

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0101  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: TAYLOR, PAUL  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 713  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	7	7	3	3.27	1555/1649	3.77	4.01	4.28	4.11	3.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	6	9	4	3.55	1467/1648	4.08	4.10	4.23	4.16	3.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	1	2	0	5	3	3.64	1159/1375	4.15	4.25	4.27	4.10	3.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	5	0	7	8	3.64	1353/1595	4.18	4.25	4.20	4.03	3.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	3	7	7	3.67	1139/1533	3.82	4.00	4.04	3.87	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	2	11	4	3.62	1196/1512	4.19	4.27	4.10	3.86	3.62	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	6	1	6	5	3.19	1498/1623	3.93	3.89	4.16	4.08	3.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1646	4.53	4.46	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	7	10	0	3.59	1310/1621	3.86	3.97	4.06	3.96	3.59	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	5	8	6	3.81	1385/1568	3.97	4.22	4.43	4.39	3.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	840/1572	4.59	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	5	9	6	3.95	1173/1564	4.11	4.24	4.28	4.20	3.95	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	2	2	8	6	3.57	1351/1559	4.00	4.17	4.29	4.20	3.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	16	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/1352	3.49	3.48	3.98	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	4	9	4	3.48	1093/1384	3.79	4.09	4.08	3.86	3.48	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	2	4	4	11	4.14	899/1382	4.09	4.34	4.29	4.03	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	472/1368	4.39	4.47	4.30	4.01	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	2	2	8	4	1	3.00	844/ 948	3.63	3.87	3.95	3.75	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 243	****	3.83	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	****/ 555	2.91	2.30	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.32	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.46	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	4.07	4.43	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	3.95	3.35	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	2.78	2.70	3.68	3.51	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A 16	Required for Majors 16	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	Under-grad 23	Non-major 23
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0201  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: BURNS, MARGIE  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 714  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	4	9	2	4	3.32	1545/1649	3.77	4.01	4.28	4.11	3.32	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	4	7	3.89	1237/1648	4.08	4.10	4.23	4.16	3.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	6	3	6	4	3.42	1236/1375	4.15	4.25	4.27	4.10	3.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	8	3	3.63	1353/1595	4.18	4.25	4.20	4.03	3.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	6	7	4	3.63	1159/1533	3.82	4.00	4.04	3.87	3.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	6	6	5	3.83	1068/1512	4.19	4.27	4.10	3.86	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	6	2	6	3.50	1387/1623	3.93	3.89	4.16	4.08	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	680/1646	4.53	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	2	3	5	3	3.69	1240/1621	3.86	3.97	4.06	3.96	3.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	6	7	4.18	1183/1568	3.97	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.18	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	912/1572	4.59	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	3	6	6	4.06	1100/1564	4.11	4.24	4.28	4.20	4.06	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	4	5	7	4.06	1098/1559	4.00	4.17	4.29	4.20	4.06	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	2	2	3	7	4.07	650/1352	3.49	3.48	3.98	3.86	4.07	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	3	2	2	5	1	2.92	1290/1384	3.79	4.09	4.08	3.86	2.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	2	3	5	3	3.69	1132/1382	4.09	4.34	4.29	4.03	3.69	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	5	4	3	3.69	1122/1368	4.39	4.47	4.30	4.01	3.69	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	0	4	1	2	0	2.71	898/ 948	3.63	3.87	3.95	3.75	2.71	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	2.91	2.30	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	3.95	3.35	3.68	3.54	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 19 Non-major 19
84-150	0	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	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0301  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: FLANIGAN, SEAN  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 715  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	16	4.80	274/1649	3.77	4.01	4.28	4.11	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	263/1648	4.08	4.10	4.23	4.16	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	401/1375	4.15	4.25	4.27	4.10	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	80/1595	4.18	4.25	4.20	4.03	4.95	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	4	13	4.40	476/1533	3.82	4.00	4.04	3.87	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	15	4.65	271/1512	4.19	4.27	4.10	3.86	4.65	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	3	5	9	3.90	1180/1623	3.93	3.89	4.16	4.08	3.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	913/1646	4.53	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	234/1621	3.86	3.97	4.06	3.96	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	791/1568	3.97	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	591/1572	4.59	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	486/1564	4.11	4.24	4.28	4.20	4.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	475/1559	4.00	4.17	4.29	4.20	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	1	3	4	9	4.06	661/1352	3.49	3.48	3.98	3.86	4.06	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	394/1384	3.79	4.09	4.08	3.86	4.58	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	2	15	4.68	464/1382	4.09	4.34	4.29	4.03	4.68	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	158/1368	4.39	4.47	4.30	4.01	4.95	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	1	0	2	6	9	4.22	353/ 948	3.63	3.87	3.95	3.75	4.22	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 243	****	3.83	4.12	4.08	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	3.95	3.35	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 312	2.78	2.70	3.68	3.51	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	5	A	7	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	19
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	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0401  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: PEKARSKE, NICOL  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 716  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	1272/1649	3.77	4.01	4.28	4.11	3.91	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	999/1648	4.08	4.10	4.23	4.16	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	9	0	0	1	1	1	4.50	****/1375	4.15	4.25	4.27	4.10	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	1067/1595	4.18	4.25	4.20	4.03	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	1	0	3	3	2	3.56	1214/1533	3.82	4.00	4.04	3.87	3.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	8	3	4.27	663/1512	4.19	4.27	4.10	3.86	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	568/1623	3.93	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	3	7	1	3.82	1615/1646	4.53	4.46	4.69	4.67	3.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	4	1	1	3.50	1345/1621	3.86	3.97	4.06	3.96	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1279/1568	3.97	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1572	4.59	4.71	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1001/1564	4.11	4.24	4.28	4.20	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1246/1559	4.00	4.17	4.29	4.20	3.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	1	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1049/1352	3.49	3.48	3.98	3.86	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1384	3.79	4.09	4.08	3.86	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1382	4.09	4.34	4.29	4.03	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1368	4.39	4.47	4.30	4.01	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 948	3.63	3.87	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	2.91	2.30	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	3.95	3.35	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	217/ 312	2.78	2.70	3.68	3.51	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
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	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0501  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: TERHORST, RAYMO  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 717  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	10	14	4.58	536/1649	3.77	4.01	4.28	4.11	4.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	225/1648	4.08	4.10	4.23	4.16	4.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	347/1375	4.15	4.25	4.27	4.10	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	174/1595	4.18	4.25	4.20	4.03	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	8	5	11	4.13	733/1533	3.82	4.00	4.04	3.87	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	21	4.83	142/1512	4.19	4.27	4.10	3.86	4.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	18	4.67	321/1623	3.93	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	19	5	4.21	1433/1646	4.53	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.21	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	125/1621	3.86	3.97	4.06	3.96	4.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	480/1568	3.97	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	532/1572	4.59	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	197/1564	4.11	4.24	4.28	4.20	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	8	16	4.67	512/1559	4.00	4.17	4.29	4.20	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	2	1	3	1	13	4.10	633/1352	3.49	3.48	3.98	3.86	4.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	2	15	4.68	310/1384	3.79	4.09	4.08	3.86	4.68	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	414/1382	4.09	4.34	4.29	4.03	4.74	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	327/1368	4.39	4.47	4.30	4.01	4.84	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	196/ 948	3.63	3.87	3.95	3.75	4.53	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.32	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.46	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.07	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.22	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	3.95	3.35	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.54	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.74	4.09	3.65	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 312	2.78	2.70	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.20	4.30	4.17	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	4.27	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 2	A 13	Required for Majors 14	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 1	B 6		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 3	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 24 Non-major 24
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 6	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0701  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: PUTZEL, DIANE M  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 718  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	6	9	4.15	1067/1649	3.77	4.01	4.28	4.11	4.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	12	4.40	702/1648	4.08	4.10	4.23	4.16	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	950/1375	4.15	4.25	4.27	4.10	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	497/1595	4.18	4.25	4.20	4.03	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	8	2	7	3.83	986/1533	3.82	4.00	4.04	3.87	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	17	4.75	194/1512	4.19	4.27	4.10	3.86	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	6	5	8	4.00	1029/1623	3.93	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	17	2	4.05	1525/1646	4.53	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.05	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	9	8	4.39	535/1621	3.86	3.97	4.06	3.96	4.39	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	2	9	8	4.15	1198/1568	3.97	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.15	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	931/1572	4.59	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	5	10	4.20	1001/1564	4.11	4.24	4.28	4.20	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	5	10	4.15	1038/1559	4.00	4.17	4.29	4.20	4.15	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	3	5	9	4.05	661/1352	3.49	3.48	3.98	3.86	4.05	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	4	4	7	4.06	774/1384	3.79	4.09	4.08	3.86	4.06	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	464/1382	4.09	4.34	4.29	4.03	4.69	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	369/1368	4.39	4.47	4.30	4.01	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	3	3	5	4	3.67	645/ 948	3.63	3.87	3.95	3.75	3.67	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	1	0	0	4	0	3.40	202/ 288	3.95	3.35	3.68	3.54	3.40	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 312	2.78	2.70	3.68	3.51	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	14	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0801  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: BROFMAN, MARGAR  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 719  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	4	0	6	3	3.00	1603/1649	3.77	4.01	4.28	4.11	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	5	4	3	3	3.00	1591/1648	4.08	4.10	4.23	4.16	3.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	4	3	1	3.44	1229/1375	4.15	4.25	4.27	4.10	3.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	2	5	5	3.47	1411/1595	4.18	4.25	4.20	4.03	3.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	4	3	3	2	2.59	1503/1533	3.82	4.00	4.04	3.87	2.59	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	4	3	1	6	3.18	1401/1512	4.19	4.27	4.10	3.86	3.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	5	1	4	4	3.19	1501/1623	3.93	3.89	4.16	4.08	3.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1646	4.53	4.46	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	2	1	7	4	1	3.07	1494/1621	3.86	3.97	4.06	3.96	3.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	4	3	1	5	3	3.00	1515/1568	3.97	4.22	4.43	4.39	3.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	3	2	3	1	8	3.53	1536/1572	4.59	4.71	4.70	4.64	3.53	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	4	2	0	8	2	3.13	1485/1564	4.11	4.24	4.28	4.20	3.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	5	1	1	4	5	3.19	1452/1559	4.00	4.17	4.29	4.20	3.19	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	3	0	1	0	2	2.67	1287/1352	3.49	3.48	3.98	3.86	2.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	3	3	4	0	2.91	1300/1384	3.79	4.09	4.08	3.86	2.91	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	3	0	4	2	2	3.00	1316/1382	4.09	4.34	4.29	4.03	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	2	1	3	3	2	3.18	1269/1368	4.39	4.47	4.30	4.01	3.18	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	3	1	2	1	0	2.14	934/ 948	3.63	3.87	3.95	3.75	2.14	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	3.83	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	5	1	1	0	0	1.43	548/ 555	2.91	2.30	4.29	4.14	1.43	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 88	****	4.32	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 85	****	4.46	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 81	****	4.07	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	4.22	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 288	3.95	3.35	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	3.54	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	3.74	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	4.05	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	4.08	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	3	0	0	3	0	2.50	279/ 312	2.78	2.70	3.68	3.51	2.50	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	4.20	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	4.63	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	****	5.00	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0801  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: BROFMAN, MARGAR  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 719  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	5	A	2	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	16
84-150	0	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	4				
				?	1						



Course-Section: ENGL 100 0901  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: TAYLOR, PAUL  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 720  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	5	4	3.71	1396/1649	3.77	4.01	4.28	4.11	3.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	7	3	3.79	1326/1648	4.08	4.10	4.23	4.16	3.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	401/1375	4.15	4.25	4.27	4.10	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	0	9	4.31	759/1595	4.18	4.25	4.20	4.03	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	3	8	4.14	718/1533	3.82	4.00	4.04	3.87	4.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	651/1512	4.19	4.27	4.10	3.86	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	3	6	4.00	1029/1623	3.93	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	531/1646	4.53	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	2	0	6	2	3.80	1151/1621	3.86	3.97	4.06	3.96	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	3	3	4	3.67	1426/1568	3.97	4.22	4.43	4.39	3.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	740/1572	4.59	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	939/1564	4.11	4.24	4.28	4.20	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	1	7	4.08	1084/1559	4.00	4.17	4.29	4.20	4.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1049/1352	3.49	3.48	3.98	3.86	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	613/1384	3.79	4.09	4.08	3.86	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	616/1382	4.09	4.34	4.29	4.03	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	461/1368	4.39	4.47	4.30	4.01	4.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	281/ 948	3.63	3.87	3.95	3.75	4.40	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 243	****	3.83	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	3	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	323/ 555	2.91	2.30	4.29	4.14	4.40	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.32	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 85	****	4.46	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 81	****	4.07	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.22	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	37/ 288	3.95	3.35	3.68	3.54	4.50	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.54	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 48	****	3.74	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.05	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.08	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 312	2.78	2.70	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 53	****	4.20	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 30	****	4.63	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 110	****	5.00	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0901  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: TAYLOR, PAUL  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 720  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 1	A 11	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 14 Non-major 14
84-150	0	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 5	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1001  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: DUNNIGAN, BRIAN  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 721  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	13	4.63	471/1649	3.77	4.01	4.28	4.11	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	188/1648	4.08	4.10	4.23	4.16	4.84	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	179/1375	4.15	4.25	4.27	4.10	4.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	254/1595	4.18	4.25	4.20	4.03	4.74	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	162/1533	3.82	4.00	4.04	3.87	4.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	286/1512	4.19	4.27	4.10	3.86	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	358/1623	3.93	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	5	4.26	1391/1646	4.53	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.26	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	117/1621	3.86	3.97	4.06	3.96	4.84	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	636/1568	3.97	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1572	4.59	4.71	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	390/1564	4.11	4.24	4.28	4.20	4.72	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	284/1559	4.00	4.17	4.29	4.20	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	16	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1352	3.49	3.48	3.98	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	376/1384	3.79	4.09	4.08	3.86	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	282/1382	4.09	4.34	4.29	4.03	4.87	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1368	4.39	4.47	4.30	4.01	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	330/ 948	3.63	3.87	3.95	3.75	4.29	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	3.83	4.12	4.08	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	1	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	****/ 555	2.91	2.30	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.32	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.46	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	4.07	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.22	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 288	3.95	3.35	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	3.54	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	3.74	4.09	3.65	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	1	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 312	2.78	2.70	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.20	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.63	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.42	4.24	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1001  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: DUNNIGAN, BRIAN  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 721  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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 8	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 19 Non-major 19
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 3	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1101  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: MCGURRIN JR, AN  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 722  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR NA		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	2	2	5	2	3.23	1564/1649	3.77	4.01	4.28	4.11	3.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	2	5	3	3.46	1499/1648	4.08	4.10	4.23	4.16	3.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1375	4.15	4.25	4.27	4.10	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	6	3	3.62	1365/1595	4.18	4.25	4.20	4.03	3.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	7	4	4.00	815/1533	3.82	4.00	4.04	3.87	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	791/1512	4.19	4.27	4.10	3.86	4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	5	3	4	3.69	1303/1623	3.93	3.89	4.16	4.08	3.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	8	2	3.92	1592/1646	4.53	4.46	4.69	4.67	3.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	2	3	3	0	2.89	1539/1621	3.86	3.97	4.06	3.96	2.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	3	1	2	3	3	3.17	1504/1568	3.97	4.22	4.43	4.39	3.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	1241/1572	4.59	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	2	5	2	3.42	1423/1564	4.11	4.24	4.28	4.20	3.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	4	2	4	3.50	1370/1559	4.00	4.17	4.29	4.20	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	1301/1352	3.49	3.48	3.98	3.86	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	3	1	0	2	2.63	1339/1384	3.79	4.09	4.08	3.86	2.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	1	1	2	2	3.13	1306/1382	4.09	4.34	4.29	4.03	3.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	560/1368	4.39	4.47	4.30	4.01	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 948	3.63	3.87	3.95	3.75	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	3.83	4.12	4.08	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	2	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	2.91	2.30	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 88	****	4.32	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.46	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	4.07	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	4.22	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	3	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 288	3.95	3.35	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	3.54	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.74	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.05	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.08	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	1	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 312	2.78	2.70	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 53	****	4.20	4.30	4.17	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	4.27	****

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1101  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: MCGURRIN JR, AN  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 722  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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 6	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 13 Non-major 13
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 3	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1201  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: CORDS, JOHN  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 723  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	7	4	3.71	1402/1649	3.77	4.01	4.28	4.11	3.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	6	7	4.06	1094/1648	4.08	4.10	4.23	4.16	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	806/1375	4.15	4.25	4.27	4.10	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	7	7	4.12	996/1595	4.18	4.25	4.20	4.03	4.12	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	7	4	3.65	1153/1533	3.82	4.00	4.04	3.87	3.65	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	2	11	4.29	639/1512	4.19	4.27	4.10	3.86	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	6	4	4	3.63	1337/1623	3.93	3.89	4.16	4.08	3.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1646	4.53	4.46	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	4	5	2	3.58	1310/1621	3.86	3.97	4.06	3.96	3.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	0	2	5	3	3.82	1381/1568	3.97	4.22	4.43	4.39	3.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	1193/1572	4.59	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	854/1564	4.11	4.24	4.28	4.20	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	987/1559	4.00	4.17	4.29	4.20	4.22	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	3	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	942/1352	3.49	3.48	3.98	3.86	3.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	2	7	4	3.93	867/1384	3.79	4.09	4.08	3.86	3.93	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	502/1382	4.09	4.34	4.29	4.03	4.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	601/1368	4.39	4.47	4.30	4.01	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	1	0	5	7	0	3.38	754/ 948	3.63	3.87	3.95	3.75	3.38	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 243	****	3.83	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	2.91	2.30	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	4.32	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.46	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	4.07	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.22	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 288	3.95	3.35	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	3.54	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	3.74	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.05	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.08	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 312	2.78	2.70	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.20	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	4.63	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	5.00	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1201  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: CORDS, JOHN  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 723  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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 3	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 17 Non-major 17
84-150	1	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 6	
			? 1		



