Course-Section: ENGL 100 0101 University of Maryla
Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County
Instructor: TAYLOR, PAUL Fall 2008

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 23

26

University of Maryland Page 713

Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009

Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	N	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect 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		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		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		1139/1533	3.82	4.00	4.04	3.87	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learn		2	0	2	2	2 1	11			1196/1512	4.19	4.27	4.10	3.86	3.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled		2	0	3 0	6 0	0	6 0		5.00	1498/1623 1/1646	3.93 4.53		4.16 4.69	4.08 4.67	3.19 5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiven		6	0	0	0	7	10			1310/1621				3.96	
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		4.24	4.28	4.20	3.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned		2	0	3	2	2	8			1351/1559	4.00	4.17	4.29	4.20	3.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	ng	2	16	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/1352	3.49	3.48	3.98	3.86	****
Discussion			•									4 00	4 00		
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned		2	0	3 0	1 2	4 4	9 4	4 11	3.48 4.14	1093/1384		4.09	4.08	3.86	3.48
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		2	0	0	0	1	4		4.14	899/1382 472/1368	4.09 4.39	4.34	4.29	4.03	4.14
4. Were special techniques successful		2	4	2	2	8	4	1				3.87			3.00
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Were you provided with adequate background informat.	ion 2	21 21	1 0	0	0	1 0	0	0	3.50	****/ 221 ****/ 243	* * * * * * * *	**** 3.83	4.16 4.12	4.05 4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities		21	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	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 them		22	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 88	****	4.32	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention		22 22	0	0	0	0	0 1	1		****/ 85 ****/ 81	****	4.46 4.07	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear		22 22	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 288	3.95			3.54	****
Field Work										, ====					
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	2.78	2.70	3.68	3.51	****
F	requen	псу	Dist	ribu	ıtior	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad	des				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	l
00-27 7 0.00-0.99 0 A 16										Graduat		0			0
00-27 7 0.00-0.99 0 A 16 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 3			кес	4uır.e	u I	ıν IVl∂	JOL	s 1	U	Graduat	E	U	Majo	ıτ	U
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0			Gen	neral	_				0	Under-g	rad 2	23	Non-	major	23
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 2 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0			Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
P 0										respons					
			Oth	ner					5						

University of Maryland Page 714

Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009

Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0201

24

COMPOSITION

BURNS, MARGIE

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 19

							_										
							-	ncies	;		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sec
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mea
		General															
. Did vo	u gain ne		ls from this course	0	0	0	4	9	2	4	3.32	1545/1649	3.77	4.01	4.28	4.11	3.3
			the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	4	7		1237/1648			4.23	4.16	3.8
			the expected goals	0	0	0	6	3	6	4		1236/1375			4.27	4.10	
			the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	8			1353/1595			4.20		3.0
			te to what you learned	0	0	1	1	6	7			1159/1533			4.04	3.87	
			oute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	6	6			1068/1512		4.27	4.10	3.86	3.
		g system clearly	-	1	0	1	3	6	2	6	3.50	1387/1623	3.93	3.89	4.16	4.08	3.
		was class cancel		0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	680/1646	4.53	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.
			l teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	2	3	5	3	3.69	1240/1621	3.86	3.97	4.06	3.96	3.0
		Lecture															
. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures	well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	6	7	4.18	1183/1568	3.97	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.
			sted in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	912/1572	4.59	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.
			and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	3	6			1100/1564			4.28	4.20	4.
			what you learned	2	0	0	1	4	5			1098/1559		4.17		4.20	
			ance your understanding	2	3	0	2	2	3			650/1352		3.48		3.86	
		ion															
. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contribut	te to what you learned	6	0	3	2	2	5	1	2.92	1290/1384	3.79	4.09	4.08	3.86	2.
. Were a	ll stude	nts actively enco	ouraged to participate	6	0	0	2	3	5	3	3.69	1132/1382	4.09	4.34	4.29	4.03	3.
. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage fa	air and open discussion	6	0	0	1	5	4	3	3.69	1122/1368	4.39	4.47	4.30	4.01	3.
. Were s	pecial to	echniques success	sful	6	6	0	4	1	2	0	2.71	898/ 948	3.63	3.87	3.95	3.75	2.
		Laborato	ory														
Did th	e lab ind	crease understand	ding of the material	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	***
. Were r	equireme	nts for lab repor	cts clearly specified	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	2.91	2.30	4.29	4.14	**:
		Seminar															
. Were c	riteria :	for grading made	clear	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	3.95	3.35	3.68	3.54	**:
			Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
redits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	;			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0 A 6			anir		or Ma		 a 1	2	 Graduat		0	Majo		(
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0 B 11		1/6/	quil!	cu I	or Ma	ייייי	υ I		Graduat	_	U	Ma J) <u>+</u>	,
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1 C 1		Cer	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad 1	.9	Non-	-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-2.99	1 D 0		GEI	пста	_				U	onder-9	144 1		11011-	a JUI	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2 F 0		E1	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here =	re not	enous	rh
orau.	J	3.30 1.00	P 0		11.1	CCLI	v CD					respons					,
			P 0		0.1						_	respons	co LU L	e prai	ııııcal	16	

Other

I

?

0

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 715 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 20

Title

Instructor:

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0301

COMPOSITION

FLANIGAN, SEAN

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	_	ncie:	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect 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		4.25	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	****
Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27 13 0.00-0.99 5 A 7		Re	 quire	ed f	or Ma	ajor	rs 1	.6	Graduat	 e	0	Majo		1

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		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	В	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4	-			
				2	Λ						

University of Maryland Page 716
Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009
Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							_	ncies	5			tructor		e Dept		Level	
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General															
1. Did	you gain n	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 instru	actor make clear the	e 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 o	questions reflect th	ne expected goals	3	9	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1375	4.15	4.25	4.27	4.10	****
4. Did	other eval	luations reflect the	e 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 r	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
			te 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
		ng system clearly e		3	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	568/1623	3.93	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.45
		s was class cancell		3	0	0	0	3	7	1	3.82	1615/1646		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	e the instr	ructor's lectures w	ell 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 instru	actor seem interest	ed 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 ma	aterial presented a	nd explained clearly	9	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1001/1564	4.11	4.24	4.28	4.20	4.20
		res contribute to w		9	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1246/1559	4.00	4.17	4.29	4.20	3.80
5. Did	audiovisua	al techniques enhan	ce your understanding	9	1	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1049/1352	3.49	3.48	3.98	3.86	3.50
		Discussion	n														
1. Did	class disc	cussions 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	e all stude	ents actively encou	raged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1382	4.09	4.34	4.29	4.03	****
3. Did	the instru	ctor encourage fai:	r and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1368	4.39	4.47	4.30	4.01	****
4. Were	e special t	echniques successf	ul	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 948	3.63	3.87	3.95	3.75	****
		Laborator	V														
5. Were	e requireme		s clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	2.91	2.30	4.29	4.14	***
		Seminar															
5. Were	e criteria	for grading made c	lear	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	3.95	3.35	3.68	3.54	****
5. Did	conference	Field Worl es help you carry o	k ut field activities	10	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	217/ 312	2.78	2.70	3.68	3.51	3.50
		1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		10 0 0 1 0								, -					
			Frequ	ıency	7 Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credita	s Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 3		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	 5	6	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	0
28-55		1.00-1.99 0	В 5		-				J						5 -		-
56-83		2.00-2.99 1	C 1		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	L4	Non-	major	14
84-15	0 0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0									3				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0		El	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	h
			P 0									respons	es to b	oe sign	nificar	ıt	
			I 0		Ot	her					2						
			? 0														

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0401 Title COMPOSITION

Instructor: PEKARSKE, NICOL

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 14

Baltimore County Fall 2008

University of Maryland Page 717 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 24 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0501

COMPOSITION

TERHORST, RAYMO

Title

Instructor:

Questions NR NR 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean							Fre	equei	ncie	S		Tnst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 8. Did would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did gain and the presented and explained learly 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9. Did did experience contribute to what you learned 9. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 9. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 9. Did presented experience contribute to what			Questions		NR	NA		_			5		_		_			Mean
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 8. Did would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did gain and the presented and explained learly 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9. Did did experience contribute to what you learned 9. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 9. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 9. Did presented experience contribute to what																		
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 20 4.79 225/1648 4.08 4.10 4.23 4.16 4.77 4.10 do ther evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 10 0 0 1 2 11 4.71 347/1375 4.15 4.25 4.27 4.10 4.77 4.10 do ther evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 4 20 4.83 174/1595 4.18 4.25 4.20 4.03 4.18 5.10 do saigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 21 4.83 142/1512 4.19 4.27 4.10 3.86 4.87 7.10 do ther evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 21 4.83 142/1512 4.19 4.27 4.10 3.86 4.87 7.10 do there evaluations contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 21 4.83 142/1512 4.19 4.27 4.10 3.86 4.87 7.10 do there evaluation grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 9 5 4.21 1433/1646 4.53 4.66 4.69 4.67 4.21 9.10 do the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 19 4.83 125/1621 3.86 3.97 4.06 3.86 4.88 7.80 Mas lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 22 4.92 532/1572 4.59 4.71 4.70 4.64 4.92 1.03 Mas lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 8 16 4.07 512/1559 4.00 4.17 4.29 4.00 4.88 1.00 do the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 8 16 4.07 512/1559 4.00 4.17 4.29 4.00 4.88 1.00 do the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 8 16 4.07 512/1559 4.00 4.17 4.29 4.00 4.88 1.00 do the instructor seem interested on the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 4.10 4.07 4.09 4.08 3.98 3.86 4.00 4.10 4.00 do the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0	1 Did wou	gain no		rom this source	0	Λ	0	0	Λ	1.0	1 /	/ E0	E26/16/0	2 77	4 01	1 20	1 11	/ E0
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	_	_					-	-	-				,					
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 20 4.83 174/1595 4.18 4.25 4.20 4.03 4.85 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 2 1 4.83 142/1512 4.19 4.27 4.10 3.86 4.85 7.83 8.89 4.00 4.04 3.88 4.12 4.10 4.15 7.84 8.18 4.25 4.20 4.03 4.85 4.12 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 2 1 4.83 142/1512 4.19 4.27 4.10 3.86 4.85 8.86 8.89 4.16 4.08 4.67 8.12 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 9 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 0 0 1 9 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 0 0 1 1 4 19 4.83 125/1621 3.86 3.97 4.06 3.96 4.83 9.83 8.80 4.10 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.0							-	-	_									
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did witten assigned readings contribute to what you learned 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8. Did witten assigned to participate 8. Did understanding system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching 9. How would you grade the ov		_						-	_									4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1. 0 0 0 0 0 1 9 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 0 1 9 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. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were especial techniques successful 5. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 88 **** 4.32 4.54 4.31 **** 4. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 3. Did dresserch projects contribute to what you learned 3. Did dresserch projects contribute to what you learned 3. Did dresserch projects contribute to what you learned 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 3. Did dresserch projects contribute to what you learned 3. Did dresserch projects contribute to what you learned 3. Did dresserch projects contribute to what you learned 3. Did dresserch projects contribute to what you learned 3. Did greatery projects contribute to what you learned 3. Did greater projects contribute to what you learned 3. Did greater projects contribute to what you learned 3. Did greater projects contribute to					0	0	0	0	8	5	11							4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 0 19 5 4 .21 1433/1646 4.53 4.46 4.69 4.67 4.23 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 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 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 0 2 22 4.92 532/1572 4.59 4.71 4.70 4.64 4.92 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 1 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 0 8 16 4.67 512/1559 4.00 4.17 4.29 4.20 4.68 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 4.00 **Discussion** 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 0 2 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 0 1 1 3 15 4.74 414/1382 4.09 4.34 4.29 4.03 4.04 4. Were special techniques successful 5 0 0 0 0 1 1 17 4.84 327/1368 4.39 4.47 4.30 4.01 4.84 4. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 23 0 0 0 0 1 1 5.00 ****/ 88 **** 4.42 4.54 4.31 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 88 **** 4.46 4.47 4.30 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 88 **** 4.46 4.47 4.30 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 88 3.95 3.35 3.68 3.51 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 88 **** 3.74 4.09 3.65 **** 5. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 88 **** 3.74 4.09 3.65 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 20 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 5.00 ****/ 53 **** 4.20 4.30 4.17 **** 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 53 **** 4.20 4.30 4.77 *****					0	0	0	0	1	2	21	4.83			4.27	4.10	3.86	4.83
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 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6. Discussion 6. Discussion 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8. Were special techniques successful 8. Seminar 8. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 8. Was the instructor available for individual attention 9. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 9. O 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 88 **** 4.32 4.54 4.31 **** 9. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 9. O 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 88 **** 4.46 4.47 4.30 **** 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 9. Was the instructor available for individual attention 9. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 9. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 9. O 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 88 **** 4.46 4.47 4.30 **** 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 9. O 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 88 **** 4.46 4.47 4.30 **** 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 9. O 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 88 **** 4.06 3.72 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 9. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 9. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 9. Did gonferences help you carry out field activities 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to wh	7. Was the	grading	system clearly exp	lained	0	0	0	0	2	4	18	4.67	321/1623	3.93	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.67
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6. Discussion 6. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O	8. How man	y 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
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7. Discussion 7. Discussion 8. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8. Were special techniques successful 8. Were special techniques relevant to the announced theme 8. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 8. Was the instructor available for individual attention 8. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 8. Were criteria for grading made clear 8. Were criteria for grading made clear 8. Were criteria for grading made clear 8. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 8. Did gradient to the sun couraged actively learned 8. Were criteria for grading made clear 8. Were criteria for grading made clear 8. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 8. Were criteria for grading made clear 8. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 8. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 8. Did gradient to the sun courage fair and solve to what you learned 8. Did gradient for grading made clear 8. Did solve experience contribute to what you learned 8. Did solve experience contribute to what you learned 8. Did gradient for grading made clear 8. Did gradient for grading made clear 8. Did solve experience contribute to what you learned 8. Did solve experience contribute to what you learned 8. Did gradient for grading made clear 8. Did gradient for grading was gradient for grading for gradient for grading for gradient for grading for gradient for grading for gradient for gradient for gradien	9. How wou	.ld you g	grade the overall te	aching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	125/1621	3.86	3.97	4.06	3.96	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 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 0 3 21 4.88 197/1564 4.11 4.24 4.28 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 Discussion Discussion 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 4.38 4.29 4.03 4.74 4.88 4.89 4.70 4.03 4.74 4.89 4.09 4.08 3.86 4.68 3.04 4.09 4.09 4.08 3.86 4.68 3.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4			Lecture															
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 3 2 11 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 4.60 Discussion Discussion Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 0 2 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 4.88 4.89 4.47 4.30 4.01 4.88 4.89 4.89 4.47 4.30 4.01 4.88 4.89 4.89 4.89 4.89 4.89 4.89 4.89	1. Were th	e instru	ctor's lectures wel	l prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	480/1568	3.97	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 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 Discussion 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 3.09 3.48 3.98 3.86 4.68 3.09 3.09 3.09 3.09 3.09 3.09 3.09 3.09	2. Did the	instruc	tor 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
Discussion Discussion Discussion Discussion Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 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 1 3 15 4.74 414/1382 4.09 4.34 4.29 4.03 4.74 4.30 4.04 4.84 4.29 4.03 4.74 4.30 4.04 4.29 4.03 4.04 4.29 4.03 4.74 4.30 4.04 4.29 4.03 4.74 4.30 4.04 4.29 4.03 4.04 4.29 4.29 4.29 4.29 4.29 4.29 4.29 4.2	3. Was lec	ture mat	erial 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
Discussion Discussion Discussion 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 4.68 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 4.30 4.01 4.84 4.89 4.47 4.30 4.01 4.84 4.89 4.47 4.30 4.01 4.84 4.89 4.47 4.30 4.01 4.84 4.89 4.47 4.30 4.01 4.84 4.89 4.47 4.30 4.01 4.84 4.89 4.47 4.30 4.01 4.84 4.89 4.47 4.30 4.01 4.84 4.89 4.47 4.30 4.01 4.84 4.89 4.47 4.30 4.01 4.84 4.89 4.89 4.47 4.30 4.01 4.84 4.89 4.47 4.30 4.01 4.84 4.89 4.47 4.30 4.01 4.84 4.89 4.47 4.30 4.01 4.84 4.89 4.47 4.30 4.01 4.84 4.89 4.47 4.30 4.01 4.84 4.89 4.47 4.30 4.01 4.84 4.89 4.47 4.30 4.01 4.84 4.89 4.47 4.30 4.01 4.84 4.89 4.89 4.47 4.30 4.01 4.84 4.89 4.89 4.89 4.89 4.89 4.89 4.89	4. Did the	lecture	es contribute to wha	t you learned	0	0	0	0	0	8	16	4.67	512/1559	4.00	4.17	4.29	4.20	4.67
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 1 3 15 4.74 414/1382 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 4.84 4.85 4.85 4.85 4.85 4.85 4.85	5. Did aud	iovisual	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
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 3.0 1 1 17 4.84 327/1368 4.39 4.47 4.30 4.01 4.84 4.84 Example 10 1 1 17 4.84 327/1368 4.39 4.47 4.30 4.01 4.84 Example 10 1 1 17 4.84 327/1368 4.39 4.47 4.30 4.01 4.84 Example 10 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1			Discussion															
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful 5 0 0 0 1 1 1 17 4.84 327/1368 4.39 4.47 4.30 4.01 4.84 4.30 4.01 4.30 4.11 4.84 4.30 4.30 4.11 4.84 4.30 4.30 4.11 4.84 4.30 4.30 4.11 4.84 4.30 4.30 4.11 4.84 4.30 4.30 4.11 4.84 4.30 4.30 4.11 4.84 4.30 4.30 4.11 4.84 4.30 4.30 4.11 4.84 4.30 4.30 4.11 4.84 4.30 4.30 4.11 4.84 4.30 4.30 4.11 4.84 4.30 4.30 4.11 4.84 4.30 4.30 4.11 4.84 4.30 4.30 4.11 4.84 4.30 4.30 4.11 4.30 4.30 4.11 4.30 4.30 4.11 4.30 4.30 4.11	1. Did cla	ss discu	ssions contribute t	o what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	2	15	4.68	310/1384	3.79	4.09	4.08	3.86	4.68
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 23 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 0 1 5.00 ****/ 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 ****/ 82 **** 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 ****/ 48 **** 3.74 4.06 3.72 **** 5. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** 3.74 4.09 3.65 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** 5.00 4.43 4.27 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** 5.00 4.43 4.27 ****	2. Were al	l studer	nts actively encoura	ged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	414/1382	4.09	4.34	4.29	4.03	4.74
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 23 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 ****						0	-	-	_	_	17	4.84	327/1368	4.39	4.47	4.30	4.01	4.84
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 ****/ 41 **** 5.00 4.43 4.27 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** 5.00 4.43 4.27 ****	4. Were sp	ecial te		5	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	196/ 948	3.63	3.87	3.95	3.75	4.53	
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 ****/ 41 **** 5.00 4.43 4.27 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** 5.00 4.43 4.27 ****			Seminar															
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 **** 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 ****						-	-		-	-	_		,					
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 23 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 ****						-	-	-	-		-			•				
5. Were criteria for grading made clear Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 288 3.95 3.35 3.68 3.54 **** 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 ****											_		, -					
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 ****						-							,					****
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 ****	J. ,,,,,,,,	100114 1				Ü	Ü	Ü	ŭ	ŭ	_	3.00	, 200	3.33	3.33	3.00	3.31	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 23 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 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** 5.00 4.43 4.27 ****	1 Did fio	ld owner		what you learned	22	٥	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 50	****	2 5/	1 06	2 72	****
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 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** 5.00 4.43 4.27 ****						-	-	-	-	-	_		, -					****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 23 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 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** 5.00 4.43 4.27 ****													,					****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 23 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 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** 5.00 4.43 4.27 ****			0-16 P1															
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 23 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** 5.00 4.43 4.27 ****	1 Did anl	f magad		a what was learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 53	****	4 20	1 20	1 17	****
Frequency Distribution		_	_									,	•				****	
riedaeuch precipacion	•			-	ienci	. Dia	-rih	ut i o	2									
				-	ленс ў	ומדמ	CT TDI	uc±01										
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors			Cum. GPA	Expected Grades									_	_			Majors	:
00-27 7 0.00-0.99 2 A 13 Required for Majors 14 Graduate 0 Major 0			0.00-0.99 2	A 13											0	Majo	or	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						Ger	nera	1				0	IInder-c	rad 1	0.4	Non-	-maior	24
84-150 1 3.00-3.49 1 D 0						Gei	c.a.	-				J	onder -6	,_ uu 2	. 1	14011_	a J O I	21
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant	Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	- *		Ele	ecti	ves				0					_	ŗh
P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 6						O+1	her					6	respons	SES LU I	e sign	ıııcdı	10	
? 0						001						•						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0701 University of Maryland Page 718
Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009
Instructor: PUTZEL, DIANE M Fall 2008
Enrollment: 24

