	****	4.21	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.54	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.17	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 53	****	4.38	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.09	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.98	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 61	****	3.97	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.25	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.53	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	2.75	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0901
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: FINDLAY, JOANNE
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 749
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	18
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	4				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1001
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: DUNNIGAN, BRIAN
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 750
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	655/1674	3.72	4.01	4.27	4.07	4.48	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	11	4.38	763/1674	4.14	4.08	4.23	4.16	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	167/1423	4.12	4.22	4.27	4.16	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	536/1609	4.21	4.24	4.22	4.05	4.48	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	191/1585	3.66	3.99	3.96	3.88	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	13	4.48	413/1535	4.19	4.24	4.08	3.89	4.48	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	568/1651	3.99	3.90	4.18	4.10	4.48	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1673	4.31	4.45	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	366/1656	4.02	4.02	4.07	3.96	4.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	738/1586	4.24	4.18	4.43	4.37	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	284/1585	4.68	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	6	13	4.55	578/1582	4.20	4.19	4.26	4.17	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	343/1575	4.06	4.11	4.27	4.17	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	11	0	1	4	1	3	3.67	962/1380	3.55	3.58	3.94	3.78	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	2	11	4.47	443/1520	3.88	4.12	4.01	3.76	4.47	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	145/1515	4.31	4.43	4.24	3.97	4.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1511	4.39	4.43	4.27	4.00	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	1	3	5	3	3.83	600/ 994	3.73	3.95	3.94	3.73	3.83	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 2	A 3	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 21 Non-major 21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 8	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1101
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: BURNS, MARGIE
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 751
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	5	3	2	6	0	2.56	1663/1674	3.72	4.01	4.27	4.07	2.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	5	4	3	2	2.88	1635/1674	4.14	4.08	4.23	4.16	2.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	2	6	1	4	3.06	1357/1423	4.12	4.22	4.27	4.16	3.06	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	2	3	3	4	3.20	1527/1609	4.21	4.24	4.22	4.05	3.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	5	4	4	3.44	1274/1585	3.66	3.99	3.96	3.88	3.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	0	4	6	2	3.27	1382/1535	4.19	4.24	4.08	3.89	3.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	4	1	5	2	2.81	1594/1651	3.99	3.90	4.18	4.10	2.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	15	1	4.06	1541/1673	4.31	4.45	4.69	4.67	4.06	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	2	3	3	2	3.27	1466/1656	4.02	4.02	4.07	3.96	3.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	4	2	5	4	3.44	1493/1586	4.24	4.18	4.43	4.37	3.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	1283/1585	4.68	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.44	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	5	4	4	3.50	1406/1582	4.20	4.19	4.26	4.17	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	5	5	2	3.13	1470/1575	4.06	4.11	4.27	4.17	3.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	2	0	1	7	5	3.87	824/1380	3.55	3.58	3.94	3.78	3.87	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	5	2	3	3.14	1321/1520	3.88	4.12	4.01	3.76	3.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	4	1	2	3	4	3.14	1405/1515	4.31	4.43	4.24	3.97	3.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	2	3	3	5	3.64	1274/1511	4.39	4.43	4.27	4.00	3.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	1	2	5	3	2	3.23	839/ 994	3.73	3.95	3.94	3.73	3.23	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	4.50	4.19	3.97	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 259	****	4.42	4.33	4.19	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 103	****	4.38	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.49	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.14	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	4.34	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.21	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	4.54	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 77	****	4.17	3.93	3.42	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 61	****	3.97	4.09	3.87	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 10
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 11	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Non-major 16
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Electives 1
					Other 1

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1201
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: MCGURRIN JR, AN
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 752
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	3	2	0	2.75	1650/1674	3.72	4.01	4.27	4.07	2.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1370/1674	4.14	4.08	4.23	4.16	3.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	0	0	0	3.00	****/1423	4.12	4.22	4.27	4.16	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	1242/1609	4.21	4.24	4.22	4.05	3.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	4	1	3.25	1364/1585	3.66	3.99	3.96	3.88	3.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1048/1535	4.19	4.24	4.08	3.89	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	713/1651	3.99	3.90	4.18	4.10	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	2	2	4	0	3.25	1659/1673	4.31	4.45	4.69	4.67	3.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	955/1656	4.02	4.02	4.07	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	5	2	0	3.00	1539/1586	4.24	4.18	4.43	4.37	3.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	640/1585	4.68	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	1434/1582	4.20	4.19	4.26	4.17	3.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	3	1	3.38	1411/1575	4.06	4.11	4.27	4.17	3.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1380	3.55	3.58	3.94	3.78	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1284/1520	3.88	4.12	4.01	3.76	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	898/1515	4.31	4.43	4.24	3.97	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1221/1511	4.39	4.43	4.27	4.00	3.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 265	****	4.00	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 278	****	4.50	4.19	3.97	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	8	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	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	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1301
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: PUTZEL, DIANE M
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 753
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	7	7	4.00	1196/1674	3.72	4.01	4.27	4.07	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	10	4.47	625/1674	4.14	4.08	4.23	4.16	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1423	4.12	4.22	4.27	4.16	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	343/1609	4.21	4.24	4.22	4.05	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	1	10	3	3.71	1093/1585	3.66	3.99	3.96	3.88	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	5	12	4.56	328/1535	4.19	4.24	4.08	3.89	4.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	4	8	6	3.95	1175/1651	3.99	3.90	4.18	4.10	3.95	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	14	4	4.16	1491/1673	4.31	4.45	4.69	4.67	4.16	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	8	4	4.23	744/1656	4.02	4.02	4.07	3.96	4.23	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	708/1586	4.24	4.18	4.43	4.37	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	853/1585	4.68	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	481/1582	4.20	4.19	4.26	4.17	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	6	10	4.32	905/1575	4.06	4.11	4.27	4.17	4.32	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	4	2	12	4.32	440/1380	3.55	3.58	3.94	3.78	4.32	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	3	7	5	3.94	889/1520	3.88	4.12	4.01	3.76	3.94	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	384/1515	4.31	4.43	4.24	3.97	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	171/1511	4.39	4.43	4.27	4.00	4.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	1	0	4	4	1	3.40	784/ 994	3.73	3.95	3.94	3.73	3.40	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 2	A 6	Required for Majors 15	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99 0	B 13		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 5	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 19 Non-major 19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 4	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 6	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1501
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: HUTZLER, ROSEMA
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 754
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	4	7	2	3.47	1524/1674	3.72	4.01	4.27	4.07	3.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	1	6	4	3.53	1484/1674	4.14	4.08	4.23	4.16	3.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1423	4.12	4.22	4.27	4.16	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	2	3	4	3	3.29	1511/1609	4.21	4.24	4.22	4.05	3.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	3	3	4	3.27	1360/1585	3.66	3.99	3.96	3.88	3.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	1	3	7	3.80	1110/1535	4.19	4.24	4.08	3.89	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	5	3	3	3	3.13	1549/1651	3.99	3.90	4.18	4.10	3.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	1246/1673	4.31	4.45	4.69	4.67	4.47	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	6	6	0	3.21	1490/1656	4.02	4.02	4.07	3.96	3.21	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	4	4	4	3.77	1412/1586	4.24	4.18	4.43	4.37	3.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	2	0	10	4.46	1258/1585	4.68	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.46	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	1	2	5	3	3.46	1420/1582	4.20	4.19	4.26	4.17	3.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	4	4	2	3.31	1432/1575	4.06	4.11	4.27	4.17	3.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	2	1	1	1	0	2.20	1351/1380	3.55	3.58	3.94	3.78	2.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	3	3	3	3.33	1252/1520	3.88	4.12	4.01	3.76	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	1	2	2	5	3.58	1279/1515	4.31	4.43	4.24	3.97	3.58	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	2	2	1	2	5	3.50	1308/1511	4.39	4.43	4.27	4.00	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	2	0	5	2	0	2.78	941/ 994	3.73	3.95	3.94	3.73	2.78	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 265	****	4.00	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 278	****	4.50	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 260	****	4.33	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 259	****	4.42	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 233	****	4.58	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 103	****	4.38	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 101	****	4.49	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 95	****	4.14	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 99	****	4.34	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 97	****	4.21	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	4.54	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	4.17	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.38	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	4.09	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 49	****	3.98	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	3.97	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	4.25	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 50	****	4.53	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	2.75	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1501
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: HUTZLER, ROSEMA
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 754
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	4	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1601
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: MACEK, PHILIP
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 755
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	1	8	7	4.11	1105/1674	3.72	4.01	4.27	4.07	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	12	7	4.37	790/1674	4.14	4.08	4.23	4.16	4.37	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1423	4.12	4.22	4.27	4.16	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	5	10	4.21	905/1609	4.21	4.24	4.22	4.05	4.21	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	2	3	5	3	3.50	1223/1585	3.66	3.99	3.96	3.88	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	481/1535	4.19	4.24	4.08	3.89	4.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	5	11	4.32	795/1651	3.99	3.90	4.18	4.10	4.32	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	15	4	4.21	1449/1673	4.31	4.45	4.69	4.67	4.21	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	10	4	4.29	680/1656	4.02	4.02	4.07	3.96	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	837/1586	4.24	4.18	4.43	4.37	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	853/1585	4.68	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	557/1582	4.20	4.19	4.26	4.17	4.58	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	11	4.42	793/1575	4.06	4.11	4.27	4.17	4.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	666/1380	3.55	3.58	3.94	3.78	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	5	7	4.00	810/1520	3.88	4.12	4.01	3.76	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	668/1515	4.31	4.43	4.24	3.97	4.47	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	586/1511	4.39	4.43	4.27	4.00	4.58	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	11	1	1	2	1	3	3.50	732/ 994	3.73	3.95	3.94	3.73	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	****	4.00	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	4.50	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.33	4.46	4.41	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99 4	A 6	Required for Majors	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 2	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 0	D 0	Under-grad	19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0		
			P 0		
			I 0	Electives	1
			? 0	Other	4
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1701
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: KILLGALLON, DON
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 756
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	9	6	4.40	768/1674	3.72	4.01	4.27	4.07	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	737/1674	4.14	4.08	4.23	4.16	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	828/1423	4.12	4.22	4.27	4.16	4.27	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	455/1609	4.21	4.24	4.22	4.05	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	3	3	6	3.86	956/1585	3.66	3.99	3.96	3.88	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	508/1535	4.19	4.24	4.08	3.89	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	484/1651	3.99	3.90	4.18	4.10	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1673	4.31	4.45	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	955/1656	4.02	4.02	4.07	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	0	12	4.71	581/1586	4.24	4.18	4.43	4.37	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1585	4.68	4.68	4.69	4.60	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	557/1582	4.20	4.19	4.26	4.17	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	932/1575	4.06	4.11	4.27	4.17	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	505/1380	3.55	3.58	3.94	3.78	4.23	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	1116/1520	3.88	4.12	4.01	3.76	3.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	707/1515	4.31	4.43	4.24	3.97	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	927/1511	4.39	4.43	4.27	4.00	4.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	390/ 994	3.73	3.95	3.94	3.73	4.20	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.38	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.49	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 95	****	4.14	4.31	3.99	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 15	Non-major 13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	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: ENGL 100 2001
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: KIDD, KATHLEEN
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 757
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	7	10	4.30	891/1674	3.72	4.01	4.27	4.07	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	12	4.40	737/1674	4.14	4.08	4.23	4.16	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	611/1423	4.12	4.22	4.27	4.16	4.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	343/1609	4.21	4.24	4.22	4.05	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	8	7	4.10	702/1585	3.66	3.99	3.96	3.88	4.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	15	4.60	283/1535	4.19	4.24	4.08	3.89	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	4	10	4.05	1064/1651	3.99	3.90	4.18	4.10	4.05	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	796/1673	4.31	4.45	4.69	4.67	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	8	6	4.25	719/1656	4.02	4.02	4.07	3.96	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	805/1586	4.24	4.18	4.43	4.37	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	1083/1585	4.68	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.65	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	8	10	4.40	777/1582	4.20	4.19	4.26	4.17	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	7	12	4.50	692/1575	4.06	4.11	4.27	4.17	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	666/1380	3.55	3.58	3.94	3.78	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	0	0	4	7	4.08	786/1520	3.88	4.12	4.01	3.76	4.08	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	3	2	7	4.08	1002/1515	4.31	4.43	4.24	3.97	4.08	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	917/1511	4.39	4.43	4.27	4.00	4.23	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	302/ 994	3.73	3.95	3.94	3.73	4.38	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	****	4.00	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 278	****	4.50	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 260	****	4.33	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 259	****	4.42	4.33	4.19	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.38	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.49	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 95	****	4.14	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.34	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.21	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	4.54	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	4.17	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.38	4.45	4.34	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	3.97	4.09	3.87	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 2	A 4	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 10	General 0	Under-grad 20 Non-major 20
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0		
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0		

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	6	
?	1			

Course-Section: ENGL 100 2101
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: SCHWARTZ, DEBRA
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 758
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	2	7	1	3.38	1550/1674	3.72	4.01	4.27	4.07	3.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	4	2	3.54	1484/1674	4.14	4.08	4.23	4.16	3.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1423	4.12	4.22	4.27	4.16	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	7	2	3.83	1266/1609	4.21	4.24	4.22	4.05	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	2	4	1	2	2.91	1491/1585	3.66	3.99	3.96	3.88	2.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	4	3	3.62	1234/1535	4.19	4.24	4.08	3.89	3.62	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	3	3	0	4	3.08	1556/1651	3.99	3.90	4.18	4.10	3.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	11	0	4.00	1566/1673	4.31	4.45	4.69	4.67	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	6	1	1	3.38	1431/1656	4.02	4.02	4.07	3.96	3.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	6	4	1	3.55	1472/1586	4.24	4.18	4.43	4.37	3.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	1354/1585	4.68	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	7	2	1	3.17	1486/1582	4.20	4.19	4.26	4.17	3.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	4	2	3.58	1353/1575	4.06	4.11	4.27	4.17	3.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	2	0	2	1	0	2.40	1338/1380	3.55	3.58	3.94	3.78	2.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	5	2	2	3.08	1337/1520	3.88	4.12	4.01	3.76	3.08	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	898/1515	4.31	4.43	4.24	3.97	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	740/1511	4.39	4.43	4.27	4.00	4.42	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	1	4	3	2	3.60	699/ 994	3.73	3.95	3.94	3.73	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	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 13
Grad.	0	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: ENGL 100 2201
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: BURNS, MARGIE
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 759
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	8	5	1	3.31	1569/1674	3.72	4.01	4.27	4.07	3.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	3	8	3	3.63	1441/1674	4.14	4.08	4.23	4.16	3.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	4	6	2	3.31	1320/1423	4.12	4.22	4.27	4.16	3.31	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	5	4	3.69	1366/1609	4.21	4.24	4.22	4.05	3.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	6	3	3.73	1066/1585	3.66	3.99	3.96	3.88	3.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	5	4	3.80	1110/1535	4.19	4.24	4.08	3.89	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	3	6	3	3.53	1430/1651	3.99	3.90	4.18	4.10	3.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	13	2	4.13	1504/1673	4.31	4.45	4.69	4.67	4.13	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	7	4	3	3.71	1267/1656	4.02	4.02	4.07	3.96	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	2	7	4	3.87	1382/1586	4.24	4.18	4.43	4.37	3.87	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	1142/1585	4.68	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	6	5	4.07	1099/1582	4.20	4.19	4.26	4.17	4.07	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	6	6	4.00	1138/1575	4.06	4.11	4.27	4.17	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	4	7	2	3.71	930/1380	3.55	3.58	3.94	3.78	3.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	1	2	4	2	3.27	1277/1520	3.88	4.12	4.01	3.76	3.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	2	1	6	2	3.73	1227/1515	4.31	4.43	4.24	3.97	3.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	875/1511	4.39	4.43	4.27	4.00	4.27	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	2	1	4	3	0	2.80	937/ 994	3.73	3.95	3.94	3.73	2.80	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.49	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 95	****	4.14	4.31	3.99	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	0	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						
				?	1						
						Other	8				