Course-Section: ENGL 100 1301  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: CORDS, JOHN  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 724  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	7	8	6	3.86	1303/1649	3.77	4.01	4.28	4.11	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	15	4.55	510/1648	4.08	4.10	4.23	4.16	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	18	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/1375	4.15	4.25	4.27	4.10	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	8	11	4.43	608/1595	4.18	4.25	4.20	4.03	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	5	6	7	3.64	1159/1533	3.82	4.00	4.04	3.87	3.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	9	8	4.09	839/1512	4.19	4.27	4.10	3.86	4.09	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	4	14	4.45	568/1623	3.93	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1646	4.53	4.46	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	6	7	4	3.88	1078/1621	3.86	3.97	4.06	3.96	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	2	5	10	4.28	1104/1568	3.97	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.28	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	1165/1572	4.59	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.59	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	801/1564	4.11	4.24	4.28	4.20	4.39	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	3	4	10	4.28	952/1559	4.00	4.17	4.29	4.20	4.28	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	4	1	2	2	2	6	3.77	907/1352	3.49	3.48	3.98	3.86	3.77	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	5	12	4.47	468/1384	3.79	4.09	4.08	3.86	4.47	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	1	1	3	13	4.37	749/1382	4.09	4.34	4.29	4.03	4.37	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	0	18	4.84	327/1368	4.39	4.47	4.30	4.01	4.84	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	2	0	2	5	8	4.00	431/ 948	3.63	3.87	3.95	3.75	4.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	2.78	2.70	3.68	3.51	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 17		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 22 Non-major 21
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 7	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1401  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: BROFMAN, MARGAR  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 725  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	4	6	4	2	3.25	1560/1649	3.77	4.01	4.28	4.11	3.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	4	5	3	4	3.44	1513/1648	4.08	4.10	4.23	4.16	3.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	1	2	2	6	0	3.18	1300/1375	4.15	4.25	4.27	4.10	3.18	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	6	6	3	3.69	1323/1595	4.18	4.25	4.20	4.03	3.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	4	5	3	3.18	1396/1533	3.82	4.00	4.04	3.87	3.18	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	6	4	5	3.71	1149/1512	4.19	4.27	4.10	3.86	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	3	3	2	2	6	3.31	1470/1623	3.93	3.89	4.16	4.08	3.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	799/1646	4.53	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	6	4	4	0	2.86	1545/1621	3.86	3.97	4.06	3.96	2.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	4	9	2	2	3.12	1509/1568	3.97	4.22	4.43	4.39	3.12	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	4	5	6	3.82	1508/1572	4.59	4.71	4.70	4.64	3.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	5	5	5	2	3.24	1464/1564	4.11	4.24	4.28	4.20	3.24	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	3	4	5	2	3.00	1479/1559	4.00	4.17	4.29	4.20	3.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	12	2	2	0	0	0	1.50	****/1352	3.49	3.48	3.98	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	7	2	4	1	1	2.13	1362/1384	3.79	4.09	4.08	3.86	2.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	7	3	3	1	1	2.07	1373/1382	4.09	4.34	4.29	4.03	2.07	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	4	4	5	1	1	2.40	1349/1368	4.39	4.47	4.30	4.01	2.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	9	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	776/ 948	3.63	3.87	3.95	3.75	3.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 555	2.91	2.30	4.29	4.14	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 312	2.78	2.70	3.68	3.51	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	6	A	7	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1501  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: WILKINSON, RACH  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 726  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	1	4	6	4.17	1057/1649	3.77	4.01	4.28	4.11	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	3	7	4.17	999/1648	4.08	4.10	4.23	4.16	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	546/1375	4.15	4.25	4.27	4.10	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	133/1595	4.18	4.25	4.20	4.03	4.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	334/1533	3.82	4.00	4.04	3.87	4.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	151/1512	4.19	4.27	4.10	3.86	4.82	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	894/1623	3.93	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	782/1646	4.53	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	754/1621	3.86	3.97	4.06	3.96	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	0	2	8	4.25	1121/1568	3.97	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	1	10	4.58	1165/1572	4.59	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.58	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	0	1	9	4.33	854/1564	4.11	4.24	4.28	4.20	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	1	9	4.55	651/1559	4.00	4.17	4.29	4.20	4.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	2	1	2	2	2	3.11	1204/1352	3.49	3.48	3.98	3.86	3.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	0	8	4.40	541/1384	3.79	4.09	4.08	3.86	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	1	0	8	4.40	716/1382	4.09	4.34	4.29	4.03	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	0	0	1	7	4.10	920/1368	4.39	4.47	4.30	4.01	4.10	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	389/ 948	3.63	3.87	3.95	3.75	4.14	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 243	****	3.83	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 555	2.91	2.30	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 88	****	4.32	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.46	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 81	****	4.07	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.22	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 288	3.95	3.35	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	3.54	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	3.74	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.05	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.08	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	1	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	287/ 312	2.78	2.70	3.68	3.51	2.33	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.20	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.63	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 110	****	5.00	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1501  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: WILKINSON, RACH  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 726  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	2	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1601  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: MACEK, PHILIP  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 727  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	15	6	4.17	1047/1649	3.77	4.01	4.28	4.11	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	441/1648	4.08	4.10	4.23	4.16	4.61	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	529/1375	4.15	4.25	4.27	4.10	4.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	383/1595	4.18	4.25	4.20	4.03	4.61	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	16	4.52	350/1533	3.82	4.00	4.04	3.87	4.52	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	5	16	4.52	366/1512	4.19	4.27	4.10	3.86	4.52	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	4	6	11	4.23	849/1623	3.93	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	13	4.59	1112/1646	4.53	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.59	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	9	10	4.53	356/1621	3.86	3.97	4.06	3.96	4.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	358/1568	3.97	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	296/1572	4.59	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	294/1564	4.11	4.24	4.28	4.20	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	14	4.52	673/1559	4.00	4.17	4.29	4.20	4.52	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	0	4	4	7	4.20	556/1352	3.49	3.48	3.98	3.86	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	3	14	4.48	468/1384	3.79	4.09	4.08	3.86	4.48	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	383/1382	4.09	4.34	4.29	4.03	4.76	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	264/1368	4.39	4.47	4.30	4.01	4.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	10	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	370/ 948	3.63	3.87	3.95	3.75	4.18	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 243	****	3.83	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	2	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 555	2.91	2.30	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 88	****	4.32	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.46	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 81	****	4.07	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 92	****	4.22	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 288	3.95	3.35	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.54	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.74	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.05	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.08	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	2.78	2.70	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 53	****	4.20	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 30	****	4.63	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	5.00	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1601  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: MACEK, PHILIP  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 727  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
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	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1701  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: KILLGALLON, DON  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 728  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	7	12	4.41	776/1649	3.77	4.01	4.28	4.11	4.41	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	336/1648	4.08	4.10	4.23	4.16	4.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	771/1375	4.15	4.25	4.27	4.10	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	5	15	4.50	497/1595	4.18	4.25	4.20	4.03	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	3	5	10	4.00	815/1533	3.82	4.00	4.04	3.87	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	1	17	4.62	302/1512	4.19	4.27	4.10	3.86	4.62	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	169/1623	3.93	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	332/1646	4.53	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	10	5	4.25	687/1621	3.86	3.97	4.06	3.96	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	1	4	14	4.50	852/1568	3.97	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	591/1572	4.59	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	550/1564	4.11	4.24	4.28	4.20	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	1	4	13	4.40	832/1559	4.00	4.17	4.29	4.20	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	3	4	4	7	3.83	860/1352	3.49	3.48	3.98	3.86	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	5	3	7	3.88	896/1384	3.79	4.09	4.08	3.86	3.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	4	2	11	4.41	706/1382	4.09	4.34	4.29	4.03	4.41	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	742/1368	4.39	4.47	4.30	4.01	4.41	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	1	1	2	3	7	4.00	431/ 948	3.63	3.87	3.95	3.75	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 243	****	3.83	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	2.91	2.30	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.32	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.46	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.07	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.22	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	3.95	3.35	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.54	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.74	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.05	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.08	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	2.78	2.70	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.20	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	4.63	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	5.00	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1701  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: KILLGALLON, DON  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 728  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	14	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	0	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				
				?	0						



Course-Section: ENGL 100 1801  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: DIALLO, MAMADOU  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 729  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	4	2	3	1	3	2.77	1632/1649	3.77	4.01	4.28	4.11	2.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	4	1	2	4	3.15	1579/1648	4.08	4.10	4.23	4.16	3.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	4	0	3	1	4	3.08	1321/1375	4.15	4.25	4.27	4.10	3.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	3	3	1	4	3.15	1513/1595	4.18	4.25	4.20	4.03	3.15	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	4	1	2	0	4	2.91	1476/1533	3.82	4.00	4.04	3.87	2.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	2	1	3	4	3.42	1314/1512	4.19	4.27	4.10	3.86	3.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	3	1	2	1	5	3.33	1462/1623	3.93	3.89	4.16	4.08	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	2	9	1	3.92	1598/1646	4.53	4.46	4.69	4.67	3.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	3	2	2	2	1	2.60	1577/1621	3.86	3.97	4.06	3.96	2.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	5	1	2	0	4	2.75	1547/1568	3.97	4.22	4.43	4.39	2.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	2	3	1	6	3.92	1489/1572	4.59	4.71	4.70	4.64	3.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	4	1	3	0	4	2.92	1517/1564	4.11	4.24	4.28	4.20	2.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	3	1	0	5	3.08	1470/1559	4.00	4.17	4.29	4.20	3.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	7	3	0	0	0	2	2.60	1293/1352	3.49	3.48	3.98	3.86	2.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	4	1	0	1	2	2.50	1346/1384	3.79	4.09	4.08	3.86	2.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	2	1	2	1	2	3.00	1316/1382	4.09	4.34	4.29	4.03	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	3	0	1	1	3	3.13	1279/1368	4.39	4.47	4.30	4.01	3.13	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	3	1	0	0	2.25	929/ 948	3.63	3.87	3.95	3.75	2.25	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 555	2.91	2.30	4.29	4.14	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 312	2.78	2.70	3.68	3.51	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
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	2				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1901  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: BLOOM, RYAN I.  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 730  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	3	2	8	4	4	3.19	1574/1649	3.77	4.01	4.28	4.11	3.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	4	9	4	3.57	1457/1648	4.08	4.10	4.23	4.16	3.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	17	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/1375	4.15	4.25	4.27	4.10	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	7	9	4.10	1015/1595	4.18	4.25	4.20	4.03	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	1	5	6	3	3.05	1432/1533	3.82	4.00	4.04	3.87	3.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	9	7	4.05	859/1512	4.19	4.27	4.10	3.86	4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	3	8	6	3.80	1241/1623	3.93	3.89	4.16	4.08	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1646	4.53	4.46	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	4	9	4	3.83	1123/1621	3.86	3.97	4.06	3.96	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	2	3	13	4.35	1031/1568	3.97	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	7	11	4.40	1321/1572	4.59	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	0	4	4	10	4.00	1127/1564	4.11	4.24	4.28	4.20	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	1	2	7	6	3.50	1370/1559	4.00	4.17	4.29	4.20	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	11	1	2	4	1	0	2.63	1291/1352	3.49	3.48	3.98	3.86	2.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	1	5	9	4.06	778/1384	3.79	4.09	4.08	3.86	4.06
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	774/1382	4.09	4.34	4.29	4.03	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	1	3	13	4.56	616/1368	4.39	4.47	4.30	4.01	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	1	0	4	8	2	3.67	645/ 948	3.63	3.87	3.95	3.75	3.67
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	2.91	2.30	4.29	4.14	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	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	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 2201  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: DUNNIGAN, BRIAN  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 731  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	4	11	4.50	644/1649	3.77	4.01	4.28	4.11	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	414/1648	4.08	4.10	4.23	4.16	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	199/1375	4.15	4.25	4.27	4.10	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	7	8	4.38	672/1595	4.18	4.25	4.20	4.03	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	342/1533	3.82	4.00	4.04	3.87	4.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	359/1512	4.19	4.27	4.10	3.86	4.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	370/1623	3.93	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	4	4.25	1398/1646	4.53	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	288/1621	3.86	3.97	4.06	3.96	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	904/1568	3.97	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1572	4.59	4.71	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	473/1564	4.11	4.24	4.28	4.20	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	561/1559	4.00	4.17	4.29	4.20	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	2	0	4	1	1	2.88	1261/1352	3.49	3.48	3.98	3.86	2.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	266/1384	3.79	4.09	4.08	3.86	4.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	540/1382	4.09	4.34	4.29	4.03	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	185/1368	4.39	4.47	4.30	4.01	4.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	1	1	3	6	3	3.64	656/ 948	3.63	3.87	3.95	3.75	3.64	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 555	2.91	2.30	4.29	4.14	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 312	2.78	2.70	3.68	3.51	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 2301  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: DIALLO, MAMADOU  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 732  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	3	5	0	2.69	1635/1649	3.77	4.01	4.28	4.11	2.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	5	3	3.67	1408/1648	4.08	4.10	4.23	4.16	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	823/1375	4.15	4.25	4.27	4.10	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	4	5	3	3.92	1188/1595	4.18	4.25	4.20	4.03	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	3	4	1	3.44	1289/1533	3.82	4.00	4.04	3.87	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	2	5	2	3.33	1345/1512	4.19	4.27	4.10	3.86	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	7	1	1	2.77	1577/1623	3.93	3.89	4.16	4.08	2.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	1	4.08	1517/1646	4.53	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.08
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	7	3	0	3.18	1468/1621	3.86	3.97	4.06	3.96	3.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	2	5	4	0	2.85	1542/1568	3.97	4.22	4.43	4.39	2.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	2	8	2	3.85	1504/1572	4.59	4.71	4.70	4.64	3.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	6	4	1	3.23	1464/1564	4.11	4.24	4.28	4.20	3.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	3	6	0	3.08	1471/1559	4.00	4.17	4.29	4.20	3.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1352	3.49	3.48	3.98	3.86	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	2	3	0	3.00	1254/1384	3.79	4.09	4.08	3.86	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	2	1	0	3	3.29	1265/1382	4.09	4.34	4.29	4.03	3.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	732/1368	4.39	4.47	4.30	4.01	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 948	3.63	3.87	3.95	3.75	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 243	****	3.83	4.12	4.08	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 555	2.91	2.30	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.32	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.46	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	4.07	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.22	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	3.95	3.35	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	3.54	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.74	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.05	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.08	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 312	2.78	2.70	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.20	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	4.63	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	5.00	3.99	3.83	****

Course-Section: ENGL 100 2301  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: DIALLO, MAMADOU  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 732  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	8	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
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	4				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 2501  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: PUTZEL, DIANE M  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 733  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	4	7	7	3.81	1351/1649	3.77	4.01	4.28	4.11	3.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	14	4.52	533/1648	4.08	4.10	4.23	4.16	4.52	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	18	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1375	4.15	4.25	4.27	4.10	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	10	9	4.33	722/1595	4.18	4.25	4.20	4.03	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	0	5	6	5	4.00	815/1533	3.82	4.00	4.04	3.87	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	9	9	4.42	493/1512	4.19	4.27	4.10	3.86	4.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	7	8	4.10	979/1623	3.93	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	3	16	1	3.90	1605/1646	4.53	4.46	4.69	4.67	3.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	10	8	4.30	632/1621	3.86	3.97	4.06	3.96	4.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	10	8	4.30	1080/1568	3.97	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	1034/1572	4.59	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	728/1564	4.11	4.24	4.28	4.20	4.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	5	11	4.30	931/1559	4.00	4.17	4.29	4.20	4.30	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	3	7	8	4.16	590/1352	3.49	3.48	3.98	3.86	4.16	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	4	3	9	4.12	755/1384	3.79	4.09	4.08	3.86	4.12	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	0	5	11	4.53	600/1382	4.09	4.34	4.29	4.03	4.53	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1368	4.39	4.47	4.30	4.01	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	1	0	5	5	4	3.73	610/ 948	3.63	3.87	3.95	3.75	3.73	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 555	2.91	2.30	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	3.95	3.35	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	2.78	2.70	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	****	5.00	3.99	3.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	10	0.00-0.99 4	A 12	Required for Majors	20
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		Under-grad 21
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	2
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0101  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: BROFMAN, MARGAR  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 734  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	6	7	4	3.78	1366/1649	4.15	4.01	4.28	4.11	3.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	1	4	9	4.00	1124/1648	4.37	4.10	4.23	4.16	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	882/1375	4.40	4.25	4.27	4.10	4.15	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	1	7	8	4.24	841/1595	4.35	4.25	4.20	4.03	4.24	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	5	7	3.83	986/1533	3.95	4.00	4.04	3.87	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	6	9	4.29	639/1512	4.39	4.27	4.10	3.86	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	5	1	0	5	6	3.35	1454/1623	4.18	3.89	4.16	4.08	3.35	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1646	4.44	4.46	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	1	4	5	4	3.86	1105/1621	4.18	3.97	4.06	3.96	3.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	5	4	7	4.00	1279/1568	4.48	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	1222/1572	4.79	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.53	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	7	6	4.12	1073/1564	4.43	4.24	4.28	4.20	4.12	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	790/1559	4.45	4.17	4.29	4.20	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	12	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	556/1352	3.65	3.48	3.98	3.86	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	1	2	2	7	3.60	1039/1384	4.12	4.09	4.08	3.86	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	1	2	6	4	3.79	1080/1382	4.26	4.34	4.29	4.03	3.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	2	0	1	5	6	3.93	1015/1368	4.41	4.47	4.30	4.01	3.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	1	1	2	1	3	3.50	699/ 948	3.79	3.87	3.95	3.75	3.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.32	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.46	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.07	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.22	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 312	2.00	2.70	3.68	3.51	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	2	A	5	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	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	0	Other	3				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0201  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: KIDD, KATHLEEN  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 735  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR NA		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	11	8	4.00	1183/1649	4.15	4.01	4.28	4.11	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	13	4.46	629/1648	4.37	4.10	4.23	4.16	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	432/1375	4.40	4.25	4.27	4.10	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	8	12	4.33	722/1595	4.35	4.25	4.20	4.03	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	3	8	10	4.13	725/1533	3.95	4.00	4.04	3.87	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	6	15	4.42	507/1512	4.39	4.27	4.10	3.86	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	1	9	11	4.26	803/1623	4.18	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	13	9	4.35	1333/1646	4.44	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.35
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	1	1	8	8	4.11	859/1621	4.18	3.97	4.06	3.96	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	2	7	12	4.32	1070/1568	4.48	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.32
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	1046/1572	4.79	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	8	11	4.32	876/1564	4.43	4.24	4.28	4.20	4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	3	5	11	4.30	931/1559	4.45	4.17	4.29	4.20	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	12	1	1	2	2	3	3.56	1025/1352	3.65	3.48	3.98	3.86	3.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	1	7	9	4.16	732/1384	4.12	4.09	4.08	3.86	4.16
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	6	6	6	3.84	1053/1382	4.26	4.34	4.29	4.03	3.84
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	2	6	10	4.26	838/1368	4.41	4.47	4.30	4.01	4.26
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	1	4	5	6	4.00	431/ 948	3.79	3.87	3.95	3.75	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 243	****	3.83	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 555	2.29	2.30	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.32	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.46	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	4.07	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.22	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	3.54	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.74	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.05	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.08	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	****/ 312	2.00	2.70	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.20	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.63	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	5.00	3.99	3.83	****



Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0201  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: KIDD, KATHLEEN  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 735  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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 5	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 3	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 24 Non-major 24
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	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		
			? 0	Other 4	