Ouestionnaires:	20	Student Co	ourse	Evaluation	Questionnaire
Questionnaires.	20	Student Co	ourse	Evaluation	Questionnai

								_	ncie	S			tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 L															
1. Did you	ı gain ne	w insights,skil	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	1	4	6	9	4.15	1067/1649	3.77	4.01	4.28	4.11	4.15
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	2	5	12	4.40	702/1648	4.08	4.10	4.23	4.16	4.40
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflect	the e	xpected goals	0	13	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	950/1375	4.15	4.25	4.27	4.10	4.00
4. Did oth	ner evalu	ations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	497/1595	4.18	4.25	4.20	4.03	4.50
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contribu	ite 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 wr	itten ass	signments contri	ibute 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	e grading	system clearly	expla	ined	0	0	0	1	6	5	8	4.00	1029/1623	3.93	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.00
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	1	17	2	4.05	1525/1646	4.53	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.05
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overal	ll teac	ning effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	9	8	4.39	535/1621	3.86	3.97	4.06	3.96	4.39
		Lecture	2															
1. Were th	ne instru	ctor's lectures		prepared	0	0	1	0	2	9	8	4.15	1198/1568	3.97	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.15
		tor seem intere			0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	931/1572		4.71	4.70	4.64	4.75
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	5			1001/1564		4.24	4.28	4.20	4.20
		es contribute to		1	0	0	0	2	3	5	10		1038/1559		4.17	4.29	4.20	4.15
		our understanding	0	1	1	1	3	5	9	4.05	661/1352		3.48	3.98		4.05		
		D:																
1 544 -1.		Discuss	what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	7	1 06	774/1204	2 70	4 00	4 00	2 06	1 00	
		d to participate	4	0	0	1 0	4 1	3	12	4.06	774/1384		4.09 4.34	4.08 4.29	3.86 4.03	4.06		
				d open discussion	4 5	0	0	0	0	3		4.80	464/1382 369/1368			4.29		4.80
		chniques succes		d open discussion	4	1	0	3	3	5		3.67	645/ 948		4.47 3.87		3.75	
4. Were Sp	peciai te	cilliques succes	SSLUI		4	1	U	3	3	5	4	3.07	045/ 940	3.03	3.07	3.95	3.75	3.07
		Seminar																
5. Were c	riteria f	for grading made	e clear		15	0	1	0	0	4	0	3.40	202/ 288	3.95	3.35	3.68	3.54	3.40
		Field W	Vork															
5. Did con	nferences	s help you carry	out f	ield activities	17	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 312	2.78	2.70	3.68	3.51	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits Ea	-wnod	Cum CDA		Ermosted Credes				Do	202	~			т.				Majora	
	arnea	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades					ason	S 			Ту	pe 			Majors	; 	
00-27	5	A 14		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s 1	8	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0		
28-55	3	В 5										_						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0		Gei	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad 2	20	Non-	major	20	
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -				_	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	oe sign	nifican	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	ner					2						
				3 0														

Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0801

24

COMPOSITION

BROFMAN, MARGAR

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Page 719 FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eauer	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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		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		1229/1375		4.25	4.27	4.10	3.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	2	5	5		1411/1595		4.25	4.20	4.03	3.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	4	3	3	2		1503/1533		4.00		3.87	2.59
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		0	3	4	3	1			1401/1512		4.27	4.10	3.86	3.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	5	1	4			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		5.00	1/1646		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	٥		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		1485/1564		4.71	4.28	4.20	3.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	5	1	1	4	5		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	-		1287/1352		3.48	3.98	3.86	2.67
5. Did additivibual econniques chiance your anderstanding	_	10	3	O	_	O		2.07	1207/1332	3.15	3.10	3.70	3.00	2.07
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		****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information		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		****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 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		****/ 81	****	4.07	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 92	****	4.22	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	1	1	0	1	0		****/ 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		****/ 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		****/ 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

24

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 719 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	 5	А	2	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0901 University of Maryland Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County

Instructor: TAYLOR, PAUL Fall 2008

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 720 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eauer	ncies	;		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	5	4	2 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		1326/1648	4.08	4.10	4.23	4.11	3.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	401/1375	4.15	4.10	4.23	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	4.10	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	3	8	4.14		3.82	4.23	4.20	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		1029/1623	3.93	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13		531/1646	4.53	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	2	0	6	2		1151/1621		3.97		3.96	3.80
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3		U	4	U	O	4	3.00	1151/1021	3.00	3.31	4.00	3.90	3.00
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		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		****/ 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		****/ 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	****	4.03	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	****
3. Did conferences help you carry out freid activities	10	_	U	_	U	U	4	1.00	/ 512	2.70	2.70	3.00	J.JI	
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

25

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 720 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	1	 А	11	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1001 University of Maryland Page 721
Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009
Instructor: DUNNIGAN, BRIAN Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 19

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Ouestions	NR	NA		equer 2		s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean			Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	471/1649		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 1	5	14 16	4.74 4.79	254/1595 162/1533		4.25 4.00	4.20	4.03	4.74 4.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.79	286/1512		4.00	4.10	3.86	4.79
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		1391/1646		4.46	4.69		4.03
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	16		117/1621					4.84
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	Ü	J	O	Ü	Ü	,		1.01	11//1021	3.00	3.77	1.00	3.70	1.01
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		4.24	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		4.17	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	^	0	0	2	2	11	1 60	276/1204	2 70	4 00	4 00	2 06	4 60
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2 1	0	11	4.60 4.87	376/1384		4.09	4.08	3.86	4.60 4.87
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	14 15	5.00	282/1382 1/1368		4.34 4.47	4.29	4.03	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	2	6	15	4.29	330/ 948			3.95		4.29
1. Were special techniques successial	-	_	U	U	2	U	U	1.27	330/ 340	3.03	3.07	3.93	3.73	4.20
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			_			_	•				4 00		4 04	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 88	****	4.32	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	Τ		****/ 85		4.46	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 81	****	4.07	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18 16	0	0 1	0	0	1 2	0		****/ 92 ****/ 288		4.22	4.35	4.01 3.54	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	Τ0	U	1	U	U	2	U	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			0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.20	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal			0	0	0	0	1		****/ 30	****	4.63	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 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

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 721 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA Expect			Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	 А	8	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1101 University of Maryland Page 722
Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009
Instructor: MCGURRIN JR, AN Fall 2008
Enrollment: 26

Questionnaires:	13	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	eauer	ncies	\$		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	0	•	0	0	•	_	0	2 02	1564/1640	2 55	4 01	4 00	4 11	2 02
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2 2	2 1	2 2	5 5	2		1564/1649	3.77	4.01	4.28	4.11	3.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0 11	0	0	1	5 1	3 0		1499/1648 ****/1375	4.08 4.15	4.10 4.25	4.23	4.16 4.10	3.46 ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	6	2		1365/1595	4.15	4.25	4.27	4.10	3.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	7	4	4.00	815/1533	3.82	4.25	4.20	3.87	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	5		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	-		1303/1623		3.89	4.16	4.08	3.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	8	2		1592/1646		4.46	4.69	4.67	3.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	2	3	3	0		1539/1621					2.89
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	-	U	1	2	J	J	U	2.09	1339/1021	3.00	3.91	1.00	3.90	2.00
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		1339/1384		4.09	4.08	3.86	2.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	1	1	2	2		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		4.47		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		****/ 555	2.91		4.29	4.14	****
5. Were requirements for tab reports creatly specified		-	_	Ü	-	O	O	2.00	, 333	2.71	2.50	1.27		
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		****/ 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	****
Ti al di Marela														
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	1	0	0	2 50	****/ 52	****	2 [4	1 00	2 72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11 11	0	0	1 0	1	0 2	0		****/ 48	****	3.54 3.74	4.06	3.72 3.65	****
<u> </u>	11	1	0	0	0	1	0		,	****		4.09		****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 39 ****/ 39	****	4.05	4.47	4.36 4.37	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations		1	1	0	0	2	0		****/ 312			4.38	3.51	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities		Τ	Т	U	U	4	U	3.00	/ 312	2.78	2.70	3.08	3.51	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned		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

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 722 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 26
Questionnaires: 13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	 А	6	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1201 University of Maryland Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County

Instructor: CORDS, JOHN

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 17

Fall 2008

Page 723

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

				-	ncies				tructor	Course	_	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	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		****/ 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		****/ 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		****/ 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		****/ 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		****/ 39	****	4.05	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 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		****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 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

22

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 723 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. G			Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	h	
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	6	-				
				?	1							

Baltimore County

Fall 2008

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1301 University of Maryland Title COMPOSITION Instructor: CORDS, JOHN

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 22

25

I	age	724
FEB	11,	2009
Job	IRBI	R3029

	Frequencies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC Level		Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	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	****

Credits Earned Cum. GPA				Expected (Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	4	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 17	7						
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	ı
				P (0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I (0	Other	7				
				? (0						

University of Maryland Page 725
Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009
Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1401