Course-Section: ENGL 100 2301
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: SCALIA, BILL
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 760
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	2	1	3.57	1489/1674	3.72	4.01	4.27	4.07	3.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	495/1674	4.14	4.08	4.23	4.16	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	376/1423	4.12	4.22	4.27	4.16	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	614/1609	4.21	4.24	4.22	4.05	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	4	1	3.57	1181/1585	3.66	3.99	3.96	3.88	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	870/1535	4.19	4.24	4.08	3.89	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1258/1651	3.99	3.90	4.18	4.10	3.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1673	4.31	4.45	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	5	0	3.71	1267/1656	4.02	4.02	4.07	3.96	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1300/1586	4.24	4.18	4.43	4.37	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	1383/1585	4.68	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.29	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	1129/1582	4.20	4.19	4.26	4.17	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	1	1	3.29	1437/1575	4.06	4.11	4.27	4.17	3.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	998/1380	3.55	3.58	3.94	3.78	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	645/1520	3.88	4.12	4.01	3.76	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	384/1515	4.31	4.43	4.24	3.97	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1511	4.39	4.43	4.27	4.00	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	3.73	3.95	3.94	3.73	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	1	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	7
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	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0101
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: DUNNIGAN, BRIAN
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 761
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	5	10	4.33	854/1674	3.79	4.01	4.27	4.07	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	10	4.33	830/1674	3.87	4.08	4.23	4.16	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	636/1423	3.99	4.22	4.27	4.16	4.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	6	10	4.28	825/1609	4.11	4.24	4.22	4.05	4.28	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	313/1585	3.87	3.99	3.96	3.88	4.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	7	10	4.44	454/1535	4.16	4.24	4.08	3.89	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	4	11	4.33	768/1651	3.86	3.90	4.18	4.10	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	832/1673	4.75	4.45	4.69	4.67	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	381/1656	3.85	4.02	4.07	3.96	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	795/1586	3.96	4.18	4.43	4.37	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	640/1585	4.38	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	632/1582	4.05	4.19	4.26	4.17	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	692/1575	3.98	4.11	4.27	4.17	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	612/1380	3.31	3.58	3.94	3.78	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	572/1520	3.72	4.12	4.01	3.76	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	483/1515	4.16	4.43	4.24	3.97	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	358/1511	4.13	4.43	4.27	4.00	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	3	2	1	6	3.83	600/ 994	3.21	3.95	3.94	3.73	3.83	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 265	3.00	4.00	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 278	4.00	4.50	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 260	3.67	4.33	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 259	3.83	4.42	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 233	4.17	4.58	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 103	4.00	4.38	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 101	3.80	4.49	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 95	3.40	4.14	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 99	3.50	4.34	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 97	3.50	4.21	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 76	3.60	4.54	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 77	3.20	4.17	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 53	3.75	4.38	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 48	3.60	4.09	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	3.40	3.98	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 61	3.40	3.97	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 52	3.75	4.25	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 50	3.60	4.53	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 35	3.00	4.00	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 31	2.75	2.75	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0101
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: DUNNIGAN, BRIAN
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 761
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0301
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: BROFMAN, MARGAR
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 762
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	8	4	3	3.67	1449/1674	3.79	4.01	4.27	4.07	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	7	5	3	3.73	1382/1674	3.87	4.08	4.23	4.16	3.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	1135/1423	3.99	4.22	4.27	4.16	3.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	5	4.00	1094/1609	4.11	4.24	4.22	4.05	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	5	5	3.73	1066/1585	3.87	3.99	3.96	3.88	3.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	578/1535	4.16	4.24	4.08	3.89	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	4	2	5	3.47	1459/1651	3.86	3.90	4.18	4.10	3.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	494/1673	4.75	4.45	4.69	4.67	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	5	5	3	3.85	1169/1656	3.85	4.02	4.07	3.96	3.85	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	5	6	2	3.47	1487/1586	3.96	4.18	4.43	4.37	3.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	3	5	5	3.87	1513/1585	4.38	4.68	4.69	4.60	3.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	7	3	3.80	1272/1582	4.05	4.19	4.26	4.17	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	6	5	3	3.67	1329/1575	3.98	4.11	4.27	4.17	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	1	2	2	0	0	2.20	1351/1380	3.31	3.58	3.94	3.78	2.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	4	3	4	3.54	1157/1520	3.72	4.12	4.01	3.76	3.54	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	778/1515	4.16	4.43	4.24	3.97	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	1121/1511	4.13	4.43	4.27	4.00	3.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	7	0	2	3	1	0	2.83	932/ 994	3.21	3.95	3.94	3.73	2.83	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	2	0	1	2	1	3.00	257/ 265	3.00	4.00	4.23	3.97	3.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	188/ 278	4.00	4.50	4.19	3.97	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	241/ 260	3.67	4.33	4.46	4.41	3.67	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	212/ 259	3.83	4.42	4.33	4.19	3.83	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	130/ 233	4.17	4.58	4.20	4.00	4.17	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	74/ 103	4.00	4.38	4.41	4.33	4.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	89/ 101	3.80	4.49	4.48	4.18	3.80	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	83/ 95	3.40	4.14	4.31	3.99	3.40	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	89/ 99	3.50	4.34	4.39	4.10	3.50	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	1	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	77/ 97	3.50	4.21	4.14	3.69	3.50	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	48/ 76	3.60	4.54	3.98	3.32	3.60	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	58/ 77	3.20	4.17	3.93	3.42	3.20	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	46/ 53	3.75	4.38	4.45	4.34	3.75	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	37/ 48	3.60	4.09	4.12	4.00	3.60	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	41/ 49	3.40	3.98	4.27	4.30	3.40	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	48/ 61	3.40	3.97	4.09	3.87	3.40	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	1	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	38/ 52	3.75	4.25	4.26	3.91	3.75	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	43/ 50	3.60	4.53	4.44	4.39	3.60	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	33/ 35	3.00	4.00	4.36	3.92	3.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	1	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	31/ 31	2.75	2.75	4.34	3.88	2.75	

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0301
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: BROFMAN, MARGAR
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 762
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	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				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0401
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: KILLGALLON, DON
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 763
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	854/1674	3.79	4.01	4.27	4.07	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	721/1674	3.87	4.08	4.23	4.16	4.41	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1423	3.99	4.22	4.27	4.16	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	12	4.56	432/1609	4.11	4.24	4.22	4.05	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	3	1	7	5	3.88	936/1585	3.87	3.99	3.96	3.88	3.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	413/1535	4.16	4.24	4.08	3.89	4.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	220/1651	3.86	3.90	4.18	4.10	4.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1673	4.75	4.45	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	2	2	7	6	4.00	955/1656	3.85	4.02	4.07	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	560/1586	3.96	4.18	4.43	4.37	4.72	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	340/1585	4.38	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	438/1582	4.05	4.19	4.26	4.17	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	692/1575	3.98	4.11	4.27	4.17	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	3	6	7	4.06	644/1380	3.31	3.58	3.94	3.78	4.06	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	0	5	7	3.81	979/1520	3.72	4.12	4.01	3.76	3.81	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	4	4	7	4.06	1005/1515	4.16	4.43	4.24	3.97	4.06	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	2	4	5	5	3.81	1188/1511	4.13	4.43	4.27	4.00	3.81	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	8	0	3	2	2	1	3.13	868/ 994	3.21	3.95	3.94	3.73	3.13	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	3.00	4.00	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	4.00	4.50	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	3.67	4.33	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	3.83	4.42	4.42	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	4.17	4.58	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	4.00	4.38	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	3.80	4.49	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	3.40	4.14	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	3.50	4.34	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	3.50	4.21	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	3.60	4.54	3.98	3.32	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 3	A 10	Required for Majors	14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	3
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0501
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: LEOPOLD, KRISTI
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 764
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	5	4	6	1	2.94	1637/1674	3.79	4.01	4.27	4.07	2.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	5	6	2	3.17	1590/1674	3.87	4.08	4.23	4.16	3.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	2	1	4	2	5	3.50	1268/1423	3.99	4.22	4.27	4.16	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	4	6	4	3.56	1431/1609	4.11	4.24	4.22	4.05	3.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	5	5	4	3.39	1306/1585	3.87	3.99	3.96	3.88	3.39	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	5	6	3.78	1132/1535	4.16	4.24	4.08	3.89	3.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	4	6	3	4	3.28	1520/1651	3.86	3.90	4.18	4.10	3.28	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	14	2	4.00	1566/1673	4.75	4.45	4.69	4.67	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	6	5	1	3.29	1462/1656	3.85	4.02	4.07	3.96	3.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	2	6	3	3	3.33	1510/1586	3.96	4.18	4.43	4.37	3.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	2	3	7	4	3.81	1522/1585	4.38	4.68	4.69	4.60	3.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	8	3	2	3.27	1470/1582	4.05	4.19	4.26	4.17	3.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	6	4	4	3.56	1356/1575	3.98	4.11	4.27	4.17	3.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	10	0	2	2	1	1	3.17	1190/1380	3.31	3.58	3.94	3.78	3.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	3	7	2	3.18	1312/1520	3.72	4.12	4.01	3.76	3.18	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	3	3	9	4.25	898/1515	4.16	4.43	4.24	3.97	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	3	4	1	9	3.94	1103/1511	4.13	4.43	4.27	4.00	3.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	1	0	7	4	3	3.53	722/ 994	3.21	3.95	3.94	3.73	3.53	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 265	3.00	4.00	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 278	4.00	4.50	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 260	3.67	4.33	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 259	3.83	4.42	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	4.17	4.58	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	4.00	4.38	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 101	3.80	4.49	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	3.40	4.14	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 99	3.50	4.34	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	3.50	4.21	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	3.60	4.54	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	3.20	4.17	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	3.75	4.38	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	3.60	4.09	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	3.40	3.98	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	3.40	3.97	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	3.75	4.25	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 50	3.60	4.53	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	3.00	4.00	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	2.75	2.75	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0501
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: LEOPOLD, KRISTI
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 764
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	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	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0601
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: SCALIA, BILL
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 765
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	3	3	5	3.69	1434/1674	3.79	4.01	4.27	4.07	3.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	3	4	3.69	1406/1674	3.87	4.08	4.23	4.16	3.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	929/1423	3.99	4.22	4.27	4.16	4.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	974/1609	4.11	4.24	4.22	4.05	4.15	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	5	5	3.85	966/1585	3.87	3.99	3.96	3.88	3.85	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	3	5	3.77	1140/1535	4.16	4.24	4.08	3.89	3.77	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	5	3	3	3.46	1459/1651	3.86	3.90	4.18	4.10	3.46	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1673	4.75	4.45	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	3	6	1	3.64	1313/1656	3.85	4.02	4.07	3.96	3.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	4	3	4	3.69	1433/1586	3.96	4.18	4.43	4.37	3.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	2	1	9	4.38	1322/1585	4.38	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	1129/1582	4.05	4.19	4.26	4.17	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	4	4	3.69	1318/1575	3.98	4.11	4.27	4.17	3.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	1	2	2	0	2	3.00	1217/1380	3.31	3.58	3.94	3.78	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	4	2	4	3.73	1051/1520	3.72	4.12	4.01	3.76	3.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	1	2	2	4	3.45	1322/1515	4.16	4.43	4.24	3.97	3.45	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	962/1511	4.13	4.43	4.27	4.00	4.18	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	7	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	944/ 994	3.21	3.95	3.94	3.73	2.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	3.00	4.00	4.23	3.97	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100H 0101
 Title
 Instructor: MCCARTHY, LUCIL
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 766
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	265/1674	4.79	4.01	4.27	4.07	4.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	237/1674	4.79	4.08	4.23	4.16	4.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1423	****	4.22	4.27	4.16	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	212/1609	4.77	4.24	4.22	4.05	4.77	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	530/1585	4.29	3.99	3.96	3.88	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	112/1535	4.86	4.24	4.08	3.89	4.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	966/1651	4.17	3.90	4.18	4.10	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	796/1673	4.86	4.45	4.69	4.67	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	214/1656	4.71	4.02	4.07	3.96	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	336/1586	4.83	4.18	4.43	4.37	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	510/1585	4.92	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	136/1582	4.92	4.19	4.26	4.17	4.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	495/1575	4.67	4.11	4.27	4.17	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	9	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1380	****	3.58	3.94	3.78	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	151/1520	4.88	4.12	4.01	3.76	4.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	384/1515	4.75	4.43	4.24	3.97	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	278/1511	4.88	4.43	4.27	4.00	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	83/ 994	4.88	3.95	3.94	3.73	4.88	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 100P 0101
 Title
 Instructor: SIMON, BARBARA
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 767
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	1056/1674	4.17	4.01	4.27	4.07	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	1090/1674	4.08	4.08	4.23	4.16	4.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	701/1609	4.36	4.24	4.22	4.05	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	2	3	3	3.17	1400/1585	3.17	3.99	3.96	3.88	3.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	3	6	4.00	870/1535	4.00	4.24	4.08	3.89	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	3	2	0	3	1	2.67	1604/1651	2.67	3.90	4.18	4.10	2.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	1300/1673	4.42	4.45	4.69	4.67	4.42	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	3	5	0	3.30	1455/1656	3.30	4.02	4.07	3.96	3.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	1260/1586	4.08	4.18	4.43	4.37	4.08	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	4	7	4.33	1354/1585	4.33	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	5	3	3	3.67	1348/1582	3.67	4.19	4.26	4.17	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	4	1	4	3	3.50	1367/1575	3.50	4.11	4.27	4.17	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	1	2	2	2	1	3.00	1217/1380	3.00	3.58	3.94	3.78	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	2	6	4.00	810/1520	4.00	4.12	4.01	3.76	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	1	0	9	4.45	694/1515	4.45	4.43	4.24	3.97	4.45	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	875/1511	4.27	4.43	4.27	4.00	4.27	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	628/ 994	3.78	3.95	3.94	3.73	3.78	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.38	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	51/ 101	4.67	4.49	4.48	4.18	4.67	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	38/ 95	4.67	4.14	4.31	3.99	4.67	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	59/ 99	4.33	4.34	4.39	4.10	4.33	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 97	****	4.21	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	32/ 76	4.55	4.54	3.98	3.32	4.55	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	2	0	1	3	5	3.82	43/ 77	3.82	4.17	3.93	3.42	3.82	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	2	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	33/ 53	4.38	4.38	4.45	4.34	4.38	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	17/ 48	4.56	4.09	4.12	4.00	4.56	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	34/ 49	4.00	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 61	****	3.97	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.25	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	4.53	4.44	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A 6	Required for Majors 0
28-55	1	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	Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Non-major 12
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 1	Other 11
#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					

Course-Section: ENGL 100Y 0101
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: MABE, MITZI J (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 768
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	5	9	5	2	3.09	1617/1674	3.45	4.01	4.27	4.07	3.09	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	6	8	1	3	2.68	1651/1674	3.36	4.08	4.23	4.16	2.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	19	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1423	3.39	4.22	4.27	4.16	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	7	4	6	3	3.14	1541/1609	3.63	4.24	4.22	4.05	3.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	3	6	5	2	2.81	1507/1585	3.06	3.99	3.96	3.88	2.81	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	4	4	8	3	3.29	1374/1535	3.66	4.24	4.08	3.89	3.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	6	5	5	3	0	2.26	1627/1651	3.02	3.90	4.18	4.10	2.26	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	706/1673	4.45	4.45	4.69	4.67	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	6	3	7	0	2.94	1564/1656	3.59	4.02	4.07	3.96	3.41	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	6	7	4	2	2.82	1558/1586	3.83	4.18	4.43	4.37	3.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	8	14	4.64	1106/1585	4.52	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.43	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	5	9	4	1	2.77	1546/1582	3.83	4.19	4.26	4.17	3.66	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	4	8	4	2	2.82	1526/1575	3.63	4.11	4.27	4.17	3.52	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	14	5	2	0	1	0	1.63	1373/1380	2.53	3.58	3.94	3.78	2.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	4	6	6	3	3.30	1266/1520	3.46	4.12	4.01	3.76	3.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	1	3	7	7	3.80	1180/1515	3.99	4.43	4.24	3.97	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	2	3	6	9	4.10	1018/1511	4.22	4.43	4.27	4.00	4.10	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	0	2	5	5	2	3.50	732/ 994	3.47	3.95	3.94	3.73	3.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	63/ 103	4.15	4.38	4.41	4.33	4.42	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	2	1	0	6	4	6	3.82	88/ 101	3.82	4.49	4.48	4.18	3.82	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	3	3	4	7	3.88	71/ 95	3.33	4.14	4.31	3.99	3.88	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	2	6	9	4.16	66/ 99	3.74	4.34	4.39	4.10	4.16	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	2	4	7	6	3.89	63/ 97	3.42	4.21	4.14	3.69	3.89	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	4.54	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	4.17	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.38	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	4.09	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	3.98	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	3.97	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.25	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.53	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	2.75	4.34	3.88	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	6	A	2	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	21
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			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	6	
?	1			

Course-Section: ENGL 100Y 0101
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: MABE, MITZI J (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 769
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	5	9	5	2	3.09	1617/1674	3.45	4.01	4.27	4.07	3.09	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	6	8	1	3	2.68	1651/1674	3.36	4.08	4.23	4.16	2.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	19	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1423	3.39	4.22	4.27	4.16	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	7	4	6	3	3.14	1541/1609	3.63	4.24	4.22	4.05	3.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	3	6	5	2	2.81	1507/1585	3.06	3.99	3.96	3.88	2.81	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	4	4	8	3	3.29	1374/1535	3.66	4.24	4.08	3.89	3.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	6	5	5	3	0	2.26	1627/1651	3.02	3.90	4.18	4.10	2.26	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	706/1673	4.45	4.45	4.69	4.67	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	1	5	10	0	3.41	1416/1656	3.59	4.02	4.07	3.96	3.41	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	2	2	5	10	4.05	1275/1586	3.83	4.18	4.43	4.37	3.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	2	1	7	9	4.05	1463/1585	4.52	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.43	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	3	7	7	3.85	1244/1582	3.83	4.19	4.26	4.17	3.66	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	6	4	7	3.65	1332/1575	3.63	4.11	4.27	4.17	3.52	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	1	1	5	3	1	3.18	1184/1380	2.53	3.58	3.94	3.78	2.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	4	6	6	3	3.30	1266/1520	3.46	4.12	4.01	3.76	3.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	1	3	7	7	3.80	1180/1515	3.99	4.43	4.24	3.97	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	2	3	6	9	4.10	1018/1511	4.22	4.43	4.27	4.00	4.10	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	0	2	5	5	2	3.50	732/ 994	3.47	3.95	3.94	3.73	3.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	63/ 103	4.15	4.38	4.41	4.33	4.42	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	2	1	0	6	4	6	3.82	88/ 101	3.82	4.49	4.48	4.18	3.82	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	3	3	4	7	3.88	71/ 95	3.33	4.14	4.31	3.99	3.88	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	2	6	9	4.16	66/ 99	3.74	4.34	4.39	4.10	4.16	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	2	4	7	6	3.89	63/ 97	3.42	4.21	4.14	3.69	3.89	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	4.54	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	4.17	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.38	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	4.09	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	3.98	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	3.97	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.25	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.53	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	2.75	4.34	3.88	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	6	A	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	13
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	1
			Required for Majors	14	Graduate
			General	0	Under-grad
			Electives	0	22
			Other	6	Non-major
					21
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