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0301  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: DUNNIGAN, BRIAN  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 736  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	8	15	4.52	617/1649	4.15	4.01	4.28	4.11	4.52	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	10	13	4.44	643/1648	4.37	4.10	4.23	4.16	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	797/1375	4.40	4.25	4.27	4.10	4.27	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	7	14	4.32	734/1595	4.35	4.25	4.20	4.03	4.32	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	5	16	4.50	366/1533	3.95	4.00	4.04	3.87	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	12	11	4.48	422/1512	4.39	4.27	4.10	3.86	4.48	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	4	6	11	4.00	1029/1623	4.18	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	1	21	1	3.92	1598/1646	4.44	4.46	4.69	4.67	3.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	7	13	4.65	243/1621	4.18	3.97	4.06	3.96	4.65	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	7	17	4.71	573/1568	4.48	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1572	4.79	4.71	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	9	16	4.64	498/1564	4.43	4.24	4.28	4.20	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	19	4.68	499/1559	4.45	4.17	4.29	4.20	4.68	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	3	2	4	0	4	3.00	1219/1352	3.65	3.48	3.98	3.86	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	6	16	4.65	335/1384	4.12	4.09	4.08	3.86	4.65	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	4	0	19	4.65	493/1382	4.26	4.34	4.29	4.03	4.65	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	306/1368	4.41	4.47	4.30	4.01	4.87	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	1	4	4	4	4	3.35	767/ 948	3.79	3.87	3.95	3.75	3.35	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 243	****	3.83	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	2.29	2.30	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.32	4.54	4.31	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.07	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.22	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.54	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.74	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.05	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.08	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 312	2.00	2.70	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.20	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.63	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	5.00	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0301  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: DUNNIGAN, BRIAN  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 736  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 4	A 7	Required for Majors 18	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 4	General 1	Under-grad 25 Non-major 25
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 3	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0401  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: KILLGALLON, DON  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 737  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	6	7	10	4.08	1129/1649	4.15	4.01	4.28	4.11	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	8	11	4.25	897/1648	4.37	4.10	4.23	4.16	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	714/1375	4.40	4.25	4.27	4.10	4.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	4	5	12	4.17	916/1595	4.35	4.25	4.20	4.03	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	4	5	6	7	3.50	1249/1533	3.95	4.00	4.04	3.87	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	6	13	4.25	687/1512	4.39	4.27	4.10	3.86	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	8	13	4.33	720/1623	4.18	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1646	4.44	4.46	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	6	8	4	3.89	1078/1621	4.18	3.97	4.06	3.96	3.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	8	13	4.42	969/1568	4.48	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	5	16	4.54	1203/1572	4.79	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	6	8	10	4.17	1028/1564	4.43	4.24	4.28	4.20	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	7	12	4.29	938/1559	4.45	4.17	4.29	4.20	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	3	5	3	10	3.82	872/1352	3.65	3.48	3.98	3.86	3.82	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	3	4	4	8	3.89	891/1384	4.12	4.09	4.08	3.86	3.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	2	2	5	10	4.21	857/1382	4.26	4.34	4.29	4.03	4.21	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	1	1	7	9	4.16	896/1368	4.41	4.47	4.30	4.01	4.16	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	1	2	3	4	5	3.67	645/ 948	3.79	3.87	3.95	3.75	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 243	****	3.83	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 555	2.29	2.30	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 88	****	4.32	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 85	****	4.46	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	4.07	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.22	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	3.54	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	3.74	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 39	****	4.05	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.08	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 312	2.00	2.70	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 53	****	4.20	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	4.63	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	5.00	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0401  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: KILLGALLON, DON  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 737  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 2	A 15	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 24 Non-major 24
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		
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0501  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: WALTERS, APRIL  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 738  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	7	4	3.88	1295/1649	4.15	4.01	4.28	4.11	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	1043/1648	4.37	4.10	4.23	4.16	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	694/1375	4.40	4.25	4.27	4.10	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	672/1595	4.35	4.25	4.20	4.03	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	4	1	4	7	3.88	945/1533	3.95	4.00	4.04	3.87	3.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	764/1512	4.39	4.27	4.10	3.86	4.19	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	5	7	4.06	999/1623	4.18	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.06	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	5	4.31	1356/1646	4.44	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.31	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	914/1621	4.18	3.97	4.06	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	983/1568	4.48	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	690/1572	4.79	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	4	2	8	4.13	1055/1564	4.43	4.24	4.28	4.20	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	1	9	4.20	1009/1559	4.45	4.17	4.29	4.20	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	3	3	1	3	3.40	1101/1352	3.65	3.48	3.98	3.86	3.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	4	1	4	3.64	1025/1384	4.12	4.09	4.08	3.86	3.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	818/1382	4.26	4.34	4.29	4.03	4.27	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	881/1368	4.41	4.47	4.30	4.01	4.18	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	2	3	1	4	3.70	624/ 948	3.79	3.87	3.95	3.75	3.70	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.54	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
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	3				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0601  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: RAY, JENNIE  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 739  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	2	6	7	8	3.91	1263/1649	4.15	4.01	4.28	4.11	3.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	441/1648	4.37	4.10	4.23	4.16	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	855/1375	4.40	4.25	4.27	4.10	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	13	8	4.26	806/1595	4.35	4.25	4.20	4.03	4.26
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	4	8	5	3.50	1249/1533	3.95	4.00	4.04	3.87	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	6	11	4.23	723/1512	4.39	4.27	4.10	3.86	4.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	7	13	4.45	568/1623	4.18	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	21	1	4.05	1528/1646	4.44	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.05
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	9	6	4.17	789/1621	4.18	3.97	4.06	3.96	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	13	10	4.43	943/1568	4.48	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	876/1572	4.79	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	8	15	4.65	486/1564	4.43	4.24	4.28	4.20	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	8	14	4.57	629/1559	4.45	4.17	4.29	4.20	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	2	1	5	4	2	3.21	1173/1352	3.65	3.48	3.98	3.86	3.21
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	9	9	4.24	685/1384	4.12	4.09	4.08	3.86	4.24
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	4	3	13	4.29	812/1382	4.26	4.34	4.29	4.03	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	522/1368	4.41	4.47	4.30	4.01	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	1	7	7	4	3.74	610/ 948	3.79	3.87	3.95	3.75	3.74
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 555	2.29	2.30	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	1	0	0	4	0	3.40	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 312	2.00	2.70	3.68	3.51	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	4	A	5	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0701  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: SNEERINGER, HOL  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 740  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	2	17	4.70	395/1649	4.15	4.01	4.28	4.11	4.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	216/1648	4.37	4.10	4.23	4.16	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	296/1375	4.40	4.25	4.27	4.10	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	144/1595	4.35	4.25	4.20	4.03	4.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	151/1533	3.95	4.00	4.04	3.87	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	156/1512	4.39	4.27	4.10	3.86	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	17	4.75	220/1623	4.18	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	1130/1646	4.44	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.58	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	234/1621	4.18	3.97	4.06	3.96	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	147/1568	4.48	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.95	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1572	4.79	4.71	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	342/1564	4.43	4.24	4.28	4.20	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	205/1559	4.45	4.17	4.29	4.20	4.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	10	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	515/1352	3.65	3.48	3.98	3.86	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	0	15	4.75	247/1384	4.12	4.09	4.08	3.86	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	570/1382	4.26	4.34	4.29	4.03	4.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	358/1368	4.41	4.47	4.30	4.01	4.81	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	1	0	5	6	4.33	310/ 948	3.79	3.87	3.95	3.75	4.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 243	****	3.83	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	1	3	1	2	0	1	2.29	517/ 555	2.29	2.30	4.29	4.14	2.29	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.32	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.46	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.07	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.22	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	1	2	1	0	0	1	2.25	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.54	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.74	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.05	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.08	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	3	1	0	0	1	2.00	291/ 312	2.00	2.70	3.68	3.51	2.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.20	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.63	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	5.00	3.99	3.83	****	



Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0701  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: SNEERINGER, HOL  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 740  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	11	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0801  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: WALTERS, APRIL  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 741  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	10	8	4.30	912/1649	4.15	4.01	4.28	4.11	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	10	8	4.30	839/1648	4.37	4.10	4.23	4.16	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	617/1375	4.40	4.25	4.27	4.10	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	9	7	4.21	865/1595	4.35	4.25	4.20	4.03	4.21	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	5	3	7	3.50	1249/1533	3.95	4.00	4.04	3.87	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	465/1512	4.39	4.27	4.10	3.86	4.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	5	11	4.25	815/1623	4.18	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	12	6	4.33	1340/1646	4.44	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	11	4	4.12	847/1621	4.18	3.97	4.06	3.96	4.12	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	683/1568	4.48	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	355/1572	4.79	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	473/1564	4.43	4.24	4.28	4.20	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	4	11	4.26	959/1559	4.45	4.17	4.29	4.20	4.26	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	2	3	6	6	3.78	900/1352	3.65	3.48	3.98	3.86	3.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	1	5	6	4.00	795/1384	4.12	4.09	4.08	3.86	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	616/1382	4.26	4.34	4.29	4.03	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	732/1368	4.41	4.47	4.30	4.01	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	1	0	3	2	6	4.00	431/ 948	3.79	3.87	3.95	3.75	4.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 555	2.29	2.30	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 312	2.00	2.70	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.20	4.30	4.17	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	4.27	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 100H 0101  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: MCCARTHY, LUCIL  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 742  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	12	4.86	230/1649	4.86	4.01	4.28	4.11	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	475/1648	4.57	4.10	4.23	4.16	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1375	****	4.25	4.27	4.10	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	119/1595	4.92	4.25	4.20	4.03	4.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	6	3	3.85	976/1533	3.85	4.00	4.04	3.87	3.85	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	88/1512	4.93	4.27	4.10	3.86	4.93	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	0	1	6	1	2	3.40	1434/1623	3.40	3.89	4.16	4.08	3.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	1004/1646	4.69	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1621	5.00	3.97	4.06	3.96	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	245/1568	4.91	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	390/1564	4.73	4.24	4.28	4.20	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	651/1559	4.55	4.17	4.29	4.20	4.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	10	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1352	****	3.48	3.98	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	0	10	4.67	326/1384	4.67	4.09	4.08	3.86	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	218/1382	4.92	4.34	4.29	4.03	4.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.47	4.30	4.01	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	102/ 948	4.82	3.87	3.95	3.75	4.82	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	1	2	0	0	1	2.50	511/ 555	2.50	2.30	4.29	4.14	2.50	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 312	****	2.70	3.68	3.51	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 14	Non-major 14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	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 9		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ENGL 100P 0101  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: SNEERINGER, HOL  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 743  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	644/1649	4.50	4.01	4.28	4.11	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	263/1648	4.75	4.10	4.23	4.16	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	236/1595	4.75	4.25	4.20	4.03	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	624/1533	4.25	4.00	4.04	3.87	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	380/1512	4.50	4.27	4.10	3.86	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	815/1623	4.25	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.46	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	374/1621	4.50	3.97	4.06	3.96	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1279/1568	4.00	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.24	4.28	4.20	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1121/1559	4.00	4.17	4.29	4.20	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1219/1352	3.00	3.48	3.98	3.86	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	326/1384	4.67	4.09	4.08	3.86	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	483/1382	4.67	4.34	4.29	4.03	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.47	4.30	4.01	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	203/ 948	4.50	3.87	3.95	3.75	4.50
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	522/ 555	2.00	2.30	4.29	4.14	2.00
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	303/ 312	1.50	2.70	3.68	3.51	1.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	4	Non-major	4
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 100Y 0101  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: MABE, MITZI J  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 744  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	4	4	4	1	5	2.94	1612/1649	3.16	4.01	4.28	4.11	2.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	6	2	3	4	2	2.65	1626/1648	3.42	4.10	4.23	4.16	2.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	12	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1243/1375	3.18	4.25	4.27	4.10	3.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	3	6	3	3	3.12	1525/1595	3.65	4.25	4.20	4.03	3.12
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	5	3	7	2	0	2.35	1520/1533	2.94	4.00	4.04	3.87	2.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	4	7	2	1	2.65	1488/1512	3.50	4.27	4.10	3.86	2.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	11	3	2	1	0	1.59	1620/1623	2.96	3.89	4.16	4.08	1.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	14	3	4.18	1454/1646	4.60	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	8	2	1	1	2.46	1591/1621	3.02	3.97	4.06	3.96	2.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	4	7	2	2	0	2.13	1562/1568	3.36	4.22	4.43	4.39	2.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	2	1	3	8	4.00	1463/1572	4.42	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	5	6	2	1	1	2.13	1557/1564	3.15	4.24	4.28	4.20	2.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	6	1	5	2	1	2.40	1534/1559	3.13	4.17	4.29	4.20	2.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	5	0	4	5	0	2.64	1289/1352	2.61	3.48	3.98	3.86	2.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	4	2	6	1	0	2.31	1356/1384	2.86	4.09	4.08	3.86	2.31
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	1	3	4	3	3.38	1238/1382	3.74	4.34	4.29	4.03	3.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	3	5	3	3.62	1140/1368	3.90	4.47	4.30	4.01	3.62
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	3	1	3	3	0	2.60	905/ 948	3.17	3.87	3.95	3.75	2.60
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 243	****	3.83	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	1	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/ 555	****	2.30	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	2	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	3.54	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	3.74	4.09	3.65	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	4.20	4.30	4.17	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	****	5.00	3.99	3.83	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5
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	0	F	1
				P	0
				I	0
				?	1
			Required for Majors	8	Graduate
			General	0	Under-grad
			Electives	0	19
			Other	5	Non-major
					17
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course-Section: ENGL 100Y 0201  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: HICKERNELL, MAR  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 745  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	2	6	6	3.88	1287/1649	3.16	4.01	4.28	4.11	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	5	7	4.12	1054/1648	3.42	4.10	4.23	4.16	4.12	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1375	3.18	4.25	4.27	4.10	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	636/1595	3.65	4.25	4.20	4.03	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	10	4	3.94	875/1533	2.94	4.00	4.04	3.87	3.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	553/1512	3.50	4.27	4.10	3.86	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	5	4	4	3.56	1363/1623	2.96	3.89	4.16	4.08	3.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1646	4.60	4.46	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	5	8	2	3.80	1151/1621	3.02	3.97	4.06	3.96	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	12	3	4.06	1257/1568	3.36	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.06	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	790/1572	4.42	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	5	9	3	3.88	1229/1564	3.15	4.24	4.28	4.20	3.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	7	5	3.82	1236/1559	3.13	4.17	4.29	4.20	3.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	13	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/1352	2.61	3.48	3.98	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	8	4	4.14	737/1384	2.86	4.09	4.08	3.86	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	616/1382	3.74	4.34	4.29	4.03	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	866/1368	3.90	4.47	4.30	4.01	4.21	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	1	1	1	7	3	3.77	596/ 948	3.17	3.87	3.95	3.75	3.77	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 555	****	2.30	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.54	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	2	A	4	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
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	4				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 100Y 0301  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: WALTERS, APRIL  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 746  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	6	3	5	2	2.67	1636/1649	3.16	4.01	4.28	4.11	2.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	5	3	8	4	3.43	1517/1648	3.42	4.10	4.23	4.16	3.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	3	0	1	3	1	2.88	1344/1375	3.18	4.25	4.27	4.10	2.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	3	1	8	5	3.33	1470/1595	3.65	4.25	4.20	4.03	3.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	8	6	2	3	1	2.15	1523/1533	2.94	4.00	4.04	3.87	2.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	3	4	6	5	3.33	1345/1512	3.50	4.27	4.10	3.86	3.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	3	3	5	6	3	3.15	1509/1623	2.96	3.89	4.16	4.08	3.15	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	16	5	4.24	1412/1646	4.60	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.24	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	7	5	3	1	2.67	1571/1621	3.02	3.97	4.06	3.96	2.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	3	4	7	4	3.53	1456/1568	3.36	4.22	4.43	4.39	3.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	1222/1572	4.42	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.53	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	2	6	6	3	3.32	1445/1564	3.15	4.24	4.28	4.20	3.32	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	5	2	7	1	4	2.84	1509/1559	3.13	4.17	4.29	4.20	2.84	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	4	4	5	1	1	2.40	1316/1352	2.61	3.48	3.98	3.86	2.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	8	3	5	2	0	2.06	1365/1384	2.86	4.09	4.08	3.86	2.06	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	2	4	3	7	3.61	1170/1382	3.74	4.34	4.29	4.03	3.61	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	3	6	8	4.17	891/1368	3.90	4.47	4.30	4.01	4.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	4	2	6	4	3	3.00	844/ 948	3.17	3.87	3.95	3.75	3.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	****	2.30	4.29	4.14	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.20	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	4.63	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	5.00	3.99	3.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100Y 0401  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: BROFMAN, MARGAR  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 747  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	3	7	4	3	3.16	1583/1649	3.16	4.01	4.28	4.11	3.16	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	6	4	5	3.47	1494/1648	3.42	4.10	4.23	4.16	3.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	1	0	4	2	1	3.25	1281/1375	3.18	4.25	4.27	4.10	3.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	8	5	3.74	1295/1595	3.65	4.25	4.20	4.03	3.74	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	4	5	4	4	3.33	1338/1533	2.94	4.00	4.04	3.87	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	2	9	4	3.63	1186/1512	3.50	4.27	4.10	3.86	3.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	3	8	4	3.53	1379/1623	2.96	3.89	4.16	4.08	3.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1646	4.60	4.46	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	2	9	4	0	3.13	1480/1621	3.02	3.97	4.06	3.96	3.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	6	8	3	3.72	1411/1568	3.36	4.22	4.43	4.39	3.72	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	8	8	4.33	1365/1572	4.42	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	2	6	5	3	3.28	1455/1564	3.15	4.24	4.28	4.20	3.28	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	4	6	4	3.44	1392/1559	3.13	4.17	4.29	4.20	3.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	11	1	2	0	1	1	2.80	1270/1352	2.61	3.48	3.98	3.86	2.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	3	6	2	3	2.94	1281/1384	2.86	4.09	4.08	3.86	2.94	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	1	8	3	4	3.47	1221/1382	3.74	4.34	4.29	4.03	3.47	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	4	3	2	7	3.59	1150/1368	3.90	4.47	4.30	4.01	3.59	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	2	1	4	3	3	3.31	789/ 948	3.17	3.87	3.95	3.75	3.31	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 555	****	2.30	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	1	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	85/ 88	3.50	4.32	4.54	4.31	3.50	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/ 85	****	4.46	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 81	****	4.07	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 92	****	4.22	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.54	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 16
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 7	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Non-major 19
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 1	Electives 0
					Other 3