24

COMPOSITION

BROFMAN, MARGAR

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 17

Questions						NA	Fre	-	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Quescion	5 			INA							Ralik				Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	om 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 th	he instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	1	0	0	4	5	3	4	3.44	1513/1648	4.08	4.10	4.23	4.16	3.44
3. Did th	he exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	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 of	ther evalu	ations reflect	the ex	spected goals	1	0	0	1	6	6	3	3.69	1323/1595	4.18	4.25	4.20	4.03	3.69
5. Did as	ssigned re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	3	2		5	3	3.18	1396/1533	3.82	4.00	4.04	3.87	3.18
6. Did w	ritten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0		6	4	5	3.71	1149/1512	4.19	4.27	4.10	3.86	3.71
7. Was th	he grading	g system clearly	y expla	ained	0	1	3	3	2	2	6	3.31	1470/1623	3.93	3.89	4.16	4.08	3.31
8. How ma	any times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	799/1646	4.53	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.82
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	ll teac	ching effectiveness	3	0	0	6	4	4	0	2.86	1545/1621	3.86	3.97	4.06	3.96	2.86
		Lectur																
		actor's lecture			0	0	0	4	9	2	2	3.12	1509/1568	3.97	4.22	4.43	4.39	3.12
		tor seem inter			0	0	1	1	4	5			1508/1572		4.71		4.64	
		explained clearly	0	0	0	5	5	5			1464/1564		4.24		4.20	3.24		
		you learned	0	0	3	3	4	5	2	3.00	1479/1559		4.17		4.20	3.00		
5. Did a	udiovisual	techniques en	our understanding	1	12	2	2	0	0	0	1.50	****/1352	3.49	3.48	3.98	3.86	****	
		Discus																
				what you learned	2	0	7	2	4	1	1	2.13	1362/1384	3.79	4.09	4.08	3.86	2.13
				ed to participate	2	0	7	3	3	1	1	2.07	1373/1382	4.09	4.34	4.29	4.03	2.07
				nd open discussion	2	0	4	4	5	1	1		1349/1368	4.39	4.47		4.01	2.40
4. Were	special te	echniques succe	ssful		2	9	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	776/ 948	3.63	3.87	3.95	3.75	3.33
		Labora	tory															
1. Did th	he lab inc	rease understa	nding c	of the material	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 221	***	****	4.16	4.05	****
5. Were	requiremen	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	15	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 555	2.91	2.30	4.29	4.14	****
		Field	Work															
5. Did co	onferences	help you carr	y out f	field activities	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 312	2.78	2.70	3.68	3.51	****
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	ution	ı									
Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	 10	 A 7					or Ma	ior	 a 1		Graduat		0	Majo		3		
28-55	3	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	6 0	В 9		r.e.	darr.	=u I)I Ind	וייטנ	o 1	J	Graduat	C	U	Ma JC) <u>T</u>	3
26-33 56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	В 9 С 1		Car	nera:	1				0	Under-q	rad 1	7	Non	-major	14
	84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0							т				U	onder-9	ıau I	. /	NOI1-	-major	14
	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0							ves				0	#### - 1	Meana +	here a	ro not	enous	rh
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	4	P 0		ьI	CCLI	ves				U	respons					111
I 0						O+1	her					5	respons	נט נט גט	e sign	ııııcaı	10	
		UL.	rict					ی										

? 0

Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1501

24

COMPOSITION

WILKINSON, RACH

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland Page 726 FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect 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		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		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		****/ 243	****	3.83	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	1	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 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		****/ 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		****/ 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		****/ 39	****	4.05	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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		****/ 53	****	4.20	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 30	****	4.63	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 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

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 726 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 12

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	redits Earned Cum. C			Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4	_		_	
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1601 University of Maryland Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: MACEK, PHILIP

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 23

Page 727 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect 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		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		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		****/ 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		****/ 81	****	4.07	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	1	2	0		****/ 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		****/ 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		****/ 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

25

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 727 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	 А	9	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6	-			
				?	0						

niversity of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2008

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 1701	Uni
Title	COMPOSITION	
Instructor:	KILLGALLON, DON	

25

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 22 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 728

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	2		Tnet	tructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	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		****/ 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	0.1	0	•	0	•	•	-	F 00	****	ale ale ale ale	4 20	4 = 4	4 21	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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		****/ 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	1 06	2 72	****
-	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****		4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria		0	0	0		0			, -	****	3.74	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	-	-	-	0	•	1		****/ 39	****	4.05	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21 21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39		4.08	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities		U	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		****/ 24	****	5.00	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 110	****	5.00	3.99	3.83	****
J. Here there chough proceeds for all the students	21	J	J	J	J	_	U	1.00	/ 110		5.00	3.99	5.05	

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1701
Title COMPOSITION
Instructor: KILLGALLON, DON

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2008

Page 728 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 22
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed 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	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1801 University of Maryland Page 729
Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009
Instructor: DIALLO, MAMADOU Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

						Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructo	r	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Ra	nk	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1																
1. Did voi	ı gain ne	w insights,ski		this course	2	0	4	2	3	1	3	2.77	1632/	1649	3.77	4.01	4.28	4.11	2.77
		tor make clear			2	0	2	4	1	2	4		1579/		4.08	4.10	4.23	4.16	3.15
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflect	the ex	spected goals	2	1	4	0	3	1	4	3.08	1321/	1375	4.15	4.25	4.27	4.10	3.08
4. Did oth	ner evalu	ations reflect	the exp	ected goals	2	0	2	3	3	1	4	3.15	1513/	1595	4.18	4.25	4.20	4.03	3.15
5. Did ass	signed rea	adings contrib	ıte to v	hat 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 wr:	itten ass	ignments contri	ibute 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	e grading	system clearly	y explai	ned	3	0	3	1	2	1	5	3.33	1462/	1623	3.93	3.89	4.16	4.08	3.33
8. How man	ny times n	was class cance	elled		3	0	0	0	2	9	1	3.92	1598/	1646	4.53	4.46	4.69	4.67	3.92
9. How wor	ıld you g	rade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	5	0	3	2	2	2	1	2.60	1577/	1621	3.86	3.97	4.06	3.96	2.60
		Lecture	2																
1. Were th	ne instru	ctor's lecture	s well r	prepared	3	0	5	1	2	0	4	2.75	1547/	1568	3.97	4.22	4.43	4.39	2.75
		tor seem inter			3	0	0	2	3	1			1489/		4.59		4.70		3.92
				plained clearly	3	0	4	1	3	0			1517/		4.11	4.24	4.28	4.20	2.92
		s contribute to			3	0	3	3	1	0			1470/		4.00		4.29		3.08
				our understanding	3	7	3	0	0	0			1293/			3.48		3.86	
	-																		
		Discus																	
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ite to v	hat 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 a	ll studen	ts actively end	couraged	l to participate	7	0	2	1	2	1	2	3.00	1316/	1382	4.09	4.34	4.29	4.03	3.00
				l open discussion	7	0	3	0	1	1			1279/		4.39	4.47	4.30	4.01	3.13
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succes	ssful		7	4	0	3	1	0	0	2.25	929/	948	3.63	3.87	3.95	3.75	2.25
		Labora	corv																
5. Were re	equiremen		-	early specified	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	555	2.91	2.30	4.29	4.14	****
		Field N	o a a a la																
5. Did com	nferences			eld activities	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	312	2.78	2.70	3.68	3.51	****
								_		-			,						
				Frequ	lency	Dis	trib	utior	ı										
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3				Тур	pe			Majors	ı
00-27	00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 7						auir	ed fo	or Ma	iors		 7	Gra	 duate		 0	Majo	 r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 1			-1 ~~~		10	.,			014		-	-		_	•
56-83	56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0					Gei	nera:	l				0	Und	er-qı	rad 1	L5	Non-	major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0								-		5-		-		5	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	###	# - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoua	h
	P 0											-			es to b			_	
				I O		Ot]	her					2				–			
	? 1																		

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1901 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County COMPOSITION Instructor: BLOOM, RYAN I. Fall 2008

Laboratory

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 21

Page 730 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

		Fre	eaner	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	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		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		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		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		3.48	3.98	3.86	2.63
Discussion														
	3	0	1	2	1	_	9	1 00	778/1384	3.79	4.09	4.08	3.86	4.06
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	3	5 6	9	4.06	774/1384	4.09	4.09	4.08	4.03	4.06
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	1	2	13	4.56	616/1368	4.09	4.47	4.29	4.03	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	1	U T	1	Ω	7.3	3.67	645/ 948	3.63	3.87	3.95	3.75	3.67
i. Were apecial techniques successivi	۷	7	1	U	7	O	4	3.07	043/ 340	3.03	3.07	3.93	3.13	3.07

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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 ****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	 А	8	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	6	_	_		
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 2201 University of Maryland
Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County
Instructor: DUNNIGAN, BRIAN Fall 2008

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 731

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Questions			NR	NA	Fr 1	eque: 2	ncie:	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean		
		 Genera	1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om 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	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	spected 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	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	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 ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	1	0	7	8	4.38	672/1595	4.18	4.25	4.20	4.03	4.38
5. Did as:	signed re	eadings contrib	ute 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 wr	itten as:	signments contr	ibute t	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	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	370/1623	3.93	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.63
8. How man	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	12	4	4.25	1398/1646	4.53	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.25
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	288/1621	3.86	3.97	4.06	3.96	4.60
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	s 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	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested :	n 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 le	cture mat	explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	473/1564	4.11	4.24	4.28	4.20	4.67		
		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 au	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand						2	0	4	1	1	2.88	1261/1352	3.49	3.48	3.98	3.86	2.88
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc			what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	266/1384	3.79	4.09	4.08	3.86	4.73
				ed to participate	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	540/1382	4.09	4.34	4.29	4.03	4.60
		_	_	nd open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	185/1368	4.39	4.47	4.30	4.01	4.93
		echniques succe			1	1	1	1	3	6	3	3.64	656/ 948		3.87	3.95		3.64
		Labora	torv															
5. Were r	equiremen		_	early specified	14	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 555	2.91	2.30	4.29	4.14	****
		Field	Work															
5. Did co	nference	s help you carr	y out i	field activities	14	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 312	2.78	2.70	3.68	3.51	****
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s I	. 3	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 10		~		,				0	77	1	_	37		1.0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 1		Ge	nera	T				0	Under-g	raa 1	.6	Non-	-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0								0			,			,
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	ın
				P 0		٥.,						-	respons	es to b	e sigr	niticar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot.	her					1						
				? 0														

Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENGL 100 2301

25

COMPOSITION

DIALLO, MAMADOU

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Page 732 FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions		NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie:	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	1	3	5	0	2 60	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		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		4.25	4.27	4.10	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	4	5	3		1188/1595		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		1542/1568		4.22	4.43	4.39	2.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	2	8	2		1504/1572		4.71	4.70	4.64	3.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	6	4	1		1464/1564		4.24	4.28	4.20	3.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	3	6			1471/1559		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		1254/1384		4.09	4.08	3.86	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	2	1	0	3		1265/1382		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		4.47	4.30	4.01	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	Т	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		****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 243	***	3.83	4.12	4.08	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 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		****/ 88	****	4.32	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 85	****	4.46	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12 12	0	0	0	0	1 1	0		****/ 81 ****/ 92	****	4.07 4.22	4.43	4.39 4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 288	3.95		3.68	3.54	****
5. Were criteria for grauing made crear	11	1	U	U	U	1	U	4.00	/ 200	3.95	3.33	3.00	3.34	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 52	****	3.54	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00		****	3.74	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 39	****	4.05	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 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		****/ 53	****	4.20	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 30	****	4.63	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00		***	5.00	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 24	****	5.00	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	U	U	U	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	^ ~ ~ ~	5.00	3.99	3.83	^ ^ * *

Course-Section: ENGL 100 2301
Title COMPOSITION
Instructor: DIALLO, MAMADOU

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 732 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 13 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4	-			
				?	1						

Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENGL 100 2501

25

COMPOSITION

PUTZEL, DIANE M

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Page 733 FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire	

Frequencies

							LT	eque.	псте	5		TIIS	LIUCLOI	Course	: Dept	UMPC	телет	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mear
		 Genera	1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	-	this course	0	0	1	2	4	7	7	3.81	1351/1649	3.77	4.01	4.28	4.11	3.81
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	1	5	14	4.52		4.08	4.10	4.23	4.16	4.52
		uestions reflec			0	18	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1375	4.15	4.25	4.27	4.10	***
	_	uations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	2	10	9	4.33	722/1595	4.18	4.25	4.20	4.03	4.33
				hat you learned	2	3	0	0	5	6	5	4.00	815/1533	3.82	4.00	4.04	3.87	4.00
				what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	9	9	4.42	493/1512	4.19	4.27	4.10	3.86	4.42
		g system clearl			1	0	0	1	4	7			979/1623		3.89	4.16	4.08	4.10
		was class cand			1	0	0	0	3	16			1605/1646		4.46	4.69	4.67	
				ing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	10			632/1621			4.06	3.96	4.30
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lecture	s well n	repared	1	0	0	0	2	10	8	4.30	1080/1568	3.97	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.30
		ctor seem inter	_	_	1	0	0	0	0	6			1034/1572	4.59	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.70
				plained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	5			728/1564	4.11		4.28	4.20	
		ou learned	1	0	0	1	3	5			931/1559			4.29	4.20			
		our understanding	1	1	0	1	3	7	8		590/1352				3.86			
. Dia au	alovisaai	r cecimiques en	di diderstanding			U	1	J	,	O	4.10	350/1332	3.42	3.40	3.70	3.00	T.1	
D441		Discus		Jane 1	4	0	-	0	4	2	0	4 10	755 /1204	2 70	4 00	4 00	2.06	4 1
				hat you learned	4	0	1	0 1	4 0	3 5	9	4.12		3.79	4.09	4.08	3.86	4.1
				l to participate	4	-	•	_	-	-			600/1382	4.09		4.29	4.03	
				l open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	17		1/1368	4.39	4.47		4.01	
. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssiul		4	2	1	0	5	5	4	3.73	610/ 948	3.63	3.87	3.95	3.75	3.7
		Labora	_															
5. Were r	requiremen	nts for lab rep	orts cle	early specified	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 555	2.91	2.30	4.29	4.14	***
		Semina																
5. Were c	riteria f	for grading mad	e clear		19	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	3.95	3.35	3.68	3.54	***
		Field																
5. Did co	nferences	s help you carr	y out fi	eld activities	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	2.78	2.70	3.68	3.51	***
		Self																
o. Were t	here enou	ugh proctors fo	r all th	e students	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	****	5.00	3.99	3.83	***
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Туј	pe			Majors	5			
	10	0.00-0.99	4	A 12		 Re	 quir	ed f	or M	ajor	 s 2	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
00-27			0	в 6			-			,						3		
00-27 28-55	1	1.00-1.99						-				0	Under-g	- h	21	37		21
			1	C 0		Ge	nera	T				U	Ulidel -d	Lau /	. Τ	Non-	-maıor	Z.L
28-55 56-83	1 2	2.00-2.99	1			Ge:	nera	T				U	onder-g.	Lau 2	3 I	Non-	-major	21
28-55 56-83 84-150	1 2 1	2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	0	C 0 D 0								-	_				-	
28-55 56-83	1 2	2.00-2.99		C 0 D 0 F 0			nera ecti					0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	
28-55 56-83 84-150	1 2 1	2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	0	C 0 D 0		El						-	_	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	

University of Maryland Page 734
Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009
Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	25			
Questionnaires:	18	Student Course 1	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0101

COMPOSITION

BROFMAN, MARGAR

Title

Instructor:
Enrollment:

	Questions					NA	Fre 1	_	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	om 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	e instruc	tor make clear	the ex	spected 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	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	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 oth	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	1	1	0	1	7	8	4.24	841/1595	4.35	4.25	4.20	4.03	4.24
				what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	5	7	3.83	986/1533	3.95	4.00	4.04	3.87	3.83
				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
		g system clearl		ained	1	0	5	1	0	5	6		1454/1623	4.18	3.89	4.16	4.08	3.35
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1646		4.46	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	2	2	0	1	4	5	4	3.86	1105/1621	4.18	3.97	4.06	3.96	3.86
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lecture	s 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	e instruc	tor seem inter	ested i	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 led	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly							0	4	7	6	4.12	1073/1564	4.43	4.24	4.28	4.20	4.12
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o 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 au	. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi							0	1	2	2	4.20	556/1352	3.65	3.48	3.98	3.86	4.20
1. Did cla	ass discu	Discus Assions contrib		what you learned	3	0	3	1	2	2	7	3.60	1039/1384	4.12	4.09	4.08	3.86	3.60
				ed to participate	4	0	1	1	2	6	4		1080/1382		4.34	4.29	4.03	3.79
		_	_	nd open discussion	4	0	2	0	1	5	6		1015/1368	4.41	4.47	4.30	4.01	3.93
		chniques succe		a open arboabbien	4	6	1	1	2	1	3	3.50				3.95	3.75	3.50
		Semina	r															
1 Were as	ssianed t			announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 88	****	4.32	4.54	4.31	****
				dividual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 85	****	4.46	4.47	4.30	****
				what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 81	****	4.07	4.43	4.39	****
	_	ons contribute		-	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	4.22	4.35	4.01	****
_		for grading mad		-	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.54	***
		Field	i onle															
5. Did co	nferences			field activities	16	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 312	2.00	2.70	3.68	3.51	****
				Frequ	onar	. Dia	+vib	t i o	2									
				riequ	terrey	DIS	CLID	ucio	11									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0-27 4 0.00-0.99 2 A 5					Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	 s 1	2	Graduat	 e	0	 Мајо	 or	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 5												-		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 5		Ge:	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	L8	Non-	-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0					El	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	jh
				P 0									respons	es to k	oe sign	nificar	nt	
				I 0		Ot:	her					3						
				? 1														

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0201 University of Maryland COMPOSITION Baltimore County Instructor: KIDD, KATHLEEN Fall 2008

Title

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 24

27

Page 735 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions			Fre	equer 2	ncie:	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect 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		4.10	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		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		4.24	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		4.09	4.08	3.86	4.16
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	6	6	6		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		****/ 81	****	4.07	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 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		****/ 52	****	3.54	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 48	****	3.74	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 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		****/ 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	1.00	****/ 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

27

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 735 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	 А	5	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0301 University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title COMPOSITION Instructor: DUNNIGAN, BRIAN Fall 2008

Enrollment: 25 Ouestionnaires: 25

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 736

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 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 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 12 11 4.48 422/1512 4.39 4.27 4.10 3.86 4.48 7. Was the grading system clearly explained
9. How many times was class cancelled 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 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 Ω 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 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 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 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 4.00 ****/ 221 **** **** 4.16 4.05 **** 0 1 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 243 **** 3.83 4.12 4.08 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 23 0 0 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 1 5.00 ****/ 88 **** 4.32 4.54 4.31 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 1 5.00 ****/ 81 **** 4.07 4.43 4.39 **** 24 0 0 0 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.22 4.35 4.01 **** 24 0 0 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 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 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** 3.74 4.09 3.65 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 24~0~0~0~0~1~5.00~****/~39~****~4.05~4.47~4.36~****4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 24 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 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 4.00 ****/ 53 **** 4.20 4.30 4.17 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 24 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 30 **** 4.63 4.16 4.06 **** Were your contacts with the instructor helpful
 Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful
 Were there enough proctors for all the students 24 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 41 **** 5.00 4.43 4.27 **** 24 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 24 **** 5.00 4.42 4.24 **** 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

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 736 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 25

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	Credits Earned Cum. GPA			Expecte	d 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	В	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3	_			
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0401 KILLGALLON, DON Fall 2008

Instructor: Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 24

COMPOSITION

Title

Page 737 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions		NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect 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 6	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1646	4.44	4.46	4.69	4.67	5.00
How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		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		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		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		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		****/ 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 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 737 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 24

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	2	 А	15	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	С	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8	-			
				?	0						

University of Maryland Page 738

Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009

Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0501

26

COMPOSITION

WALTERS, APRIL

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 16

2. Did the	instruc exam qu	Genera w insights,ski	1			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	_	1/	D 1-	Moon	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
2. Did the	instruc exam qu	ew insights,ski	_		Questions					5	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	ricall
2. Did the	instruc exam qu	ew insights,ski	_	General															
2. Did the	instruc exam qu	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course Did the instructor make clear the expected goals							1	4	7	1	3 88	1295/1649	4.15	4.01	4.28	4.11	3.88
	exam qu	TEAR MAKA ALASK				0	0	0	1	3	5	7		1043/1648		4.10	4.23		4.13
3 Did the	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals						8	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	,		4.25	4.27		4.38
	27 272 11					0	0	0	1	1	5	-	4.38			4.25	4.20		4.38
		eadings contrib				0	0	0	4	1	4			945/1533		4.00	4.04	3.87	
		signments contr				0	0	0	1	3	4			764/1512		4.27	4.10	3.86	4.19
		g system clearl			carnea	0	0	0	2	2	5			999/1623		3.89	4.16		4.06
		was class canc		incu		0	0	0	0	0	11			1356/1646		4.46	4.69		4.31
_	•	arade the overa		hing effecti	veness	4	2	0	0	4	2			914/1621		3.97		3.96	
J. 110	-u 70u <u>-</u>	jiado ono overa				-	_	Ü	Ü	-	-	-	1.00	711,1021	1.10	3.77	1.00	3.70	1.00
1		Lectur	_			1	0	0	0	2	2	0	4 40	002/1560	4 40	4 00	4 42	4 20	4 40
		uctor's lecture				1	0	0	0	3	3		4.40				4.43		4.40
		ctor seem inter				1	0	0	0	0				690/1572		4.71			4.87
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					1	0	0	1		2			1055/1564			4.28		
	1. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					1	0	0	1	4	1	-		1009/1559			4.29		4.20
5. Did audi	. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding				anding	4	2	0	3	3	1	3	3.40	1101/1352	3.65	3.48	3.98	3.86	3.40
		Discus	sion																
1. Did clas	ss discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you lea	rned	5	0	0	2	4	1	4	3.64	1025/1384	4.12	4.09	4.08	3.86	3.64
2. Were all	l studer	nts actively en	courage	d to partici	pate	5	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	818/1382	4.26	4.34	4.29	4.03	4.27
		ctor encourage				5	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	881/1368	4.41	4.47	4.30	4.01	4.18
4. Were spe	ecial te	echniques succe	ssful	-		5	1	0	2	3	1	4	3.70	624/ 948	3.79	3.87	3.95	3.75	3.70
		0	_																
5. Were cri	iteria f	Semina For grading mad				15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 288	***	3.35	3.68	3.54	****
		3 3																	
					Frequ	ency	Dist	tribi	utioi	n									
Credits Ear	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	s Reasons					Ту	pe			Majors	;			
00-27	00-27 4 0.00-0.99 0 A 2						Red	mire	ed fo	 or M.	 aior	 s 1	1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r	0
28-55											,	_			-	-) 0		-
56-83					-		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	6	Non-	major	16
	34-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0			-		001	u.	-				~	onder 9	1	. •	1,011	2		
Grad.				0		E14	ectiv	ves				0	#### - Means there are not end		enous	ıh.			
SI aa.	U	3.30 1.00	U	P	0		1110	LT	v CD					respons				_	,
				I	0	Other					3	TCBPOHB		,c bigi	ıııcan				
				2	2		OCI	.101					J						

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0601 University of Maryland COMPOSITION Baltimore County Instructor: RAY, JENNIE Fall 2008

Title

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 23

28

Page 739 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	
---	--

Questions				NR	NA	Fr 1	eque	ncie	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General															
			ls from this course	0	0	0	2	6	7	8		1263/1649		4.01		4.11	3.91
			the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	,		4.10	4.23	4.16	4.61
	_		the expected goals	0	8	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	,		4.25	4.27	4.10	4.20
			the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	13	8	4.26			4.25	4.20	4.03	4.26
	_		te to what you learned	1	0	2	3	4	8	5		1249/1533		4.00	4.04	3.87	3.50
			bute to what you learned		0	0	1	4	6	11	4.23	723/1512		4.27	4.10	3.86	4.23
		g system clearly		1	0	0	1	1	7	13	4.45	568/1623	4.18	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.45
	-	was class cance		1	0	0	0	0	21	1		1528/1646		4.46	4.69	4.67	4.05
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overal	l teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	9	6	4.17	789/1621	4.18	3.97	4.06	3.96	4.17
		Lecture															
		actor's lectures		0	0	0	0	0	13	10	4.43			4.22	4.43	4.39	4.43
			sted in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	18		876/1572		4.71	4.70	4.64	4.78
		_	and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	8	15	4.65	,		4.24	4.28	4.20	4.65
			what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	8		4.57			4.17	4.29	4.20	4.57
5. Did au	udiovisual	l techniques enha	ance 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 cl	ass discu	ussions contribu	te 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 a	all studer	nts actively enc	ouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	4	3	13	4.29	812/1382	4.26	4.34	4.29	4.03	4.29
			air 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 s	special te	echniques succes	sful	2	2	0	1	7	7	4	3.74	610/ 948	3.79	3.87	3.95	3.75	3.74
		Laborat	ory														
5. Were r	requiremen	nts for lab repo	rts clearly specified	20	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 555	2.29	2.30	4.29	4.14	****
		Seminar															
5. Were c	riteria f	for grading made	clear	18	0	1	0	0	4	0	3.40	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.54	****
		Field W	ork														
5. Did co	nferences	s help you carry	out field activities	20	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 312	2.00	2.70	3.68	3.51	****
			Free	quency	y Dis	strib	outic	n									
Credits E	Expected Grades	3			Re	ason	s			Ty	pe			Majors	1		
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	4 A 5		Re	equir	red f	or M	ajor	s 1	. 4	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0 B 10				_				_			_			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1 C 4		Ge	enera	11				0	Under-g	rad 2	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 end			_	n			
		P 0			responses to be			e sigr	ııııcar	ıt							
			I 0	Other				7									
			? 1														

Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0701

26

COMPOSITION

SNEERINGER, HOL

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Page 740 FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies		ies Instructor			tructor	Course Dept		TIMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	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		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		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 5	1 0	0	0	1	6 5	12		1130/1646		4.46	4.69	4.67	4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	U	U	U	U	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		****	****	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		****/ 88	****	4.32	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	,	****	4.46	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	, -	****	4.07	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00		****	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		****	3.74	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	4.05	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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		****/ 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	,	****	4.63	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50		****	5.00	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00		****	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

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 740 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 26
Questionnaires: 20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits H	Earned	ed Cum. GPA			d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	11	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5	-			
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 741 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	27		
Questionnaires:	20	Student Course Evaluation Question	nnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0801

COMPOSITION

WALTERS, APRIL

Title

Instructor:

Questions				NR	NA	Fr 1	eque: 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean	
		General	 1															
1 Did voi	u gain ne	General w insights,skil	=	this course	0	0	0	0	2	10	8	4.30	912/1649	4.15	4.01	4 28	4.11	4.30
-	_	tor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	10	8	4.30	839/1648	4.37	4.10	4.23	4.16	4.30
		estions reflect			0	11	0	0	2	1		4.44		4.40	4.25	4.27	4.10	4.44
		ations reflect			0	1	0	0	3	9	7	4.21	865/1595	4.35	4.25	4.20	4.03	4.21
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contribu	ıte to w	hat 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 wr	itten ass	ignments contri	ibute 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	e grading	system clearly	y explai	ned	0	0	0	2	2	5	11	4.25	815/1623	4.18	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.25
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		2	0	0	0	0	12	6	4.33	1340/1646	4.44	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.33
9. How wor	uld you g	rade the overal	ll teach	ing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	11	4	4.12	847/1621	4.18	3.97	4.06	3.96	4.12
		Lecture		_														
		ctor's lectures	_	-	1	0	0	0	2	3		4.63			4.22	4.43	4.39	4.63
		tor seem intere			1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	355/1572		4.71	4.70	4.64	4.95
				plained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67		4.43	4.24	4.28	4.20	4.67
		s contribute to	_		1	0	0	2	2	4		4.26		4.45	4.17	4.29		4.26
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques en	nance yo	our understanding	1	1	1	2	3	6	6	3.78	900/1352	3.65	3.48	3.98	3.86	3.78
!.	Discussion . Did class discussions contribute to what you learne				_		_			_	_		505/4004	4 10	4 00	4 00	2 2 2	4 00
					6	0	1	1	1	5 5	6 8	4.00	,	4.12	4.09	4.08	3.86	4.00
		-	_	l to participate	6	-	0	0	1 2	4	-	4.50	616/1382		4.34	4.29	4.03	4.50
		chniques succes		l open discussion	6 6	0 2	1	0	3	2			732/1368 431/ 948	4.41 3.79	4.47 3.87	4.30	3.75	
T. WELE S	peciai te	cilliques succes	SSIUI		U	۷		U	J	۷	0	1.00	431/ 340	3.75	3.07	3.93	3.73	1.00
5. Were re	eguiremen	Laborat ts for lab repo	-	early specified	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 555	2.29	2.30	4.29	4.14	****
	-	-		• •														
5. Were c	riteria f	Seminan or grading made			18	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.54	****
		Field W	vi o zele															
5. Did con	nferences			eld activities	18	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 312	2.00	2.70	3.68	3.51	****
		Self I	Dagad															
1. Did se	lf-paced			hat you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.20	4.30	4.17	****
	_	cts with the ir		_	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 41	****		4.43		****
	F				iency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Ea	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad				s Reasons						Ty	pe			Majors	5		
						Required for Majors 6 Graduate 0 M												
00-27 28-55	28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 3				Re	quır	ed i	or M	ajor	`S	6	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0	
56-83	56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 3				Ger	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 2	0	Non-	-major	20	
	84-150 0 3.00-3.49 1 D 0			. רקד	0 a t d					0	#### - Means there a:				- 020	*h		
Grad.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0			E10	ecti	ves				U					_	ìīī		
	P 0 I 0	Other					7		7	responses to be significant				10				
				? 1		001						'						

University of Maryland Page 742
Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009
Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions				NR	NA		equei 2	ncies 3		5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		_		Level Mean	Sect Mean	
		General																
_	_	ew insights, skil			0	0	0	0	0	2	12 9	4.86		4.86	4.01		4.11	4.86
		ctor make clear uestions reflect	_	_	0	0 13	0	0	1 0	4	9	4.57	475/1648 ****/1375	4.57 ****	4.10 4.25	4.23	4.16 4.10	4.57 ****
	_	uations reflect	_	_	0	2	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	119/1595	4.92	4.25	4.27	4.10	4.92
		eadings contribu			0	1	0	1	3	6	3		976/1533	3.85	4.00	4.04	3.87	3.85
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0			4.93	88/1512		4.27	4.10	3.86	4.93
		g system clearly		_	0	4	0	1	6	1	2		1434/1623	3.40	3.89	4.16	4.08	3.40
	_	was class cance	_		0	1	0	0	0	4	9		1004/1646		4.46	4.69	4.67	4.69
	_			ng effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1621	5.00	3.97	4.06	3.96	5.00
		Lecture	<u> </u>															
		uctor's lectures	_	_	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	245/1568	4.91	4.22		4.39	4.91
2. Did the	e instru	ctor seem intere	sted in	the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.64	5.00
		terial presented	_	_	3	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73		4.73	4.24	4.28	4.20	4.73
		es contribute to	_		3	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	651/1559	4.55	4.17	4.29	4.20	4.55
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques enh	ance you	r understanding	3	10	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1352	****	3.48	3.98	3.86	****
	Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learned																	
				_	2	0	0	0	2	0	10	4.67	,		4.09	4.08	3.86	4.67
		nts actively end	_		2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	-,		4.34	4.29	4.03	4.92
		ctor encourage f		open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1368		4.47		4.01	
4. Were s	pecial t	echniques succes	sful		2	1	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	102/ 948	4.82	3.87	3.95	3.75	4.82
		Laborat	-															
5. Were re	equireme:	nts for lab repo	orts clea	rly 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 c	riteria	for grading made	e clear		13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.54	****
		Field W																
5. Did co	nference	s help you carry	out fie	ld activities	11	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 312	***	2.70	3.68	3.51	***
				Frequ	lency	Dis Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 10					Re	 auir	ed f	or Ma	aior	 :s	4	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55															-) -		-
56-83				C 0		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.4	Non-	-major	14
84-150						onder grad							-					
Grad.					Electives 1 #### - Means there are					are not	enoug	h						
P 0												respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	nt		
				I 0		Ot:	her					9						
	? 0																	