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	5	9	5	2	3.09	1617/1674	3.45	4.01	4.27	4.07	3.09	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	6	8	1	3	2.68	1651/1674	3.36	4.08	4.23	4.16	2.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	19	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1423	3.39	4.22	4.27	4.16	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	7	4	6	3	3.14	1541/1609	3.63	4.24	4.22	4.05	3.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	3	6	5	2	2.81	1507/1585	3.06	3.99	3.96	3.88	2.81	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	4	4	8	3	3.29	1374/1535	3.66	4.24	4.08	3.89	3.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	6	5	5	3	0	2.26	1627/1651	3.02	3.90	4.18	4.10	2.26	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	706/1673	4.45	4.45	4.69	4.67	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	3	13	1	3.88	1139/1656	3.59	4.02	4.07	3.96	3.41	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	3	3	13	4.40	1004/1586	3.83	4.18	4.43	4.37	3.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	1142/1585	4.52	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.43	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	9	9	4.35	829/1582	3.83	4.19	4.26	4.17	3.66	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	6	6	8	4.10	1100/1575	3.63	4.11	4.27	4.17	3.52	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	1	2	4	4	2	3.31	1142/1380	2.53	3.58	3.94	3.78	2.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	4	6	6	3	3.30	1266/1520	3.46	4.12	4.01	3.76	3.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	1	3	7	7	3.80	1180/1515	3.99	4.43	4.24	3.97	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	2	3	6	9	4.10	1018/1511	4.22	4.43	4.27	4.00	4.10	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	0	2	5	5	2	3.50	732/ 994	3.47	3.95	3.94	3.73	3.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	63/ 103	4.15	4.38	4.41	4.33	4.42	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	2	1	0	6	4	6	3.82	88/ 101	3.82	4.49	4.48	4.18	3.82	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	3	3	4	7	3.88	71/ 95	3.33	4.14	4.31	3.99	3.88	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	2	6	9	4.16	66/ 99	3.74	4.34	4.39	4.10	4.16	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	2	4	7	6	3.89	63/ 97	3.42	4.21	4.14	3.69	3.89	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	4.54	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	4.17	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.38	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	4.09	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	3.98	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	3.97	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.25	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.53	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	2.75	4.34	3.88	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	6	A	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	13
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0
				Required for Majors	14
				General	0
				Electives	0
				Graduate	0
				Under-grad	22
				Major	1
				Non-major	21
#### - Means there are not enough					