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



Course-Section: ENGL 110 0201  
 Title COMPOSITION ESL STUDEN  
 Instructor: COLLINS, ELSA T  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 748  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	2	6	9	4.05	1149/1649	4.05	4.01	4.28	4.11	4.05	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	11	4.30	839/1648	4.30	4.10	4.23	4.16	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	788/1375	4.27	4.25	4.27	4.10	4.27	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	5	2	10	4.29	770/1595	4.29	4.25	4.20	4.03	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	6	9	4.21	663/1533	4.21	4.00	4.04	3.87	4.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	2	14	4.53	366/1512	4.53	4.27	4.10	3.86	4.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	4	12	4.30	757/1623	4.30	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.46	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	0	0	2	10	3	4.07	881/1621	4.07	3.97	4.06	3.96	4.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	387/1568	4.80	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	1034/1572	4.70	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	728/1564	4.45	4.24	4.28	4.20	4.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	12	4.40	832/1559	4.40	4.17	4.29	4.20	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	4	1	2	1	5	3.15	1192/1352	3.15	3.48	3.98	3.86	3.15	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	771/1384	4.07	4.09	4.08	3.86	4.07	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	899/1382	4.14	4.34	4.29	4.03	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	3	3	8	4.13	905/1368	4.13	4.47	4.30	4.01	4.13	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	7	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	3.87	3.95	3.75	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 243	****	3.83	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	504/ 555	2.80	2.30	4.29	4.14	2.80	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.54	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 8
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 11	Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	Major 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D 0	General 0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Under-grad 20
				P 0	Non-major 20
				I 0	Electives 0
				? 1	Other 9
					#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENGL 210 0101  
 Title INTRODUCTION TO LIT  
 Instructor: DONOVAN, JANE  
 Enrollment: 43  
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 749  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	4	9	16	4.13	1096/1649	4.13	4.01	4.28	4.29	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	3	10	16	4.16	1010/1648	4.16	4.10	4.23	4.25	4.16	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	1	0	5	17	4.65	412/1375	4.65	4.25	4.27	4.37	4.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	3	6	20	4.47	552/1595	4.47	4.25	4.20	4.22	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	2	3	24	4.52	358/1533	4.52	4.00	4.04	4.04	4.52	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	3	2	3	19	4.17	773/1512	4.17	4.27	4.10	4.14	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	1	4	8	16	4.23	838/1623	4.23	3.89	4.16	4.21	4.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	26	5	4.16	1462/1646	4.16	4.46	4.69	4.63	4.16	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	2	13	12	4.17	777/1621	4.17	3.97	4.06	4.01	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	2	1	3	6	14	4.12	1227/1568	4.12	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.12	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	1	0	1	0	24	4.77	912/1572	4.77	4.71	4.70	4.73	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	2	2	8	13	4.15	1037/1564	4.15	4.24	4.28	4.27	4.15	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	3	0	1	4	18	4.31	931/1559	4.31	4.17	4.29	4.33	4.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	13	3	0	5	2	3	3.15	1192/1352	3.15	3.48	3.98	4.07	3.15	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	1	2	12	4.50	437/1384	4.50	4.09	4.08	3.99	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	2	0	0	2	12	4.38	740/1382	4.38	4.34	4.29	4.19	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	0	1	0	14	4.63	560/1368	4.63	4.47	4.30	4.21	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	1	0	1	2	10	4.43	265/ 948	4.43	3.87	3.95	3.89	4.43	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 243	****	3.83	4.12	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.62	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.64	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	2	3	0	0	2	2.57	****/ 555	****	2.30	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 88	****	4.32	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 85	****	4.46	4.47	3.33	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 81	****	4.07	4.43	3.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	4.22	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	1	2	1	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	3.54	4.06	3.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	3.74	4.09	4.05	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	4.05	4.47	4.49	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	4.08	4.38	3.66	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	2	1	3	0	1	0	2.20	****/ 312	****	2.70	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	4.20	4.30	4.07	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	4.63	4.16	1.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	3.50	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.42	2.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	****	5.00	3.99	3.72	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 210 0101  
 Title INTRODUCTION TO LIT  
 Instructor: DONOVAN, JANE  
 Enrollment: 43  
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 749  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	21	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	6						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	32	Non-major	30
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 226 0101  
 Title ENGLISH GRAMMAR USAGE  
 Instructor: HARRIS, LINDA R  
 Enrollment: 44  
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 750  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	6	1	12	7	10	3.39	1528/1649	3.39	4.01	4.28	4.29	3.39	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	9	12	10	3.74	1354/1648	3.74	4.10	4.23	4.25	3.74	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	3	2	3	9	15	3.97	983/1375	3.97	4.25	4.27	4.37	3.97	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	3	3	5	14	9	3.68	1329/1595	3.68	4.25	4.20	4.22	3.68	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	4	3	10	6	9	3.41	1317/1533	3.41	4.00	4.04	4.04	3.41	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	6	6	10	10	3.51	1259/1512	3.51	4.27	4.10	4.14	3.51	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	4	4	6	10	8	3.44	1419/1623	3.44	3.89	4.16	4.21	3.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	2	3	9	17	3	3.47	1632/1646	3.47	4.46	4.69	4.63	3.47	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	3	0	6	12	5	3.62	1295/1621	3.62	3.97	4.06	4.01	3.62	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	3	1	4	10	15	4.00	1279/1568	4.00	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	4	7	22	4.44	1289/1572	4.44	4.71	4.70	4.73	4.44	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	3	5	10	15	4.12	1064/1564	4.12	4.24	4.28	4.27	4.12	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	2	2	6	9	13	3.91	1197/1559	3.91	4.17	4.29	4.33	3.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	16	2	3	4	4	4	3.29	1146/1352	3.29	3.48	3.98	4.07	3.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	2	2	3	1	5	3.38	1132/1384	3.38	4.09	4.08	3.99	3.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	2	4	3	4	3.69	1132/1382	3.69	4.34	4.29	4.19	3.69	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	1	2	7	0	3	3.15	1274/1368	3.15	4.47	4.30	4.21	3.15	
4. Were special techniques successful	23	6	1	0	3	0	3	3.57	****/ 948	****	3.87	3.95	3.89	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	7	3	0	0	1	1.64	541/ 555	1.64	2.30	4.29	4.33	1.64	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	1	5	1	0	0	0	1.17	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	1	2	2	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 312	****	2.70	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	34	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	5.00	3.99	3.72	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 30	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0	Major 10
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	2	B 4			
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	7	C 0	General 10	Under-grad 36	Non-major 26
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	6	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 15		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ENGL 233 0101  
 Title ISSUES IN WORLD LIT  
 Instructor: BLOOM, RYAN I.  
 Enrollment: 43  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 751  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	2	10	17	4.40	776/1649	4.40	4.01	4.28	4.29	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	10	15	4.34	784/1648	4.34	4.10	4.23	4.25	4.34	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	20	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	546/1375	4.50	4.25	4.27	4.37	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	0	1	8	18	4.38	672/1595	4.38	4.25	4.20	4.22	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	23	4.76	180/1533	4.76	4.00	4.04	4.04	4.76	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	11	13	4.21	747/1512	4.21	4.27	4.10	4.14	4.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	0	4	8	15	4.29	780/1623	4.29	3.89	4.16	4.21	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	27	4.93	465/1646	4.93	4.46	4.69	4.63	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	0	1	7	14	4.43	469/1621	4.43	3.97	4.06	4.01	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	2	6	21	4.53	815/1568	4.53	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	2	27	4.80	840/1572	4.80	4.71	4.70	4.73	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	4	8	17	4.33	854/1564	4.33	4.24	4.28	4.27	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	5	21	4.43	790/1559	4.43	4.17	4.29	4.33	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	1	0	2	4	14	4.43	379/1352	4.43	3.48	3.98	4.07	4.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	3	6	17	4.32	623/1384	4.32	4.09	4.08	3.99	4.32	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	6	21	4.68	474/1382	4.68	4.34	4.29	4.19	4.68	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	1	2	24	4.75	426/1368	4.75	4.47	4.30	4.21	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	2	0	6	8	7	3.78	587/ 948	3.78	3.87	3.95	3.89	3.78	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 243	****	3.83	4.12	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.62	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.64	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 555	****	2.30	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.32	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.46	4.47	3.33	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	4.07	4.43	3.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.22	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	4	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.54	4.06	3.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.74	4.09	4.05	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.05	4.47	4.49	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.08	4.38	3.66	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 312	****	2.70	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.20	4.30	4.07	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.63	4.16	1.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	3.50	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.42	2.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	5.00	3.99	3.72	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 233 0101  
 Title ISSUES IN WORLD LIT  
 Instructor: BLOOM, RYAN I.  
 Enrollment: 43  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 751  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	7	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	11	Under-grad	30	Non-major	23
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 241 0101  
 Title CURRENTS IN BRITISH LI  
 Instructor: PEKARSKE, NICOL  
 Enrollment: 43  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 752  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	6	8	11	4.00	1183/1649	4.00	4.01	4.28	4.29	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	7	8	9	3.81	1304/1648	3.81	4.10	4.23	4.25	3.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	22	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/1375	****	4.25	4.27	4.37	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	3	11	11	4.07	1027/1595	4.07	4.25	4.20	4.22	4.07	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	5	18	4.52	358/1533	4.52	4.00	4.04	4.04	4.52	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	6	10	9	3.93	994/1512	3.93	4.27	4.10	4.14	3.93	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	5	4	4	13	3.96	1089/1623	3.96	3.89	4.16	4.21	3.96	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	4	23	0	3.85	1611/1646	3.85	4.46	4.69	4.63	3.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	10	10	3	3.70	1240/1621	3.70	3.97	4.06	4.01	3.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	1	2	14	4	3.86	1362/1568	3.86	4.22	4.43	4.39	3.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	6	8	6	3.90	1219/1564	3.90	4.24	4.28	4.27	3.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	3	5	3	11	4.00	1121/1559	4.00	4.17	4.29	4.33	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	6	2	2	2	6	4	3.50	1049/1352	3.50	3.48	3.98	4.07	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	3	19	4.71	294/1384	4.71	4.09	4.08	3.99	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	352/1382	4.79	4.34	4.29	4.19	4.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	2	21	4.83	337/1368	4.83	4.47	4.30	4.21	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	14	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	3.87	3.95	3.89	4.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 243	****	3.83	4.12	4.47	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	1	1	2	0	0	1	2.50	****/ 555	****	2.30	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 88	****	4.32	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.46	4.47	3.33	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	4.07	4.43	3.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.22	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	1	3	1	1	0	2.33	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.54	4.06	3.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.74	4.09	4.05	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.08	4.38	3.66	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	2.70	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.20	4.30	4.07	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	4.63	4.16	1.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	3.50	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 241 0101  
 Title CURRENTS IN BRITISH LI  
 Instructor: PEKARSKE, NICOL  
 Enrollment: 43  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 752  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	7	Under-grad	27	Non-major	25
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	2						



Course-Section: ENGL 243B 0101  
 Title CURRENTS IN AMERICAN L  
 Instructor: BLUMBERG, ARNOL  
 Enrollment: 50  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 753  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	9	16	4.43	749/1649	4.43	4.01	4.28	4.29	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	2	21	4.54	521/1648	4.54	4.10	4.23	4.25	4.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	2	5	14	4.30	763/1375	4.30	4.25	4.27	4.27	4.30		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	7	15	4.30	770/1595	4.30	4.25	4.20	4.22	4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	20	4.67	241/1533	4.67	4.00	4.04	4.04	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	8	16	4.41	522/1512	4.41	4.27	4.10	4.14	4.41	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	6	19	4.59	405/1623	4.59	3.89	4.16	4.21	4.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	21	5	4.15	1476/1646	4.15	4.46	4.69	4.63	4.15	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	4	9	9	4.13	824/1621	4.13	3.97	4.06	4.01	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	5	7	13	4.32	1060/1568	4.32	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.32	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	740/1572	4.84	4.71	4.70	4.73	4.84	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	4	6	15	4.44	728/1564	4.44	4.24	4.28	4.27	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	448/1559	4.72	4.17	4.29	4.33	4.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	6	1	2	8	1	5	3.41	1095/1352	3.41	3.48	3.98	4.07	3.41	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	367/1384	4.62	4.09	4.08	3.99	4.62	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	593/1382	4.54	4.34	4.29	4.19	4.54	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	415/1368	4.77	4.47	4.30	4.21	4.77	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	9	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.87	3.95	3.89	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 243	****	3.83	4.12	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.62	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.64	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	1	2	1	0	1	1	2.60	****/ 555	****	2.30	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 88	****	4.32	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 85	****	4.46	4.47	3.33	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 81	****	4.07	4.43	3.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 92	****	4.22	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	1	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	3.54	4.06	3.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.74	4.09	4.05	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	4.05	4.47	4.49	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.08	4.38	3.66	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	2	0	1	3	0	2.83	****/ 312	****	2.70	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.20	4.30	4.07	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	4.63	4.16	1.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	3.50	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.42	2.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	5.00	3.99	3.72	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 243B 0101  
 Title CURRENTS IN AMERICAN L  
 Instructor: BLUMBERG, ARNOL  
 Enrollment: 50  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 753  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	16	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	8	Under-grad	28	Non-major	25
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	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	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 250 0101  
 Title INTRO TO SHAKESPEARE  
 Instructor: FARABAUGH, ROBI  
 Enrollment: 34  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 754  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	497/1649	4.61	4.01	4.28	4.29	4.61	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	3	10	4.35	770/1648	4.35	4.10	4.23	4.25	4.35	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	5	11	4.39	684/1375	4.39	4.25	4.27	4.37	4.39	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	4	9	4.17	930/1595	4.17	4.25	4.20	4.22	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	174/1533	4.76	4.00	4.04	4.04	4.76	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	543/1512	4.39	4.27	4.10	4.14	4.39	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	5	4	7	3.83	1222/1623	3.83	3.89	4.16	4.21	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	16	2	4.11	1498/1646	4.11	4.46	4.69	4.63	4.11	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	1	2	3	7	4.00	914/1621	4.00	3.97	4.06	4.01	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	667/1568	4.65	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	1	15	4.72	985/1572	4.72	4.71	4.70	4.73	4.72	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	2	13	4.50	651/1564	4.50	4.24	4.28	4.27	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	695/1559	4.50	4.17	4.29	4.33	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	13	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/1352	****	3.48	3.98	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	644/1384	4.30	4.09	4.08	3.99	4.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	869/1382	4.20	4.34	4.29	4.19	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	915/1368	4.11	4.47	4.30	4.21	4.11	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	3.87	3.95	3.89	4.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	1	2	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	****	2.30	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 312	****	2.70	3.68	3.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	6
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
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				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ENGL 271 0101  
 Title INTRO CREAT WRITG-FICTI  
 Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 755  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	7	10	4.44	723/1649	4.44	4.01	4.28	4.29	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	556/1648	4.50	4.10	4.23	4.25	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	950/1375	4.00	4.25	4.27	4.37	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	362/1595	4.63	4.25	4.20	4.22	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	495/1533	4.39	4.00	4.04	4.04	4.39	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	302/1512	4.61	4.27	4.10	4.14	4.61	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	7	7	4.17	915/1623	4.17	3.89	4.16	4.21	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	15	3	4.17	1462/1646	4.17	4.46	4.69	4.63	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	595/1621	4.33	3.97	4.06	4.01	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	767/1568	4.57	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	912/1572	4.77	4.71	4.70	4.73	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	434/1564	4.69	4.24	4.28	4.27	4.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	573/1559	4.62	4.17	4.29	4.33	4.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	8	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1101/1352	3.40	3.48	3.98	4.07	3.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	201/1384	4.80	4.09	4.08	3.99	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	455/1382	4.70	4.34	4.29	4.19	4.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	493/1368	4.70	4.47	4.30	4.21	4.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	281/ 948	4.40	3.87	3.95	3.89	4.40	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	2	1	0	0	1	2.25	****/ 555	****	2.30	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	2.70	3.68	3.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	1 Graduate 0 Major 8
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 8	General	Under-grad 18 Non-major 10
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0		
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0	Electives	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0		
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 273 0101  
 Title INT CREATIVE WTG-POETR  
 Instructor: FALLON, MICHAEL  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 756  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	1	17	4.59	523/1649	3.90	4.01	4.28	4.29	4.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	19	4.73	291/1648	4.04	4.10	4.23	4.25	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	0	4	14	4.63	432/1375	4.63	4.25	4.27	4.37	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	18	4.68	301/1595	4.12	4.25	4.20	4.22	4.68	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	295/1533	3.87	4.00	4.04	4.04	4.59	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	18	4.73	217/1512	4.45	4.27	4.10	4.14	4.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	1	2	3	4	9	3.95	1119/1623	3.20	3.89	4.16	4.21	3.95	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	731/1646	4.47	4.46	4.69	4.63	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	4	10	3	3.94	1001/1621	3.47	3.97	4.06	4.01	3.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	6	14	4.50	852/1568	3.80	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1572	4.91	4.71	4.70	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	6	15	4.59	560/1564	4.02	4.24	4.28	4.27	4.59	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	4	15	4.45	763/1559	3.82	4.17	4.29	4.33	4.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	2	2	1	5	6	3.69	960/1352	3.69	3.48	3.98	4.07	3.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	3	2	13	4.37	582/1384	3.75	4.09	4.08	3.99	4.37	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	2	2	3	12	4.32	790/1382	4.22	4.34	4.29	4.19	4.32	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	732/1368	4.40	4.47	4.30	4.21	4.42	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	11	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	601/ 948	3.75	3.87	3.95	3.89	3.75	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 555	2.50	2.30	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	3	0	0	1	0	1.75	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	1	1	1	7	0	3.40	232/ 312	3.40	2.70	3.68	3.59	3.40	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	8	Under-grad	22	Non-major	13
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	7	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	8				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 273 0201  
 Title INT CREATIVE WTG-POETR  
 Instructor: MCGURRIN JR, AN  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 757  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	7	4	1	3.21	1569/1649	3.90	4.01	4.28	4.29	3.21	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	8	0	3.36	1541/1648	4.04	4.10	4.23	4.25	3.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1375	4.63	4.25	4.27	4.37	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	3	4	1	3.56	1384/1595	4.12	4.25	4.20	4.22	3.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	6	2	2	3.15	1404/1533	3.87	4.00	4.04	4.04	3.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	782/1512	4.45	4.27	4.10	4.14	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	5	3	3	0	2	1	2.44	1602/1623	3.20	3.89	4.16	4.21	2.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	1	4.07	1517/1646	4.47	4.46	4.69	4.63	4.07	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	2	1	2	0	3.00	1504/1621	3.47	3.97	4.06	4.01	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	3	5	2	1	3.09	1510/1568	3.80	4.22	4.43	4.39	3.09	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	815/1572	4.91	4.71	4.70	4.73	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	3	4	2	3.45	1407/1564	4.02	4.24	4.28	4.27	3.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	2	2	2	3	3.18	1452/1559	3.82	4.17	4.29	4.33	3.18	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1352	3.69	3.48	3.98	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	3	1	2	3.13	1240/1384	3.75	4.09	4.08	3.99	3.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	911/1382	4.22	4.34	4.29	4.19	4.13	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	771/1368	4.40	4.47	4.30	4.21	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 948	3.75	3.87	3.95	3.89	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	3.83	4.12	4.47	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	1	2	0	0	1	2.50	511/ 555	2.50	2.30	4.29	4.33	2.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.32	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.46	4.47	3.33	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	2	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 312	3.40	2.70	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	5.00	3.99	3.72	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 6	Under-grad 14	Non-major 13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ENGL 281P 0101  
 Title INTERMEDIATE EXPOSITIO  
 Instructor: SNEERINGER, HOL  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 758  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	1366/1649	3.78	4.01	4.28	4.29	3.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	931/1648	4.22	4.10	4.23	4.25	4.22	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1375	****	4.25	4.27	4.37	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	996/1595	4.11	4.25	4.20	4.22	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	2	3	3.67	1139/1533	3.67	4.00	4.04	4.04	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	595/1512	4.33	4.27	4.10	4.14	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	4	2	3.67	1318/1623	3.67	3.89	4.16	4.21	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.46	4.69	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	1123/1621	3.83	3.97	4.06	4.01	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	852/1568	4.50	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	1121/1572	4.63	4.71	4.70	4.73	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	651/1564	4.50	4.24	4.28	4.27	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	1211/1559	3.88	4.17	4.29	4.33	3.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	690/1352	4.00	3.48	3.98	4.07	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	247/1384	4.75	4.09	4.08	3.99	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.34	4.29	4.19	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	295/1368	4.88	4.47	4.30	4.21	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	1	2	0	2	2	3.29	793/ 948	3.29	3.87	3.95	3.89	3.29	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	550/ 555	1.33	2.30	4.29	4.33	1.33	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.65	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	****	5.00	3.99	3.72	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	9
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	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 291 0101  
 Title INTRO WRTG CREAT ESSAY  
 Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 759  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	6	5	3.88	1295/1649	4.24	4.01	4.28	4.29	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	1032/1648	4.38	4.10	4.23	4.25	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1375	4.50	4.25	4.27	4.37	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	636/1595	4.51	4.25	4.20	4.22	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	2	8	4.06	774/1533	4.12	4.00	4.04	4.04	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	194/1512	4.79	4.27	4.10	4.14	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	1	9	4	3.81	1234/1623	4.17	3.89	4.16	4.21	3.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	3	4.19	1447/1646	4.56	4.46	4.69	4.63	4.19	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	8	3	4.08	875/1621	4.17	3.97	4.06	4.01	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	1248/1568	4.48	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.08	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	1212/1572	4.80	4.71	4.70	4.73	4.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	0	5	7	4.38	801/1564	4.51	4.24	4.28	4.27	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	1	5	5	3.92	1181/1559	4.46	4.17	4.29	4.33	3.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	11	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1352	3.29	3.48	3.98	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	201/1384	4.81	4.09	4.08	3.99	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	540/1382	4.66	4.34	4.29	4.19	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	264/1368	4.89	4.47	4.30	4.21	4.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	353/ 948	4.48	3.87	3.95	3.89	4.22	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	2	2	0	0	1	2.20	519/ 555	2.20	2.30	4.29	4.33	2.20	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	3	0	0	3	0	2.50	253/ 288	3.02	3.35	3.68	3.65	2.50	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 312	2.33	2.70	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 110	****	5.00	3.99	3.72	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	6
			? 0		



Course-Section: ENGL 291 0201  
 Title INTRO WRTG CREAT ESSAY  
 Instructor: FALLON, MICHAEL  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 760  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	0	6	12	4.67	433/1649	4.24	4.01	4.28	4.29	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	464/1648	4.38	4.10	4.23	4.25	4.59	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	15	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1375	4.50	4.25	4.27	4.37	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	2	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	462/1595	4.51	4.25	4.20	4.22	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	8	6	4.06	781/1533	4.12	4.00	4.04	4.04	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	179/1512	4.79	4.27	4.10	4.14	4.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	0	5	5	7	4.12	968/1623	4.17	3.89	4.16	4.21	4.12	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1646	4.56	4.46	4.69	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	0	8	4	4.33	595/1621	4.17	3.97	4.06	4.01	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	517/1568	4.48	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	690/1572	4.80	4.71	4.70	4.73	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	702/1564	4.51	4.24	4.28	4.27	4.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	318/1559	4.46	4.17	4.29	4.33	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	11	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/1352	3.29	3.48	3.98	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	219/1384	4.81	4.09	4.08	3.99	4.79	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	435/1382	4.66	4.34	4.29	4.19	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	211/1368	4.89	4.47	4.30	4.21	4.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	167/ 948	4.48	3.87	3.95	3.89	4.62	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 555	2.20	2.30	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	1	2	0	1	7	0	3.30	211/ 288	3.02	3.35	3.68	3.65	3.30	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	3	2	2	0	2	0	2.33	287/ 312	2.33	2.70	3.68	3.59	2.33	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	5.00	3.99	3.72	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 4
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 10	Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	Major 5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D 0	General 3
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Under-grad 20
				P 0	Non-major 15
				I 0	Electives 1
				? 1	Other 7
					#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENGL 291 0301  
 Title INTRO WRTG CREAT ESSAY  
 Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 761  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	6	4	4.17	1057/1649	4.24	4.01	4.28	4.29	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	687/1648	4.38	4.10	4.23	4.25	4.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	546/1375	4.50	4.25	4.27	4.37	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	405/1595	4.51	4.25	4.20	4.22	4.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	624/1533	4.12	4.00	4.04	4.04	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	142/1512	4.79	4.27	4.10	4.14	4.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	416/1623	4.17	3.89	4.16	4.21	4.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	1193/1646	4.56	4.46	4.69	4.63	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	7	2	4.10	859/1621	4.17	3.97	4.06	4.01	4.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	699/1568	4.48	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1572	4.80	4.71	4.70	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	473/1564	4.51	4.24	4.28	4.27	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	512/1559	4.46	4.17	4.29	4.33	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	1149/1352	3.29	3.48	3.98	4.07	3.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	185/1384	4.81	4.09	4.08	3.99	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	483/1382	4.66	4.34	4.29	4.19	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	337/1368	4.89	4.47	4.30	4.21	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	170/ 948	4.48	3.87	3.95	3.89	4.60	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 555	2.20	2.30	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	1	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	215/ 288	3.02	3.35	3.68	3.65	3.25	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	2.33	2.70	3.68	3.59	****	