Course-Section: ENGL 100H 0101

Title COMPOSITION Instructor: MCCARTHY, LUCIL

Enrollment: 16
Questionnaires: 14

Course-Section: ENGL 100P 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County COMPOSITION Instructor: SNEERINGER, HOL Fall 2008

Enrollment:	5
Questionnaires:	4

I	age	743
FEB	11,	2009
Job	IRBE	R3029

	-			Frequencies			Instructor		tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	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		4.34	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														

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d 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	В	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	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				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

			Fr	equer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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		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		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		1525/1595		4.25	4.20	4.03	3.12
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	5	3	7	2	0		1520/1533		4.00	4.04	3.87	2.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	4	7	2	1		1488/1512		4.27	4.10	3.86	2.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	11	3	2	1	0		1620/1623		3.89	4.16	4.08	1.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	14	3		1454/1646		4.46	4.69	4.67	4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	8	2	1	1		1591/1621		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	Λ	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		1238/1382		4.34	4.29	4.03	3.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	3	5	3		1140/1368	3.90	4.47	4.30	4.01	3.62
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	3	1	3	3	0		905/ 948		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	****	****	116	4.05	****
	17	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 243	****	3.83	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 212	****	3.83	4.12	4.08	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	1	2	1	0	0	υ_		****/ 555	****	2.30	4.33	4.14	****
J. Were requirements for rab reports creatry specified	13		2		U	U	U	1.33	/ 555		2.30	1.27	1,11	
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	****
Frequ	iencv	Dis	trib	utior	า									
-	_													

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	 А	2	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5	-			
				2	1						

Course-Section:ENGL 100Y 0201University of MarylandPage 745TitleCOMPOSITIONBaltimore CountyFEB 11, 2009Instructor:HICKERNELL, MARFall 2008Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Enrollment: 26
Questionnaires: 17

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	Λ	Ω	Λ	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		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		****/1375		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		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	,		4.00	4.04	3.87	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	0	4.38	553/1512		4.27	4.10	3.86	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	5	4	1		1363/1623		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		4.46	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	5	0	2		1151/1621		3.97	4.06	3.96	
7. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	U	U	U	5	0	2	3.00	1131/1021	3.02	3.91	4.00	3.90	3.00
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		1236/1559		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	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	2	 А	4	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4	-			
				2	1						

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2008

Page 746 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 100Y 0301

23

COMPOSITION

WALTERS, APRIL

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 21

Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 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 8 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 8 3 8 4 3.43 1517/1648 3.42 4.10 4.23 4.16 2.88 4.10 4.23 4.16 2.88 4.10 4.23 4.16 2.88 4.10 4.23 4.16 2.88 4.10 4.23 4.16 2.88 4.10 4.23 4.16 2.88 4.10 4.23 4.16 2.88 4.10 4.23 4.16 2.88 4.10 4.23 4.16 2.88 4.10 4.23 4.16 2.88 4.10 4.23 4.16 2.88 4.10 4.12 4.10 4.28 4.10 4.23 4.16 2.88 4.10 4.12 4.10 4.28 4.10 4.23 4.16 2.88 4.10 4.12 4.10 4.28 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10			Question	s		NR	NA	Fro	eque: 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_		Level Mean	Sect Mean
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected gals			 Genera	 1															
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fr	om this course	0	0	5	6	3	5	2	2.67	1636/1649	3.16	4.01	4.28	4.11	2.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	1	5	3	8	4	3.43	1517/1648	3.42	4.10	4.23	4.16	3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 8 6 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 1 3 3 3 4 6 2 3 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 1 3 3 2 5 6 8 3 3.18 1509/1523 2.96 3.89 4.16 4.08 3.15 8.00 mm yrines was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 4 .02 1411/1646 4.06 4.64 4.69 4.67 4.29 9.00 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	3. Did the	e exam qu	uestions reflec	t the	expected goals	0	13	3	0	1	3	1	2.88	1344/1375	3.18	4.25	4.27	4.10	2.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 3 3 3 4 6 6 5 3.33 1345/1512 3.50 4.27 4.10 3.86 3.32 1.88 to grading system clearly explained 0 1 3 3 5 6 6 5 3.31 1345/1512 3.50 4.27 4.10 3.86 3.32 1.88 1.89 1.89 1.89 1.89 1.89 1.89 1.89						0	0	4	3	1	8	5	3.33	1470/1595	3.65	4.25	4.20	4.03	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 1412/1664 4.00 4.46 4.69 4.67 4.24 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 2 7 5 3 1 1 2.67 1571/1621 3.02 3.97 4.06 3.96 2.67 Lecture Lecture 1. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 1 3 4 7 4 3.53 1456/1568 3.36 4.22 4.43 4.39 3.53 2.00 dthe 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 3.45 2.00 dthe instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 5 2 7 1 4 2.84 1509/1579 3.13 4.17 4.28 4.20 3.32 4.00 dthe lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 5 2 7 1 4 2.84 1509/1559 3.13 4.17 4.28 4.20 3.32 4.00 dthe lectures contribute to what you learned 3 0 8 3 5 5 2 0 2.06 1365/1384 2.86 4.09 4.08 2.86 2.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 8 3 5 5 2 0 2.06 1365/1384 2.86 4.09 4.08 2.86 2.06 Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0		8	6	2	3	1	2.15	1523/1533	2.94	4.00	4.04	3.87	2.15
8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 16 5 4.24 1412/1646 4.60 4.46 4.69 4.67 8.26 2.67 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 2 7 5 3 1 1 2.67 1571/1621 3.02 3.79 4.06 3.96 2.67 Executive Lecture 1. Where 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 3.00 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1						0	-		_	_	6	5	3.33	1345/1512	3.50	4.27	4.10	3.86	3.33
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 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 2.01 d 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 3.08 slecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 2 2 6 6 3 3.32 1445/1564 3.15 4.24 4.28 4.20 3.12 4.01 d 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 2.44 5.01 d 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 2.06 2.06 2.06 2.06 2.06 2.06 2.0					ained			-	_	-	•	-							
Lecture						-	-	-	•	-		_							
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 1 3 3 4 7 4 3.53 1456/1568 3.36 4.22 4.43 4.39 3.53 2.00 this instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 0 2 5 12 4.53 1222/1572 4.42 4.71 4.70 4.64 4.53 3.30 Mas lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 2 0 6 6 3 3.32 1445/1564 3.15 4.24 4.28 4.20 3.32 4.50 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 5.00 that is a straight of the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 0 8 3 5 2 7 1 1 2 2.40 1316/1352 2.61 3.48 3.98 3.86 2.40 2.84 2.84 2.84 2.84 2.84 2.84 2.84 2.84	9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	3	0	2	7	5	3	1	2.67	1571/1621	3.02	3.97	4.06	3.96	2.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 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 2.06 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 89/1368 3.90 4.47 4.03 4.01 4.17 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.0			Lectur	e															
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 2 2 6 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 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 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 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 555 **** 2.30 4.29 4.14 **** Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 2 0 0 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 2 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 555 **** 2.30 4.29 4.14 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 20 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 50 **** 4.60 4.06 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 20 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 50 **** 4.63 4.16 4.06 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 20 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 50 **** 5.00 4.42 4.27 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 20 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 50 *** 5.00 4.42 4.24 **** 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 20 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 50 *** 5.00 4.90 4.24 **** 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 20 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 50 *** 5.00 4.90 4.24 **** 6. General 0 0 0.00-99 1 A 5 5 0.00-0.99 1 A 5 5 0 0.00-0.99 1 A	1. Were th	he instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	1	3	4	7	4	3.53	1456/1568	3.36	4.22	4.43	4.39	3.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance you understanding 3 3 4 4 5 1 1 2.84 1509/1559 3.13 4.17 4.29 4.20 2.84 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance you understanding 3 3 4 4 5 1 1 2.40 1316/1352 2.61 3.46 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 2.06 2.06 2.06 2.06 2.06 2.06 2.0	2. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested :	in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	1222/1572	4.42	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.53
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	3. Was led	cture mat	terial presente	d and	explained clearly	2	0	2	2	6	6	3	3.32	1445/1564	3.15	4.24	4.28	4.20	3.32
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 3.99 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 5. Mere requirements for lab reports clearly specified 20 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/555 **** 2.30 4.29 4.14 **** Self Paced 5. Mere requirements for lab reports clearly specified 20 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/53 **** 4.20 4.30 4.17 **** 2. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 20 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 30 **** 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 **** 4.20 4.30 4.17 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 20 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 30 **** 4.63 4.16 4.06 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 20 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 41 **** 5.00 4.43 4.27 **** 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 Frequency Di						2	0	5	2	7	1	4	2.84	1509/1559	3.13	4.17	4.29	4.20	
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 8 3 5 2 0 2.06 1365/1384 2.86 4.09 4.08 3.86 2.06 2.06 2.06 2.06 2.06 2.06 2.06 2.0	5. Did aud						3	4	4	5	1	1	2.40	1316/1352	2.61	3.48	3.98	3.86	2.40
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 4.00 4.01 4.17 4.00 4.01 4.17 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.0			Discus	sion															
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful 2 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 1 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 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 ****/ 41 **** 5.00 4.43 4.27 **** 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 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 H### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant Frequency Distribution	1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute 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
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 O0-27 5 0.00-0.99 1 A 5 8 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	2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	3	0	2	2	4	3	7	3.61	1170/1382	3.74	4.34	4.29	4.03	3.61
Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 20 0 0 1 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 O0-27 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 I 0 Other 4	3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair a	nd open discussion	3	0	0	1	3	6	8	4.17	891/1368	3.90	4.47	4.30	4.01	4.17
Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 20 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 555 **** 2.30 4.29 4.14 **** 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 4.43 4.27 **** 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 O0-27 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 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant Figure 1	4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		2	0	4	2	6	4	3	3.00	844/ 948	3.17	3.87	3.95	3.75	3.00
Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 20 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 555 **** 2.30 4.29 4.14 **** 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 4.43 4.27 **** 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 O0-27 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 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant Figure 1			Labora	torv															
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 4.43 4.27 **** 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 O0-27 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 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0 Electives 0 ### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 4	5. Were re	equiremer	nts for lab rep	orts c	learly specified	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	****	2.30	4.29	4.14	***
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 1 0 4.00 ****/ 41 **** 5.00 4.43 4.27 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 20 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 Frequency Distribution			Self	Paced															
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 20 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 1 0 4.00 ****/ 24 **** 5.00 4.42 4.24 **** 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 20 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 110 **** 5.00 3.99 3.83 **** Frequency Distribution	1. Did se	lf-paced	system contrib	ute to	what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	***	4.20	4.30	4.17	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 20 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 1 0 4.00 ****/ 24 **** 5.00 4.42 4.24 **** 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 20 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 110 **** 5.00 3.99 3.83 **** Frequency Distribution	2. Did st	udy quest	tions make clea	r the	expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	4.63	4.16	4.06	****
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						20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	4.27	****
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 I 0 Other 4	4. Was the	e feedbac	ck/tutoring by	procto	rs helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.42	4.24	****
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 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 7 0 B 7 0 Under-grad 21 Non-major 21 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 3 General 0 Under-grad 21 Non-major 21 0 84-150 0 Graduate 0 Under-grad 21 Non-major 21 6rad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0 Electives 0 Electives 0 Electives 0 Under-grad 21 Non-major 21 0 0 F 0 F 0 F 0 F 0 F 0 Electives 0 F 0 F 0 Electives 0 F 0 F 0 F 0 F 0 F 0 F 0 F 0 F 0 F 0	5. Were th	here enou	ugh proctors fo	r all t	the students	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	5.00	3.99	3.83	****
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 I 0 Other 4					Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									
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 I 0 Other 4	Credits E	arned	Cum GPA	Expected Grades				Re	ason	g			Тът	ne			Maiors	:	
28-55																	, 		
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 I 0 Other 4							Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s 1	2	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	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 P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 4				-	= :		~		,				0	TT7		. 7	37 -		0.1
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 4		-		-			Ge	nera.	Τ				U	unaer-g	rad 2	: 1	Non-	-major	Z T
P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 4		-		_	- *		TO 7	0a+ i -					0	ннтт -	Moana +	horo -	.xo	ono	x h
I 0 Other 4	Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	U	- *		БŢ	ecrl,	ves				U					_	111
- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					- *		0+	har					4	respons	co LU L	e sign	iiiidl	10	
							OL.	TICI					1						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Page 747 FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Question	s		NR	NA	Fro	_	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	u gain new	w insights,ski	lls fro	om 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	e instruct	tor make clear	the ex	xpected 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	e exam que	estions reflec	t 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 oth	her evalua	ations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	1	2	3	8	5	3.74	1295/1595	3.65	4.25	4.20	4.03	3.74
				what you learned	0	1	1	4	5	4	4	3.33	1338/1533	2.94	4.00	4.04	3.87	3.33
				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
		system clearl		ained	0	0	2	2	3	8	4		1379/1623	2.96	3.89	4.16	4.08	3.53
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1646	4.60	4.46	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How wor	uld you gi	rade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	3	1	0	2	9	4	0	3.13	1480/1621	3.02	3.97	4.06	3.96	3.13
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instru	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	e instruct	tor seem inter	ested :	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 led	cture mate	erial presente	d 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	e lectures	s contribute t	o 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 aud	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understar					11	1	2	0	1	1	2.80	1270/1352	2.61	3.48	3.98	3.86	2.80
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discus	ssions contrib	ute 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
				ed to participate	2	0	1	1	8	3	4		1221/1382	3.74	4.34	4.29	4.03	3.47
		_	_	nd open discussion	2	0	1	4	3	2	7	3.59	1150/1368	3.90	4.47	4.30	4.01	3.59
		chniques succe		•	2	4	2	1	4	3	3		789/ 948	3.17	3.87	3.95	3.75	3.31
		Labora	torv															
5. Were re	equirement		-	learly specified	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 555	***	2.30	4.29	4.14	***
		Semina	r															
1 Were as	ssianed to		_	e announced theme	12	1	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	85/ 88	3.50	4.32	4.54	4.31	3.50
	_	-		dividual attention	15	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	,	****	4.46	4.47	4.30	****
				what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	2	0		****/ 81	****	4.07	4.43	4.39	***
	_	ns contribute		_	17	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 92	****	4.22	4.35	4.01	****
_		or grading mad		-	16	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	***	3.35	3.68	3.54	****
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
		Cum. GPA		_	.01107	210	0112		-									
Credits Ea	arned 	Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту]	pe 			Majors 	5		
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s 1	6	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 7														
56-83						Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.9	Non-	-major	19
84-150																		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	jh
				P 0			_						respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	nt	
				I 0		Ot	her					3						
				? 1														