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	6	
?	1			

Course-Section: ENGL 100Y 0201
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: FINDLAY, JOANNE
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 771
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	9	7	4.10	1123/1674	3.45	4.01	4.27	4.07	4.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	15	4.57	495/1674	3.36	4.08	4.23	4.16	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1254/1423	3.39	4.22	4.27	4.16	3.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	9	9	4.30	786/1609	3.63	4.24	4.22	4.05	4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	10	4	3.71	1084/1585	3.06	3.99	3.96	3.88	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	454/1535	3.66	4.24	4.08	3.89	4.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	9	9	4.24	889/1651	3.02	3.90	4.18	4.10	4.24	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	2	13	5	0	3.15	1661/1673	4.45	4.45	4.69	4.67	3.15	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	8	9	4.53	366/1656	3.59	4.02	4.07	3.96	4.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	5	7	7	4.11	1250/1586	3.83	4.18	4.43	4.37	4.11	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	0	19	4.81	811/1585	4.52	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	7	8	4.21	978/1582	3.83	4.19	4.26	4.17	4.21	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	6	10	4.20	1010/1575	3.63	4.11	4.27	4.17	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	18	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1380	2.53	3.58	3.94	3.78	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	4	15	4.65	302/1520	3.46	4.12	4.01	3.76	4.65	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	266/1515	3.99	4.43	4.24	3.97	4.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	301/1511	4.22	4.43	4.27	4.00	4.85	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	9	1	0	4	3	2	3.50	732/ 994	3.47	3.95	3.94	3.73	3.50	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 278	****	4.50	4.19	3.97	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 103	4.15	4.38	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 101	3.82	4.49	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 95	3.33	4.14	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 99	3.74	4.34	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 97	3.42	4.21	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 76	****	4.54	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.17	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.38	4.45	4.34	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 61	****	3.97	4.09	3.87	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 50	****	4.53	4.44	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
			Required for Majors		12
			General		0
			Electives		0
			Other		6
				Graduate	0
				Under-grad	21
				Major	1
				Non-major	20
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course-Section: ENGL 100Y 0301
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: HICKERNELL, MAR
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 772
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	8	6	5	3.70	1429/1674	3.45	4.01	4.27	4.07	3.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	10	6	4	3.70	1401/1674	3.36	4.08	4.23	4.16	3.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	2	3	0	0	2.60	1408/1423	3.39	4.22	4.27	4.16	2.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	4	6	6	3.70	1355/1609	3.63	4.24	4.22	4.05	3.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	4	8	3	2	2.85	1499/1585	3.06	3.99	3.96	3.88	2.85	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	3	5	8	3.75	1147/1535	3.66	4.24	4.08	3.89	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	9	3	3	3.21	1534/1651	3.02	3.90	4.18	4.10	3.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	1	0	0	1	17	4.74	987/1673	4.45	4.45	4.69	4.67	4.74	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	0	5	7	1	3.50	1377/1656	3.59	4.02	4.07	3.96	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	7	6	4	3.50	1480/1586	3.83	4.18	4.43	4.37	3.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	1183/1585	4.52	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.55	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	9	6	5	3.80	1272/1582	3.83	4.19	4.26	4.17	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	8	5	5	3.60	1350/1575	3.63	4.11	4.27	4.17	3.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	11	4	0	2	2	0	2.25	1347/1380	2.53	3.58	3.94	3.78	2.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	2	5	0	1	2.78	1430/1520	3.46	4.12	4.01	3.76	2.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	5	4	0	3.44	1325/1515	3.99	4.43	4.24	3.97	3.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	1050/1511	4.22	4.43	4.27	4.00	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	773/ 994	3.47	3.95	3.94	3.73	3.43	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 103	4.15	4.38	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	3.82	4.49	4.48	4.18	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 99	3.74	4.34	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	3.42	4.21	4.14	3.69	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 100Y 0401
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: LEOPOLD, KRISTI
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 773
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	4	2	3.64	1464/1674	3.45	4.01	4.27	4.07	3.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	2	3.82	1333/1674	3.36	4.08	4.23	4.16	3.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	1016/1423	3.39	4.22	4.27	4.16	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	701/1609	3.63	4.24	4.22	4.05	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	6	2	2	3.36	1315/1585	3.06	3.99	3.96	3.88	3.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	4	3	3.91	1022/1535	3.66	4.24	4.08	3.89	3.91	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	4	3	3.91	1228/1651	3.02	3.90	4.18	4.10	3.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	1	4.09	1529/1673	4.45	4.45	4.69	4.67	4.09	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	7	3	0	3.30	1455/1656	3.59	4.02	4.07	3.96	3.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	1250/1586	3.83	4.18	4.43	4.37	4.10	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	1225/1585	4.52	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	1129/1582	3.83	4.19	4.26	4.17	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	5	1	3.40	1402/1575	3.63	4.11	4.27	4.17	3.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	2	3	0	2	0	2.29	1345/1380	2.53	3.58	3.94	3.78	2.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	4	2	3.45	1195/1520	3.46	4.12	4.01	3.76	3.45	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	881/1515	3.99	4.43	4.24	3.97	4.27	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	962/1511	4.22	4.43	4.27	4.00	4.18	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	2	3	1	2	3.38	795/ 994	3.47	3.95	3.94	3.73	3.38	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	1	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	95/ 103	4.15	4.38	4.41	4.33	3.33	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	2	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 101	3.82	4.49	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	1	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	95/ 95	3.33	4.14	4.31	3.99	1.67	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	99/ 99	3.74	4.34	4.39	4.10	2.50	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	2	0	2	0	0	2.00	94/ 97	3.42	4.21	4.14	3.69	2.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 76	****	4.54	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	4.17	3.93	3.42	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 61	****	3.97	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.25	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.53	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	2.75	4.34	3.88	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	2	A	3	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
84-150	0	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: ENGL 110 0101
 Title COMPOSITION ESL STUDEN
 Instructor: COLLINS, ELSA T
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 774
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	4	8	4.25	954/1674	4.09	4.01	4.27	4.07	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	7	8	4.38	776/1674	4.33	4.08	4.23	4.16	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	1	5	8	4.27	836/1423	3.93	4.22	4.27	4.16	4.27	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	4	9	4.25	852/1609	4.13	4.24	4.22	4.05	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	326/1585	4.21	3.99	3.96	3.88	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	538/1535	4.29	4.24	4.08	3.89	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	6	1	9	4.19	945/1651	3.99	3.90	4.18	4.10	4.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	760/1673	4.69	4.45	4.69	4.67	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	588/1656	4.18	4.02	4.07	3.96	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	663/1586	4.53	4.18	4.43	4.37	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	1142/1585	4.45	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	599/1582	4.46	4.19	4.26	4.17	4.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	742/1575	4.31	4.11	4.27	4.17	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	576/1380	4.12	3.58	3.94	3.78	4.15	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	726/1520	4.27	4.12	4.01	3.76	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	960/1515	4.27	4.43	4.24	3.97	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	642/1511	4.44	4.43	4.27	4.00	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	474/ 994	4.14	3.95	3.94	3.73	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 265	****	4.00	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 278	****	4.50	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 260	****	4.33	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 259	****	4.42	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.58	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 103	****	4.38	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 101	****	4.49	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 95	****	4.14	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 99	****	4.34	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.21	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.54	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.17	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.38	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.09	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.98	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	3.97	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.25	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.53	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	2.75	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 110 0101
 Title COMPOSITION ESL STUDEN
 Instructor: COLLINS, ELSA T
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 774
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	1	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: ENGL 110 0201
 Title COMPOSITION ESL STUDEN
 Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 775
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	2	6	3.93	1296/1674	4.09	4.01	4.27	4.07	3.93	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	894/1674	4.33	4.08	4.23	4.16	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	2	3	2	3	3.60	1249/1423	3.93	4.22	4.27	4.16	3.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	6	5	4.00	1094/1609	4.13	4.24	4.22	4.05	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	2	4	5	3.92	879/1585	4.21	3.99	3.96	3.88	3.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	715/1535	4.29	4.24	4.08	3.89	4.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	1	2	7	3.79	1303/1651	3.99	3.90	4.18	4.10	3.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	1203/1673	4.69	4.45	4.69	4.67	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	955/1656	4.18	4.02	4.07	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	1024/1586	4.53	4.18	4.43	4.37	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	1374/1585	4.45	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.31	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	798/1582	4.46	4.19	4.26	4.17	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	3	7	4.15	1050/1575	4.31	4.11	4.27	4.17	4.15	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	1	0	4	6	4.08	630/1380	4.12	3.58	3.94	3.78	4.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	537/1520	4.27	4.12	4.01	3.76	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	788/1515	4.27	4.43	4.24	3.97	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	779/1511	4.44	4.43	4.27	4.00	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	346/ 994	4.14	3.95	3.94	3.73	4.29	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.50	4.19	3.97	****	
Seminar															
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.14	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.34	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.21	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.54	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	4.17	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.38	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.09	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.98	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	3.97	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.25	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.53	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	2.75	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 110 0201
 Title COMPOSITION ESL STUDEN
 Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 775
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 210 0101
 Title INTRODUCTION TO LIT
 Instructor: FITZPATRICK, VI
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 776
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	9	17	4.59	497/1674	4.53	4.01	4.27	4.32	4.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	10	16	4.56	519/1674	4.55	4.08	4.23	4.26	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	21	4.74	274/1423	4.73	4.22	4.27	4.36	4.74	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	9	13	4.46	567/1609	4.51	4.24	4.22	4.23	4.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	8	17	4.56	295/1585	4.63	3.99	3.96	3.91	4.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	12	11	4.22	703/1535	4.27	4.24	4.08	4.03	4.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	20	4.67	330/1651	4.70	3.90	4.18	4.20	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	283/1673	4.69	4.45	4.69	4.67	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	13	8	4.38	548/1656	4.39	4.02	4.07	4.10	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	6	20	4.77	474/1586	4.82	4.18	4.43	4.48	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	227/1585	4.94	4.68	4.69	4.76	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	7	18	4.65	452/1582	4.65	4.19	4.26	4.35	4.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	7	19	4.73	391/1575	4.72	4.11	4.27	4.39	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	0	2	6	6	5	3.74	916/1380	3.82	3.58	3.94	4.03	3.74	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	397/1520	4.67	4.12	4.01	4.03	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	483/1515	4.52	4.43	4.24	4.28	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	289/1511	4.91	4.43	4.27	4.28	4.87	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	11	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 994	****	3.95	3.94	3.98	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 1	A 7	Required for Majors	5
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 13		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 2	General	27
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		Non-major 27
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENGL 210 0201
 Title INTRODUCTION TO LIT
 Instructor: KENDALL, GEORGE
 Enrollment: 49
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 777
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	5	11	23	4.46	671/1674	4.53	4.01	4.27	4.32	4.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	9	26	4.54	542/1674	4.55	4.08	4.23	4.26	4.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	0	0	9	24	4.73	298/1423	4.73	4.22	4.27	4.36	4.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	3	0	1	4	4	26	4.57	408/1609	4.51	4.24	4.22	4.23	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	4	3	31	4.71	191/1585	4.63	3.99	3.96	3.91	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	6	7	23	4.32	598/1535	4.27	4.24	4.08	4.03	4.32	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	0	7	30	4.74	254/1651	4.70	3.90	4.18	4.20	4.74	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	22	16	4.42	1289/1673	4.69	4.45	4.69	4.67	4.42	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	1	16	13	4.40	522/1656	4.39	4.02	4.07	4.10	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	5	32	4.86	284/1586	4.82	4.18	4.43	4.48	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	3	34	4.92	510/1585	4.94	4.68	4.69	4.76	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	1	8	27	4.65	467/1582	4.65	4.19	4.26	4.35	4.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	7	28	4.70	440/1575	4.72	4.11	4.27	4.39	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	14	1	3	3	5	10	3.91	796/1380	3.82	3.58	3.94	4.03	3.91	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	168/1520	4.67	4.12	4.01	4.03	4.84	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	1	1	1	3	13	4.37	798/1515	4.52	4.43	4.24	4.28	4.37	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	146/1511	4.91	4.43	4.27	4.28	4.95	
4. Were special techniques successful	23	10	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	****/ 994	****	3.95	3.94	3.98	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 21	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		
56-83	9	2.00-2.99 2	C 1	General 2	Under-grad 41 Non-major 41
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 12	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 22	
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENGL 226 0101
 Title ENGLISH GRAMMAR USAGE
 Instructor: FITZPATRICK, CA
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 778
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	3	4	5	15	3.97	1246/1674	3.97	4.01	4.27	4.32	3.97	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	6	8	12	3.93	1233/1674	3.93	4.08	4.23	4.26	3.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	6	5	17	4.31	792/1423	4.31	4.22	4.27	4.36	4.31	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	8	5	6	8	3.34	1497/1609	3.34	4.24	4.22	4.23	3.34	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	3	4	9	8	3.50	1223/1585	3.50	3.99	3.96	3.91	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	6	6	7	4	5	2.86	1478/1535	2.86	4.24	4.08	4.03	2.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	3	10	13	4.18	956/1651	4.18	3.90	4.18	4.20	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	283/1673	4.97	4.45	4.69	4.67	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	7	14	5	3.81	1192/1656	3.81	4.02	4.07	4.10	3.81	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	4	5	17	4.32	1084/1586	4.32	4.18	4.43	4.48	4.32	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	7	20	4.68	1059/1585	4.68	4.68	4.69	4.76	4.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	7	12	8	3.96	1164/1582	3.96	4.19	4.26	4.35	3.96	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	4	1	6	16	4.26	958/1575	4.26	4.11	4.27	4.39	4.26	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	18	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	887/1380	3.78	3.58	3.94	4.03	3.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	3	2	3	6	7	3.57	1141/1520	3.57	4.12	4.01	4.03	3.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	5	2	3	10	3.76	1203/1515	3.76	4.43	4.24	4.28	3.76	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	4	4	3	5	5	3.14	1396/1511	3.14	4.43	4.27	4.28	3.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	14	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	****/ 994	****	3.95	3.94	3.98	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0 Major 12
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 6	C 11	General 6	Under-grad 30 Non-major 18
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 4	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 14	
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENGL 241 0101
 Title CURRENTS IN BRITISH LI
 Instructor: QUINN, CAROL (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 779
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	6	8	4.24	979/1674	4.24	4.01	4.27	4.32	4.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	6	6	4.00	1146/1674	4.00	4.08	4.23	4.26	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1423	****	4.22	4.27	4.36	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	5	9	4.24	879/1609	4.24	4.24	4.22	4.23	4.24	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	101/1585	4.88	3.99	3.96	3.91	4.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	747/1535	4.19	4.24	4.08	4.03	4.19	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	3	2	10	4.06	1064/1651	4.06	3.90	4.18	4.20	4.06	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	14	2	4.13	1511/1673	4.13	4.45	4.69	4.67	4.13	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	575/1656	4.27	4.02	4.07	4.10	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	858/1586	4.50	4.18	4.43	4.48	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	737/1585	4.83	4.68	4.69	4.76	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	525/1582	4.60	4.19	4.26	4.35	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	279/1575	4.80	4.11	4.27	4.39	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	5	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1380	****	3.58	3.94	4.03	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	221/1520	4.76	4.12	4.01	4.03	4.76	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	301/1515	4.82	4.43	4.24	4.28	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	402/1511	4.76	4.43	4.27	4.28	4.76	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	1	4	5	4	3.86	591/ 994	3.86	3.95	3.94	3.98	3.86	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 278	****	4.50	4.19	4.36	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	4.54	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 77	****	4.17	3.93	4.20	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 61	****	3.97	4.09	4.23	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	6	Under-grad	17	Non-major	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 241 0101
 Title CURRENTS IN BRITISH LI
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 780
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	6	8	4.24	979/1674	4.24	4.01	4.27	4.32	4.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	6	6	4.00	1146/1674	4.00	4.08	4.23	4.26	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1423	****	4.22	4.27	4.36	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	5	9	4.24	879/1609	4.24	4.24	4.22	4.23	4.24	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	101/1585	4.88	3.99	3.96	3.91	4.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	747/1535	4.19	4.24	4.08	4.03	4.19	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	3	2	10	4.06	1064/1651	4.06	3.90	4.18	4.20	4.06	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	14	2	4.13	1511/1673	4.13	4.45	4.69	4.67	4.13	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	827/1656	4.27	4.02	4.07	4.10	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1586	4.50	4.18	4.43	4.48	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1585	4.83	4.68	4.69	4.76	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1582	4.60	4.19	4.26	4.35	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1575	4.80	4.11	4.27	4.39	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1380	****	3.58	3.94	4.03	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	221/1520	4.76	4.12	4.01	4.03	4.76	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	301/1515	4.82	4.43	4.24	4.28	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	402/1511	4.76	4.43	4.27	4.28	4.76	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	1	4	5	4	3.86	591/ 994	3.86	3.95	3.94	3.98	3.86	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 278	****	4.50	4.19	4.36	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	4.54	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 77	****	4.17	3.93	4.20	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 61	****	3.97	4.09	4.23	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 6
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 8	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 2	General 6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D 0	Under-grad 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Non-major 14
				P 0	
				I 0	Electives 2
				? 1	Other 6
					#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENGL 243A 0101
 Title COMIC BOOK LITERATURE
 Instructor: BLUMBERG, ARNOL
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 781
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	2	5	12	19	4.02	1179/1674	4.02	4.01	4.27	4.32	4.02	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	8	15	15	4.02	1132/1674	4.02	4.08	4.23	4.26	4.02	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	1	1	3	8	15	4.25	845/1423	4.25	4.22	4.27	4.36	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	3	2	5	12	16	3.95	1172/1609	3.95	4.24	4.22	4.23	3.95	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	6	30	4.57	283/1585	4.57	3.99	3.96	3.91	4.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	3	0	9	12	14	3.89	1030/1535	3.89	4.24	4.08	4.03	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	7	11	20	4.20	934/1651	4.20	3.90	4.18	4.20	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	4	25	11	1	3.22	1660/1673	3.22	4.45	4.69	4.67	3.22	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	0	7	19	8	4.03	942/1656	4.03	4.02	4.07	4.10	4.03	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	6	13	20	4.30	1104/1586	4.30	4.18	4.43	4.48	4.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	4	34	4.80	811/1585	4.80	4.68	4.69	4.76	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	17	20	4.43	748/1582	4.43	4.19	4.26	4.35	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	3	3	6	25	4.18	1030/1575	4.18	4.11	4.27	4.39	4.18	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	31	2	2	1	2	2	3.00	****/1380	****	3.58	3.94	4.03	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	3	2	2	6	15	4.00	810/1520	4.00	4.12	4.01	4.03	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	4	8	16	4.43	733/1515	4.43	4.43	4.24	4.28	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	3	6	19	4.57	586/1511	4.57	4.43	4.27	4.28	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	22	2	1	1	0	1	2.40	****/ 994	****	3.95	3.94	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	2	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 265	****	4.00	4.23	4.34	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	38	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 278	****	4.50	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	38	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 260	****	4.33	4.46	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	38	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 259	****	4.42	4.33	4.42	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	38	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 233	****	4.58	4.20	4.48	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 103	****	4.38	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	38	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 101	****	4.49	4.48	4.45	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	38	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 95	****	4.14	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	38	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 99	****	4.34	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 97	****	4.21	4.14	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	4.54	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	39	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	4.17	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	39	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.38	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	39	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 48	****	4.09	4.12	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	38	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 49	****	3.98	4.27	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	3.97	4.09	4.23	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	4.25	4.26	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.53	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.36	4.63	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 31	****	2.75	4.34	4.50	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 243A 0101
 Title COMIC BOOK LITERATURE
 Instructor: BLUMBERG, ARNOL
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 781
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	21	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	18	Under-grad	41	Non-major	34
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	14	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	2	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ENGL 243B 0101
 Title NATIVE AMER LITERATURE
 Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 782
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	7	12	6	3.88	1334/1674	3.88	4.01	4.27	4.32	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	7	12	6	3.88	1284/1674	3.88	4.08	4.23	4.26	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	0	4	14	5	4.04	992/1423	4.04	4.22	4.27	4.36	4.04	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	6	10	8	4.00	1094/1609	4.00	4.24	4.22	4.23	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	9	17	4.65	231/1585	4.65	3.99	3.96	3.91	4.65	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	6	7	11	4.04	857/1535	4.04	4.24	4.08	4.03	4.04	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	3	6	11	6	3.77	1317/1651	3.77	3.90	4.18	4.20	3.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	24	1	3.96	1589/1673	3.96	4.45	4.69	4.67	3.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	1	8	7	2	3.56	1353/1656	3.56	4.02	4.07	4.10	3.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	5	10	9	4.17	1211/1586	4.17	4.18	4.43	4.48	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	7	17	4.71	1024/1585	4.71	4.68	4.69	4.76	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	4	10	10	4.25	935/1582	4.25	4.19	4.26	4.35	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	6	6	10	3.92	1208/1575	3.92	4.11	4.27	4.39	3.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	1	5	7	8	4.05	648/1380	4.05	3.58	3.94	4.03	4.05	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	2	6	11	4.35	555/1520	4.35	4.12	4.01	4.03	4.35	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	759/1515	4.40	4.43	4.24	4.28	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	3	7	10	4.35	798/1511	4.35	4.43	4.27	4.28	4.35	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	1	1	3	11	3	3.74	647/ 994	3.74	3.95	3.94	3.98	3.74	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	****	4.00	4.23	4.34	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 278	****	4.50	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 260	****	4.33	4.46	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 259	****	4.42	4.33	4.42	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.58	4.20	4.48	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 103	****	4.38	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 101	****	4.49	4.48	4.45	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 95	****	4.14	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 99	****	4.34	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	4.21	4.14	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	4.54	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 77	****	4.17	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	4.38	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	4.09	4.12	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 49	****	3.98	4.27	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	3.97	4.09	4.23	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	4.25	4.26	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 50	****	4.53	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.36	4.63	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	2.75	4.34	4.50	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 243B 0101
 Title NATIVE AMER LITERATURE
 Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 782
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	5	Under-grad	28	Non-major	23
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 250 0101
 Title INTRO TO SHAKESPEARE
 Instructor: FARABAUGH, ROBI
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 783
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	582/1674	4.52	4.01	4.27	4.32	4.52	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	4	15	4.52	554/1674	4.52	4.08	4.23	4.26	4.52	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	5	13	4.33	771/1423	4.33	4.22	4.27	4.36	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	5	12	4.35	715/1609	4.35	4.24	4.22	4.23	4.35	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	86/1585	4.90	3.99	3.96	3.91	4.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	7	11	4.38	528/1535	4.38	4.24	4.08	4.03	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	4	12	4.35	741/1651	4.35	3.90	4.18	4.20	4.35	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	887/1673	4.81	4.45	4.69	4.67	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	2	8	9	4.37	575/1656	4.37	4.02	4.07	4.10	4.37	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	581/1586	4.71	4.18	4.43	4.48	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	340/1585	4.95	4.68	4.69	4.76	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	510/1582	4.62	4.19	4.26	4.35	4.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	495/1575	4.67	4.11	4.27	4.39	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	1	6	5	4	3.59	1005/1380	3.59	3.58	3.94	4.03	3.59	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	330/1520	4.61	4.12	4.01	4.03	4.61	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	289/1515	4.83	4.43	4.24	4.28	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	323/1511	4.83	4.43	4.27	4.28	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	197/ 994	4.53	3.95	3.94	3.98	4.53	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 265	****	4.00	4.23	4.34	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 278	****	4.50	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 260	****	4.33	4.46	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.42	4.33	4.42	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.58	4.20	4.48	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 103	****	4.38	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 101	****	4.49	4.48	4.45	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 95	****	4.14	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.34	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.21	4.14	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 76	****	4.54	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.17	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.38	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.09	4.12	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.98	4.27	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 61	****	3.97	4.09	4.23	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.25	4.26	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.53	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.36	4.63	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	2.75	4.34	4.50	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 250 0101
 Title INTRO TO SHAKESPEARE
 Instructor: FARABAUGH, ROBI
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 783
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	7
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 271 0101
 Title INTRO CREAT WRTG-FICTI
 Instructor: Oliver, Laura
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 784
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	9	7	4.22	991/1674	4.22	4.01	4.27	4.32	4.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	10	8	4.32	856/1674	4.32	4.08	4.23	4.26	4.32	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	397/1609	4.59	4.24	4.22	4.23	4.59	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	244/1585	4.63	3.99	3.96	3.91	4.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	238/1535	4.67	4.24	4.08	4.03	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	1	4	4	2	6	3.47	1454/1651	3.47	3.90	4.18	4.20	3.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	5	4.26	1412/1673	4.26	4.45	4.69	4.67	4.26	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	9	3	3.94	1073/1656	3.94	4.02	4.07	4.10	3.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	0	6	9	4.38	1034/1586	4.38	4.18	4.43	4.48	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	640/1585	4.88	4.68	4.69	4.76	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	808/1582	4.38	4.19	4.26	4.35	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	2	5	8	4.19	1020/1575	4.19	4.11	4.27	4.39	4.19	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	13	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1380	****	3.58	3.94	4.03	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	5	7	4.31	598/1520	4.31	4.12	4.01	4.03	4.31	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	1	1	10	4.46	681/1515	4.46	4.43	4.24	4.28	4.46	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	0	4	8	4.38	769/1511	4.38	4.43	4.27	4.28	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	9	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	****/ 994	****	3.95	3.94	3.98	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.34	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 97	****	4.21	4.14	4.63	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 12	Required for Majors	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	6
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENGL 273 0101
 Title INT CREATIVE WTG-POETR
 Instructor: FALLON, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 785
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	8	7	4.22	991/1674	4.22	4.01	4.27	4.32	4.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	6	10	4.33	830/1674	4.33	4.08	4.23	4.26	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	1	0	2	0	6	4.11	950/1423	4.11	4.22	4.27	4.36	4.11	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	852/1609	4.25	4.24	4.22	4.23	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	521/1585	4.29	3.99	3.96	3.91	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	208/1535	4.71	4.24	4.08	4.03	4.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	0	2	2	2	8	4.14	988/1651	4.14	3.90	4.18	4.20	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.45	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	3	9	5	4.12	882/1656	4.12	4.02	4.07	4.10	4.12	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	5	11	4.44	945/1586	4.44	4.18	4.43	4.48	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	340/1585	4.94	4.68	4.69	4.76	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	7	10	4.39	798/1582	4.39	4.19	4.26	4.35	4.39	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	0	5	10	4.11	1090/1575	4.11	4.11	4.27	4.39	4.11	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	13	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	540/1380	4.20	3.58	3.94	4.03	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	1	4	8	4.00	810/1520	4.00	4.12	4.01	4.03	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	2	2	11	4.44	720/1515	4.44	4.43	4.24	4.28	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	1	2	12	4.56	594/1511	4.56	4.43	4.27	4.28	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	9	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	346/ 994	4.29	3.95	3.94	3.98	4.29	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	5
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENGL 281P 0101
 Title
 Instructor: SIMON, BARBARA
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 786
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	607/1674	4.50	4.01	4.27	4.32	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1146/1674	4.00	4.08	4.23	4.26	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	852/1609	4.25	4.24	4.22	4.23	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	769/1585	4.00	3.99	3.96	3.91	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	667/1535	4.25	4.24	4.08	4.03	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	1599/1651	2.75	3.90	4.18	4.20	2.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1203/1673	4.50	4.45	4.69	4.67	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1237/1656	3.75	4.02	4.07	4.10	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	496/1586	4.75	4.18	4.43	4.48	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1225/1585	4.50	4.68	4.69	4.76	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1129/1582	4.00	4.19	4.26	4.35	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	958/1575	4.25	4.11	4.27	4.39	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1036/1380	3.50	3.58	3.94	4.03	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.12	4.01	4.03	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.43	4.24	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	642/1511	4.50	4.43	4.27	4.28	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	474/ 994	4.00	3.95	3.94	3.98	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	74/ 103	4.00	4.38	4.41	4.07	4.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	72/ 101	4.00	4.49	4.48	4.45	4.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	89/ 95	3.00	4.14	4.31	4.33	3.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	70/ 99	4.00	4.34	4.39	4.22	4.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	4.21	4.14	4.63	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	33/ 76	4.50	4.54	3.98	3.97	4.50	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	20/ 77	4.75	4.17	3.93	4.20	4.75	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	29/ 53	4.50	4.38	4.45	4.50	4.50	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	24/ 48	4.25	4.09	4.12	4.50	4.25	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	21/ 49	4.75	3.98	4.27	4.82	4.75	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	29/ 61	4.00	3.97	4.09	4.23	4.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	29/ 52	4.00	4.25	4.26	4.53	4.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 50	5.00	4.53	4.44	4.42	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 291 0101
 Title INTRO WRTG CREAT ESSAY
 Instructor: SIMON, BARBARA
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 787
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	582/1674	4.04	4.01	4.27	4.32	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	625/1674	4.20	4.08	4.23	4.26	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1423	****	4.22	4.27	4.36	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	490/1609	4.30	4.24	4.22	4.23	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	6	6	3	3.69	1107/1585	3.71	3.99	3.96	3.91	3.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	253/1535	4.52	4.24	4.08	4.03	4.65	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	6	7	4.18	956/1651	4.13	3.90	4.18	4.20	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	3	8	5	4.13	1511/1673	3.79	4.45	4.69	4.67	4.13	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	1	9	4	4.00	955/1656	3.99	4.02	4.07	4.10	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	1211/1586	3.94	4.18	4.43	4.48	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1585	4.90	4.68	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	850/1582	3.98	4.19	4.26	4.35	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	958/1575	3.68	4.11	4.27	4.39	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	11	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1380	****	3.58	3.94	4.03	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	355/1520	3.93	4.12	4.01	4.03	4.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1515	4.43	4.43	4.24	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	642/1511	4.49	4.43	4.27	4.28	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	193/ 994	4.22	3.95	3.94	3.98	4.54	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	3
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	3
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 291 0201
 Title INTRO WRTG CREAT ESSAY
 Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 788
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	768/1674	4.04	4.01	4.27	4.32	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	673/1674	4.20	4.08	4.23	4.26	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	18	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1423	****	4.22	4.27	4.36	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	432/1609	4.30	4.24	4.22	4.23	4.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	7	9	4.20	612/1585	3.71	3.99	3.96	3.91	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	245/1535	4.52	4.24	4.08	4.03	4.65	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	10	7	4.15	977/1651	4.13	3.90	4.18	4.20	4.15	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	15	5	4.25	1420/1673	3.79	4.45	4.69	4.67	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	561/1656	3.99	4.02	4.07	4.10	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	5	10	4.33	1074/1586	3.94	4.18	4.43	4.48	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	340/1585	4.90	4.68	4.69	4.76	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	2	12	4.44	719/1582	3.98	4.19	4.26	4.35	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	6	5	7	4.06	1119/1575	3.68	4.11	4.27	4.39	4.06	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	16	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1380	****	3.58	3.94	4.03	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	3	1	6	4.00	810/1520	3.93	4.12	4.01	4.03	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	513/1515	4.43	4.43	4.24	4.28	4.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	610/1511	4.49	4.43	4.27	4.28	4.55	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	2	2	2	5	3.91	568/ 994	4.22	3.95	3.94	3.98	3.91	