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	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	12	Non-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	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	6				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 300 0101  
 Title COMM/TECH - ANALYSIS  
 Instructor: MAHER, JENNIFER  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 762  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	1037/1649	4.18	4.01	4.28	4.27	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	5	2	3.64	1428/1648	3.64	4.10	4.23	4.18	3.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1375	****	4.25	4.27	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	759/1595	4.30	4.25	4.20	4.21	4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	288/1533	4.60	4.00	4.04	4.05	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	627/1512	4.30	4.27	4.10	4.11	4.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	4	1	3	3.40	1434/1623	3.40	3.89	4.16	4.08	3.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	3.00	1644/1646	3.00	4.46	4.69	4.67	3.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	5	3	2	3.70	1234/1621	3.70	3.97	4.06	4.02	3.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1366/1568	3.86	4.22	4.43	4.39	3.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1121/1572	4.63	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1246/1564	3.86	4.24	4.28	4.25	3.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	1045/1559	4.14	4.17	4.29	4.23	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	836/1352	3.88	3.48	3.98	3.97	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	437/1384	4.50	4.09	4.08	4.11	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	342/1382	4.80	4.34	4.29	4.37	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	579/1368	4.60	4.47	4.30	4.39	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	404/ 948	4.11	3.87	3.95	4.00	4.11	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	2.30	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.35	3.68	3.58	4.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	2.70	3.68	3.60	****	

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	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	11	Non-major	3
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	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 301 0101  
 Title ANALYSIS LITERARY LANG  
 Instructor: FARABAUGH, ROBI  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 763  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	7	12	4.43	749/1649	4.32	4.01	4.28	4.27	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	15	4.57	475/1648	4.54	4.10	4.23	4.18	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	1	0	0	5	9	4.40	665/1375	4.39	4.25	4.27	4.22	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	0	5	13	4.40	636/1595	4.47	4.25	4.20	4.21	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	151/1533	4.76	4.00	4.04	4.05	4.81	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	14	4.52	366/1512	4.43	4.27	4.10	4.11	4.52	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	9	10	4.29	780/1623	4.39	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	17	4	4.19	1440/1646	4.10	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.19	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	0	10	7	4.22	720/1621	4.18	3.97	4.06	4.02	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	480/1568	4.72	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	355/1572	4.84	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	3	14	4.58	580/1564	4.60	4.24	4.28	4.25	4.58	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	3	15	4.68	487/1559	4.51	4.17	4.29	4.23	4.68	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	5	1	5	3	1	2.60	1293/1352	3.07	3.48	3.98	3.97	2.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	2	14	4.53	424/1384	4.66	4.09	4.08	4.11	4.53	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	3	4	11	4.26	825/1382	4.61	4.34	4.29	4.37	4.26	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	1	1	5	10	4.05	934/1368	4.57	4.47	4.30	4.39	4.05	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	1	1	7	9	4.33	310/ 948	4.30	3.87	3.95	4.00	4.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.07	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 243	****	3.83	4.12	3.89	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.21	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	1	1	1	2	0	2	3.17	488/ 555	3.17	2.30	4.29	4.22	3.17	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	4.32	4.54	4.63	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	3.54	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.74	4.09	4.21	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.08	4.38	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	1	0	0	4	0	3.40	****/ 312	2.17	2.70	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.20	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	4.63	4.16	4.44	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.42	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	3	A	5	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	19	
?	2			

Course-Section: ENGL 301 0201  
 Title ANALYSIS LITERARY LANG  
 Instructor: DONOVAN, JULIE  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 764  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	2	1	8	6	4.06	1149/1649	4.32	4.01	4.28	4.27	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	770/1648	4.54	4.10	4.23	4.18	4.35	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	2	1	7	7	4.12	908/1375	4.39	4.25	4.27	4.22	4.12	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	1	1	7	8	4.29	770/1595	4.47	4.25	4.20	4.21	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	1	14	4.65	256/1533	4.76	4.00	4.04	4.05	4.65	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	7	8	4.29	639/1512	4.43	4.27	4.10	4.11	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	621/1623	4.39	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.41	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	1	0	12	4	4.12	1498/1646	4.10	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.12	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	2	0	1	7	4	3.79	1167/1621	4.18	3.97	4.06	4.02	3.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	667/1568	4.72	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	1096/1572	4.84	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.65	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	630/1564	4.60	4.24	4.28	4.25	4.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	938/1559	4.51	4.17	4.29	4.23	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	1	4	6	6	4.00	690/1352	3.07	3.48	3.98	3.97	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	284/1384	4.66	4.09	4.08	4.11	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	502/1382	4.61	4.34	4.29	4.37	4.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	472/1368	4.57	4.47	4.30	4.39	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	3	7	4	4.07	415/ 948	4.30	3.87	3.95	4.00	4.07	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 243	****	3.83	4.12	3.89	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	4.32	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.46	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	4.07	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.22	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	3.54	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	3.74	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.05	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.08	4.38	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	2	2	1	1	0	2.17	289/ 312	2.17	2.70	3.68	3.60	2.17	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.20	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	4.63	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	5.00	3.99	4.05	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 301 0201  
 Title ANALYSIS LITERARY LANG  
 Instructor: DONOVAN, JULIE  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 764  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 301 0301  
 Title ANALYSIS LITERARY LANG  
 Instructor: DONOVAN, JULIE  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 765  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	683/1649	4.32	4.01	4.28	4.27	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	310/1648	4.54	4.10	4.23	4.18	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	422/1375	4.39	4.25	4.27	4.22	4.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	14	4.71	281/1595	4.47	4.25	4.20	4.21	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	142/1533	4.76	4.00	4.04	4.05	4.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	422/1512	4.43	4.27	4.10	4.11	4.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	541/1623	4.39	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	14	1	4.00	1544/1646	4.10	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	348/1621	4.18	3.97	4.06	4.02	4.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	480/1568	4.72	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	414/1572	4.84	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	447/1564	4.60	4.24	4.28	4.25	4.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	629/1559	4.51	4.17	4.29	4.23	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	3	2	3	0	2	2.60	1293/1352	3.07	3.48	3.98	3.97	2.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	247/1384	4.66	4.09	4.08	4.11	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	170/1382	4.61	4.34	4.29	4.37	4.94	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	185/1368	4.57	4.47	4.30	4.39	4.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	203/ 948	4.30	3.87	3.95	4.00	4.50	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	3.83	4.12	3.89	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	3.17	2.30	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.32	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.46	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.07	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.22	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.54	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.74	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.05	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.08	4.38	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	2.17	2.70	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.20	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.63	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	5.00	3.99	4.05	****	



Course-Section: ENGL 301 0301  
 Title ANALYSIS LITERARY LANG  
 Instructor: DONOVAN, JULIE  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 765  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	A	11	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	8
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	15				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 303 0101  
 Title ART OF THE ESSAY  
 Instructor: SNEERINGER, HOL  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 766  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	10	4.56	563/1649	4.56	4.01	4.28	4.27	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	336/1648	4.69	4.10	4.23	4.18	4.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	233/1375	4.80	4.25	4.27	4.22	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	236/1595	4.75	4.25	4.20	4.21	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	5	10	4.50	366/1533	4.50	4.00	4.04	4.05	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	151/1512	4.81	4.27	4.10	4.11	4.81	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	437/1623	4.56	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	11	4	4.19	1447/1646	4.19	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.19	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	535/1621	4.38	3.97	4.06	4.02	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	779/1568	4.56	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	414/1572	4.94	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	524/1564	4.63	4.24	4.28	4.25	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	390/1559	4.75	4.17	4.29	4.23	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	13	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1352	****	3.48	3.98	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	238/1384	4.77	4.09	4.08	4.11	4.77	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	194/1382	4.92	4.34	4.29	4.37	4.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	211/1368	4.92	4.47	4.30	4.39	4.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	1	0	1	6	4	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	3.87	3.95	4.00	4.00	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.46	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.07	4.43	4.30	****	

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 5		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 16
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 304 0101  
 Title BRIT LIT:MEDIEVAL/RENA  
 Instructor: MCKINLEY, KATHE  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 767  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	14	4.72	361/1649	4.72	4.01	4.28	4.27	4.72	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	336/1648	4.69	4.10	4.23	4.18	4.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	422/1375	4.65	4.25	4.27	4.22	4.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	405/1595	4.59	4.25	4.20	4.21	4.59	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	137/1533	4.83	4.00	4.04	4.05	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	422/1512	4.47	4.27	4.10	4.11	4.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	4	10	4.33	720/1623	4.33	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.46	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	469/1621	4.44	3.97	4.06	4.02	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	535/1568	4.72	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.72	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	665/1572	4.88	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	1	13	4.63	524/1564	4.63	4.24	4.28	4.25	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	14	4.71	463/1559	4.71	4.17	4.29	4.23	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	10	2	0	2	0	2	3.00	1219/1352	3.00	3.48	3.98	3.97	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	561/1384	4.38	4.09	4.08	4.11	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	530/1382	4.62	4.34	4.29	4.37	4.62	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	327/1368	4.85	4.47	4.30	4.39	4.85	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	1	4	2	5	3.92	522/ 948	3.92	3.87	3.95	4.00	3.92	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	3	Under-grad	18	Non-major	5
84-150	3	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	12				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ENGL 305 0101  
 Title BRIT LIT:RESTOR - ROMA  
 Instructor: ORGELFINGER, GA  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 768  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	350/1649	4.74	4.01	4.28	4.27	4.74	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	599/1648	4.47	4.10	4.23	4.18	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	6	12	4.53	529/1375	4.53	4.25	4.27	4.22	4.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	352/1595	4.63	4.25	4.20	4.21	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	110/1533	4.89	4.00	4.04	4.05	4.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	331/1512	4.58	4.27	4.10	4.11	4.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	9	8	4.32	744/1623	4.32	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.32	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	19	0	4.00	1544/1646	4.00	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	165/1621	4.75	3.97	4.06	4.02	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	147/1568	4.94	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	355/1572	4.94	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	498/1564	4.65	4.24	4.28	4.25	4.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	284/1559	4.83	4.17	4.29	4.23	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	1	3	4	5	2	3.27	1156/1352	3.27	3.48	3.98	3.97	3.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	561/1384	4.38	4.09	4.08	4.11	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	383/1382	4.77	4.34	4.29	4.37	4.77	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	569/1368	4.62	4.47	4.30	4.39	4.62	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	413/ 948	4.08	3.87	3.95	4.00	4.08	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 555	****	2.30	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.58	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	19	Non-major	2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
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	14				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 306 0101  
 Title BRIT LIT: VICTORIAN-MO  
 Instructor: FERNANDEZ, JEAN  
 Enrollment: 31  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 769  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	4	5	11	4.24	986/1649	4.24	4.01	4.28	4.27	4.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	5	6	8	4.00	1124/1648	4.00	4.10	4.23	4.18	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	4	12	4.29	780/1375	4.29	4.25	4.27	4.22	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	2	3	5	10	4.15	943/1595	4.15	4.25	4.20	4.21	4.15	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	350/1533	4.52	4.00	4.04	4.05	4.52	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	7	10	4.19	755/1512	4.19	4.27	4.10	4.11	4.19	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	0	5	3	10	3.81	1241/1623	3.81	3.89	4.16	4.08	3.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	18	1	3.95	1574/1646	3.95	4.46	4.69	4.67	3.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	4	6	8	4.11	859/1621	4.11	3.97	4.06	4.02	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	2	3	13	4.30	1080/1568	4.30	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	1034/1572	4.70	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	3	3	1	13	4.20	1001/1564	4.20	4.24	4.28	4.25	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	4	3	12	4.25	966/1559	4.25	4.17	4.29	4.23	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	19	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1352	****	3.48	3.98	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	3	4	7	4.13	743/1384	4.13	4.09	4.08	4.11	4.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	1	3	10	4.40	716/1382	4.40	4.34	4.29	4.37	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	2	1	11	4.40	752/1368	4.40	4.47	4.30	4.39	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	13	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 948	****	3.87	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	****	2.30	4.29	4.22	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	2	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 312	****	2.70	3.68	3.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	22	Non-major	7
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	3						

Course-Section: ENGL 307 0101  
 Title AM LIT TO CIVIL WAR  
 Instructor: STEWART, CAROLE  
 Enrollment: 31  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 770  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	8	16	4.31	898/1649	4.31	4.01	4.28	4.27	4.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	10	14	4.31	825/1648	4.31	4.10	4.23	4.18	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	10	18	18	4.59	480/1375	4.59	4.25	4.27	4.22	4.59	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	10	17	4.57	417/1595	4.57	4.25	4.20	4.21	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	5	20	4.61	288/1533	4.61	4.00	4.04	4.05	4.61	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	0	2	12	11	4.23	711/1512	4.23	4.27	4.10	4.11	4.23	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	3	21	4.61	395/1623	4.61	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.61	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.46	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	3	13	6	4.14	824/1621	4.14	3.97	4.06	4.02	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	5	21	4.68	620/1568	4.68	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	3	23	4.71	1003/1572	4.71	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	10	16	4.43	754/1564	4.43	4.24	4.28	4.25	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	9	16	4.43	804/1559	4.43	4.17	4.29	4.23	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	3	3	3	5	6	3.40	1101/1352	3.40	3.48	3.98	3.97	3.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	1	10	10	4.22	697/1384	4.22	4.09	4.08	4.11	4.22	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	3	3	17	4.61	540/1382	4.61	4.34	4.29	4.37	4.61	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	348/1368	4.83	4.47	4.30	4.39	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	3	1	3	5	7	3.63	661/ 948	3.63	3.87	3.95	4.00	3.63	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	4	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 555	****	2.30	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	1	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 312	****	2.70	3.68	3.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	27
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	29	Non-major	2
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	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	21				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 308 0101  
 Title AM LIT AFTER CIVIL WAR  
 Instructor: BERMAN, JESSICA  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 771  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	10	13	4.35	857/1649	4.35	4.01	4.28	4.27	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	8	12	4.23	920/1648	4.23	4.10	4.23	4.18	4.23	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	7	16	4.42	641/1375	4.42	4.25	4.27	4.22	4.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	9	13	4.40	636/1595	4.40	4.25	4.20	4.21	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	22	4.77	174/1533	4.77	4.00	4.04	4.05	4.77	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	13	11	4.31	627/1512	4.31	4.27	4.10	4.11	4.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	8	13	4.27	803/1623	4.27	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	17	4.65	1048/1646	4.65	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.65	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	11	9	4.45	456/1621	4.45	3.97	4.06	4.02	4.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	8	16	4.60	731/1568	4.60	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	5	19	4.79	858/1572	4.79	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	8	14	4.50	651/1564	4.50	4.24	4.28	4.25	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	4	17	4.54	651/1559	4.54	4.17	4.29	4.23	4.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	1	3	9	3	2	3.11	1204/1352	3.11	3.48	3.98	3.97	3.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	376/1384	4.61	4.09	4.08	4.11	4.61	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	3	4	15	4.43	686/1382	4.43	4.34	4.29	4.37	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	2	19	4.74	449/1368	4.74	4.47	4.30	4.39	4.74	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	11	2	1	4	4	1	3.08	837/ 948	3.08	3.87	3.95	4.00	3.08	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	****	2.30	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.32	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.46	4.47	4.55	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.22	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 312	****	2.70	3.68	3.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 11		Graduate 0
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	4
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 26
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	17
			? 1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept		
	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	5	4.07	1136/1649	4.09	4.01	4.28	4.27	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	7	1	3.62	1441/1648	4.00	4.10	4.23	4.18	3.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1375	4.28	4.25	4.27	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	782/1595	4.25	4.25	4.20	4.21	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	6	4	3	3.64	1153/1533	3.85	4.00	4.04	4.05	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	6	5	4.00	883/1512	4.24	4.27	4.10	4.11	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	2	3	4	3	3.46	1405/1623	3.81	3.89	4.16	4.08	3.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	7	7	0	3.50	1630/1646	3.93	4.46	4.69	4.67	3.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	3	4	4	3.69	1240/1621	3.97	3.97	4.06	4.02	3.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	7	3	3.92	1333/1568	4.38	4.22	4.43	4.39	3.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	473/1572	4.82	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	4	6	2	3.69	1324/1564	4.18	4.24	4.28	4.25	3.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	6	5	1	3.46	1385/1559	3.98	4.17	4.29	4.23	3.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	2	3	1	0	0	1.83	1345/1352	3.04	3.48	3.98	3.97	1.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	613/1384	4.45	4.09	4.08	4.11	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	555/1382	4.72	4.34	4.29	4.37	4.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	844/1368	4.52	4.47	4.30	4.39	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	699/ 948	3.96	3.87	3.95	4.00	3.50
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 243	****	3.83	4.12	3.89	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.46	4.47	4.55	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.07	4.43	4.30	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.22	4.35	4.46	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.58	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.54	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.74	4.09	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.05	4.47	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.08	4.38	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 312	****	2.70	3.68	3.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.20	4.30	4.32	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.42	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 3	General 2	Under-grad 14	Non-major 5
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough	



P	0			responses to be significant
I	1	Other	10	
?	0			

Course-Section: ENGL 324 0201  
 Title THEORIES OF COMM TECH  
 Instructor: BURGESS, HELEN  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 773  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	3	6	8	4.11	1106/1649	4.09	4.01	4.28	4.27	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	3	11	4.39	729/1648	4.00	4.10	4.23	4.18	4.39	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	5	10	4.28	788/1375	4.28	4.25	4.27	4.22	4.28	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	7	8	4.22	853/1595	4.25	4.25	4.20	4.21	4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	1	6	8	4.06	781/1533	3.85	4.00	4.04	4.05	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	422/1512	4.24	4.27	4.10	4.11	4.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	4	9	4.17	915/1623	3.81	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	11	6	4.35	1325/1646	3.93	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.35	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	1	6	8	4.25	687/1621	3.97	3.97	4.06	4.02	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	344/1568	4.38	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	1	15	4.72	985/1572	4.82	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.72	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	473/1564	4.18	4.24	4.28	4.25	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	12	4.50	695/1559	3.98	4.17	4.29	4.23	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	515/1352	3.04	3.48	3.98	3.97	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	394/1384	4.45	4.09	4.08	4.11	4.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	292/1382	4.72	4.34	4.29	4.37	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	392/1368	4.52	4.47	4.30	4.39	4.79	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	7	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	265/ 948	3.96	3.87	3.95	4.00	4.43	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 19 Non-major 9
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 5	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	
			? 2		