Course-Section: ENGL 100Y 0401

23

Title COMPOSITION Instructor: BROFMAN, MARGAR

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 19

Course-Section: ENGL 110 0201
Title COMPOSITION ESL STUDEN

University of Maryland
N Baltimore County
Fall 2008

Instructor: COLLINS, ELSA T

Enrollment: 21
Questionnaires: 20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 748 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

		Question		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean	
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	w insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	3	2	6	9	4.05	1149/1649	4.05	4.01	4.28	4.11	4.05
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	3	5	11	4.30	839/1648	4.30	4.10	4.23	4.16	4.30
		estions reflec			0	9	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	788/1375	4.27	4.25	4.27	4.10	4.27
	_	ations reflect		_	0	3	0	0	5	2	10	4.29	770/1595	4.29	4.25	4.20	4.03	4.29
				what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	6	9	4.21	663/1533	4.21	4.00	4.04	3.87	4.21
	_	_		what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	2	14	4.53	366/1512	4.53	4.27	4.10	3.86	4.53
		system clearl		2	0	0	0	2	2	4	12	4.30	757/1623	4.30	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.30
		was class canc		21100	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.46	4.69	4.67	5.00
				ning effectiveness	3	2	0	0	-	10		4.07	,			4.06	3.96	
3. 110W W	oura you g	rade ene overa	II ccac.	iiiig circcerveness	3	_	J	Ü	_	10	3	1.07	001/1021	1.07	3.57	1.00	3.70	1.07
		Lectur	_															
1. Were t	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	387/1568	4.80	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.80
2. Did th	id the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	1034/1572	4.70	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.70
3. Was le	oid the instructor seem interested in the subject as lecture material presented and explained clear					0	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	728/1564	4.45	4.24	4.28	4.20	4.45
4. Did th	ne lecture	es contribute t	o 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 a	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand					6	4	1	2	1	5	3.15	1192/1352	3.15	3.48	3.98	3.86	3.15
1 543		Discus		3	_	0	^	1	2	4	_	4 07	771 /1204	4 07	4 00	4 00	2 06	4 07
				what you learned	6	0	0	1	3	4		4.07	771/1384	4.07	4.09	4.08	3.86	4.07
		_	_	d to participate	6	0	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	899/1382	4.14	4.34	4.29	4.03	4.14
		_		d 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 s	special te	echniques succe	sstul		6	7	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	3.87	3.95	3.75	4.00
		Labora	tory															
1. Did th	ne lab inc	rease understa	_	f the material	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****
				ground information	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 243	****	3.83	4.12	4.08	****
				or lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****
	_	structor provid			18	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****
				early specified	15	0	2	0	1	1	_	2.80	504/ 555	2.80	2.30	4.29	4.14	2.80
J. Were I	requiremen	icb for fab fep	OICD CI	edily bpecified		Ü	-	Ü	_	_	_	2.00	3017 333	2.00	2.50	1.25		2.00
		Semina																
5. Were	criteria f	for grading mad	e clear		17	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.54	***
				Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	ution	n									
Gradita I	Formed	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Dos	aana				П				Majawa	
Credits I	ea	Expected Grades					asons				Ту]	pe 			Majors 	· 		
00-27						Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	8	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0 B 11																
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	20	Non-	-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - I	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	jh
				P 0									response	es to b	e sign	nificar	nt	
				I 0		Oth	ner					9	_		_			
				? 1														

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

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		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
<u> </u>														
Lecture	_	0	0	-	2	_	1 4	4 10	1005/1560	4 10	4 00	4 42	4 20	4 10
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	2	1	3	6	14		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		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	****
Quantum and														
Seminar	2.1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1 00	****/ 88	****	4 20	4 54	2 75	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31 31	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 85	****	4.32 4.46	$4.54 \\ 4.47$	3.75 3.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 81	****	4.40	4.47	3.67	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 92	****	4.07	4.43	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	1	2	1	0	1	0		****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.65	****
J. Were criteria for grading made crear	27		2		U		U	2.00	/ 200		3.33	3.00	3.03	
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		****/ 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		****/ 53	****	4.20	4.30	4.07	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 30	****	4.63	4.16	1.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	3.50	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 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	****

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

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	21	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				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 Cours	e Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------------	--------------	---------------

		Question	ıs		NR	NA	Fre	eque: 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		e Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Conomo	.1															
1 Did vo	u gain ne	Genera w insights,ski		m this course	0	0	6	1	12	7	10	3 39	1528/1649	3 39	4.01	4 28	4.29	3.39
		tor make clear			1	0	2	2	9	12	10		1354/1648		4.10	4.23	4.25	3.74
		estions reflec		-	1	3	3	2	3	9	15		983/1375		4.25	4.27		3.97
		ations reflect			1	1	3	3	5	14	9	3.68	1329/1595	3.68	4.25	4.20	4.22	3.68
5. Did as	signed rea	adings contrib	ute 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
				o 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 th	e grading	system clearl	y expla	ined	1	3	4	4	6	10	8	3.44	1419/1623	3.44	3.89	4.16	4.21	3.44
8. How ma	ny times v	was class cand	elled		1	1	2	3	9	17	3	3.47	1632/1646	3.47	4.46	4.69	4.63	3.47
9. How wo	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	10	0	3	0	6	12	5	3.62	1295/1621	3.62	3.97	4.06	4.01	3.62
		Lectur	·e															
		ctor's lecture		3	0	3	1	4	10	15		1279/1568		4.22	4.43	4.39	4.00	
			2	0	1	0	4	7	22		1289/1572		4.71	4.70	4.73	4.44		
	old the instructor seem interested in the subjectors lecture material presented and explained clotd the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	3	5	10	15		1064/1564		4.24	4.28		4.12
			3	1	2	2	6	9	13		1197/1559		4.17	4.29		3.91		
5. Did au	diovisual	our understanding	3	16	2	3	4	4	4	3.29	1146/1352	3.29	3.48	3.98	4.07	3.29		
		Discus																
				what you learned	23	0	2	2	3	1	5	3.38	1132/1384	3.38	4.09	4.08	3.99	3.38
				d to participate	23	0	0	2	4	3	4		1132/1382		4.34	4.29	4.19	3.69
				d open discussion	23	0	1	2	7	0	3		1274/1368	3.15	4.47	4.30	4.21	3.15
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succe	essful		23	6	1	0	3	0	3	3.57	****/ 948	****	3.87	3.95	3.89	***
_		Labora					_				_							
5. Were r	equiremen	ts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	25	0	7	3	0	0	1	1.64	541/ 555	1.64	2.30	4.29	4.33	1.64
		Semina	ır															
5. Were c	riteria f	or grading mad	le clear	•	29	1	5	1	0	0	0	1.17	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.65	****
		Field	Work															
5. Did co	nferences	help you carr	y out f	ield activities	30	1	2	2	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 312	****	2.70	3.68	3.59	****
		Self	Paced															
5. Were t	here enoug	gh proctors fo	or all t	he students	34	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	5.00	3.99	3.72	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Туј	pe			Majors	3		
00-27	2	A 30			าแร่ห	 ed f	or M	 aior		7	Graduat	 _	0	Majo	 r	10		
28-55	3	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0 2	B 4		100	~~++(-u 1	J. 1'1	⊥∪ر م	~	•	or adda t	_	5	1100		10
56-83	6	C 0		Ger	nera:	1			1	0	Under-g	rad '	36	Non-	major	26		
84-150	10	D 0							_	-			-		5 2			
Grad.	0	3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00	6 7	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				2	#### - 1				_	ιh
				P 0								_	respons	es to 1	oe sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Oth	ner				1	5						

?

0

ISSUES IN WORLD LIT

Title

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

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	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		3.97		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		****/ 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		****/ 52	****	3.54	4.06	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	3.74	4.09	4.05	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	4.05	4.47	4.49	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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		****/ 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	****

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

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	 7	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5	-			
				?	0						

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	
---------	--------	------------	---------------	--

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General					_									
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	6	8	11		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		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		****/1375	****	4.25	4.27	4.37	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	3		11		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	, -	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		1121/1559		4.17	4.29	4.33	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	6	2	2	2	6			1049/1352			3.98	4.07	
	-	_	_	_	_	-	_							
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		****/ 85	****	4.46	4.47	3.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 81	****	4.07	4.43	3.67	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 92	****	4.22	4.35	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	1	3	1	1	0		****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.65	****
J. Were criteria for grading made crear	21	U		J		1	U	2.55	/ 200		3.33	3.00	3.03	
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		****/ 41	****	5.00		3.50	****
5. Hold four contacts with the instructor neighbor	20	J	J	J	J	_	3	1.00	, 11		3.00	1.15	3.33	

Title CURRENTS IN BRITISH LI

Instructor:

Questionnaires: 27

Enrollment: 43

Baltimore County PEKARSKE, NICOL Fall 2008

Page 752 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d 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	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6	-		_	
				?	2						

Course-Section: ENGL 243B 0101

Title CURRENTS IN AMERICAN L

Instructor: BLUMBERG, ARNOL

Enrollment: 50
Ouestionnaires: 28

BLUMBERG, ARNOL Fall 2008 50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 753

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 1 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 1 2 5 14 4.30 763/1375 4.30 4.25 4.27 4.37 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 4.67 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 Ω 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 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 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 4 5.00 ****/ 948 **** 3.87 3.95 3.89 **** Laboratory 1 4.00 ****/ 221 **** **** 4.16 4.45 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 0 0 3 5.00 ****/ 243 **** 3.83 4.12 4.47 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 25 0 0 Ω 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 25 1 0 1 0 1 4.00 **** / 212 **** **** 4.40 4.62 **** 25 1 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 ****/ 209 **** **** 4.35 4.64 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 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 2 4.67 ****/ 88 **** 4.32 4.54 3.75 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 25 0 2 4.67 ****/ 85 **** 4.46 4.47 3.33 **** 25 0 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 2 0 1 3.67 ****/ 81 **** 4.07 4.43 3.67 **** 0 0 1 2 4.67 ****/ 92 **** 4.22 4.35 5.00 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 25 0 0 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 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 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 **** 27 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** 4.08 4.38 3.66 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 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 1 5.00 ****/ 53 **** 4.20 4.30 4.07 **** 26 0 0 4.00 ****/ 30 **** 4.63 4.16 1.50 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 0 0 0 Were your contacts with the instructor helpful
 Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful
 Were there enough proctors for all the students 26 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 41 **** 5.00 4.43 3.50 **** 26 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 24 **** 5.00 4.42 2.00 **** 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

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	16	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4	-		-	
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 250 0101 University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Title INTRO TO SHAKESPEARE Fall 2008 Instructor: FARABAUGH, ROBI

Enrollment: 34 Questionnaires: 18

Page 754 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

	Our ablance						Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	on gain n	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	497/1649	4.61	4.01	4.28	4.29	4.61
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	4	3	10	4.35	770/1648		4.10	4.23	4.25	4.35
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	2	0	5	11	4.39	684/1375	4.39	4.25	4.27	4.37	4.39
	_	uations reflect		_	0	0	0	1	4	4	9	4.17	930/1595	4.17	4.25	4.20	4.22	4.17
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	174/1533	4.76	4.00	4.04	4.04	4.76
				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 th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla:	ined	0	0	1	1	5	4	7	3.83	1222/1623	3.83	3.89	4.16	4.21	3.83
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	16	2		1498/1646		4.46	4.69	4.63	4.11
	-			ning effectiveness	3	1	1	1	2	3	7		914/1621			4.06	4.01	4.00
1 Works to	Lecture ere the instructor's lectures well prepared d the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	667/1568	1 6 5	4.22	1 12	4 20	4.65
	id the instructor seem interested in the subject					-	-	-	2	_			,			4.43	4.39	
	as lecture material presented and explained clear:					0	0	0		1			985/1572			4.70	4.73	4.72
	d the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	1	2	2		4.50			4.24	4.28	4.27	4.50
	d the lectures contribute to what you learned d audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi					0	0	0	3	3		4.50			4.17	4.29	4.33	4.50
5. Did au						13	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/1352	***	3.48	3.98	4.07	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	Discussion d class discussions contribute to what you learn					0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	644/1384	4.30	4.09	4.08	3.99	4.30
				d to participate	8 8	0	0	0	2	4			869/1382		4.34	4.29		4.20
				d open discussion	9	0	0	0	3	2			915/1368			4.30	4.21	
		echniques succe		a open arbeablion	9	2	0	0	2	3		4.00	,		3.87		3.89	
F		Labora	_	1	- 4	0	-	0	-	0	0	0 00	**** / 555	ate ate ate ate	0 20	4 00	4 22	ale ale ale ale
5. Were r	equireme	nts for lab rep	orts cle	early specified	14	0	1	2	1	0	U	2.00	****/ 555	***	2.30	4.29	4.33	****
		Semina	r															
5. Were c	riteria :	for grading mad	e clear		14	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.65	****
		Field	Work															
5. Did co	nference			ield activities	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 312	****	2.70	3.68	3.59	****
				Frequ	lency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Rea	asons	5			Ту	ре			Majors	
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2					Red	ากเราะ	ed f	or Ma			2	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	12
28-55						1,50	70TT	cu I	J_ 1'1C	בטנ ג	_	_	Graduat	_	J	1.10.)	<i>,</i> _	12
56-83						Cer	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	.8	Non-	-major	6
84-150						061	c.a.	-				_	onaci -g.	Luu I	. 0	14011		Ü
Grad.						ភ្ជ	ecti	17AC				0	#### - 1	Meane +	here =	re not	enous	h
Grau.	Frad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0					11.1	CCLI	v CD				U	respons					11
				I O		O+1	her				1	.3	respons	LD LU L	o argi	ııııdı	10	
				? 2		ULI	TCT				1							
				; Z														