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	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	1	Other	14				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 291 0301
 Title INTRO WRTG CREAT ESSAY
 Instructor: MCGURRIN JR, AN
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 789
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	8	3	2	3.19	1599/1674	4.04	4.01	4.27	4.32	3.19	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	6	4	3.69	1411/1674	4.20	4.08	4.23	4.26	3.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	3	7	3	3.86	1254/1609	4.30	4.24	4.22	4.23	3.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	8	2	3	3.25	1364/1585	3.71	3.99	3.96	3.91	3.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	655/1535	4.52	4.24	4.08	4.03	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	4	8	4.06	1057/1651	4.13	3.90	4.18	4.20	4.06	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	3	10	3	0	3.00	1663/1673	3.79	4.45	4.69	4.67	3.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	3	8	0	3.58	1339/1656	3.99	4.02	4.07	4.10	3.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	2	4	2	3	3.33	1510/1586	3.94	4.18	4.43	4.48	3.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	896/1585	4.90	4.68	4.69	4.76	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	2	6	2	2	3.15	1487/1582	3.98	4.19	4.26	4.35	3.15	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	2	4	2	1	2	2.73	1534/1575	3.68	4.11	4.27	4.39	2.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	12	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1380	****	3.58	3.94	4.03	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	5	4	2	3.21	1299/1520	3.93	4.12	4.01	4.03	3.21	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	2	3	3	5	3.64	1260/1515	4.43	4.43	4.24	4.28	3.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	729/1511	4.49	4.43	4.27	4.28	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	11	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 994	4.22	3.95	3.94	3.98	****	
Field Work															
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	4.09	4.12	4.50	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	12
84-150	2	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	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 291H 0101
 Title
 Instructor: SIMON, BARBARA
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 790
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1196/1674	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.32	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1370/1674	3.75	4.08	4.23	4.26	3.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1320/1609	3.75	4.24	4.22	4.23	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	769/1585	4.00	3.99	3.96	3.91	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.24	4.08	4.03	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1442/1651	3.50	3.90	4.18	4.20	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1640/1673	3.75	4.45	4.69	4.67	3.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1377/1656	3.50	4.02	4.07	4.10	3.50	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1510/1586	3.33	4.18	4.43	4.48	3.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1129/1582	4.00	4.19	4.26	4.35	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	495/1575	4.67	4.11	4.27	4.39	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	666/1380	4.00	3.58	3.94	4.03	4.00	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	229/1520	4.75	4.12	4.01	4.03	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1024/1515	4.00	4.43	4.24	4.28	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1221/1511	3.75	4.43	4.27	4.28	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	360/ 994	4.25	3.95	3.94	3.98	4.25	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 301 0101
 Title ANALYSIS LITERARY LANG
 Instructor: Smith, Orianne
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 791
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	406/1674	4.58	4.01	4.27	4.26	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	259/1674	4.68	4.08	4.23	4.21	4.76	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	16	4.62	445/1423	4.63	4.22	4.27	4.27	4.62	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	173/1609	4.76	4.24	4.22	4.27	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	111/1585	4.76	3.99	3.96	3.95	4.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	238/1535	4.58	4.24	4.08	4.15	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	4	15	4.57	432/1651	4.29	3.90	4.18	4.16	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	1072/1673	4.84	4.45	4.69	4.68	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	239/1656	4.53	4.02	4.07	4.07	4.68	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	301/1586	4.81	4.18	4.43	4.42	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	340/1585	4.94	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	152/1582	4.87	4.19	4.26	4.26	4.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	171/1575	4.76	4.11	4.27	4.25	4.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	13	1	1	1	0	4	3.71	930/1380	3.86	3.58	3.94	4.01	3.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	162/1520	4.70	4.12	4.01	4.09	4.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	266/1515	4.79	4.43	4.24	4.32	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	525/1511	4.67	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	7	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	827/ 994	3.79	3.95	3.94	3.96	3.29	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 278	****	4.50	4.19	4.24	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	4.54	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 77	****	4.17	3.93	3.70	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 61	****	3.97	4.09	3.20	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 16
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 12	
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C 1	General 2 Under-grad 21 Non-major 5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	
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 16
				? 0	

Course-Section: ENGL 301 0201
 Title ANALYSIS LITERARY LANG
 Instructor: WIEST, AIMEE
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 792
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	432/1674	4.58	4.01	4.27	4.26	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	237/1674	4.68	4.08	4.23	4.21	4.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	181/1423	4.63	4.22	4.27	4.27	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	152/1609	4.76	4.24	4.22	4.27	4.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	111/1585	4.76	3.99	3.96	3.95	4.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	146/1535	4.58	4.24	4.08	4.15	4.79	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	3	7	4.07	1050/1651	4.29	3.90	4.18	4.16	4.07	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	796/1673	4.84	4.45	4.69	4.68	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	230/1656	4.53	4.02	4.07	4.07	4.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	474/1586	4.81	4.18	4.43	4.42	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	453/1585	4.94	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	208/1582	4.87	4.19	4.26	4.26	4.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	565/1575	4.76	4.11	4.27	4.25	4.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	2	6	4	4.00	666/1380	3.86	3.58	3.94	4.01	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1520	4.70	4.12	4.01	4.09	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1515	4.79	4.43	4.24	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	195/1511	4.67	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	148/ 994	3.79	3.95	3.94	3.96	4.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.38	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.49	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.14	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.34	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.21	4.14	3.48	****	

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	2	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 301 0301
 Title ANALYSIS LITERARY LANG
 Instructor: Fernandez, Jean
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 793
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	5	10	4.44	719/1674	4.58	4.01	4.27	4.26	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	578/1674	4.68	4.08	4.23	4.21	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	0	4	9	4.43	672/1423	4.63	4.22	4.27	4.27	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	353/1609	4.76	4.24	4.22	4.27	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	0	11	4.57	283/1585	4.76	3.99	3.96	3.95	4.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	631/1535	4.58	4.24	4.08	4.15	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	889/1651	4.29	3.90	4.18	4.16	4.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1673	4.84	4.45	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	1	5	7	4.21	770/1656	4.53	4.02	4.07	4.07	4.21	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1586	4.81	4.18	4.43	4.42	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1585	4.94	4.68	4.69	4.66	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1582	4.87	4.19	4.26	4.26	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1575	4.76	4.11	4.27	4.25	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	4	9	4.25	645/1520	4.70	4.12	4.01	4.09	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	629/1515	4.79	4.43	4.24	4.32	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	718/1511	4.67	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	3	5	3	3	3.43	773/ 994	3.79	3.95	3.94	3.96	3.43	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 303 0101
 Title ART OF THE ESSAY
 Instructor: FALLON, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 794
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	804/1674	4.38	4.01	4.27	4.26	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	689/1674	4.44	4.08	4.23	4.21	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.22	4.27	4.27	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	192/1609	4.79	4.24	4.22	4.27	4.79	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	5	8	4.19	622/1585	4.19	3.99	3.96	3.95	4.19	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	12	4.56	319/1535	4.56	4.24	4.08	4.15	4.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	5	9	4.25	866/1651	4.25	3.90	4.18	4.16	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	760/1673	4.88	4.45	4.69	4.68	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	451/1656	4.45	4.02	4.07	4.07	4.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	0	4	9	4.43	974/1586	4.43	4.18	4.43	4.42	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	689/1585	4.86	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	557/1582	4.57	4.19	4.26	4.26	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	5	3	6	4.07	1111/1575	4.07	4.11	4.27	4.25	4.07	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	114/1380	4.80	3.58	3.94	4.01	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	1	10	4.58	349/1520	4.58	4.12	4.01	4.09	4.58	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	0	0	11	4.67	483/1515	4.67	4.43	4.24	4.32	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	507/1511	4.67	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	1	0	0	10	4.73	127/ 994	4.73	3.95	3.94	3.96	4.73	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.00	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 278	****	4.50	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.33	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.42	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.58	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.38	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.49	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.14	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.34	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.21	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 76	****	4.54	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 77	****	4.17	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.38	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.09	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.98	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 61	****	3.97	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	4.25	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.53	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	2.75	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 303 0101
 Title ART OF THE ESSAY
 Instructor: FALLON, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 794
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	16	Non-major	3
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	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	12				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 304 0101
 Title BRIT LIT:MEDIEVAL/RENA
 Instructor: FALCO, RAPHAEL
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 795
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	20	4.69	367/1674	4.69	4.01	4.27	4.26	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	7	14	4.31	870/1674	4.31	4.08	4.23	4.21	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	18	4.54	540/1423	4.54	4.22	4.27	4.27	4.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	262/1609	4.72	4.24	4.22	4.27	4.72	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	23	4.88	96/1585	4.88	3.99	3.96	3.95	4.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	3	4	16	4.46	440/1535	4.46	4.24	4.08	4.15	4.46	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	8	15	4.58	419/1651	4.58	3.90	4.18	4.16	4.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	11	13	4.54	1175/1673	4.54	4.45	4.69	4.68	4.54	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	11	11	4.50	381/1656	4.50	4.02	4.07	4.07	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	4	18	4.60	753/1586	4.60	4.18	4.43	4.42	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	227/1585	4.96	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	5	16	4.50	632/1582	4.50	4.19	4.26	4.26	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	3	19	4.67	495/1575	4.67	4.11	4.27	4.25	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	4	3	16	4.52	385/1520	4.52	4.12	4.01	4.09	4.52	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	2	0	6	15	4.48	668/1515	4.48	4.43	4.24	4.32	4.48	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	3	3	17	4.61	563/1511	4.61	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.61	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	22	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	****	3.95	3.94	3.96	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 13		Graduate 0
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	3
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 26
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 1	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	22
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 305 0101
 Title BRIT LIT: NEOCLASS-ROM
 Instructor: SMITH, ORIANNE
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 796
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	3	7	15	4.21	1004/1674	4.21	4.01	4.27	4.26	4.21	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	9	13	4.18	1018/1674	4.18	4.08	4.23	4.21	4.18	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	2	4	3	10	4.11	957/1423	4.11	4.22	4.27	4.27	4.11	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	2	5	18	4.44	583/1609	4.44	4.24	4.22	4.27	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	20	4.61	265/1585	4.61	3.99	3.96	3.95	4.61	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	5	18	4.39	518/1535	4.39	4.24	4.08	4.15	4.39	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	4	20	4.46	583/1651	4.46	3.90	4.18	4.16	4.46	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	20	4.71	1015/1673	4.71	4.45	4.69	4.68	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	5	12	7	3.96	1022/1656	3.96	4.02	4.07	4.07	3.96	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	4	4	17	4.33	1074/1586	4.33	4.18	4.43	4.42	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	25	4.89	615/1585	4.89	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	8	15	4.37	808/1582	4.37	4.19	4.26	4.26	4.37	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	4	7	13	4.11	1090/1575	4.11	4.11	4.27	4.25	4.11	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	20	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	****/1380	****	3.58	3.94	4.01	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	8	5	11	3.88	936/1520	3.88	4.12	4.01	4.09	3.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	1	2	3	19	4.46	681/1515	4.46	4.43	4.24	4.32	4.46	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	0	4	21	4.69	479/1511	4.69	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.69	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	16	1	0	1	0	6	4.25	360/ 994	4.25	3.95	3.94	3.96	4.25	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 3	C 6	General	0
84-150	11	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		Under-grad 28
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 1	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	24
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 306 0101
 Title BRIT LIT: VICTORIAN-MO
 Instructor: Fernandez, Jean
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 797
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	6	8	4.24	979/1674	4.24	4.01	4.27	4.26	4.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	9	4.29	882/1674	4.29	4.08	4.23	4.21	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	540/1423	4.53	4.22	4.27	4.27	4.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	397/1609	4.59	4.24	4.22	4.27	4.59	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	167/1585	4.75	3.99	3.96	3.95	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	7	5	4.06	844/1535	4.06	4.24	4.08	4.15	4.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	2	5	8	4.19	945/1651	4.19	3.90	4.18	4.16	4.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	6	4.35	1347/1673	4.35	4.45	4.69	4.68	4.35	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	9	4	4.06	918/1656	4.06	4.02	4.07	4.07	4.06	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/1586	****	4.18	4.43	4.42	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1585	****	4.68	4.69	4.66	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1582	****	4.19	4.26	4.26	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1575	****	4.11	4.27	4.25	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	229/1520	4.75	4.12	4.01	4.09	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	0	14	4.75	384/1515	4.75	4.43	4.24	4.32	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	346/1511	4.81	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.81	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	5	6	5	4.00	474/ 994	4.00	3.95	3.94	3.96	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	17
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 6
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENGL 307 0101
 Title AMER LIT THROUGH CIV W
 Instructor: ~~HBLWIG, TIM~~ Holton, Adalaine
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 798
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	8	8	16	4.06	1155/1674	4.06	4.01	4.27	4.26	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	5	23	4.52	566/1674	4.52	4.08	4.23	4.21	4.52	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	0	8	9	4.53	551/1423	4.53	4.22	4.27	4.27	4.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	2	10	20	4.45	567/1609	4.45	4.24	4.22	4.27	4.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	2	6	22	4.36	452/1585	4.36	3.99	3.96	3.95	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	3	9	18	4.21	715/1535	4.21	4.24	4.08	4.15	4.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	6	7	19	4.30	809/1651	4.30	3.90	4.18	4.16	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	11	21	4.66	1082/1673	4.66	4.45	4.69	4.68	4.66	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	7	11	8	3.96	1022/1656	3.96	4.02	4.07	4.07	3.96	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	3	6	19	4.57	784/1586	4.57	4.18	4.43	4.42	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	2	3	24	4.76	917/1585	4.76	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	3	8	17	4.50	632/1582	4.50	4.19	4.26	4.26	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	4	6	16	4.21	992/1575	4.21	4.11	4.27	4.25	4.21	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	16	3	2	2	1	4	3.08	1209/1380	3.08	3.58	3.94	4.01	3.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	4	6	18	4.30	598/1520	4.30	4.12	4.01	4.09	4.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	5	23	4.70	453/1515	4.70	4.43	4.24	4.32	4.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	3	6	21	4.60	563/1511	4.60	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	1	2	3	6	13	4.12	432/ 994	4.12	3.95	3.94	3.96	4.12	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	27
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	34	Non-major	7
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	29				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 308 0101
 Title AMERICAN LIT:1865-1945
 Instructor: BERMAN, JESSICA
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 799
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1353/1674	3.86	4.01	4.27	4.26	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	1043/1674	4.14	4.08	4.23	4.21	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	819/1423	4.29	4.22	4.27	4.27	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	0	2	3	3.57	1423/1609	3.57	4.24	4.22	4.27	3.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	395/1585	4.43	3.99	3.96	3.95	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	631/1535	4.29	4.24	4.08	4.15	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	643/1651	4.43	3.90	4.18	4.16	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1155/1673	4.57	4.45	4.69	4.68	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	1540/1656	3.00	4.02	4.07	4.07	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1300/1586	4.00	4.18	4.43	4.42	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1071/1585	4.67	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	632/1582	4.50	4.19	4.26	4.26	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	1040/1575	4.17	4.11	4.27	4.25	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	666/1380	4.00	3.58	3.94	4.01	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	955/1520	3.86	4.12	4.01	4.09	3.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	733/1515	4.43	4.43	4.24	4.32	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	729/1511	4.43	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	3.95	3.94	3.96	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 0	Required for Majors	0	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	1	
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 7	
Grad.	0	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: ENGL 316 0101
 Title LITERATURE & OTHER ART
 Instructor: Newmantsaul, El
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 800
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	6	2	4	7	4	3.04	1623/1674	3.04	4.01	4.27	4.26	3.04	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	6	5	5	1	6	2.83	1640/1674	2.83	4.08	4.23	4.21	2.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	3	7	8	3.74	1180/1423	3.74	4.22	4.27	4.27	3.74	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	4	1	6	6	4	3.24	1521/1609	3.24	4.24	4.22	4.27	3.24	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	5	4	10	3.83	986/1585	3.83	3.99	3.96	3.95	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	5	9	2	4	2.96	1452/1535	2.96	4.24	4.08	4.15	2.96	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	5	2	7	6	3.45	1463/1651	3.45	3.90	4.18	4.16	3.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	850/1673	4.83	4.45	4.69	4.68	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	9	4	7	2	3.09	1527/1656	3.09	4.02	4.07	4.07	3.09	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	3	5	6	4	4	3.05	1536/1586	3.05	4.18	4.43	4.42	3.05	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	2	5	13	4.43	1292/1585	4.43	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.43	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	6	3	6	4	3	2.77	1546/1582	2.77	4.19	4.26	4.26	2.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	5	3	2	5	6	3.19	1459/1575	3.19	4.11	4.27	4.25	3.19	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	247/1380	4.59	3.58	3.94	4.01	4.59	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	5	3	2	6	3	2.95	1390/1520	2.95	4.12	4.01	4.09	2.95	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	4	3	3	7	3.47	1314/1515	3.47	4.43	4.24	4.32	3.47	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	3	2	3	0	11	3.74	1232/1511	3.74	4.43	4.27	4.34	3.74	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	2	2	6	3	3	3.19	852/ 994	3.19	3.95	3.94	3.96	3.19	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 10	Graduate	0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 2	C 2	General	15
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 3	D 0	Under-grad	23
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 15	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	5
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENGL 320 0101
 Title COMMUNICATION & TECH
 Instructor: Fitzgerald, Wil
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 801
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	471/1674	4.62	4.01	4.27	4.26	4.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	763/1674	4.38	4.08	4.23	4.21	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	718/1423	4.38	4.22	4.27	4.27	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	212/1609	4.77	4.24	4.22	4.27	4.77	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	204/1585	4.69	3.99	3.96	3.95	4.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	215/1535	4.69	4.24	4.08	4.15	4.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	583/1651	4.46	3.90	4.18	4.16	4.46	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	3	4.23	1434/1673	4.23	4.45	4.69	4.68	4.23	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	493/1656	4.43	4.02	4.07	4.07	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	1074/1586	4.33	4.18	4.43	4.42	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	737/1585	4.83	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	632/1582	4.50	4.19	4.26	4.26	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	495/1575	4.67	4.11	4.27	4.25	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/1380	****	3.58	3.94	4.01	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	213/1520	4.78	4.12	4.01	4.09	4.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	230/1515	4.89	4.43	4.24	4.32	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	391/1511	4.78	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	270/ 994	4.43	3.95	3.94	3.96	4.43	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 324 0101
 Title LITERATURE OF TECHNOLO
 Instructor: SHIPKA, JODY
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 802
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	829/1674	4.36	4.01	4.27	4.26	4.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	3	8	4.21	980/1674	4.21	4.08	4.23	4.21	4.21	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	1	10	4.36	715/1609	4.36	4.24	4.22	4.27	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	462/1585	4.36	3.99	3.96	3.95	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	1	10	4.36	558/1535	4.36	4.24	4.08	4.15	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	3	5	3.92	1201/1651	3.92	3.90	4.18	4.16	3.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	915/1673	4.79	4.45	4.69	4.68	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	1	2	10	4.43	493/1656	4.43	4.02	4.07	4.07	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	1	3	8	4.14	1224/1586	4.14	4.18	4.43	4.42	4.14	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	2	3	7	4.07	1094/1582	4.07	4.19	4.26	4.26	4.07	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	1	0	9	4.15	1050/1575	4.15	4.11	4.27	4.25	4.15	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	1127/1380	3.33	3.58	3.94	4.01	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	1	9	4.31	598/1520	4.31	4.12	4.01	4.09	4.31	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	681/1515	4.46	4.43	4.24	4.32	4.46	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	553/1511	4.62	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.62	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	337/ 994	4.30	3.95	3.94	3.96	4.30	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 3
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENGL 326 0101
 Title STRUCTURE OF ENGLISH
 Instructor: Fitzgerald, Wil
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 803
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	367/1674	4.70	4.01	4.27	4.26	4.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	737/1674	4.40	4.08	4.23	4.21	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	132/1423	4.90	4.22	4.27	4.27	4.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	374/1609	4.60	4.24	4.22	4.27	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	413/1585	4.40	3.99	3.96	3.95	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	608/1535	4.30	4.24	4.08	4.15	4.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	673/1651	4.40	3.90	4.18	4.16	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	2	4.20	1463/1673	4.20	4.45	4.69	4.68	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	757/1656	4.22	4.02	4.07	4.07	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	1074/1586	4.33	4.18	4.43	4.42	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	578/1582	4.56	4.19	4.26	4.26	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	1138/1575	4.00	4.11	4.27	4.25	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	1	4	1	0	3.00	1217/1380	3.00	3.58	3.94	4.01	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	466/1520	4.44	4.12	4.01	4.09	4.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	483/1515	4.67	4.43	4.24	4.32	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	391/1511	4.78	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	7	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 994	****	3.95	3.94	3.96	****	