Course-Section: ENGL 326 0101  
 Title STRUCTURE OF ENGLISH  
 Instructor: FITZPATRICK, CA  
 Enrollment: 31  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 774  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	3	7	7	4.06	1149/1649	4.06	4.01	4.28	4.27	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	6	8	4.22	931/1648	4.22	4.10	4.23	4.18	4.22	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	480/1375	4.59	4.25	4.27	4.22	4.59	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	806/1595	4.27	4.25	4.20	4.21	4.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	5	8	4.00	815/1533	4.00	4.00	4.04	4.05	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	3	2	5	5	3.47	1282/1512	3.47	4.27	4.10	4.11	3.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	7	8	4.22	849/1623	4.22	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	1037/1646	4.67	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	2	8	3	3.93	1030/1621	3.93	3.97	4.06	4.02	3.93	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	667/1568	4.65	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	355/1572	4.94	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	854/1564	4.33	4.24	4.28	4.25	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	736/1559	4.47	4.17	4.29	4.23	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	14	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/1352	****	3.48	3.98	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	0	1	6	5	3.86	911/1384	3.86	4.09	4.08	4.11	3.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	696/1382	4.43	4.34	4.29	4.37	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	5	8	4.43	732/1368	4.43	4.47	4.30	4.39	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	1	0	5	5	1	3.42	741/ 948	3.42	3.87	3.95	4.00	3.42	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 312	****	2.70	3.68	3.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	3	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	3	Under-grad	19	Non-major	4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	2						
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	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 332 0101  
 Title CONTEMP AMERICAN LIT  
 Instructor: CORBETT, CHRIS  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 775  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	510/1649	4.60	4.01	4.28	4.27	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	885/1648	4.27	4.10	4.23	4.18	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	546/1375	4.50	4.25	4.27	4.22	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	3	3	6	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	4.25	4.20	4.21	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	124/1533	4.87	4.00	4.04	4.05	4.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	3	8	4.27	675/1512	4.27	4.27	4.10	4.11	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	1	1	2	2	6	3.92	1164/1623	3.92	3.89	4.16	4.08	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	5	4.33	1340/1646	4.33	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	313/1621	4.57	3.97	4.06	4.02	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	301/1568	4.87	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	263/1564	4.80	4.24	4.28	4.25	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	143/1559	4.93	4.17	4.29	4.23	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	341/1352	4.46	3.48	3.98	3.97	4.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	219/1384	4.79	4.09	4.08	4.11	4.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	292/1382	4.86	4.34	4.29	4.37	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.47	4.30	4.39	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	7	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	330/ 948	4.29	3.87	3.95	4.00	4.29
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	****	2.30	4.29	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	6
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	3
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	4
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENGL 332H 0101  
 Title LITERATURE OF NONFICTI  
 Instructor: CORBETT, CHRIS  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 776  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1498/1649	3.50	4.01	4.28	4.27	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	897/1648	4.25	4.10	4.23	4.18	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	950/1375	4.00	4.25	4.27	4.22	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	321/1595	4.67	4.25	4.20	4.21	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	180/1533	4.75	4.00	4.04	4.05	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	883/1512	4.00	4.27	4.10	4.11	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1398/1646	4.25	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	914/1621	4.00	3.97	4.06	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1121/1568	4.25	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	939/1564	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.25	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	966/1559	4.25	4.17	4.29	4.23	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	914/1352	3.75	3.48	3.98	3.97	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	795/1384	4.00	4.09	4.08	4.11	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	616/1382	4.50	4.34	4.29	4.37	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.47	4.30	4.39	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 0		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	4
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1		

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

Course-Section: ENGL 348 0101  
 Title LITERATURE AND CULTURE  
 Instructor: OSHEROW, MICHEL  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 777  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	7	4.78	306/1649	4.78	4.01	4.28	4.27	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	161/1648	4.89	4.10	4.23	4.18	4.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	179/1375	4.89	4.25	4.27	4.22	4.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	218/1595	4.78	4.25	4.20	4.21	4.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.00	4.04	4.05	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	263/1512	4.67	4.27	4.10	4.11	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	671/1623	4.38	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	1340/1646	4.33	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	121/1621	4.83	3.97	4.06	4.02	4.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	316/1568	4.86	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	216/1564	4.86	4.24	4.28	4.25	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	618/1559	4.57	4.17	4.29	4.23	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	303/1352	4.50	3.48	3.98	3.97	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	165/1384	4.88	4.09	4.08	4.11	4.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	272/1382	4.88	4.34	4.29	4.37	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	295/1368	4.88	4.47	4.30	4.39	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	265/ 948	4.43	3.87	3.95	4.00	4.43	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 350 0101  
 Title MAJ BRIT & AMER WRITER  
 Instructor: FALCO, RAPHAEL  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 778  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.01	4.28	4.27	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.10	4.23	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.25	4.27	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	890/1595	4.20	4.25	4.20	4.21	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	151/1533	4.80	4.00	4.04	4.05	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.27	4.10	4.11	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1103/1646	4.60	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1621	5.00	3.97	4.06	4.02	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	983/1568	4.40	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	263/1564	4.80	4.24	4.28	4.25	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	318/1559	4.80	4.17	4.29	4.23	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1352	****	3.48	3.98	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	541/1384	4.40	4.09	4.08	4.11	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.34	4.29	4.37	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	579/1368	4.60	4.47	4.30	4.39	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.87	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	490/ 555	3.00	2.30	4.29	4.22	3.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	34/ 88	4.80	4.32	4.54	4.63	4.80	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.46	4.47	4.55	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	30/ 81	4.75	4.07	4.43	4.30	4.75	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	54/ 92	4.40	4.22	4.35	4.46	4.40	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.35	3.68	3.58	4.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 312	****	2.70	3.68	3.60	****	

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	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	0
84-150	3	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	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 351 0101  
 Title STUDIES IN SHAKESPEARE  
 Instructor: FALCO, RAPHAEL  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 779  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	8	4.25	965/1649	4.25	4.01	4.28	4.27	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	4	7	4.06	1088/1648	4.06	4.10	4.23	4.18	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	380/1375	4.69	4.25	4.27	4.22	4.69		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	4	4	6	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	4.25	4.20	4.21	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	272/1533	4.63	4.00	4.04	4.05	4.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	574/1512	4.36	4.27	4.10	4.11	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	2	5	6	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	1340/1646	4.33	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	331/1621	4.56	3.97	4.06	4.02	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	2	2	7	4.17	1191/1568	4.17	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	591/1572	4.91	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	822/1564	4.36	4.24	4.28	4.25	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	434/1559	4.73	4.17	4.29	4.23	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1195/1352	3.14	3.48	3.98	3.97	3.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	359/1384	4.63	4.09	4.08	4.11	4.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	831/1382	4.25	4.34	4.29	4.37	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	426/1368	4.75	4.47	4.30	4.39	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 948	****	3.87	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.07	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	3.83	4.12	3.89	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.21	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.12	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.32	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.46	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.07	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.22	4.35	4.46	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.54	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.74	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.05	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.08	4.38	4.32	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.20	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.63	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	5.00	3.99	4.05	****	



Course-Section: ENGL 351 0101  
 Title STUDIES IN SHAKESPEARE  
 Instructor: FALCO, RAPHAEL  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 779  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	16	Non-major	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	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	11				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	306/1649	4.77	4.01	4.28	4.27	4.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	336/1648	4.68	4.10	4.23	4.18	4.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	4	15	4.57	488/1375	4.57	4.25	4.27	4.22	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	17	4.64	352/1595	4.64	4.25	4.20	4.21	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	128/1533	4.86	4.00	4.04	4.05	4.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	225/1512	4.71	4.27	4.10	4.11	4.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	6	12	4.38	659/1623	4.38	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	21	0	4.00	1544/1646	4.00	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	356/1621	4.53	3.97	4.06	4.02	4.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	442/1568	4.77	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	3	2	16	4.45	715/1564	4.45	4.24	4.28	4.25	4.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	487/1559	4.68	4.17	4.29	4.23	4.68	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	1	5	13	4.50	303/1352	4.50	3.48	3.98	3.97	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	673/1384	4.25	4.09	4.08	4.11	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	686/1382	4.44	4.34	4.29	4.37	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	609/1368	4.56	4.47	4.30	4.39	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	1	2	7	3	3.92	512/ 948	3.92	3.87	3.95	4.00	3.92	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	3.83	4.12	3.89	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	1	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 555	****	2.30	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	3.54	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	3.74	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.05	4.47	4.43	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	2.70	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.20	4.30	4.32	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	6	Under-grad	22	Non-major	6
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	2	#### - 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: GOODMAN, IVY  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 781  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	5	5	4.17	1057/1649	4.17	4.01	4.28	4.27	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	1076/1648	4.08	4.10	4.23	4.18	4.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	983/1595	4.13	4.25	4.20	4.21	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	2	5	3.58	1193/1533	3.58	4.00	4.04	4.05	3.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	263/1512	4.67	4.27	4.10	4.11	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	2	4	1	3	3.50	1387/1623	3.50	3.89	4.16	4.08	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.46	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	5	4	2	3.73	1217/1621	3.73	3.97	4.06	4.02	3.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	1050/1568	4.33	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	894/1572	4.78	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	971/1564	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.25	4.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	5	0	3	3.56	1357/1559	3.56	4.17	4.29	4.23	3.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1352	****	3.48	3.98	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	582/1384	4.36	4.09	4.08	4.11	4.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	455/1382	4.70	4.34	4.29	4.37	4.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	369/1368	4.80	4.47	4.30	4.39	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	164/ 948	4.63	3.87	3.95	4.00	4.63	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 555	****	2.30	4.29	4.22	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 312	****	2.70	3.68	3.60	****	

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 2		Graduate
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 373 0101  
 Title CREATIVE WRITING-POETR  
 Instructor: PEKARSKE, NICOL  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 782  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	510/1649	4.60	4.01	4.28	4.27	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	966/1648	4.20	4.10	4.23	4.18	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1375	****	4.25	4.27	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	636/1595	4.40	4.25	4.20	4.21	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	680/1533	4.20	4.00	4.04	4.05	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	194/1512	4.75	4.27	4.10	4.11	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	1496/1623	3.20	3.89	4.16	4.08	3.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1287/1646	4.40	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	914/1621	4.00	3.97	4.06	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.22	4.43	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.24	4.28	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.17	4.29	4.23	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1352	****	3.48	3.98	3.97	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.09	4.08	4.11	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.34	4.29	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.47	4.30	4.39	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	3.87	3.95	4.00	5.00
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	2.70	3.68	3.60	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	2	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	4
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 380 0101  
 Title INTRO TO NEWS WRITING  
 Instructor: WEISS, KENNETH  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 783  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	2	8	4	4.00	1183/1649	4.00	4.01	4.28	4.27	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	8	5	4.20	966/1648	4.20	4.10	4.23	4.18	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	733/1375	4.33	4.25	4.27	4.22	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	806/1595	4.27	4.25	4.20	4.21	4.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	525/1533	4.36	4.00	4.04	4.05	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	263/1512	4.67	4.27	4.10	4.11	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	3	8	3	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	945/1646	4.73	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	6	2	3.83	1123/1621	3.83	3.97	4.06	4.02	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	956/1568	4.43	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	1174/1572	4.57	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	908/1564	4.29	4.24	4.28	4.25	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	5	7	4.21	994/1559	4.21	4.17	4.29	4.23	4.21	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	2	0	4	2	2	3.20	1177/1352	3.20	3.48	3.98	3.97	3.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	2	1	2	3	3.75	965/1384	3.75	4.09	4.08	4.11	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1098/1382	3.75	4.34	4.29	4.37	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	601/1368	4.57	4.47	4.30	4.39	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	699/ 948	3.50	3.87	3.95	4.00	3.50	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	1	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	247/ 312	3.25	2.70	3.68	3.60	3.25	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	16	Non-major	13
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	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	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 382 0101  
 Title FEATURE WRITING  
 Instructor: CORBETT, CHRIS  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 784  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	11	4.37	830/1649	4.37	4.01	4.28	4.27	4.37	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	3	11	4.16	1010/1648	4.16	4.10	4.23	4.18	4.16	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1375	****	4.25	4.27	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	342/1595	4.65	4.25	4.20	4.21	4.65	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	6	2	8	3.79	1036/1533	3.79	4.00	4.04	4.05	3.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	137/1512	4.84	4.27	4.10	4.11	4.84	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	2	4	4	6	3.42	1424/1623	3.42	3.89	4.16	4.08	3.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	17	1	4.06	1525/1646	4.06	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.06	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	0	0	2	12	4.60	288/1621	4.60	3.97	4.06	4.02	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	0	2	4	8	4.00	1279/1568	4.00	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	702/1564	4.47	4.24	4.28	4.25	4.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	662/1559	4.53	4.17	4.29	4.23	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	12	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1352	****	3.48	3.98	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	489/1384	4.45	4.09	4.08	4.11	4.45	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	511/1382	4.64	4.34	4.29	4.37	4.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	1	0	9	4.45	703/1368	4.45	4.47	4.30	4.39	4.45	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	8	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 948	****	3.87	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 243	****	3.83	4.12	3.89	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.32	4.54	4.63	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	2.70	3.68	3.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	4	Under-grad	19	Non-major	9
84-150	3	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	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 387 0101  
 Title WEB DESIGN & AUTHORIZING  
 Instructor: BURGESS, HELEN  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 785  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	13	4.81	265/1649	4.81	4.01	4.28	4.27	4.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	336/1648	4.69	4.10	4.23	4.18	4.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.25	4.27	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	192/1595	4.80	4.25	4.20	4.21	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	2	5	1	3	3.08	1428/1533	3.08	4.00	4.04	4.05	3.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	883/1512	4.00	4.27	4.10	4.11	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	803/1623	4.27	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	1166/1646	4.53	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.53	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	159/1621	4.77	3.97	4.06	4.02	4.77	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	588/1568	4.69	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	740/1572	4.85	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	326/1564	4.77	4.24	4.28	4.25	4.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	376/1559	4.77	4.17	4.29	4.23	4.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	389/1352	4.42	3.48	3.98	3.97	4.42	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	0	1	2	3	3.50	1081/1384	3.50	4.09	4.08	4.11	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	1	0	6	4.25	831/1382	4.25	4.34	4.29	4.37	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	771/1368	4.38	4.47	4.30	4.39	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	310/ 948	4.33	3.87	3.95	4.00	4.33	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	3	1	0	0	0	1.25	552/ 555	1.25	2.30	4.29	4.22	1.25	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 312	****	2.70	3.68	3.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	7	Under-grad	16	Non-major	5
84-150	3	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	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 391 0101  
 Title ADV EXPOS & ARGUMENT  
 Instructor: MCGURRIN JR, AN  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 786  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	1	2	3	5	1	3.25	1560/1649	3.63	4.01	4.28	4.27	3.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	4	5	0	3.00	1591/1648	3.62	4.10	4.23	4.18	3.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1375	3.50	4.25	4.27	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	1	3	5	3.83	1242/1595	3.91	4.25	4.20	4.21	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	1	4	4	3.58	1193/1533	3.56	4.00	4.04	4.05	3.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	3	2	4	3.55	1240/1512	4.05	4.27	4.10	4.11	3.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	1	4	4	3.67	1318/1623	3.76	3.89	4.16	4.08	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	1	4.08	1513/1646	4.46	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.08	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	1	0	5	3	2	3.45	1375/1621	3.62	3.97	4.06	4.02	3.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	4	2	3	3.45	1470/1568	3.82	4.22	4.43	4.39	3.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	985/1572	4.70	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	5	3	2	3.45	1407/1564	3.76	4.24	4.28	4.25	3.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	4	4	2	3.55	1359/1559	3.61	4.17	4.29	4.23	3.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	1	3	2	3.63	1029/1384	3.71	4.09	4.08	4.11	3.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	3	1	3	3.63	1165/1382	4.21	4.34	4.29	4.37	3.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	2	0	5	4.00	948/1368	4.45	4.47	4.30	4.39	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	7	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 948	3.42	3.87	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 555	****	2.30	4.29	4.22	****	

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	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	12	Non-major	6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	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	9				
				?	0						



Course-Section: ENGL 391 0201  
 Title ADV EXPOS & ARGUMENT  
 Instructor: FITZPATRICK, CA  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 787  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	4	3	5	7	3.65	1436/1649	3.63	4.01	4.28	4.27	3.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	0	3	6	8	3.80	1313/1648	3.62	4.10	4.23	4.18	3.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	19	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1375	3.50	4.25	4.27	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	3	5	10	4.05	1038/1595	3.91	4.25	4.20	4.21	4.05	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	5	4	3	5	3.10	1423/1533	3.56	4.00	4.04	4.05	3.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	4	11	4.15	791/1512	4.05	4.27	4.10	4.11	4.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	4	8	4	3.63	1332/1623	3.76	3.89	4.16	4.08	3.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	680/1646	4.46	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	5	9	2	3.56	1323/1621	3.62	3.97	4.06	4.02	3.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	2	4	4	7	3.78	1394/1568	3.82	4.22	4.43	4.39	3.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	0	3	14	4.61	1133/1572	4.70	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	4	5	7	3.89	1229/1564	3.76	4.24	4.28	4.25	3.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	5	4	5	3.50	1370/1559	3.61	4.17	4.29	4.23	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	14	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	****/1352	2.59	3.48	3.98	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	4	6	6	3.83	921/1384	3.71	4.09	4.08	4.11	3.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	0	2	15	4.67	483/1382	4.21	4.34	4.29	4.37	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	337/1368	4.45	4.47	4.30	4.39	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	1	0	4	3	3	3.64	661/ 948	3.42	3.87	3.95	4.00	3.64	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.58	****	

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	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	8						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	12
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	1						

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 788  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	6	5	3.71	1402/1649	3.63	4.01	4.28	4.27	3.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	6	5	3.94	1187/1648	3.62	4.10	4.23	4.18	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	2	5	4	3	3.25	1281/1375	3.50	4.25	4.27	4.22	3.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	6	6	3.88	1213/1595	3.91	4.25	4.20	4.21	3.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	7	3	6	3.82	996/1533	3.56	4.00	4.04	4.05	3.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	711/1512	4.05	4.27	4.10	4.11	4.24	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	5	6	3.82	1228/1623	3.76	3.89	4.16	4.08	3.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	897/1646	4.46	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	2	3	8	3	3.75	1192/1621	3.62	3.97	4.06	4.02	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	9	7	4.35	1031/1568	3.82	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.35	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	790/1572	4.70	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	5	8	4	3.94	1182/1564	3.76	4.24	4.28	4.25	3.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	5	6	4	3.75	1277/1559	3.61	4.17	4.29	4.23	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	3	2	1	1	0	2.00	1335/1352	2.59	3.48	3.98	3.97	2.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	5	6	2	3.38	1137/1384	3.71	4.09	4.08	4.11	3.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	3	5	6	3.88	1042/1382	4.21	4.34	4.29	4.37	3.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	4	3	8	4.13	910/1368	4.45	4.47	4.30	4.39	4.13	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	10	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	811/ 948	3.42	3.87	3.95	4.00	3.20	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	****	2.30	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	2	1	2	0	1	0	2.25	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 312	****	2.70	3.68	3.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	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	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 391 0401  
 Title ADV EXPOS & ARGUMENT  
 Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 789  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	9	5	3.90	1272/1649	3.63	4.01	4.28	4.27	3.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	8	4	3.75	1347/1648	3.62	4.10	4.23	4.18	3.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	1112/1375	3.50	4.25	4.27	4.22	3.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	2	3	8	5	3.89	1213/1595	3.91	4.25	4.20	4.21	3.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	8	5	3.75	1065/1533	3.56	4.00	4.04	4.05	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	7	10	4.25	687/1512	4.05	4.27	4.10	4.11	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	9	5	3.90	1180/1623	3.76	3.89	4.16	4.08	3.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	14	4	4.10	1506/1646	4.46	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.10	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	6	7	2	3.73	1209/1621	3.62	3.97	4.06	4.02	3.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	6	6	3	3.69	1422/1568	3.82	4.22	4.43	4.39	3.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	1121/1572	4.70	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	8	4	4	3.75	1297/1564	3.76	4.24	4.28	4.25	3.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	3	6	4	3.63	1336/1559	3.61	4.17	4.29	4.23	3.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	4	1	2	3	4	1	3.18	1183/1352	2.59	3.48	3.98	3.97	3.18	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	795/1384	3.71	4.09	4.08	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	483/1382	4.21	4.34	4.29	4.37	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	337/1368	4.45	4.47	4.30	4.39	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 948	3.42	3.87	3.95	4.00	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 312	****	2.70	3.68	3.60	****	

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	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	10
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0101  
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING  
 Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 790  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1429/1649	3.98	4.01	4.28	4.27	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1546/1648	3.77	4.10	4.23	4.18	3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1335/1595	4.52	4.25	4.20	4.21	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1170/1512	4.58	4.27	4.10	4.11	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1029/1623	3.75	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1340/1646	4.92	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1429/1621	4.14	3.97	4.06	4.02	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1254/1384	4.38	4.09	4.08	4.11	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	946/1382	4.83	4.34	4.29	4.37	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	948/1368	4.81	4.47	4.30	4.39	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	844/ 948	4.17	3.87	3.95	4.00	3.00
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	291/ 312	2.00	2.70	3.68	3.60	2.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0301  
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING  
 Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 791  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1429/1649	3.98	4.01	4.28	4.27	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	362/1648	3.77	4.10	4.23	4.18	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1595	4.52	4.25	4.20	4.21	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1512	4.58	4.27	4.10	4.11	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1623	3.75	3.89	4.16	4.08	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1646	4.92	4.46	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	595/1621	4.14	3.97	4.06	4.02	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1568	4.57	4.22	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1564	4.71	4.24	4.28	4.25	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	4.57	4.17	4.29	4.23	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	4.38	4.09	4.08	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	483/1382	4.83	4.34	4.29	4.37	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1368	4.81	4.47	4.30	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 948	4.17	3.87	3.95	4.00	5.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	553/ 555	1.50	2.30	4.29	4.22	1.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	308/ 312	2.00	2.70	3.68	3.60	1.00	