Course-Section: ENGL 271 0101 University of Maryland Title

INTRO CREAT WRTG-FICTI Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 18

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

Page 755 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

								LTC	: daei	TICTE	5		TIID	LIUCLUI	COULSE	= Debr	UMBC	пелет	Sect
	Questions					NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1																
1. Did you	ı gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course		0	0	0	1	0	7	10	4.44	723/1649	4.44	4.01	4.28	4.29	4.44
		ctor make clear				0	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	556/1648			4.23	4.25	4.50
3. Did the	e exam qu	uestions reflec	t the ex	xpected goals		0	10	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	950/1375	4.00	4.25	4.27	4.37	4.00
4. Did oth	ner evalī	uations reflect	the exp	pected goals		0	2	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	362/1595	4.63	4.25	4.20	4.22	4.63
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to v	what you learn	ıed	0	0	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	495/1533	4.39	4.00	4.04	4.04	4.39
		signments contr			irned	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	302/1512	4.61	4.27	4.10	4.14	4.61
		g system clearl		ined		0	0	0	0	4	7			915/1623		3.89		4.21	4.17
		was class canc				0	0	0	0		15			1462/1646				4.63	
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overa	ll teach	ning effective	ness	3	0	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	595/1621	4.33	3.97	4.06	4.01	4.33
		Lectur	e																
1. Were th	ne instru	uctor's lecture	s well r	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	instruc	ctor seem inter	ested in	n 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 led	cture mat	terial presente	d and ex	xplained clear	rly	5	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	434/1564	4.69	4.24	4.28	4.27	4.69
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o 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 aud	diovisual	l techniques en	hance yo	our understand	ling	5	8	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1101/1352	3.40	3.48	3.98	4.07	3.40
		Discus																	
1 Did ala	aa diaa	DISCUS ussions contrib		what was laam		8	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.80	201/1204	1 00	4 00	4.08	2 00	4.80
		nts actively en				8	0	0	0	0	3		4.80						4.80
		nts actively en ctor encourage				8	0	0	0	0	3			455/1382		4.34			
		echniques succe		ı open discuss	,1011	8	0	0	0	1	3 4		4.70						
4. Were sp	Deciai Le	eciniiques succe	SSIUI			0	U	U	U	1	4	5	4.40	201/ 940	4.40	3.07	3.95	3.09	4.40
		Labora																	
5. Were re	equiremer	nts for lab rep	orts cle	early specifie	ed.	14	0	2	1	0	0	1	2.25	****/ 555	****	2.30	4.29	4.33	****
		Semina	r																
5. Were cr	riteria f	for grading mad	e clear			16	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.65	****
		Field	Work																
5. Did con	nferences	s help you carr		ield activitie	es	15	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	2.70	3.68	3.59	***
					_		<u> </u>												
					Freque	ncy	Dist	tribu	ıtıoı	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra									Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 A 9			Re	 quire	ed f	or M	 aior	 s	1	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	 8
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 8							J						5		-
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 0			Ge:	neral	Ĺ				6	Under-g	rad 1	18	Non-	-major	10
	4	3.00-3.49	3	D 0										3				3	
84-150							El	ectiv	<i>i</i> es				3	#### -	Means t	there a	are not	enouc	ηh
84-150 Grad.	0																		•
	0	3.50-4.00		P 0										respons	es to 1	oe siar	nifican	ıt	
	0	3.50-4.00		P 0 I 0			Otl	her					7	respons	es to 1	oe sigr	nificar.	ıt	

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

						Fre	eque:	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General															
1 Did vo	u gain ne	w insights,skills fr	om this course	0	0	0	0	4	1	17	4.59	523/1649	3.90	4.01	4.28	4.29	4.59
		tor make clear the e		0	0	0	1	1	1	19	4.73	291/1648		4.10	4.23		4.73
		estions reflect the		0	3	0	1	0	4	14	4.63			4.25	4.27	4.37	4.63
		ations reflect the e		0	0	0	1	1	2	18	4.68	301/1595		4.25	4.20	4.22	4.68
		adings contribute to		0	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	295/1533		4.00	4.04	4.04	4.59
		ignments contribute		0	0	0	0	2	2	18	4.73			4.27	4.10		4.73
		system clearly expl		0	3	1	2	3	4	9		1119/1623		3.89	4.16		3.95
		was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	731/1646		4.46	4.69		4.86
	-	rade the overall tea	ching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	4	10	3		1001/1621				4.01	
		Lecture															
1. Were t	he instru	prepared	0	0	0	1	1	6	14	4.50	852/1568	3.80	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.50	
	re the instructor's lectures well prepared d the instructor seem interested in the subject s lecture material presented and explained clea:				0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1572		4.71	4.70		5.00
					0	0	1	0	-	15	4.59	560/1564		4.24	4.28		4.59
					0	1	0	2	4	15	4.45	763/1559		4.17	4.29		4.45
			0 1	5	2	2	1	5	6	3.69	960/1352		3.48	3.98		3.69	
J. 214 44		your undersounding	_	J	_	_	-		Ū	3.05	300, 2002	3.07	3.10	3.70	2.07	3.03	
		Discussion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	what you learned	3	0	1	0	3	2	13	4.37	582/1384	3.75	4.09	4.08	3.99	4.37	
		ed to participate	3	0	0	2	2	3	12	4.32			4.34	4.29		4.32	
		tor encourage fair a		3	0	0	0	3	5	11	4.42			4.47	4.30		4.42
		chniques successful		3	11	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	601/ 948		3.87		3.89	3.75
		Laboratory															
5. Were r	equiremen	its for lab reports c	learly specified	19	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 555	2.50	2.30	4.29	4.33	****
		Seminar															
5. Were c	riteria f	for grading made clea	r	18	0	3	0	0	1	0	1.75	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.65	****
		Field Work															
5. Did co	nferences		field activities	12	0	1	1	1	7	0	3.40	232/ 312	3.40	2.70	3.68	3.59	3.40
	Did conferences help you carry out field activities				Dis	-rih	u+ i o	n									
			riequ	iency	DIS	CIID	ucio.	11									
Credits E	Carned	Expected Grades				Re	ason	s 			Ту	pe 			Majors	3	
00-27						quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	5	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	9
28-55																	
56-83						nera	1				8	Under-g	rad 2	22	Non-	-major	13
84-150																	
Grad.						ecti	ves				1	#### - 1				_	jh
	P 0											respons	es to k	e sign	ificar	ıt	
			I 0		Ot1	ner					8						
			? 1														

Title INT CREATIVE WTG-POETR

Instructor: MCGURRIN JR, AN

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 14

Fall 2008

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 757 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	7	4	1		1569/1649		4.01	4.28	4.29	3.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	8	0		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		****/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		****/1352		3.48	3.98	4.07	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	3	1	2	2 12	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		4.34	4.29	4.19	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.13	771/1368	4.40	4.47	4.30	4.21	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 948		3.87	3.95	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 221	***	****	4.16	4.45	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information		0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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	****
Freq	uency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	.s			Ty	pe			Majors	.

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	А	10	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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 enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: ENGL 281P 0101 University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Title INTERMEDIATE EXPOSITIO Instructor: SNEERINGER, HOL

Enrollment: 9 Ouestionnaires: 9

4. Were special techniques successful

Fall 2008

2 0 2 2 3.29 793/948 3.29 3.87 3.95 3.89 3.29

Page 758 FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	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

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

1 1 1

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	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	 А	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7	-			
				?	0						

Title INTRO WRTG CREAT ESSAY

Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 759 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 13 1 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 2 0	2 0 0 0 1 0 0 0	3 3 0 2 5 0 1 0 2	6 7 2 5 2 4 9	5 5 1 8 8 12 4 3	4.13 4.33 4.40 4.06 4.75 3.81 4.19	1295/1649 1032/1648 ****/1375 636/1595 774/1533 194/1512 1234/1623 1447/1646 875/1621	4.24 4.38 4.50 4.51 4.12 4.79 4.17 4.56 4.17	4.01 4.10 4.25 4.25 4.00 4.27 3.89 4.46 3.97	4.28 4.23 4.27 4.20 4.04 4.10 4.16 4.69 4.06	4.29 4.25 4.37 4.22 4.04 4.14 4.21 4.63 4.01	3.88 4.13 **** 4.40 4.06 4.75 3.81 4.19 4.08
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3 3 3 4	0 0 0 0 11	0 0 0 1 1	1 1 1 0	2 0 0 1	5 3 5 5		4.54 4.38 3.92	1248/1568 1212/1572 801/1564 1181/1559 ****/1352	4.48 4.80 4.51 4.46 3.29	4.22 4.71 4.24 4.17 3.48	4.43 4.70 4.28 4.29 3.98	4.39 4.73 4.27 4.33 4.07	4.08 4.54 4.38 3.92 ****
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	6 6 6	0 0 0 1	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 1	0 1 0 1	2 2 1 2	8 7 9 5	4.80 4.60 4.90 4.22	201/1384 540/1382 264/1368 353/ 948	4.81 4.66 4.89 4.48	4.09 4.34 4.47 3.87	4.08 4.29 4.30 3.95	3.99 4.19 4.21 3.89	4.80 4.60 4.90 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	***
Frequ	iency	Dist	crib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7 28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 4		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor:	 s	3	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	4
56-83 2 2.00-2.99 1 C 3 84-150 2 3.00-3.49 3 D 0		Ger	nera:	1				5	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non-	major	12
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 P 0 I 0 ? 0		Ele Oth	ectiv ner	ves				0 6	#### - 1 respons				_	h

Title INTRO WRTG CREAT ESSAY

Instructor:

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 20

Baltimore County FALLON, MICHAEL Fall 2008

Page 760 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

					Fre	equer	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 L															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	w insights,skil	lls 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 th	e instruc	ctor make clear	the expe	cted goals	3	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	464/1648	4.38	4.10	4.23	4.25	4.59
3. Did th	e exam qu	estions reflect	the exp	ected goals	2	15	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1375	4.50	4.25	4.27	4.37	****
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the expe	cted goals	3	2	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	462/1595	4.51	4.25	4.20	4.22	4.53
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contribu	ite to wh	at you learned	2	0	0	1	3	8	6	4.06	781/1533	4.12	4.00	4.04	4.04	4.06
				what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	179/1512	4.79	4.27	4.10	4.14	4.78
		system clearly			2	1	0	0	5	5	7	4.12	968/1623	4.17	3.89	4.16	4.21	4.12
		was class cance			2	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1646	4.56	4.46	4.69	4.63	5.00
				ng effectiveness	7	1	0	0	0	8	4	4.33	595/1621		3.97	4.06	4.01	4.33
		Lecture	<u> </u>															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lectures		epared	5	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	517/1568	4.48	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.73
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor seem intere	ested 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 le	as lecture material presented and explained clead the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	702/1564	4.51	4.24	4.28	4.27	4.47
4. Did th	d the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	318/1559	4.46	4.17	4.29	4.33	4.80
5. Did au	d audiovisual techniques enhance your understand Discussion					11	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/1352	3.29	3.48	3.98	4.07	****
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contribu		at vou learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	219/1384	4.81	4.09	4.08	3.99	4.79
		nts actively end			6	0	0	0	1	2	11		435/1382	4.66	4.34	4.29	4.19	4.71
				open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	211/1368	4.89	4.47	4.30	4.21	
		echniques succes		open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	3	9		167/ 948				3.89	
		T - 1																
5. Were r	equiremen	Laborat nts for lab repo	_	rly specified	16	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 555	2.20	2.30	4.29	4.33	****
		Semina	2															
5. Were c	riteria f	for grading made	e clear		9	1	2	0	1	7	0	3.30	211/ 288	3.02	3.35	3.68	3.65	3.30
		Field V	Vork															
5. Did co	nferences	s help you carry	y out fie	ld activities	11	3	2	2	0	2	0	2.33	287/ 312	2.33	2.70	3.68	3.59	2.33
		Self I																
5. Were t	here enou	igh proctors for	all the	students	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	5.00	3.99	3.72	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	ı									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	 0	A 7				 ed f	or Ma			4	Graduat		0	Majo		5
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 10		re(4utt (cu I	J⊥ I¹Id	יייר	b	1	Graduat	_	U	Ma JC) <u> </u>	5
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				3	Under-g	rad ?	0	Non-	-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-2.99	6	D 0		Gel	ı-cı d.	_				J	onder -g.	rau 2	U	14011-	iia Jui	10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		רם.	ecti					1	#### - 1	Meane +	horo -	re not	enous	rh
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	4	P 0		ET.	=CLI	vcb				_	respons				_	111
				I O		O+1	her					7	respons	co LU L	c sign	ıııcaı	10	
				? 1		ULI	TCT					,						
				t T														

Title INTRO WRTG CREAT ESSAY

Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 12

Baltimore County Fall 2008

University of Maryland

Page 761 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

	Questions							Fre		ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructo: Rar		Course	-		Level Mean	
1 0:	: d	anin no	General w insights,skil	1a from +	hia aourao	0	0	0	0	2	6	4	1 17	1057/1	1640	1 21	4.01	1 20	4.29	4.17
			tor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.17	,		4.24	4.10	4.23	4.25	4.17
			estions reflect			0	8	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	,		4.50		4.27	4.37	
		_	ations reflect	_	-	0	0	0	0	1	3	8		405/1		4.51	4.25	4.20	4.22	
			adings contribu			0	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	624/1	1533	4.12	4.00	4.04	4.04	4.25
6. Di	id wri	tten ass	ignments contri	bute to w	hat you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	142/1	1512	4.79	4.27	4.10	4.14	4.83
			system clearly		d	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	416/1	1623	4.17	3.89	4.16	4.21	4.58
		-	was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	6			1193/1		4.56	4.46	4.69	4.63	
9. Ho	ow wou	ld you g	rade the overal	l teachin	g effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	7	2	4.10	859/1	1621	4.17	3.97	4.06	4.01	4.10
			Lecture																	
			ctor's lectures			4	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	699/1	1568	4.48	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.63
			tor seem intere			3	0	0	0	0	0		5.00		1572		4.71		4.73	
	as lecture material presented and explained clearled the lectures contribute to what you learned					3	0	0	0	0	3			473/1			4.24		4.27	
	id the lectures contribute to what you learned					3	0	0	0	0	3			512/1			4.17		4.33	
5. Di	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi					3	2	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	1149/1	1352	3.29	3.48	3.98	4.07	3.29
			Discuss	ion																
1. Di	id cla	ss discu	ssions contribu	te to wha	t you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	185/1	1384	4.81	4.09	4.08	3.99	4.83
			ts actively enc			6	0	0	0	1	0			483/1		4.66	4.34	4.29	4.19	
			tor encourage f		pen discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1			337/1		4.89		4.30	4.21	
4. W∈	ere sp	ecial te	chniques succes	sful		6	1	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	170/	948	4.48	3.87	3.95	3.89	4.60
			Laborat	ory																
5. W∈	ere re	quiremen	ts for lab repo	rts clear	ly specified	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	555	2.20	2.30	4.29	4.33	****
			Seminar																	
5. We	ere cr	iteria f	or 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 W	ork																
5. Di	id con	ferences	help you carry		d activities	9	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	312	2.33	2.70	3.68	3.59	****
					Frequ	ienas	Diet	-rih	ution	2										
					rred	iency	DIS		ucioi	.1										
Credi	its Ea	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons					Тур	pe			Majors	
00-2	27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	 5	1	Grad	duate	<u> </u>	0	Majo	r	1
28-5		1	1.00-1.99	0	В 2															
56-8		2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				3	Unde	er-gi	rad 1	2	Non-	major	11
84-1		1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0															
Grad	i.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				1			Means t			_	h
					P 0		O+1						_	resp	ponse	es to b	e sign	niican	ıt	
					I 0 ? 1		Oth	ner					6							
					t T															