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	2	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
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	8
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 347 0101
 Title CONT DEV LIT & CULTUR
 Instructor: Gladstone, Jaso
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 804
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	4	7	3.94	1284/1674	3.94	4.01	4.27	4.26	3.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	5	7	4.06	1104/1674	4.06	4.08	4.23	4.21	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	540/1423	4.53	4.22	4.27	4.27	4.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	1	10	4.33	743/1609	4.33	4.24	4.22	4.27	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	12	4.60	265/1585	4.60	3.99	3.96	3.95	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	0	4	8	4.07	844/1535	4.07	4.24	4.08	4.15	4.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	768/1651	4.33	3.90	4.18	4.16	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	1182/1673	4.53	4.45	4.69	4.68	4.53	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	2	10	2	3.87	1154/1656	3.87	4.02	4.07	4.07	3.87	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	1104/1586	4.31	4.18	4.43	4.42	4.31	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	1035/1585	4.69	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	1034/1582	4.15	4.19	4.26	4.26	4.15	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	1050/1575	4.15	4.11	4.27	4.25	4.15	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	278/1380	4.55	3.58	3.94	4.01	4.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	355/1520	4.57	4.12	4.01	4.09	4.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	165/1515	4.92	4.43	4.24	4.32	4.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	195/1511	4.93	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	12	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 994	****	3.95	3.94	3.96	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	16
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 1		Non-major 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	5
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 350 0101
 Title MAJ BRIT & AMER WRITER
 Instructor: Fernandez, Jean
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 805
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	485/1674	4.60	4.01	4.27	4.26	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	1146/1674	4.00	4.08	4.23	4.21	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	376/1423	4.67	4.22	4.27	4.27	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	583/1609	4.44	4.24	4.22	4.27	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1585	5.00	3.99	3.96	3.95	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	578/1535	4.33	4.24	4.08	4.15	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	2	1	5	3.90	1228/1651	3.90	3.90	4.18	4.16	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	2	4.20	1463/1673	4.20	4.45	4.69	4.68	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	381/1656	4.50	4.02	4.07	4.07	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	1004/1586	4.40	4.18	4.43	4.42	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	998/1582	4.20	4.19	4.26	4.26	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	819/1575	4.40	4.11	4.27	4.25	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	598/1520	4.30	4.12	4.01	4.09	4.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	1	0	8	4.50	629/1515	4.50	4.43	4.24	4.32	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	751/1511	4.40	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	86/ 994	4.86	3.95	3.94	3.96	4.86

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 366 0101
 Title WORLD LIT IN ENGLISH
 Instructor: PEKARSKE, NICOL
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 806
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	655/1674	4.47	4.01	4.27	4.26	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	5	7	4.06	1111/1674	4.06	4.08	4.23	4.21	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1423	****	4.22	4.27	4.27	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	629/1609	4.41	4.24	4.22	4.27	4.41	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	238/1585	4.65	3.99	3.96	3.95	4.65	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	598/1535	4.31	4.24	4.08	4.15	4.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	3	4	7	3.88	1240/1651	3.88	3.90	4.18	4.16	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	5	11	4.53	1189/1673	4.53	4.45	4.69	4.68	4.53	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	838/1656	4.15	4.02	4.07	4.07	4.15	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	1	3	0	3	3.71	1427/1586	3.71	4.18	4.43	4.42	3.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	1328/1585	4.38	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	1129/1582	4.00	4.19	4.26	4.26	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1289/1575	3.75	4.11	4.27	4.25	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	0	0	2	0	2	4	4.00	666/1380	4.00	3.58	3.94	4.01	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	221/1520	4.76	4.12	4.01	4.09	4.76	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	0	15	4.76	372/1515	4.76	4.43	4.24	4.32	4.76	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	335/1511	4.82	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	154/ 994	4.64	3.95	3.94	3.96	4.64	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 278	****	4.50	4.19	4.24	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.38	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 101	****	4.49	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 95	****	4.14	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 99	****	4.34	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 97	****	4.21	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	4.54	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	4.17	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.38	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	4.09	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	3.98	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	3.97	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.25	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.53	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	2.75	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 366 0101
 Title WORLD LIT IN ENGLISH
 Instructor: PEKARSKE, NICOL
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 806
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	2	Graduate 1 Major 9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9			
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	8	Under-grad 17 Non-major 9
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0			
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				P	0			
				I	0	Other	7	
				?	3			

Course-Section: ENGL 371 0101
 Title CREATIVE WRITING-FICTI
 Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 807
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	558/1674	4.55	4.01	4.27	4.26	4.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	530/1674	4.55	4.08	4.23	4.21	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	376/1423	4.67	4.22	4.27	4.27	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	567/1609	4.45	4.24	4.22	4.27	4.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	1	7	4.27	539/1585	4.27	3.99	3.96	3.95	4.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	215/1535	4.70	4.24	4.08	4.15	4.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	524/1651	4.50	3.90	4.18	4.16	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	706/1673	4.91	4.45	4.69	4.68	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	757/1656	4.22	4.02	4.07	4.07	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	1211/1586	4.17	4.18	4.43	4.42	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	1071/1585	4.67	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	438/1582	4.67	4.19	4.26	4.26	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	692/1575	4.50	4.11	4.27	4.25	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1380	5.00	3.58	3.94	4.01	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	274/1520	4.70	4.12	4.01	4.09	4.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	453/1515	4.70	4.43	4.24	4.32	4.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	358/1511	4.80	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	160/ 994	4.63	3.95	3.94	3.96	4.63	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	6
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 11
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	5
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 373 0101
 Title CREATIVE WRITING-POETR
 Instructor: MCGURRIN JR, AN
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 808
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	768/1674	4.40	4.01	4.27	4.26	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1001/1674	4.20	4.08	4.23	4.21	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	852/1609	4.25	4.24	4.22	4.27	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	413/1585	4.40	3.99	3.96	3.95	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.24	4.08	4.15	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1289/1651	3.80	3.90	4.18	4.16	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	1463/1673	4.20	4.45	4.69	4.68	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	719/1656	4.25	4.02	4.07	4.07	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1499/1586	3.40	4.18	4.43	4.42	3.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1129/1582	4.00	4.19	4.26	4.26	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	819/1575	4.40	4.11	4.27	4.25	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	810/1520	4.00	4.12	4.01	4.09	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1024/1515	4.00	4.43	4.24	4.32	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	507/1511	4.67	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 994	****	3.95	3.94	3.96	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 380 0101
 Title INTRO TO NEWS WRITING
 Instructor: WEISS, KENNETH
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 809
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	1139/1674	4.08	4.01	4.27	4.26	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	3	3.92	1246/1674	3.92	4.08	4.23	4.21	3.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	5	3	1	3.56	1258/1423	3.56	4.22	4.27	4.27	3.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	2	5	2	3.64	1394/1609	3.64	4.24	4.22	4.27	3.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	4	2	3	2	3.08	1426/1585	3.08	3.99	3.96	3.95	3.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	1	3	5	3.83	1083/1535	3.83	4.24	4.08	4.15	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	3	2	3	3.25	1525/1651	3.25	3.90	4.18	4.16	3.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	1001/1673	4.73	4.45	4.69	4.68	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	3	6	1	3.64	1313/1656	3.64	4.02	4.07	4.07	3.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	5	3	3.92	1363/1586	3.92	4.18	4.43	4.42	3.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	1035/1585	4.69	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	882/1582	4.31	4.19	4.26	4.26	4.31	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	1	3	6	4.08	1107/1575	4.08	4.11	4.27	4.25	4.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/1380	****	3.58	3.94	4.01	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1141/1520	3.57	4.12	4.01	4.09	3.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1024/1515	4.00	4.43	4.24	4.32	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	990/1511	4.14	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	881/ 994	3.00	3.95	3.94	3.96	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	6
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	5
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENGL 383 0101
 Title SCIENCE WRITING
 Instructor: CARPENTER, KARE
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 810
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	854/1674	4.33	4.01	4.27	4.26	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1146/1674	4.00	4.08	4.23	4.21	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1094/1609	4.00	4.24	4.22	4.27	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	642/1585	4.17	3.99	3.96	3.95	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	373/1535	4.50	4.24	4.08	4.15	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	1537/1651	3.20	3.90	4.18	4.16	3.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	1072/1673	4.67	4.45	4.69	4.68	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	615/1656	4.33	4.02	4.07	4.07	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	1400/1586	3.80	4.18	4.43	4.42	3.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1371/1582	3.60	4.19	4.26	4.26	3.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	1458/1575	3.20	4.11	4.27	4.25	3.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1036/1380	3.50	3.58	3.94	4.01	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	986/1520	3.80	4.12	4.01	4.09	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	759/1515	4.40	4.43	4.24	4.32	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	751/1511	4.40	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	638/ 994	3.75	3.95	3.94	3.96	3.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	****	4.00	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	4.50	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.33	4.46	4.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	44/ 61	3.50	3.97	4.09	3.20	3.50	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.25	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	27/ 50	4.50	4.53	4.44	3.82	4.50	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.36	3.29	****	

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
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	General 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	Under-grad 6
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Non-major 4
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Electives 0
					Other 6

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENGL 383H 0101
 Title
 Instructor: CARPENTER, KARE
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 811
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1511/1674	3.50	4.01	4.27	4.26	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1146/1674	4.00	4.08	4.23	4.21	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1363/1423	3.00	4.22	4.27	4.27	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	490/1609	4.50	4.24	4.22	4.27	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	326/1585	4.50	3.99	3.96	3.95	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	667/1535	4.25	4.24	4.08	4.15	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	768/1651	4.33	3.90	4.18	4.16	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.45	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.02	4.07	4.07	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1300/1586	4.00	4.18	4.43	4.42	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1302/1582	3.75	4.19	4.26	4.26	3.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1367/1575	3.50	4.11	4.27	4.25	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1377/1380	1.00	3.58	3.94	4.01	1.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.12	4.01	4.09	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.43	4.24	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.43	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	3.95	3.94	3.96	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		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	4
			P 0		Non-major
			I 0		4
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENGL 391 0201
 Title ADV EXPOS & ARGUMENT
 Instructor: BURNS, MARGIE
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 812
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	5	2	3	4	4	3.00	1628/1674	3.71	4.01	4.27	4.26	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	3	4	2	4	2.83	1639/1674	3.72	4.08	4.23	4.21	2.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	8	0	7	1	2	2.39	1414/1423	2.39	4.22	4.27	4.27	2.39	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	5	1	4	3	4	3.00	1557/1609	3.93	4.24	4.22	4.27	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	7	3	1	1	5	2.65	1535/1585	3.45	3.99	3.96	3.95	2.65	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	3	1	4	6	3.28	1378/1535	3.98	4.24	4.08	4.15	3.28	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	5	1	6	3	3.06	1558/1651	3.70	3.90	4.18	4.16	3.06	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	13	2	3.94	1600/1673	4.39	4.45	4.69	4.68	3.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	4	2	5	0	2	2.54	1618/1656	3.30	4.02	4.07	4.07	2.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	3	4	2	6	3.28	1519/1586	3.86	4.18	4.43	4.42	3.28	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	5	3	9	4.06	1463/1585	4.44	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.06	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	3	2	6	4	3.28	1468/1582	3.82	4.19	4.26	4.26	3.28	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	2	5	2	4	2.89	1519/1575	3.65	4.11	4.27	4.25	2.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	4	0	3	2	0	2.33	1342/1380	2.33	3.58	3.94	4.01	2.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	7	1	1	3	4	2.75	1434/1520	4.00	4.12	4.01	4.09	2.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	2	2	2	8	3.75	1209/1515	4.42	4.43	4.24	4.32	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	1	5	2	7	3.81	1188/1511	4.33	4.43	4.27	4.34	3.81	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	4	0	2	2	2	2.80	937/ 994	3.86	3.95	3.94	3.96	2.80	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 265	****	4.00	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 278	****	4.50	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 260	****	4.33	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 259	****	4.42	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 233	****	4.58	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 103	****	4.38	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 101	****	4.49	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 95	****	4.14	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 99	****	4.34	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 97	****	4.21	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 76	****	4.54	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 77	****	4.17	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 53	****	4.38	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	4.09	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.98	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 61	****	3.97	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.25	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 50	****	4.53	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	2.75	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 391 0201
 Title ADV EXPOS & ARGUMENT
 Instructor: BURNS, MARGIE
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 812
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	18	Non-major	12
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 391 0301
 Title ADV EXPOS & ARGUMENT
 Instructor: FALLON, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 813
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	2	12	4.53	582/1674	3.71	4.01	4.27	4.26	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	406/1674	3.72	4.08	4.23	4.21	4.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1423	2.39	4.22	4.27	4.27	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	85/1609	3.93	4.24	4.22	4.27	4.94	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	5	2	8	4.00	769/1585	3.45	3.99	3.96	3.95	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	14	4.59	301/1535	3.98	4.24	4.08	4.15	4.59	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	419/1651	3.70	3.90	4.18	4.16	4.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1673	4.39	4.45	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	561/1656	3.30	4.02	4.07	4.07	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	633/1586	3.86	4.18	4.43	4.42	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	640/1585	4.44	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	409/1582	3.82	4.19	4.26	4.26	4.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	467/1575	3.65	4.11	4.27	4.25	4.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	14	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1380	2.33	3.58	3.94	4.01	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1520	4.00	4.12	4.01	4.09	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1515	4.42	4.43	4.24	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	323/1511	4.33	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 994	3.86	3.95	3.94	3.96	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.00	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 278	****	4.50	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.33	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.42	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.58	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.38	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.49	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.14	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.34	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.21	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.54	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.17	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.38	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.09	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.98	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	3.97	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.25	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.53	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	2.75	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 391 0301
 Title ADV EXPOS & ARGUMENT
 Instructor: FALLON, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 813
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	17	Non-major	8
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 391 0401
 Title ADV EXPOS & ARGUMENT
 Instructor: PEKARSKE, NICOL
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 814
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	1	0	7	3	3.62	1474/1674	3.71	4.01	4.27	4.26	3.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	4	4	3.69	1406/1674	3.72	4.08	4.23	4.21	3.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1423	2.39	4.22	4.27	4.27	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	4	5	3.85	1260/1609	3.93	4.24	4.22	4.27	3.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	5	4	3.69	1100/1585	3.45	3.99	3.96	3.95	3.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	5	6	4.08	840/1535	3.98	4.24	4.08	4.15	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	3	3	4	3.46	1459/1651	3.70	3.90	4.18	4.16	3.46	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	1434/1673	4.39	4.45	4.69	4.68	4.23	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	2	0	2	2	1	3.00	1540/1656	3.30	4.02	4.07	4.07	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1454/1586	3.86	4.18	4.43	4.42	3.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	1328/1585	4.44	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	1	1	3	2	3.50	1406/1582	3.82	4.19	4.26	4.26	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	1	0	2	3	3.38	1411/1575	3.65	4.11	4.27	4.25	3.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	6	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1380	2.33	3.58	3.94	4.01	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	6	5	4.25	645/1520	4.00	4.12	4.01	4.09	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	629/1515	4.42	4.43	4.24	4.32	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	2	1	8	4.33	816/1511	4.33	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	628/ 994	3.86	3.95	3.94	3.96	3.78	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 2	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	8	2.00-2.99 5	C 5	General 0	Under-grad 13 Non-major 7
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 2	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 13	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0101
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING
 Instructor: MABE, MITZI J
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 815
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	3.88	4.01	4.27	4.26	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	4.13	4.08	4.23	4.21	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1609	4.70	4.24	4.22	4.27	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	5.00	3.99	3.96	3.95	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1535	4.90	4.24	4.08	4.15	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1651	3.63	3.90	4.18	4.16	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.45	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1656	4.58	4.02	4.07	4.07	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	4.43	4.12	4.01	4.09	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1515	4.93	4.43	4.24	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1050/1511	4.64	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	474/ 994	4.40	3.95	3.94	3.96	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	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0201
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING
 Instructor: MABE, MITZI J
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 816
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1196/1674	3.88	4.01	4.27	4.26	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1146/1674	4.13	4.08	4.23	4.21	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	490/1609	4.70	4.24	4.22	4.27	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1535	4.90	4.24	4.08	4.15	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1097/1651	3.63	3.90	4.18	4.16	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.45	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	955/1656	4.58	4.02	4.07	4.07	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1539/1586	3.33	4.18	4.43	4.42	3.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	4.75	4.68	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1129/1582	4.00	4.19	4.26	4.26	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1575	4.33	4.11	4.27	4.25	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	4.43	4.12	4.01	4.09	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1515	4.93	4.43	4.24	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1511	4.64	4.43	4.27	4.34	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	Graduate	0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	2
Grad.	0	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: ENGL 392 0301
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING
 Instructor: MABE, MITZI J
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 817
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1511/1674	3.88	4.01	4.27	4.26	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	578/1674	4.13	4.08	4.23	4.21	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1609	4.70	4.24	4.22	4.27	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1535	4.90	4.24	4.08	4.15	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1442/1651	3.63	3.90	4.18	4.16	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.45	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	381/1656	4.58	4.02	4.07	4.07	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1586	3.33	4.18	4.43	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	4.75	4.68	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1582	4.00	4.19	4.26	4.26	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1575	4.33	4.11	4.27	4.25	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	4.43	4.12	4.01	4.09	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1515	4.93	4.43	4.24	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1511	4.64	4.43	4.27	4.34	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 0 Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0 Under-grad 2 Non-major 1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	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: ENGL 392 0701
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING
 Instructor: HARRIS, LINDA R
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 818
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1656	4.58	4.02	4.07	4.07	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	810/1520	4.43	4.12	4.01	4.09	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1515	4.93	4.43	4.24	4.32	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1511	4.64	4.43	4.27	4.34	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 994	4.40	3.95	3.94	3.96	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0801
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING
 Instructor: HARRIS, LINDA R
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 819
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1609	4.70	4.24	4.22	4.27	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1535	4.90	4.24	4.08	4.15	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1656	4.58	4.02	4.07	4.07	5.00	
Lecture															
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	4.75	4.68	4.69	4.66	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1169/1520	4.43	4.12	4.01	4.09	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1515	4.93	4.43	4.24	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1511	4.64	4.43	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 994	4.40	3.95	3.94	3.96	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 1	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate
56-83	0	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	2
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	2