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
56-83	1	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	3
			P 0		Major
			I 0		Non-major
			? 0		0

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

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0401  
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING  
 Instructor: MABE, MITZI J  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 792  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	644/1649	3.98	4.01	4.28	4.27	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1481/1648	3.77	4.10	4.23	4.18	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	497/1595	4.52	4.25	4.20	4.21	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1512	4.58	4.27	4.10	4.11	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1533/1623	3.75	3.89	4.16	4.08	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1646	4.92	4.46	4.69	4.67	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1279/1568	4.57	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1127/1564	4.71	4.24	4.28	4.25	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	695/1559	4.57	4.17	4.29	4.23	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	690/1352	4.00	3.48	3.98	3.97	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	437/1384	4.38	4.09	4.08	4.11	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1382	4.83	4.34	4.29	4.37	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1368	4.81	4.47	4.30	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 948	4.17	3.87	3.95	4.00	5.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 243	5.00	3.83	4.12	3.89	5.00	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.46	4.47	4.55	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	50/ 52	1.00	3.54	4.06	3.59	1.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 53	4.50	4.20	4.30	4.32	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 30	5.00	4.63	4.16	4.44	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	5.00	4.43	5.00	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	5.00	4.42	5.00	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 110	5.00	5.00	3.99	4.05	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0501  
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING  
 Instructor: MABE, MITZI J  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 793  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	2	0	3.00	1603/1649	3.98	4.01	4.28	4.27	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	1642/1648	3.77	4.10	4.23	4.18	2.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1537/1595	4.52	4.25	4.20	4.21	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	595/1512	4.58	4.27	4.10	4.11	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1591/1623	3.75	3.89	4.16	4.08	2.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1646	4.92	4.46	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1261/1621	4.14	3.97	4.06	4.02	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1279/1568	4.57	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	651/1564	4.71	4.24	4.28	4.25	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	695/1559	4.57	4.17	4.29	4.23	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1346/1384	4.38	4.09	4.08	4.11	2.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1382	4.83	4.34	4.29	4.37	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	654/1368	4.81	4.47	4.30	4.39	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	936/ 948	4.17	3.87	3.95	4.00	2.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	522/ 555	1.50	2.30	4.29	4.22	2.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.50	3.35	3.68	3.58	4.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	291/ 312	2.00	2.70	3.68	3.60	2.00	

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

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0601  
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING  
 Instructor: MABE, MITZI J  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 794  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1183/1649	3.98	4.01	4.28	4.27	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1591/1648	3.77	4.10	4.23	4.18	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1595	4.52	4.25	4.20	4.21	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	883/1512	4.58	4.27	4.10	4.11	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	1608/1623	3.75	3.89	4.16	4.08	2.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1646	4.92	4.46	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	914/1621	4.14	3.97	4.06	4.02	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1279/1568	4.57	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	651/1564	4.71	4.24	4.28	4.25	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1121/1559	4.57	4.17	4.29	4.23	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	4.38	4.09	4.08	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1382	4.83	4.34	4.29	4.37	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1368	4.81	4.47	4.30	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 948	4.17	3.87	3.95	4.00	5.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	544/ 555	1.50	2.30	4.29	4.22	1.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 88	5.00	4.32	4.54	4.63	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.46	4.47	4.55	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	63/ 81	4.00	4.07	4.43	4.30	4.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	4.22	4.35	4.46	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 288	4.50	3.35	3.68	3.58	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	256/ 312	2.00	2.70	3.68	3.60	3.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	35/ 53	4.50	4.20	4.30	4.32	4.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	5.00	4.43	5.00	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	5.00	4.42	5.00	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 110	5.00	5.00	3.99	4.05	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: ENGL 392 0701  
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING  
 Instructor: FALLON, MICHAEL  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 795  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	0	1	1	3.67	1429/1649	3.98	4.01	4.28	4.27	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1124/1648	3.77	4.10	4.23	4.18	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1595	4.52	4.25	4.20	4.21	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1512	4.58	4.27	4.10	4.11	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	321/1623	3.75	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1646	4.92	4.46	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	234/1621	4.14	3.97	4.06	4.02	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1568	4.57	4.22	4.43	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1564	4.71	4.24	4.28	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1121/1559	4.57	4.17	4.29	4.23	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	4.38	4.09	4.08	4.11	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1382	4.83	4.34	4.29	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1368	4.81	4.47	4.30	4.39	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0801  
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING  
 Instructor: FALLON, MICHAEL  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 796  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	2	4.33	871/1649	3.98	4.01	4.28	4.27	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	797/1648	3.77	4.10	4.23	4.18	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.25	4.27	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1595	4.52	4.25	4.20	4.21	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	263/1512	4.58	4.27	4.10	4.11	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1318/1623	3.75	3.89	4.16	4.08	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1646	4.92	4.46	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	234/1621	4.14	3.97	4.06	4.02	4.67
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1568	4.57	4.22	4.43	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1564	4.71	4.24	4.28	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	4.57	4.17	4.29	4.23	5.00
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	4.38	4.09	4.08	4.11	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1382	4.83	4.34	4.29	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1368	4.81	4.47	4.30	4.39	5.00

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

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0901  
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING  
 Instructor: FALLON, MICHAEL  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 797  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1649	3.98	4.01	4.28	4.27	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1648	3.77	4.10	4.23	4.18	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1595	4.52	4.25	4.20	4.21	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1512	4.58	4.27	4.10	4.11	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	321/1623	3.75	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1646	4.92	4.46	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	595/1621	4.14	3.97	4.06	4.02	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1568	4.57	4.22	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1564	4.71	4.24	4.28	4.25	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	4.57	4.17	4.29	4.23	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	4.38	4.09	4.08	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1382	4.83	4.34	4.29	4.37	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1368	4.81	4.47	4.30	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 948	4.17	3.87	3.95	4.00	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0101  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: SIMS, DIANA  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 798  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	2	7	4	3.93	1254/1649	3.58	4.01	4.28	4.27	3.93	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	5	5	4.00	1124/1648	3.77	4.10	4.23	4.18	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	4	6	3	3.92	1017/1375	4.10	4.25	4.27	4.22	3.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	497/1595	4.03	4.25	4.20	4.21	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	1	5	5	3.92	895/1533	3.66	4.00	4.04	4.05	3.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	3	10	4.50	380/1512	4.11	4.27	4.10	4.11	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	936/1623	3.76	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	5	4.36	1325/1646	4.26	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.36	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	2	5	2	3.70	1234/1621	3.57	3.97	4.06	4.02	3.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	2	7	2	3.83	1373/1568	3.99	4.22	4.43	4.39	3.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	931/1572	4.42	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	4	5	3	3.92	1209/1564	3.96	4.24	4.28	4.25	3.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	1088/1559	3.78	4.17	4.29	4.23	4.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	616/1352	3.62	3.48	3.98	3.97	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	394/1384	3.74	4.09	4.08	4.11	4.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	562/1382	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.37	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	472/1368	4.13	4.47	4.30	4.39	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 948	3.67	3.87	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	3	2	1	0	0	1.67	539/ 555	2.47	2.30	4.29	4.22	1.67	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	1	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 288	2.44	3.35	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	2.99	2.70	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	****	5.00	3.99	4.05	****	

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		0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	12

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

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0201  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: SIMS, DIANA  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 799  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	1	4	3	0	2.38	1642/1649	3.58	4.01	4.28	4.27	2.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	6	1	1	1	2.15	1645/1648	3.77	4.10	4.23	4.18	2.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	5	3	1	1	0	1	2.17	1371/1375	4.10	4.25	4.27	4.22	2.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	1	4	3	1	2.69	1574/1595	4.03	4.25	4.20	4.21	2.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	1	5	1	2	2.69	1497/1533	3.66	4.00	4.04	4.05	2.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	6	1	3	2	2.92	1452/1512	4.11	4.27	4.10	4.11	2.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	8	3	0	0	2	1.85	1618/1623	3.76	3.89	4.16	4.08	1.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	1	4.08	1517/1646	4.26	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.08	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	6	3	1	1	0	1.73	1616/1621	3.57	3.97	4.06	4.02	1.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	3	2	3	0	2	2.60	1551/1568	3.99	4.22	4.43	4.39	2.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	2	0	2	2	5	3.73	1520/1572	4.42	4.71	4.70	4.64	3.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	5	1	2	0	2	2.30	1553/1564	3.96	4.24	4.28	4.25	2.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	3	0	1	2	2.40	1534/1559	3.78	4.17	4.29	4.23	2.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	5	0	2	0	0	1.57	1349/1352	3.62	3.48	3.98	3.97	1.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	2	1	1	2	2.67	1335/1384	3.74	4.09	4.08	4.11	2.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	2	0	2	5	4.11	917/1382	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.37	4.11	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	2	4	2	3.67	1129/1368	4.13	4.47	4.30	4.39	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	3	1	1	0	0	1.60	944/ 948	3.67	3.87	3.95	4.00	1.60	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 555	2.47	2.30	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	2.44	3.35	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	2	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	279/ 312	2.99	2.70	3.68	3.60	2.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
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	11
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0301  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: HARRIS, LINDA R  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 800  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	5	6	3	3	2.90	1619/1649	3.58	4.01	4.28	4.27	2.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	1	8	2	5	3.26	1561/1648	3.77	4.10	4.23	4.18	3.26	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	2	0	0	3	3.80	1087/1375	4.10	4.25	4.27	4.22	3.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	4	1	4	5	5	3.32	1478/1595	4.03	4.25	4.20	4.21	3.32	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	2	0	2	1	4	3.56	1214/1533	3.66	4.00	4.04	4.05	3.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	5	4	6	3.47	1282/1512	4.11	4.27	4.10	4.11	3.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	3	2	9	0	5	3.11	1523/1623	3.76	3.89	4.16	4.08	3.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	2	1	6	6	4	3.47	1632/1646	4.26	4.46	4.69	4.67	3.47	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	2	3	6	2	1	2.79	1557/1621	3.57	3.97	4.06	4.02	2.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	3	6	7	4.00	1279/1568	3.99	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	4	6	7	4.06	1456/1572	4.42	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.06	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	7	4	7	4.00	1127/1564	3.96	4.24	4.28	4.25	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	4	5	2	5	3.11	1468/1559	3.78	4.17	4.29	4.23	3.11	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	3	6	1	5	3.38	1113/1352	3.62	3.48	3.98	3.97	3.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	1	1	0	4	3.71	987/1384	3.74	4.09	4.08	4.11	3.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	812/1382	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.37	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	948/1368	4.13	4.47	4.30	4.39	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	578/ 948	3.67	3.87	3.95	4.00	3.80	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.07	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	3.83	4.12	3.89	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.21	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.12	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 555	2.47	2.30	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	2.44	3.35	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	1	2	0	0	0	1.67	****/ 312	2.99	2.70	3.68	3.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	19
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	3	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 393 0401  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: HARRIS, LINDA R  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 801  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	5	3	2	3.23	1564/1649	3.58	4.01	4.28	4.27	3.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	6	1	2	2.85	1609/1648	3.77	4.10	4.23	4.18	2.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1375	4.10	4.25	4.27	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	3	4	3.62	1365/1595	4.03	4.25	4.20	4.21	3.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	1354/1533	3.66	4.00	4.04	4.05	3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	1	5	4	3.92	1008/1512	4.11	4.27	4.10	4.11	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	3	0	3	2	4	3.33	1462/1623	3.76	3.89	4.16	4.08	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	3	0	4	5	0	2.92	1646/1646	4.26	4.46	4.69	4.67	2.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	2	2	4	2	1	2.82	1553/1621	3.57	3.97	4.06	4.02	2.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	1	2	1	6	3.46	1468/1568	3.99	4.22	4.43	4.39	3.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	4	1	7	4.08	1453/1572	4.42	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.08
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	5	2	4	3.54	1379/1564	3.96	4.24	4.28	4.25	3.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	3	4	2	3.08	1471/1559	3.78	4.17	4.29	4.23	3.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	2	0	3	5	4.10	633/1352	3.62	3.48	3.98	3.97	4.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	1322/1384	3.74	4.09	4.08	4.11	2.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	1363/1382	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.37	2.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1252/1368	4.13	4.47	4.30	4.39	3.25
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	3.67	3.87	3.95	4.00	****
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 555	2.47	2.30	4.29	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	11
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	2	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	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0501  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: ROCKETT, DANIKA  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 802  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	6	11	4.19	1027/1649	3.58	4.01	4.28	4.27	4.19	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	216/1648	3.77	4.10	4.23	4.18	4.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	296/1375	4.10	4.25	4.27	4.22	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	227/1595	4.03	4.25	4.20	4.21	4.76	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	8	7	4.10	748/1533	3.66	4.00	4.04	4.05	4.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	380/1512	4.11	4.27	4.10	4.11	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	284/1623	3.76	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	14	6	4.30	1364/1646	4.26	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.30	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	10	7	4.41	497/1621	3.57	3.97	4.06	4.02	4.41	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	554/1568	3.99	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	591/1572	4.42	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	263/1564	3.96	4.24	4.28	4.25	4.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	573/1559	3.78	4.17	4.29	4.23	4.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	0	3	8	7	4.05	661/1352	3.62	3.48	3.98	3.97	4.05	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	499/1384	3.74	4.09	4.08	4.11	4.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	483/1382	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.37	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	522/1368	4.13	4.47	4.30	4.39	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	179/ 948	3.67	3.87	3.95	4.00	4.57	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	2.47	2.30	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 288	2.44	3.35	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	****/ 312	2.99	2.70	3.68	3.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	1						



Course-Section: ENGL 393 0701  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: HARRIS, LINDA R  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 803  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	3	1	6	4	3.17	1580/1649	3.58	4.01	4.28	4.27	3.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	6	4	4	3.39	1532/1648	3.77	4.10	4.23	4.18	3.39	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1375	4.10	4.25	4.27	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	6	8	4.06	1038/1595	4.03	4.25	4.20	4.21	4.06	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	2	1	4	3	3.33	1338/1533	3.66	4.00	4.04	4.05	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	4	9	4.12	826/1512	4.11	4.27	4.10	4.11	4.12	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	2	10	3	3.72	1287/1623	3.76	3.89	4.16	4.08	3.72	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	5	4.28	1384/1646	4.26	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.28	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	3	3	6	0	3.08	1492/1621	3.57	3.97	4.06	4.02	3.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	2	5	8	4.19	1176/1568	3.99	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.19	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	2	4	4	6	3.88	1498/1572	4.42	4.71	4.70	4.64	3.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	4	7	4	3.88	1235/1564	3.96	4.24	4.28	4.25	3.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	5	0	2	5	4	3.19	1452/1559	3.78	4.17	4.29	4.23	3.19	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	4	1	2	4	3	3.07	1210/1352	3.62	3.48	3.98	3.97	3.07	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	1081/1384	3.74	4.09	4.08	4.11	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	1	2	3	1	3.25	1275/1382	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.37	3.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1051/1368	4.13	4.47	4.30	4.39	3.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	431/ 948	3.67	3.87	3.95	4.00	4.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	2	2	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 555	2.47	2.30	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	2	2	1	0	2	0	2.40	260/ 288	2.44	3.35	3.68	3.58	2.40	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	2	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 312	2.99	2.70	3.68	3.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0801  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: MEADE, VICKI  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 804  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	6	2	4	3.25	1560/1649	3.58	4.01	4.28	4.27	3.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	2	6	3.63	1434/1648	3.77	4.10	4.23	4.18	3.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	888/1375	4.10	4.25	4.27	4.22	4.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	3	5	3.63	1359/1595	4.03	4.25	4.20	4.21	3.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	6	1	4	1	3	2.60	1502/1533	3.66	4.00	4.04	4.05	2.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	5	2	6	3.63	1191/1512	4.11	4.27	4.10	4.11	3.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	3	3	1	7	3.50	1387/1623	3.76	3.89	4.16	4.08	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	1340/1646	4.26	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	3	3	3	2	3.36	1419/1621	3.57	3.97	4.06	4.02	3.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	6	1	7	3.87	1362/1568	3.99	4.22	4.43	4.39	3.87	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	1	0	4	8	4.21	1412/1572	4.42	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.21	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	2	3	2	6	3.53	1379/1564	3.96	4.24	4.28	4.25	3.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	0	3	4	4	3.27	1438/1559	3.78	4.17	4.29	4.23	3.27	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	1	4	3	3	3.50	1049/1352	3.62	3.48	3.98	3.97	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	1029/1384	3.74	4.09	4.08	4.11	3.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1098/1382	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.37	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1043/1368	4.13	4.47	4.30	4.39	3.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	684/ 948	3.67	3.87	3.95	4.00	3.57	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.07	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 243	****	3.83	4.12	3.89	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	3	1	1	0	1	2.17	520/ 555	2.47	2.30	4.29	4.22	2.17	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	2.44	3.35	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	3.54	4.06	3.59	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	3	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 312	2.99	2.70	3.68	3.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	1	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	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 393 1101  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: ROCKETT, DANIKA  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 805  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	8	12	4.30	912/1649	3.58	4.01	4.28	4.27	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	17	4.65	375/1648	3.77	4.10	4.23	4.18	4.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	617/1375	4.10	4.25	4.27	4.22	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	5	16	4.52	474/1595	4.03	4.25	4.20	4.21	4.52	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	17	4.64	264/1533	3.66	4.00	4.04	4.05	4.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	209/1512	4.11	4.27	4.10	4.11	4.74	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	18	4.65	333/1623	3.76	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	13	4.57	1139/1646	4.26	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	313/1621	3.57	3.97	4.06	4.02	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	4	16	4.52	827/1568	3.99	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.52	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	790/1572	4.42	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	6	16	4.61	550/1564	3.96	4.24	4.28	4.25	4.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	7	16	4.70	475/1559	3.78	4.17	4.29	4.23	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	252/1352	3.62	3.48	3.98	3.97	4.59	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	520/1384	3.74	4.09	4.08	4.11	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	292/1382	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.37	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	601/1368	4.13	4.47	4.30	4.39	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	****/ 948	3.67	3.87	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	1	3	0	1	1	2.67	509/ 555	2.47	2.30	4.29	4.22	2.67	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	1	5	1	0	3	0	2.11	265/ 288	2.44	3.35	3.68	3.58	2.11	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	1	1	1	3	0	3.00	256/ 312	2.99	2.70	3.68	3.60	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 393 1201  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: JAMAL, MAHBUB  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 806  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	3	6	6	4.00	1183/1649	3.58	4.01	4.28	4.27	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	4	8	4.25	897/1648	3.77	4.10	4.23	4.18	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	212/1375	4.10	4.25	4.27	4.22	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	672/1595	4.03	4.25	4.20	4.21	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	2	6	6	3.88	945/1533	3.66	4.00	4.04	4.05	3.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	380/1512	4.11	4.27	4.10	4.11	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	5	6	4	3.93	1134/1623	3.76	3.89	4.16	4.08	3.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1646	4.26	4.46	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	754/1621	3.57	3.97	4.06	4.02	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	2	1	3	6	3.85	1369/1568	3.99	4.22	4.43	4.39	3.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	912/1572	4.42	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	1	1	2	8	4.15	1037/1564	3.96	4.24	4.28	4.25	4.15	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	4	8	4.38	851/1559	3.78	4.17	4.29	4.23	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	3	0	1	1	4	3.33	1130/1352	3.62	3.48	3.98	3.97	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	1209/1384	3.74	4.09	4.08	4.11	3.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1291/1382	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.37	3.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	948/1368	4.13	4.47	4.30	4.39	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 948	3.67	3.87	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/ 555	2.47	2.30	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	2	0	0	3	0	2.80	244/ 288	2.44	3.35	3.68	3.58	2.80	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 312	2.99	2.70	3.68	3.60	****	

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	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	4	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	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 393 1301  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: SINGH, YASHODA  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 807  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	10	3	4	3.65	1443/1649	3.58	4.01	4.28	4.27	3.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	7	8	4.24	920/1648	3.77	4.10	4.23	4.18	4.24	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	2	0	1	7	4.30	763/1375	4.10	4.25	4.27	4.22	4.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	672/1595	4.03	4.25	4.20	4.21	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	7	6	4.00	815/1533	3.66	4.00	4.04	4.05	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	338/1512	4.11	4.27	4.10	4.11	4.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	8	5	4.06	999/1623	3.76	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.06	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	731/1646	4.26	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	801/1621	3.57	3.97	4.06	4.02	4.15	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	1050/1568	3.99	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	1071/1572	4.42	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	7	6	4.20	1001/1564	3.96	4.24	4.28	4.25	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	6	5	4.07	1093/1559	3.78	4.17	4.29	4.23	4.07	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	0	2	2	3	2	3.56	1025/1352	3.62	3.48	3.98	3.97	3.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	2	5	2	3.80	937/1384	3.74	4.09	4.08	4.11	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	799/1382	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.37	4.30	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	876/1368	4.13	4.47	4.30	4.39	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	6	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	****/ 948	3.67	3.87	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.07	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	3.83	4.12	3.89	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.21	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.12	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	2	0	0	0	3	3.40	479/ 555	2.47	2.30	4.29	4.22	3.40	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 88	****	4.32	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.46	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 81	****	4.07	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 92	****	4.22	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	1	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 288	2.44	3.35	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.54	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.74	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.05	4.47	4.43	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	1	2	1	0	3	0	2.67	275/ 312	2.99	2.70	3.68	3.60	2.67	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.20	4.30	4.32	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	****	5.00	3.99	4.05	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 393 1301  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: SINGH, YASHODA  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 807  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	11	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	17	Non-major	14
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 393 1401  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: SINGH, YASHODA  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 808  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	3	6	11	4.40	776/1649	3.58	4.01	4.28	4.27	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	3	11	4.25	897/1648	3.77	4.10	4.23	4.18	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	546/1375	4.10	4.25	4.27	4.22	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	580/1595	4.03	4.25	4.20	4.21	4.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	3	11	4.26	614/1533	3.66	4.00	4.04	4.05	4.26	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	6	10	4.37	564/1512	4.11	4.27	4.10	4.11	4.37	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	2	3	12	4.32	744/1623	3.76	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.32	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	945/1646	4.26	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.74	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	428/1621	3.57	3.97	4.06	4.02	4.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	9	10	4.53	827/1568	3.99	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	967/1572	4.42	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.74	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	580/1564	3.96	4.24	4.28	4.25	4.58	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	512/1559	3.78	4.17	4.29	4.23	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	269/1352	3.62	3.48	3.98	3.97	4.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	541/1384	3.74	4.09	4.08	4.11	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	2	0	3	10	4.40	716/1382	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.37	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	579/1368	4.13	4.47	4.30	4.39	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	203/ 948	3.67	3.87	3.95	4.00	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.07	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 243	****	3.83	4.12	3.89	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.21	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.12	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 555	2.47	2.30	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.32	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.46	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.07	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.22	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	1	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 288	2.44	3.35	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	3.54	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	3.74	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.05	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 39	****	4.08	4.38	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	1	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	184/ 312	2.99	2.70	3.68	3.60	3.80	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.20	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	4.63	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 110	****	5.00	3.99	4.05	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 393 1401  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: SINGH, YASHODA  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 808  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	2	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	20	Non-major	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	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	16				
				?	1						



Course-Section: ENGL 393E 0201  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: SLYTHOMPSON, AL  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 809  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	2	3	1	4	4	3.36	1536/1649	3.36	4.01	4.28	4.27	3.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	1	1	8	3.86	1271/1648	3.86	4.10	4.23	4.18	3.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	901/1375	4.13	4.25	4.27	4.22	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	5	5	3.86	1231/1595	3.86	4.25	4.20	4.21	3.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	3	2	3	3.25	1366/1533	3.25	4.00	4.04	4.05	3.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	651/1512	4.29	4.27	4.10	4.11	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	2	1	1	6	3.58	1355/1623	3.58	3.89	4.16	4.08	3.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	531/1646	4.93	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	3	3	1	1	2.78	1558/1621	2.78	3.97	4.06	4.02	2.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	2	2	1	5	3.42	1478/1568	3.42	4.22	4.43	4.39	3.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	3	1	7	4.17	1429/1572	4.17	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.17	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	1	1	2	5	3.42	1423/1564	3.42	4.24	4.28	4.25	3.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	2	1	1	5	3.45	1389/1559	3.45	4.17	4.29	4.23	3.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	3	1	1	1	1	2.43	1313/1352	2.43	3.48	3.98	3.97	2.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	2	1	2	3	3.44	1105/1384	3.44	4.09	4.08	4.11	3.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	4	1	4	4.00	946/1382	4.00	4.34	4.29	4.37	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	2	2	1	4	3.78	1085/1368	3.78	4.47	4.30	4.39	3.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	389/ 948	4.14	3.87	3.95	4.00	4.14	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	3	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.07	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	234/ 243	2.67	3.83	4.12	3.89	2.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	3	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.21	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	3	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.12	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	2	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	470/ 555	3.50	2.30	4.29	4.22	3.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	74/ 88	4.00	4.32	4.54	4.63	4.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	75/ 85	3.80	4.46	4.47	4.55	3.80	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	71/ 81	3.80	4.07	4.43	4.30	3.80	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	88/ 92	3.20	4.22	4.35	4.46	3.20	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	212/ 288	3.29	3.35	3.68	3.58	3.29	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	36/ 52	3.80	3.54	4.06	3.59	3.80	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	38/ 48	3.60	3.74	4.09	4.21	3.60	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	37/ 39	3.75	4.05	4.47	4.43	3.75	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	19/ 39	4.50	4.08	4.38	4.32	4.50	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	1	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	193/ 312	3.75	2.70	3.68	3.60	3.75	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	44/ 53	3.60	4.20	4.30	4.32	3.60	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	16/ 30	4.25	4.63	4.16	4.44	4.25	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	2	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	2	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 110	****	5.00	3.99	4.05	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 393E 0201  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: SLYTHOMPSON, AL  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 809  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	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	13				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 395 0101  
 Title WRITING INTERNSHIP  
 Instructor: HICKERNELL, MAR (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 810  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	8	6	4.19	1037/1649	4.19	4.01	4.28	4.27	4.19	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	4	7	4.13	1043/1648	4.13	4.10	4.23	4.18	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1112/1375	3.75	4.25	4.27	4.22	3.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	9	3	3.75	1285/1595	3.75	4.25	4.20	4.21	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	2	7	3	3.60	1180/1533	3.60	4.00	4.04	4.05	3.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	5	5	2	3.33	1345/1512	3.33	4.27	4.10	4.11	3.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	4	5	2	3.27	1482/1623	3.27	3.89	4.16	4.08	3.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	731/1646	4.87	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	4	8	0	3.46	1369/1621	3.65	3.97	4.06	4.02	3.65	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	8	3	3.93	1326/1568	4.00	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	1365/1572	4.31	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.31	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	7	3	3.93	1200/1564	4.00	4.24	4.28	4.25	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	8	3	3.79	1258/1559	3.96	4.17	4.29	4.23	3.96	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	1	1	2	2	3	3.56	1025/1352	3.56	3.48	3.98	3.97	3.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	2	4	5	4.00	795/1384	4.00	4.09	4.08	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	831/1382	4.25	4.34	4.29	4.37	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	742/1368	4.42	4.47	4.30	4.39	4.42	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	2	1	4	3	3.80	578/ 948	3.80	3.87	3.95	4.00	3.80	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 555	****	2.30	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	23/ 52	4.69	3.54	4.06	3.59	4.69	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	1	0	3	9	3	3.81	35/ 48	3.81	3.74	4.09	4.21	3.81	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	6	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	26/ 39	4.20	4.05	4.47	4.43	4.20	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	1	0	2	1	9	3	3.87	34/ 39	3.87	4.08	4.38	4.32	3.87	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	7	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	207/ 312	3.67	2.70	3.68	3.60	3.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	8	Under-grad	16	Non-major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 395 0101  
 Title WRITING INTERNSHIP  
 Instructor: FITZPATRICK, CA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 811  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	8	6	4.19	1037/1649	4.19	4.01	4.28	4.27	4.19	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	4	7	4.13	1043/1648	4.13	4.10	4.23	4.18	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1112/1375	3.75	4.25	4.27	4.22	3.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	9	3	3.75	1285/1595	3.75	4.25	4.20	4.21	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	2	7	3	3.60	1180/1533	3.60	4.00	4.04	4.05	3.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	5	5	2	3.33	1345/1512	3.33	4.27	4.10	4.11	3.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	4	5	2	3.27	1482/1623	3.27	3.89	4.16	4.08	3.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	731/1646	4.87	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.87	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	11	0	3.85	1114/1621	3.65	3.97	4.06	4.02	3.65	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	7	4	4.07	1248/1568	4.00	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	1390/1572	4.31	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.31	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	8	3	4.08	1096/1564	4.00	4.24	4.28	4.25	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	9	4	4.14	1045/1559	3.96	4.17	4.29	4.23	3.96	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	1	1	2	2	3	3.56	1025/1352	3.56	3.48	3.98	3.97	3.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	2	4	5	4.00	795/1384	4.00	4.09	4.08	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	831/1382	4.25	4.34	4.29	4.37	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	742/1368	4.42	4.47	4.30	4.39	4.42	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	2	1	4	3	3.80	578/ 948	3.80	3.87	3.95	4.00	3.80	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 555	****	2.30	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	23/ 52	4.69	3.54	4.06	3.59	4.69	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	1	0	3	9	3	3.81	35/ 48	3.81	3.74	4.09	4.21	3.81	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	6	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	26/ 39	4.20	4.05	4.47	4.43	4.20	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	1	0	2	1	9	3	3.87	34/ 39	3.87	4.08	4.38	4.32	3.87	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	7	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	207/ 312	3.67	2.70	3.68	3.60	3.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	8	Under-grad	16	Non-major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 401 0101  
 Title METHOD OF INTERPRETATI  
 Instructor: FERNANDEZ, JEAN  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 812  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	644/1649	4.50	4.01	4.28	4.50	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	1021/1648	4.14	4.10	4.23	4.36	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	546/1375	4.50	4.25	4.27	4.48	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	9	5	4.36	697/1595	4.36	4.25	4.20	4.36	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	5	8	4.36	525/1533	4.36	4.00	4.04	4.14	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	3	6	3.71	1143/1512	3.71	4.27	4.10	4.26	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	4	4	3.64	1327/1623	3.64	3.89	4.16	4.27	3.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	977/1646	4.71	4.46	4.69	4.71	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	914/1621	4.00	3.97	4.06	4.24	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	2	8	4.29	1096/1568	4.29	4.22	4.43	4.54	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	715/1572	4.86	4.71	4.70	4.79	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	6	5	3	3.79	1282/1564	3.79	4.24	4.28	4.40	3.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	618/1559	4.57	4.17	4.29	4.41	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1352	****	3.48	3.98	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	795/1384	4.00	4.09	4.08	4.35	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	774/1382	4.33	4.34	4.29	4.56	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1039/1368	3.89	4.47	4.30	4.58	3.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.87	3.95	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	****	2.30	4.29	4.41	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	4	1	3	0	0	0	1.75	276/ 288	1.75	3.35	3.68	3.71	1.75	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 312	****	2.70	3.68	3.95	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	5.00	3.99	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 2		

Course-Section: ENGL 407 0101  
 Title LANGUAGE IN SOCIETY  
 Instructor: SHIPKA, JODY  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 813  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	4	4.00	1183/1649	4.00	4.01	4.28	4.50	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	4	4	4.00	1124/1648	4.00	4.10	4.23	4.36	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1375	****	4.25	4.27	4.48	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	622/1595	4.42	4.25	4.20	4.36	4.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	3	4	2	3.25	1366/1533	3.25	4.00	4.04	4.14	3.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	5	6	4.25	687/1512	4.25	4.27	4.10	4.26	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	1	1	4	5	3.92	1164/1623	3.92	3.89	4.16	4.27	3.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	1166/1646	4.54	4.46	4.69	4.71	4.54	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	428/1621	4.46	3.97	4.06	4.24	4.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1191/1568	4.17	4.22	4.43	4.54	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	854/1564	4.33	4.24	4.28	4.40	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	695/1559	4.50	4.17	4.29	4.41	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	914/1352	3.75	3.48	3.98	4.07	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	437/1384	4.50	4.09	4.08	4.35	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	831/1382	4.25	4.34	4.29	4.56	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	742/1368	4.42	4.47	4.30	4.58	4.42	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	203/ 948	4.50	3.87	3.95	4.31	4.50	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 555	****	2.30	4.29	4.41	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.71	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	2.70	3.68	3.95	****	

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	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	2
84-150	9	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	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 419 0101  
 Title SEMINAR IN LIT & SCIEN  
 Instructor: MCCARTHY, LUCIL  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 814  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	372/1649	4.71	4.01	4.28	4.50	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	12	4.71	300/1648	4.71	4.10	4.23	4.36	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1375	****	4.25	4.27	4.48	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	168/1595	4.85	4.25	4.20	4.36	4.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.00	4.04	4.14	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	12	4.71	225/1512	4.71	4.27	4.10	4.26	4.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	2	11	4.57	427/1623	4.57	3.89	4.16	4.27	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.46	4.69	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	234/1621	4.67	3.97	4.06	4.24	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	588/1568	4.70	4.22	4.43	4.54	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	473/1564	4.67	4.24	4.28	4.40	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	227/1559	4.89	4.17	4.29	4.41	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	7	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1352	****	3.48	3.98	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	302/1384	4.70	4.09	4.08	4.35	4.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.34	4.29	4.56	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	264/1368	4.90	4.47	4.30	4.58	4.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	186/ 948	4.56	3.87	3.95	4.31	4.56	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 555	****	2.30	4.29	4.41	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	41/ 88	4.71	4.32	4.54	4.66	4.71	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	38/ 85	4.67	4.46	4.47	4.54	4.67	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.07	4.43	4.57	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	24/ 92	4.83	4.22	4.35	4.44	4.83	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	31/ 288	4.67	3.35	3.68	3.71	4.67	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	2.70	3.68	3.95	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	13	Non-major	3
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 448 0101  
 Title SEMINAR IN LIT & CULTU  
 Instructor: STEWART, CAROLE  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 815  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	5	4.44	723/1649	4.44	4.01	4.28	4.50	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	931/1648	4.22	4.10	4.23	4.36	4.22	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	855/1375	4.20	4.25	4.27	4.48	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	722/1595	4.33	4.25	4.20	4.36	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	241/1533	4.67	4.00	4.04	4.14	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	465/1512	4.44	4.27	4.10	4.26	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	720/1623	4.33	3.89	4.16	4.27	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.46	4.69	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	835/1621	4.13	3.97	4.06	4.24	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	636/1568	4.67	4.22	4.43	4.54	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	640/1572	4.89	4.71	4.70	4.79	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	854/1564	4.33	4.24	4.28	4.40	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	777/1559	4.44	4.17	4.29	4.41	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	690/1352	4.00	3.48	3.98	4.07	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	359/1384	4.63	4.09	4.08	4.35	4.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	911/1382	4.13	4.34	4.29	4.56	4.13	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	426/1368	4.75	4.47	4.30	4.58	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	555/ 948	3.86	3.87	3.95	4.31	3.86	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 88	5.00	4.32	4.54	4.66	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	56/ 85	4.40	4.46	4.47	4.54	4.40	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	63/ 81	4.00	4.07	4.43	4.57	4.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	64/ 92	4.20	4.22	4.35	4.44	4.20	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.35	3.68	3.71	4.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	2.70	3.68	3.95	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

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



Course-Section: ENGL 471 0101  
 Title ADV CREATIVE WRITNG:FIC  
 Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 816  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	5	4.71	372/1649	4.71	4.01	4.28	4.50	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	672/1648	4.43	4.10	4.23	4.36	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.25	4.20	4.36	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	454/1533	4.43	4.00	4.04	4.14	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	133/1512	4.86	4.27	4.10	4.26	4.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	502/1623	4.50	3.89	4.16	4.27	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	1476/1646	4.14	4.46	4.69	4.71	4.14	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	234/1621	4.67	3.97	4.06	4.24	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	636/1568	4.67	4.22	4.43	4.54	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.24	4.28	4.40	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.17	4.29	4.41	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1352	****	3.48	3.98	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.09	4.08	4.35	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	312/1382	4.83	4.34	4.29	4.56	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	522/1368	4.67	4.47	4.30	4.58	4.67	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 555	****	2.30	4.29	4.41	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.71	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 312	****	2.70	3.68	3.95	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 490 0101  
 Title ADV TOPICS IN ENGL LAN  
 Instructor: MCKINLEY, KATHE  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 817  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.01	4.28	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	441/1648	4.60	4.10	4.23	4.36	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	665/1375	4.40	4.25	4.27	4.48	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.25	4.20	4.36	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	151/1533	4.80	4.00	4.04	4.14	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	156/1512	4.80	4.27	4.10	4.26	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	635/1623	4.40	3.89	4.16	4.27	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	1544/1646	4.00	4.46	4.69	4.71	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	511/1621	4.40	3.97	4.06	4.24	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	480/1568	4.75	4.22	4.43	4.54	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.24	4.28	4.40	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	390/1559	4.75	4.17	4.29	4.41	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1352	****	3.48	3.98	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	613/1384	4.33	4.09	4.08	4.35	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	483/1382	4.67	4.34	4.29	4.56	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.47	4.30	4.58	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	645/ 948	3.67	3.87	3.95	4.31	3.67	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 312	****	2.70	3.68	3.95	****	

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
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	5
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		

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

Course-Section: ENGL 493 0101  
 Title SEMINAR IN CT  
 Instructor: MAHER, JENNIFER  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 818  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	3	3	0	2	2.89	1621/1649	2.89	4.01	4.28	4.50	2.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	2	3	0	2.78	1615/1648	2.78	4.10	4.23	4.36	2.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1375	****	4.25	4.27	4.48	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	5	1	0	2	2.67	1576/1595	2.67	4.25	4.20	4.36	2.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1139/1533	3.67	4.00	4.04	4.14	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	3	1	2	3.22	1387/1512	3.22	4.27	4.10	4.26	3.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	3	0	1	1	2.11	1614/1623	2.11	3.89	4.16	4.27	2.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	2	0	7	0	3.56	1629/1646	3.56	4.46	4.69	4.71	3.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	1345/1621	3.50	3.97	4.06	4.24	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	4	1	0	1	2.25	1561/1568	2.25	4.22	4.43	4.54	2.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	3	1	2	3.38	1544/1572	3.38	4.71	4.70	4.79	3.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	4	3	0	1	2.75	1532/1564	2.75	4.24	4.28	4.40	2.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	5	1	1	0	2.25	1541/1559	2.25	4.17	4.29	4.41	2.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	4	2	1	3.38	1113/1352	3.38	3.48	3.98	4.07	3.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	3	2	3.44	1105/1384	3.44	4.09	4.08	4.35	3.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	2	2	1	2	3.13	1306/1382	3.13	4.34	4.29	4.56	3.13	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	4	2	1	1	2.88	1316/1368	2.88	4.47	4.30	4.58	2.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	811/ 948	3.20	3.87	3.95	4.31	3.20	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 555	****	2.30	4.29	4.41	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	1	2	2	2	2	3.22	86/ 88	3.22	4.32	4.54	4.66	3.22	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	4	0	3	2	3.33	84/ 85	3.33	4.46	4.47	4.54	3.33	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	72/ 81	3.78	4.07	4.43	4.57	3.78	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	79/ 92	3.67	4.22	4.35	4.44	3.67	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	4	3	1	0	1	2.00	266/ 288	2.00	3.35	3.68	3.71	2.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	2.70	3.68	3.95	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 1	Major 7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 8	Non-major 2
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 8		
				? 0			