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0901
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING
 Instructor: HARRIS, LINDA R
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 820
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	810/1520	4.43	4.12	4.01	4.09	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1515	4.93	4.43	4.24	4.32	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1511	4.64	4.43	4.27	4.34	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	474/ 994	4.40	3.95	3.94	3.96	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	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 392 1001
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING
 Instructor: MABE, MITZI J
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 821
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1628/1674	3.88	4.01	4.27	4.26	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1608/1674	4.13	4.08	4.23	4.21	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1094/1609	4.70	4.24	4.22	4.27	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	373/1535	4.90	4.24	4.08	4.15	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	1636/1651	3.63	3.90	4.18	4.16	2.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.45	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	955/1656	4.58	4.02	4.07	4.07	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1579/1586	3.33	4.18	4.43	4.42	2.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1472/1585	4.75	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1504/1582	4.00	4.19	4.26	4.26	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1487/1575	4.33	4.11	4.27	4.25	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	397/1520	4.43	4.12	4.01	4.09	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	629/1515	4.93	4.43	4.24	4.32	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1308/1511	4.64	4.43	4.27	4.34	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	474/ 994	4.40	3.95	3.94	3.96	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0101
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: KIRKPATRICK, RO
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 822
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	6	10	4.14	1075/1674	3.43	4.01	4.27	4.26	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	8	6	3.76	1364/1674	3.60	4.08	4.23	4.21	3.76	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	575/1423	4.08	4.22	4.27	4.27	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	8	8	4.10	1035/1609	3.91	4.24	4.22	4.27	4.10	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	1	4	6	6	3.43	1282/1585	3.10	3.99	3.96	3.95	3.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	8	7	4.05	853/1535	3.86	4.24	4.08	4.15	4.05	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	5	3	3	7	3.29	1517/1651	3.38	3.90	4.18	4.16	3.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	14	3	2	0	2	1.71	1672/1673	3.82	4.45	4.69	4.68	1.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	2	5	7	2	3.41	1416/1656	3.38	4.02	4.07	4.07	3.41	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	3	7	6	5	3.62	1457/1586	3.81	4.18	4.43	4.42	3.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	7	11	4.38	1322/1585	4.24	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	4	10	5	3.86	1244/1582	3.81	4.19	4.26	4.26	3.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	3	2	7	6	3.48	1377/1575	3.63	4.11	4.27	4.25	3.48	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	3	1	4	2	2	2.92	1264/1380	3.47	3.58	3.94	4.01	2.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	7	1	2	3.36	1239/1520	3.37	4.12	4.01	4.09	3.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	5	2	4	3.91	1137/1515	3.76	4.43	4.24	4.32	3.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	1021/1511	3.61	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.09	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	577/ 994	3.51	3.95	3.94	3.96	3.89	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	****	4.00	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 278	****	4.50	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 260	****	4.33	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 259	****	4.42	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.58	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 103	****	4.38	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 101	****	4.49	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 95	****	4.14	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 99	****	4.34	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	4.21	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.54	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	4.17	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.38	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	4.09	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	3.98	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	3.97	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	4.25	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.53	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	2.75	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0101
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: KIRKPATRICK, RO
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 822
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 1	A 12	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 4	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 21 Non-major 19
84-150	2	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 19	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0201
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: KIRKPATRICK, RO
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 823
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	11	3	4	5	0	2.13	1669/1674	3.43	4.01	4.27	4.26	2.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	7	5	7	4	0	2.35	1666/1674	3.60	4.08	4.23	4.21	2.35	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	21	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1423	4.08	4.22	4.27	4.27	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	6	3	1	8	2	2.85	1583/1609	3.91	4.24	4.22	4.27	2.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	12	3	4	3	0	1.91	1580/1585	3.10	3.99	3.96	3.95	1.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	7	6	5	4	0	2.27	1519/1535	3.86	4.24	4.08	4.15	2.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	10	3	5	0	3	2.19	1631/1651	3.38	3.90	4.18	4.16	2.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	17	5	0	1	0	1.35	1673/1673	3.82	4.45	4.69	4.68	1.35	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	10	1	10	1	0	2.09	1640/1656	3.38	4.02	4.07	4.07	2.09	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	9	5	5	3	0	2.09	1578/1586	3.81	4.18	4.43	4.42	2.09	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	5	3	9	3	2	2.73	1580/1585	4.24	4.68	4.69	4.66	2.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	8	5	6	3	0	2.18	1577/1582	3.81	4.19	4.26	4.26	2.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	11	4	7	0	0	1.82	1570/1575	3.63	4.11	4.27	4.25	1.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	6	4	2	1	0	1.85	1367/1380	3.47	3.58	3.94	4.01	1.85	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	4	2	1	0	0	1.57	1512/1520	3.37	4.12	4.01	4.09	1.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	3	1	2	1	0	2.14	1490/1515	3.76	4.43	4.24	4.32	2.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	3	2	1	1	0	2.00	1495/1511	3.61	4.43	4.27	4.34	2.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	1	3	1	2	0	0	1.83	984/ 994	3.51	3.95	3.94	3.96	1.83	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 1	B 14		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General	1
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 8	D 0		Under-grad 23
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	19
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0401
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: HARRIS, LINDA R
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 824
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	5	2	2	3.40	1545/1674	3.43	4.01	4.27	4.26	3.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	1146/1674	3.60	4.08	4.23	4.21	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1423	4.08	4.22	4.27	4.27	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1224/1609	3.91	4.24	4.22	4.27	3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	1	3	0	3.20	1385/1585	3.10	3.99	3.96	3.95	3.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	870/1535	3.86	4.24	4.08	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	2	3	2	1	3.25	1525/1651	3.38	3.90	4.18	4.16	3.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	1442/1673	3.82	4.45	4.69	4.68	4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	1444/1656	3.38	4.02	4.07	4.07	3.33

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	1237/1586	3.81	4.18	4.43	4.42	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	1397/1585	4.24	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	1061/1582	3.81	4.19	4.26	4.26	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	0	4	3.75	1289/1575	3.63	4.11	4.27	4.25	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	2	0	3	2	3.71	930/1380	3.47	3.58	3.94	4.01	3.71

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	10	Non-major	10
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0501
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: HARRIS, LINDA R
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 825
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	6	1	3.70	1429/1674	3.43	4.01	4.27	4.26	3.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	870/1674	3.60	4.08	4.23	4.21	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1423	4.08	4.22	4.27	4.27	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	490/1609	3.91	4.24	4.22	4.27	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	1	3	0	3.20	1385/1585	3.10	3.99	3.96	3.95	3.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	454/1535	3.86	4.24	4.08	4.15	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	1097/1651	3.38	3.90	4.18	4.16	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	1267/1673	3.82	4.45	4.69	4.68	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	7	1	3.90	1124/1656	3.38	4.02	4.07	4.07	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	453/1586	3.81	4.18	4.43	4.42	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	1071/1585	4.24	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	438/1582	3.81	4.19	4.26	4.26	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	495/1575	3.63	4.11	4.27	4.25	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	303/1380	3.47	3.58	3.94	4.01	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1520	3.37	4.12	4.01	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1515	3.76	4.43	4.24	4.32	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1511	3.61	4.43	4.27	4.34	****
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 994	3.51	3.95	3.94	3.96	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	4	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	9
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0701
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: SCHWARTZ, DEBRA
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 826
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	1	5	3	4	3.12	1613/1674	3.43	4.01	4.27	4.26	3.12	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	2	4	5	1	2.71	1650/1674	3.60	4.08	4.23	4.21	2.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1155/1423	4.08	4.22	4.27	4.27	3.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	1	5	3	4	3.12	1548/1609	3.91	4.24	4.22	4.27	3.12	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	2	1	5	4	3.19	1392/1585	3.10	3.99	3.96	3.95	3.19	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	1	6	4	3.38	1342/1535	3.86	4.24	4.08	4.15	3.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	6	2	3	5	0	2.44	1617/1651	3.38	3.90	4.18	4.16	2.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	760/1673	3.82	4.45	4.69	4.68	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	3	2	4	6	0	2.87	1585/1656	3.38	4.02	4.07	4.07	2.87	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	3	3	3	4	2	2.93	1550/1586	3.81	4.18	4.43	4.42	2.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	2	0	0	4	9	4.20	1423/1585	4.24	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.20	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	3	3	5	1	2.87	1535/1582	3.81	4.19	4.26	4.26	2.87	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	3	2	5	2	3.00	1487/1575	3.63	4.11	4.27	4.25	3.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	3	0	1	2	2	3.00	1217/1380	3.47	3.58	3.94	4.01	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	4	4	3	3.67	1092/1520	3.37	4.12	4.01	4.09	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	1	1	3	5	3.67	1253/1515	3.76	4.43	4.24	4.32	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	0	2	3	5	3.75	1221/1511	3.61	4.43	4.27	4.34	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	1	1	0	4	1	3.43	773/ 994	3.51	3.95	3.94	3.96	3.43	
Laboratory															
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.42	4.33	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.38	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.49	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.14	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.34	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.21	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	4.54	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	4.17	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.38	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.09	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.98	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	3.97	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.25	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.53	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	2.75	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0701
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: SCHWARTZ, DEBRA
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 826
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0801
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: Meade, Vicki
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 827
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	0	4	3	2	3.08	1618/1674	3.43	4.01	4.27	4.26	3.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	3	2	3.17	1590/1674	3.60	4.08	4.23	4.21	3.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1214/1423	4.08	4.22	4.27	4.27	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	3	2	4	3.64	1394/1609	3.91	4.24	4.22	4.27	3.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	2	2	1	2	2.55	1541/1585	3.10	3.99	3.96	3.95	2.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	6	1	4	3.82	1101/1535	3.86	4.24	4.08	4.15	3.82	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	3	3	4	3.82	1282/1651	3.38	3.90	4.18	4.16	3.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	1257/1673	3.82	4.45	4.69	4.68	4.45	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	2	4	1	1	2.89	1583/1656	3.38	4.02	4.07	4.07	2.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	3	2	4	3.64	1451/1586	3.81	4.18	4.43	4.42	3.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	1455/1585	4.24	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.10	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	3	4	2	3.60	1371/1582	3.81	4.19	4.26	4.26	3.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	1	2	3	2	3.44	1388/1575	3.63	4.11	4.27	4.25	3.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	1	4	0	3	3.33	1127/1380	3.47	3.58	3.94	4.01	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	1303/1520	3.37	4.12	4.01	4.09	3.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1024/1515	3.76	4.43	4.24	4.32	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1333/1511	3.61	4.43	4.27	4.34	3.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	847/ 994	3.51	3.95	3.94	3.96	3.20	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 278	****	4.50	4.19	4.24	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	4.54	3.98	4.03	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 61	****	3.97	4.09	3.20	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 393 1101
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: PORTER, JANE P.
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 828
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	7	3	5	3.65	1459/1674	3.43	4.01	4.27	4.26	3.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	6	4.12	1068/1674	3.60	4.08	4.23	4.21	4.12	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1423	4.08	4.22	4.27	4.27	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	4	11	4.41	629/1609	3.91	4.24	4.22	4.27	4.41	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	10	3	1	3.12	1419/1585	3.10	3.99	3.96	3.95	3.12	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	413/1535	3.86	4.24	4.08	4.15	4.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	7	4	3.76	1317/1651	3.38	3.90	4.18	4.16	3.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1673	3.82	4.45	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	9	5	4.27	706/1656	3.38	4.02	4.07	4.07	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	723/1586	3.81	4.18	4.43	4.42	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	1047/1585	4.24	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	632/1582	3.81	4.19	4.26	4.26	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	7	5	4.06	1115/1575	3.63	4.11	4.27	4.25	4.06	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	363/1380	3.47	3.58	3.94	4.01	4.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	967/1520	3.37	4.12	4.01	4.09	3.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1024/1515	3.76	4.43	4.24	4.32	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	1177/1511	3.61	4.43	4.27	4.34	3.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 994	3.51	3.95	3.94	3.96	****	

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 7		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	17
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 17
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: ENGL 393 1201
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: Meade, Vicki
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 829
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	2	5	5	4	3.39	1550/1674	3.43	4.01	4.27	4.26	3.39	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	5	5	5	3.67	1421/1674	3.60	4.08	4.23	4.21	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	2	1	1	4	3.88	1121/1423	4.08	4.22	4.27	4.27	3.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	3	9	4.12	1018/1609	3.91	4.24	4.22	4.27	4.12	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	3	3	4	4	3.18	1396/1585	3.10	3.99	3.96	3.95	3.18	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	3	5	6	3.67	1207/1535	3.86	4.24	4.08	4.15	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	5	4	3	4	3.24	1529/1651	3.38	3.90	4.18	4.16	3.24	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	11	6	4.35	1347/1673	3.82	4.45	4.69	4.68	4.35	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	5	3	2	3.70	1275/1656	3.38	4.02	4.07	4.07	3.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	2	1	3	7	3.73	1421/1586	3.81	4.18	4.43	4.42	3.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	2	1	12	4.50	1225/1585	4.24	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	3	4	6	3.87	1239/1582	3.81	4.19	4.26	4.26	3.87	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	4	6	4	3.80	1264/1575	3.63	4.11	4.27	4.25	3.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	2	2	6	5	0	2.93	1254/1380	3.47	3.58	3.94	4.01	2.93	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	1027/1520	3.37	4.12	4.01	4.09	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	3	0	5	4.25	898/1515	3.76	4.43	4.24	4.32	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1155/1511	3.61	4.43	4.27	4.34	3.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	420/ 994	3.51	3.95	3.94	3.96	4.14	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 18 Non-major 18
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 4	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 14	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 393 8020
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: HARRIS, LINDA R
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 830
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	928/1674	3.43	4.01	4.27	4.26	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	790/1674	3.60	4.08	4.23	4.21	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	493/1423	4.08	4.22	4.27	4.27	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	443/1609	3.91	4.24	4.22	4.27	4.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	682/1585	3.10	3.99	3.96	3.95	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	260/1535	3.86	4.24	4.08	4.15	4.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	598/1651	3.38	3.90	4.18	4.16	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	8	1	4.00	1566/1673	3.82	4.45	4.69	4.68	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	955/1656	3.38	4.02	4.07	4.07	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	560/1586	3.81	4.18	4.43	4.42	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	1106/1585	4.24	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	481/1582	3.81	4.19	4.26	4.26	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	537/1575	3.63	4.11	4.27	4.25	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	241/1380	3.47	3.58	3.94	4.01	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	673/1520	3.37	4.12	4.01	4.09	4.22	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	827/1515	3.76	4.43	4.24	4.32	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	816/1511	3.61	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	178/ 994	3.51	3.95	3.94	3.96	4.57	

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
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	8
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENGL 394 0101
 Title TECHNICAL EDITING
 Instructor: PORTER, JANE P.
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 831
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	276/1674	4.78	4.01	4.27	4.26	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	379/1674	4.67	4.08	4.23	4.21	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.22	4.27	4.27	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.24	4.22	4.27	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	295/1585	4.56	3.99	3.96	3.95	4.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	238/1535	4.67	4.24	4.08	4.15	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	208/1651	4.78	3.90	4.18	4.16	4.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.45	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	136/1656	4.83	4.02	4.07	4.07	4.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	453/1586	4.78	4.18	4.43	4.42	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	874/1585	4.78	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	438/1582	4.67	4.19	4.26	4.26	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	495/1575	4.67	4.11	4.27	4.25	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	348/1380	4.44	3.58	3.94	4.01	4.44	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	726/1520	4.17	4.12	4.01	4.09	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	629/1515	4.50	4.43	4.24	4.32	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	507/1511	4.67	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	835/ 994	3.25	3.95	3.94	3.96	3.25	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	4	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	5
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 395 0101
 Title WRITING INTERNSHIP
 Instructor: HICKERNELL, MAR (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 832
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	1	2	5	9	3.95	1271/1674	3.95	4.01	4.27	4.26	3.95	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	3	7	6	3.79	1352/1674	3.79	4.08	4.23	4.21	3.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	16	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1423	****	4.22	4.27	4.27	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	2	5	9	4.00	1094/1609	4.00	4.24	4.22	4.27	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	4	4	4	6	3.53	1211/1585	3.53	3.99	3.96	3.95	3.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	5	5	6	3.68	1196/1535	3.68	4.24	4.08	4.15	3.68	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	2	5	8	3.79	1303/1651	3.79	3.90	4.18	4.16	3.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	987/1673	4.74	4.45	4.69	4.68	4.74	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	8	6	3	3.56	1353/1656	3.87	4.02	4.07	4.07	3.87	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	4	7	6	3.84	1388/1586	4.08	4.18	4.43	4.42	4.08	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	8	11	4.58	1166/1585	4.57	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	2	3	5	7	3.68	1340/1582	4.00	4.19	4.26	4.26	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	6	7	3	3.47	1377/1575	3.67	4.11	4.27	4.25	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	1	2	7	1	1	2.92	1264/1380	3.01	3.58	3.94	4.01	3.01	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	3	6	5	3.71	1068/1520	3.71	4.12	4.01	4.09	3.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	2	6	8	4.18	955/1515	4.18	4.43	4.24	4.32	4.18	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	2	7	7	4.12	1011/1511	4.12	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.12	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	3	1	4	5	3	3.25	835/ 994	3.25	3.95	3.94	3.96	3.25	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	****	4.00	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 278	****	4.50	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 260	****	4.33	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 259	****	4.42	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.58	4.20	4.18	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	23/ 76	4.80	4.54	3.98	4.03	4.80	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	2	9	4	4.13	35/ 77	4.13	4.17	3.93	3.70	4.13	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	3	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	35/ 53	4.33	4.38	4.45	3.87	4.33	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	1	1	1	4	5	3	3.57	38/ 48	3.57	4.09	4.12	3.67	3.57	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	4	0	3	3	3	2	3.36	42/ 49	3.36	3.98	4.27	3.27	3.36	

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	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 7	
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	0	C 2	General 10
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D 0	Under-grad 20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F 0	Non-major 8
				P 0	
				I 0	Electives 5
				? 1	Other 4

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENGL 395 0101
 Title WRITING INTERNSHIP
 Instructor: FITZPATRICK, CA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 833
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	1	2	5	9	3.95	1271/1674	3.95	4.01	4.27	4.26	3.95	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	3	7	6	3.79	1352/1674	3.79	4.08	4.23	4.21	3.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	16	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1423	****	4.22	4.27	4.27	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	2	5	9	4.00	1094/1609	4.00	4.24	4.22	4.27	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	4	4	4	6	3.53	1211/1585	3.53	3.99	3.96	3.95	3.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	5	5	6	3.68	1196/1535	3.68	4.24	4.08	4.15	3.68	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	2	5	8	3.79	1303/1651	3.79	3.90	4.18	4.16	3.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	987/1673	4.74	4.45	4.69	4.68	4.74	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	7	6	4.19	805/1656	3.87	4.02	4.07	4.07	3.87	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	1094/1586	4.08	4.18	4.43	4.42	4.08	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	1175/1585	4.57	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	871/1582	4.00	4.19	4.26	4.26	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	5	5	5	3.88	1230/1575	3.67	4.11	4.27	4.25	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	6	0	2	6	1	1	3.10	1208/1380	3.01	3.58	3.94	4.01	3.01	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	3	6	5	3.71	1068/1520	3.71	4.12	4.01	4.09	3.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	2	6	8	4.18	955/1515	4.18	4.43	4.24	4.32	4.18	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	2	7	7	4.12	1011/1511	4.12	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.12	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	3	1	4	5	3	3.25	835/ 994	3.25	3.95	3.94	3.96	3.25	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	****	4.00	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 278	****	4.50	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 260	****	4.33	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 259	****	4.42	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.58	4.20	4.18	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	23/ 76	4.80	4.54	3.98	4.03	4.80	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	2	9	4	4.13	35/ 77	4.13	4.17	3.93	3.70	4.13	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	3	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	35/ 53	4.33	4.38	4.45	3.87	4.33	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	1	1	1	4	5	3	3.57	38/ 48	3.57	4.09	4.12	3.67	3.57	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	4	0	3	3	3	2	3.36	42/ 49	3.36	3.98	4.27	3.27	3.36	

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	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 7	
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	0	C 2	General 10
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D 0	Under-grad 20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F 0	Non-major 8
				P 0	
				I 0	Electives 5
				? 1	Other 4

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENGL 401 0101
 Title METHOD OF INTERPRETATI
 Instructor: DONOVAN, JANE
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 834
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	276/1674	4.78	4.01	4.27	4.42	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	379/1674	4.67	4.08	4.23	4.31	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	445/1423	4.61	4.22	4.27	4.34	4.61	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	212/1609	4.76	4.24	4.22	4.30	4.76	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	17	4.89	96/1585	4.89	3.99	3.96	4.01	4.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	328/1535	4.56	4.24	4.08	4.18	4.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	4	10	4.33	768/1651	4.33	3.90	4.18	4.23	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	1001/1673	4.72	4.45	4.69	4.67	4.72	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	493/1656	4.43	4.02	4.07	4.19	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	249/1586	4.88	4.18	4.43	4.46	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	340/1585	4.94	4.68	4.69	4.76	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	227/1582	4.82	4.19	4.26	4.31	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	192/1575	4.88	4.11	4.27	4.35	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	480/1380	4.27	3.58	3.94	4.04	4.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	2	12	4.47	431/1520	4.47	4.12	4.01	4.18	4.47	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	0	2	14	4.71	444/1515	4.71	4.43	4.24	4.40	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	266/1511	4.88	4.43	4.27	4.45	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	1	4	7	5	3.94	530/994	3.94	3.95	3.94	4.19	3.94	

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 5		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	18
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 5
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	16
			? 1		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENGL 405 0101
 Title SEMINAR IN LITERARY HI
 Instructor: ORGELFINGER, GA
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 835
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.01	4.27	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.08	4.23	4.31	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.22	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	157/1609	4.83	4.24	4.22	4.30	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1585	5.00	3.99	3.96	4.01	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.24	4.08	4.18	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	157/1651	4.83	3.90	4.18	4.23	4.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.45	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.02	4.07	4.19	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.18	4.43	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.19	4.26	4.31	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.11	4.27	4.35	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	666/1380	4.00	3.58	3.94	4.04	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.12	4.01	4.18	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.43	4.24	4.40	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.43	4.27	4.45	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	3.95	3.94	4.19	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 103	5.00	4.38	4.41	4.42	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 101	5.00	4.49	4.48	4.65	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	32/ 95	4.83	4.14	4.31	4.60	4.83	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 99	5.00	4.34	4.39	4.57	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	34/ 97	4.67	4.21	4.14	4.46	4.67	

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	1	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 6
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: ENGL 405B 0101
 Title THE RENAISSANCE
 Instructor: ORLIN, LENA
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 836
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.01	4.27	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	176/1674	4.86	4.08	4.23	4.31	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.22	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.24	4.22	4.30	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1585	5.00	3.99	3.96	4.01	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.24	4.08	4.18	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	276/1651	4.71	3.90	4.18	4.23	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	1566/1673	4.00	4.45	4.69	4.67	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	149/1656	4.80	4.02	4.07	4.19	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.18	4.43	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	217/1582	4.83	4.19	4.26	4.31	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.11	4.27	4.35	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	143/1380	4.75	3.58	3.94	4.04	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	162/1520	4.86	4.12	4.01	4.18	4.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	266/1515	4.86	4.43	4.24	4.40	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.43	4.27	4.45	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	3.95	3.94	4.19	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 103	5.00	4.38	4.41	4.42	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 101	5.00	4.49	4.48	4.65	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 95	5.00	4.14	4.31	4.60	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 99	5.00	4.34	4.39	4.57	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	4.21	4.14	4.46	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 6
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
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENGL 407 0101
 Title LANGUAGE IN SOCIETY
 Instructor: SHIPKA, JODY
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 837
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	2	17	4.64	445/1674	4.64	4.01	4.27	4.42	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	5	5	9	3.91	1271/1674	3.91	4.08	4.23	4.31	3.91	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	19	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1423	****	4.22	4.27	4.34	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	0	7	12	4.23	892/1609	4.23	4.24	4.22	4.30	4.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	3	15	4.41	413/1585	4.41	3.99	3.96	4.01	4.41	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	16	4.55	337/1535	4.55	4.24	4.08	4.18	4.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	5	5	8	3.68	1368/1651	3.68	3.90	4.18	4.23	3.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	1001/1673	4.73	4.45	4.69	4.67	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	1	1	6	12	4.45	465/1656	4.45	4.02	4.07	4.19	4.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	2	6	11	4.30	1104/1586	4.30	4.18	4.43	4.46	4.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	5	4	8	3.89	1222/1582	3.89	4.19	4.26	4.31	3.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	5	3	12	4.35	867/1575	4.35	4.11	4.27	4.35	4.35	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	2	1	2	2	4	3.45	1065/1380	3.45	3.58	3.94	4.04	3.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	9	7	4.15	734/1520	4.15	4.12	4.01	4.18	4.15	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	1	18	4.80	325/1515	4.80	4.43	4.24	4.40	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	358/1511	4.80	4.43	4.27	4.45	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	1	1	1	7	10	4.20	390/ 994	4.20	3.95	3.94	4.19	4.20	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	22
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	D 1		Non-major 3
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	20
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 486 0101
 Title SEMINAR IN TEACHING CO
 Instructor: MCCARTHY, LUCIL
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 838
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	546/1674	4.56	4.01	4.27	4.42	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	1	4	4.00	1146/1674	4.00	4.08	4.23	4.31	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1423	****	4.22	4.27	4.34	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	743/1609	4.33	4.24	4.22	4.30	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	96/1585	4.89	3.99	3.96	4.01	4.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	238/1535	4.67	4.24	4.08	4.18	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	3	2	3.56	1422/1651	3.56	3.90	4.18	4.23	3.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	760/1673	4.88	4.45	4.69	4.67	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	827/1656	4.17	4.02	4.07	4.19	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	858/1586	4.50	4.18	4.43	4.46	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	632/1582	4.50	4.19	4.26	4.31	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	692/1575	4.50	4.11	4.27	4.35	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	151/1520	4.88	4.12	4.01	4.18	4.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.43	4.24	4.40	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.43	4.27	4.45	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	178/ 994	4.57	3.95	3.94	4.19	4.57	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 103	5.00	4.38	4.41	4.42	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 101	5.00	4.49	4.48	4.65	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	38/ 95	4.67	4.14	4.31	4.60	4.67	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	44/ 99	4.67	4.34	4.39	4.57	4.67	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	73/ 97	3.67	4.21	4.14	4.46	3.67	

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	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	9	Non-major	3
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	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 488 0101
 Title COMPUTER ASST WRITING
 Instructor: CARPENTER, KARE
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 839
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1385/1674	3.80	4.01	4.27	4.42	3.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1539/1674	3.40	4.08	4.23	4.31	3.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1423	****	4.22	4.27	4.34	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1094/1609	4.00	4.24	4.22	4.30	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	413/1585	4.40	3.99	3.96	4.01	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1110/1535	3.80	4.24	4.08	4.18	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1485/1651	3.40	3.90	4.18	4.23	3.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1135/1673	4.60	4.45	4.69	4.67	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.02	4.07	4.19	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	496/1586	4.75	4.18	4.43	4.46	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	935/1582	4.25	4.19	4.26	4.31	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	359/1575	4.75	4.11	4.27	4.35	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	303/1380	4.50	3.58	3.94	4.04	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	295/1520	4.67	4.12	4.01	4.18	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	483/1515	4.67	4.43	4.24	4.40	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	507/1511	4.67	4.43	4.27	4.45	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	3.95	3.94	4.19	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.00	4.23	4.53	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.50	4.19	4.21	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.33	4.46	4.24	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	96/ 103	3.00	4.38	4.41	4.42	3.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 101	5.00	4.49	4.48	4.65	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 95	5.00	4.14	4.31	4.60	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 99	5.00	4.34	4.39	4.57	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	4.21	4.14	4.46	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	1 Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1 Under-grad 5 Non-major 2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	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: ENGL 490 0101
 Title ADV TOPICS IN ENGL LAN
 Instructor: ORGELFINGER, GA
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 840
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	298/1674	4.75	4.01	4.27	4.42	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	270/1674	4.75	4.08	4.23	4.31	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	575/1423	4.50	4.22	4.27	4.34	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	687/1609	4.38	4.24	4.22	4.30	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	251/1585	4.63	3.99	3.96	4.01	4.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	538/1535	4.38	4.24	4.08	4.18	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	372/1651	4.63	3.90	4.18	4.23	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.45	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.02	4.07	4.19	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	266/1586	4.88	4.18	4.43	4.46	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	180/1582	4.88	4.19	4.26	4.31	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.11	4.27	4.35	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	540/1380	4.20	3.58	3.94	4.04	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	151/1520	4.88	4.12	4.01	4.18	4.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.43	4.24	4.40	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	278/1511	4.88	4.43	4.27	4.45	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	205/ 994	4.50	3.95	3.94	4.19	4.50	

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 5		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	8
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 6
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 498 0101
 Title
 Instructor: Falco, R.
 Enrollment: 0
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 7
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1489/1674	****	3.99	4.27	4.07	3.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	1	3.43	1531/1674	****	4.11	4.23	4.16	3.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	2	3	4.00	1094/1609	****	3.97	4.22	4.05	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	1352/1585	****	3.78	3.96	3.88	3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1066/1535	****	4.03	4.08	3.89	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	0	2	3.29	1517/1651	****	3.77	4.18	4.10	3.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	1497/1673	****	4.58	4.69	4.67	4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	849/1656	****	4.07	4.07	3.96	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	5	0	0	2.57	1570/1586	****	4.34	4.43	4.37	2.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1585	****	4.73	4.69	4.60	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1244/1582	****	4.17	4.26	4.17	3.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	1309/1575	****	4.09	4.27	4.17	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	143/1380	****	4.17	3.94	3.78	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	726/1520	****	3.57	4.01	3.76	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	960/1515	****	3.72	4.24	3.97	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	4	0	1	3.00	1420/1511	****	3.92	4.27	4.00	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	474/ 994	****	3.96	3.94	3.73	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 7	Non-major 7
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	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 7		
				? 2			

Course-Section: ENGL 686 0101
 Title TEACHING COMP
 Instructor: MCCARTHY, LUCIL
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 841
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.01	4.27	4.44	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.08	4.23	4.34	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.24	4.22	4.34	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	5.00	3.99	3.96	4.23	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.24	4.08	4.27	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1651	5.00	3.90	4.18	4.32	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.45	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.02	4.07	4.15	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.18	4.43	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.19	4.26	4.33	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.11	4.27	4.30	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.12	4.01	4.19	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.43	4.24	4.47	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.43	4.27	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	3.95	3.94	4.07	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 103	5.00	4.38	4.41	4.56	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 101	5.00	4.49	4.48	4.62	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 95	5.00	4.14	4.31	4.43	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 99	5.00	4.34	4.39	4.54	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	4.21	4.14	4.26	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1	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 1	Under-grad 0	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 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ENGL 688 0101
 Title WRITING/COMPUTERS
 Instructor: CARPENTER, KARE
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 842
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.01	4.27	4.44	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.08	4.23	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.22	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.24	4.22	4.34	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	5.00	3.99	3.96	4.23	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.24	4.08	4.27	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1651	5.00	3.90	4.18	4.32	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.45	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.02	4.07	4.15	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.18	4.43	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.19	4.26	4.33	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.11	4.27	4.30	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	5.00	3.58	3.94	3.85	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.12	4.01	4.19	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.43	4.24	4.47	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.43	4.27	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	3.95	3.94	4.07	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 265	5.00	4.00	4.23	4.51	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 278	5.00	4.50	4.19	4.42	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 260	5.00	4.33	4.46	4.67	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 259	5.00	4.42	4.33	4.66	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 233	5.00	4.58	4.20	4.53	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 103	5.00	4.38	4.41	4.56	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 101	5.00	4.49	4.48	4.62	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 95	5.00	4.14	4.31	4.43	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 99	5.00	4.34	4.39	4.54	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	4.21	4.14	4.26	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4.54	3.98	4.20	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 77	5.00	4.17	3.93	4.31	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 53	5.00	4.38	4.45	4.64	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.09	4.12	4.35	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 49	5.00	3.98	4.27	4.46	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 61	5.00	3.97	4.09	4.46	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.25	4.26	4.59	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 50	5.00	4.53	4.44	4.64	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.00	4.36	4.84	5.00	

Course-Section: ENGL 688 0101
 Title WRITING/COMPUTERS
 Instructor: CARPENTER, KARE
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 842
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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