Course-Section: ENGL 300 0101 University of Maryland Title COMM/TECH - ANALYSIS

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 762

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: MAHER, JENNIFER Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 11 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			NR	NA	Fr 1	_	ncies	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean		
		General																
		ew insights,skil			0	0	0	1	1	4	5		1037/1649	4.18	4.01		4.27	4.18
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	2	2	5	2		1428/1648	3.64	4.10	4.23	4.18	3.64
	_	uestions reflect			1	9	0	0	0	0	1		****/1375	****	4.25	4.27	4.22	****
		uations reflect			0	1 0	0	0	2 0	3 4	5	4.30	759/1595	4.30	4.25	4.20	4.21	4.30
		eadings contribu signments contri			1	0	0	0	1	4 5	6 4	4.60	288/1533 627/1512	4.60 4.30	4.00	4.04	4.05 4.11	4.60 4.30
		signments contri g system clearly		ou learned	1	0	1	1	4	5 1	3		1434/1623	3.40	3.89	4.10	4.11	3.40
		y system clearly was class cance			0	0	0	0	11	0	-		1644/1646	3.40	4.46	4.10	4.67	3.40
	_	was class cance grade the overal		atimonoga	0	1	0	0	5	3	-		1234/1621		3.97		4.02	
9. HOW WO	uiu you y	grade the overar	i teaching erre	cciveness	U	_	U	U	3	3	4	3.70	1234/1021	3.70	3.31	4.00	4.02	3.70
		Lecture																
1. Were t	he instr	uctor'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	e instru	ctor seem intere	sted in the sub	ject	3	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1121/1572	4.63	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.63
3. Was le	cture ma	terial 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
		es contribute to			4	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	1045/1559		4.17	4.29	4.23	4.14
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques enh	ance your under	standing	3	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	836/1352	3.88	3.48	3.98	3.97	3.88
		Discuss			_		_	_		•	_	4 = 0	405/4004	4 = 0	4 00	4 00		4 = 0
		ussions contribu	-		1	0	0	1	0	2		4.50	- ,		4.09	4.08	4.11	4.50
		nts actively end			1	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	342/1382	4.80	4.34	4.29	4.37	4.80
		ctor encourage f echniques succes		scussion	1 1	0 1	0	0	1 2	2 4	3	4.60 4.11	579/1368	4.60	4.47	4.30	4.39	4.60
4. were s	рестат с	echniques succes	SLUI		Т	1	U	U	۷	4	3	4.11	404/ 948	4.11	3.87	3.95	4.00	4.11
		Laborat	ory															
5. Were re	equireme	nts for lab repo	rts clearly spe	cified	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	2.30	4.29	4.22	***
F		Seminar			•	•	0	_	0	_	0	4 00	02/000	4 00	2 25	2 60	2 50	4 00
5. Were c	riteria	for grading made	clear		8	0	0	0	0	3	U	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.35	3.68	3.58	4.00
		Field W	ork															
5. Did co	nference	s help you carry		vities	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	2.70	3.68	3.60	****
						-	-		_	_	-		,					
				Frequ	uency	/ Dis	trib	utic	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Evneat	ed Grades				D.c	asons	4			Ту	ne			Majors	
																		,
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0 A	8		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	S	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0 B	2														
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0 C	1		Ge	nera	1				3	Under-g	rad 1	.1	Non-	-major	3
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2 D	0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5 F	0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	ſh
			P	0								_	respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	nt	
			I	0		Ot.	her					7						
			?	0														

ANALYSIS LITERARY LANG

Title 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

			Fre	equei	ncie	S		Tnst	tructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_	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	-	0	0	•	•	-	1 -	4 85	400 /1560	4 50	4 00	4 42	4 20	4 85
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	480/1568		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		4.71	4.70	4.64	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	3		4.58	580/1564		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		4.17	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		4.26	825/1382		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		4.30		4.05
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	1	1	7	9	4.33	310/ 948		3.87		4.00	
1. Were special techniques successivi		_	O	_	_	,		1.55	310/ 310	1.50	3.07	3.75	1.00	1.55
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														
	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	1 22	4 54	1 (2	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	5	0		****/ 288	****	4.32	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	Тр	U	U	U	U	5	U	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	20	0	0	0	-	0	0	2 00	**** / F2		4 00	4 20	4 20	***
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		****/ 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	****
_		. D	27		_									

Credits E	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades							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	в 1	.3						
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	e are not enough	1

0 responses to be significant I ? Other 19

0 2

ANALYSIS LITERARY LANG

Title Instructor: DONOVAN, JULIE

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 21 Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 764 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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		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		4.41	,	4.39	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	1	0	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		1167/1621	4.18	3.97			3.79
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	,	U	4	U		,	-	3.15	1107/1021	4.10	3.91	1.00	4.02	3.15
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		1096/1572	4.72	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	4		4.53	630/1564	4.60		4.70	4.25	
	4	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.53	938/1559		4.24			4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	_	0	•		_	_	_		,	4.51	4.17	4.29	4.23	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	U	0	1	4	6	6	4.00	690/1352	3.07	3.48	3.98	3.97	4.00
_1														
Discussion	_				_									
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2		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		4.71	472/1368	4.57	4.47		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		****/ 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		****/ 110	****	5.00		4.05	****
J. Here there chough proceeds for all the students	20	J	U	U	_	U	U	5.00	, 110		5.00	3.77	1.05	

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

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14	-			
				?	0						

ANALYSIS LITERARY LANG

Title 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

			Fre	Frequencies				Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		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		4.17	4.29	4.23	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	3	2	3	0	2	2.60	1293/1352		3.48	3.98		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	4.73	170/1382	4.61	4.34	4.29	4.37	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	185/1368	4.57			4.37	4.94
3 -	2	0	0	0	2	4	10		,		4.47	4.30		
4. Were special techniques successful	2	U	U	U	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		****/ 52	****	3.54	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	3.74	4.09	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	4.05	4.47	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Type		
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	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 303 0101 University of Maryland Title ART OF THE ESSAY Baltimore County Instructor: SNEERINGER, HOL Fall 2008

Enrollment: 23

Questionnaires: 16

SNEERINGER, HOLE
FAIL 2006

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Ouestions	MD	NA	Fre	equei	ncie 3	s 4	5		ructor	Course	_	UMBC		Sect
	Quescions	NR	NA						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
	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
	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
	e 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
	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	****
	research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.07	4.43	4.30	****
	Freq	iency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Cmodit =	Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades	-				ason	~			Τv	n 0			Maiors	

Page 766

FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	16	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	10	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 304 0101 University of Maryland Page 767 Title Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 BRIT LIT:MEDIEVAL/RENA

Instructor: MCKINLEY, KATHE

Enrollment: 27 Questionnaires: 18

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

		Frequencie			ncies	s Instructor			ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	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	Λ	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		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 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		1	0	1	4	2	5	3.92	522/ 948	3.92	3.87	3.95	4.00	3.92

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	d 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	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ENGL 305 0101 University of Maryland BRIT LIT:RESTOR - ROMA

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Title Instructor: ORGELFINGER, GA

Enrollment: 29 Questionnaires: 19

Page 768 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Evaluation	

0								equer			-		ructor		e Dept		Level	Sect
		Question	S 		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	w insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	350/1649	4.74	4.01	4.28	4.27	4.74
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	599/1648	4.47	4.10	4.23	4.18	4.47
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	1	0	6	12	4.53	529/1375	4.53	4.25	4.27	4.22	4.53
		ations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	352/1595	4.63	4.25	4.20	4.21	4.63
5. Did as:	signed re	adings contrib	ute 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
				o 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	e grading	system clearly	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	2	9	8	4.32	744/1623	4.32	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.32
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	19	0	4.00	1544/1646	4.00	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.00
9. How wo	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	165/1621	4.75	3.97	4.06	4.02	4.75
		Lecture	_															
		ctor's lecture			1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	,		4.22	4.43	4.39	4.94
		tor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	355/1572		4.71	4.70	4.64	4.94
				xplained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	498/1564		4.24	4.28	4.25	4.65
		s contribute to			1	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	284/1559		4.17	4.29	4.23	4.83
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques en	nance y	our understanding	0	4	1	3	4	5	2	3.27	1156/1352	3.27	3.48	3.98	3.97	3.27
		Discus	sion															
				what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	561/1384	4.38	4.09	4.08	4.11	4.38
				d to participate	6	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	383/1382	4.77	4.34	4.29	4.37	4.77
				d 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 s	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		6	1	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	413/ 948	4.08	3.87	3.95	4.00	4.08
		Labora	tory															
5. Were r	equiremen	ts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	16	0	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 555	****	2.30	4.29	4.22	****
		Semina	r															
5. Were c	riteria f	or grading made	e clear		18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.58	****
				Frequ	ency	/ Dist	ribu	ution	ı									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	17
28-55 56-83	1 3	1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99	0 1	В 9 С 1		Cox	neral	1				4	Under-g	rad 1	L9	Non	-major	2
84-150	3 4	3.00-2.99	2	D 1		Gel	ıcıal	L				7	onder-g	ıau l	LJ	11011-	ilia JOE	۷
84-150 Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		רם.	act i i	700				0	####	Meane +	-here -	re not	enous	rh
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	T	P 0		Electives			0 #### - Means there are not enou responses to be significant			_	1++					
I O						Other 14				JC 5191.	ıııcaı							
				± 0		UCI	ICI			± ±								

1

Course-Section: ENGL 306 0101

Title BRIT LIT: VICTORIAN-MO

Instructor: FERNANDEZ, JEAN

Enrollment: 31

Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 769 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	3 L	
Ouestionnaires:	2.2	

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

							Frequencies			S		Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	gain ne	ew insights,ski		m 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	instruc	ctor make clear	the exp	pected 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	e exam qu	estions reflect	the ex	xpected goals	1	0	0	1	4	4	12	4.29	780/1375	4.29	4.25	4.27	4.22	4.29
4. Did oth	er evalu	ations reflect	the exp	pected goals	1	1	0	2	3	5	10	4.15	943/1595	4.15	4.25	4.20	4.21	4.15
	what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	350/1533	4.52	4.00	4.04	4.05	4.52			
				what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	7	10	4.19	755/1512		4.27	4.10	4.11	4.19
		g system clearly		ined	1	0	3	0	5	3	10	3.81	1241/1623	3.81	3.89	4.16	4.08	3.81
		was class cance			1	0	0	0	2	18	1	3.95	1574/1646	3.95	4.46	4.69	4.67	3.95
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overa	ll teacl	ning effectiveness	3	0	0	1	4	6	8	4.11	859/1621	4.11	3.97	4.06	4.02	4.11
		Lecture	2															
1. Were th	e instru	actor's lectures		prepared	2	0	1	1	2	3	13	4.30	1080/1568	4.30	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.30
		ctor seem inter			2	0	0	0	1	4	15		1034/1572			4.70	4.64	
				xplained clearly	2	0	0	3	3	1	13		1001/1564	4.20	4.24	4.28	4.25	4.20
		es contribute to			2	0	1	0	4	3	12		966/1559		4.17	4.29	4.23	4.25
				our understanding		19	0	0	0	1			****/1352				3.97	****
		Discus	aion															
l Did ala	ee diea			what you learned	7	0	0	1	3	4	7	4.13	743/1384	4.13	4.09	4.08	4.11	4.13
				d to participate	7	0	1	0	1	3		4.40	716/1382	4.40	4.34	4.29	4.37	4.40
		-	_	d open discussion	7	0	1	0	2	1	11		.,	4.40	4.47	4.30	4.39	4.40
		echniques succes		d open discussion		13	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 948		3.87	3.95	4.00	****
r. were be	cciai cc	cominques succes	JULUI		,	13	O	U	_	O	_	1.00	, 510		3.07	3.75	1.00	
		Labora																
. Were re	quiremen	nts for lab repo	orts cle	early specified	20	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	****	2.30	4.29	4.22	****
		Field W	Work															
5. Did con	ferences	s help you carry	y out f	ield activities	18	2	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 312	***	2.70	3.68	3.60	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ation	n									
Credits Ea	- mod	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Dos	ason	~			т.				Majors	
Edits Ea		Cuiii. GPA								5 			Ту	 be			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 9		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	15
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 6		_		,				0		, .				_
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Gei	nera:	L				2	Under-g	rad 2	22	Non-	-major	7
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	0	D 0											,			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0							Means there are not enough							
				P 0							_		respons	es to b	e sigr	nifican	ıt	
				I 0		Other				1	.3							
? 3																		

Course-Section: ENGL 307 0101 University of Maryland Title AM LIT TO CIVIL WAR

Baltimore County Fall 2008

STEWART, CAROLE Instructor:

Enrollment:	31
Questionnaires:	29

E	age	//0
FEB	11,	2009
Job	IRBI	R3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire	

							Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 General																
1. Did vo	u gain ne	w insights,skil		this course	0	0	0	2	3	8	16	4.31	898/1649	4.31	4.01	4.28	4.27	4.31
_	_	tor make clear			0	0	0	0	5	10	14	4.31		4.31	4.10	4.23	4.18	4.31
		estions reflect			0	0	0	0	1	10	18	4.59	480/1375	4.59	4.25	4.27	4.22	4.59
		ations reflect			0	1	0	0	1	10	17	4.57	417/1595	4.57	4.25	4.20	4.21	4.57
		adings contribu			1	0	0	0	3	5	20	4.61		4.61	4.00	4.04	4.05	4.61
				what you learned	2	1	1	0	2	12	11	4.23	711/1512	4.23	4.27	4.10	4.11	4.23
		system clearly			1	0	0	0	4	3	21	4.61		4.61	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.61
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.46	4.69	4.67	5.00
				ng effectiveness	7	0	0	0	3	13	6		824/1621				4.02	4.14
		Lecture	1															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lectures	well pr	epared	1	0	0	0	2	5	21	4.68	620/1568	4.68	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.68
		tor seem intere	_	_	1	0	0	1	1	3	23		1003/1572		4.71	4.70	4.64	4.71
					1	0	1	0	1	10	16	4.43		4.43	4.24	4.28	4.25	4.43
	lecture material presented and explained of the lectures contribute to what you learned			_	1	0	0	1	2	9	16		804/1559	4.43	4.17	4.29	4.23	4.43
	d the lectures contribute to what you learned d audiovisual techniques enhance your understa				2	7	3	3	3	5	6	3.40	1101/1352	3.40	3.48	3.98	3.97	3.40
	d audiovisual techniques enhance your understa. Discussion																	
1 Did cl	Discussion id class discussions contribute to what you lea				6	0	0	2	1	10	10	4.22	697/1384	4.22	4.09	4.08	4.11	4.22
		its actively enc			6	0	0	0	3	3	17	4.61			4.34	4.29	4.37	4.61
		tor encourage f	_		6	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	348/1368	4.83	4.47	4.30	4.39	4.83
		chniques succes		open discussion	6	4	3	1	3	5	7				3.87		4.00	
		Laborat	orv															
5. Were r	equiremen	its for lab repo	-	rly specified	25	0	4	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 555	****	2.30	4.29	4.22	****
		Seminar	•															
5. Were c	riteria f	or grading made	e clear		26	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.58	****
		Field W	lork															
5. Did co	nferences	s help you carry	out fie	ld activities	25	1	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 312	****	2.70	3.68	3.60	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Туј	pe			Majors	l
00-27	1	A 11			 quire		 ox M			2	Graduat		0	Majo		27		
28-55	2	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	1 0	B 14		Ke(4utr.e	=u 1	_T I ₄ I	ajur	۵	۷	G1 adual	-	U	ria JC) <u>T</u>	۷ /
26-33 56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C 1		Co	neral	1				3	Under-g	rad ?	9	Non	-major	2
84-150	3 7	3.00-2.99	5	D 0		Gel	ierd.	L				٥	onder-g.	rau Z	J	MOI1-	-ıııa JOE	۷
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		רם.	ectiv	700				0	#### - 1	Meane +	here -	re not	enous	rh
orau.	U	3.30-4.00	¥	P 0		11.1	-C L I \	v CD				U	respons				_	11
				I O		O+1	ner				2	:1	T CPPOIIS	CD CO D	c bigi	cal		
				2 1		001					2							
				t T														

Course-Section: ENGL 308 0101

Title AM LIT AFTER CIVIL WAR

Instructor:

Enrollment: 30 Questionnaires: 26

Baltimore County BERMAN, JESSICA

University of Maryland Fall 2008

Page 771 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie:	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
		General																
1. Did vou	u gain new	insights, skil		his course	0	0	0	1	2	10	13	4.35	857/1649	4.35	4.01	4.28	4.27	4.35
_	_	or make clear			0	0	0	0	6	8	12	4.23	920/1648	4.23	4.10	4.23	4.18	4.23
		stions reflect	_	_	0	0	0	2	1	7	16	4.42	641/1375	4.42	4.25	4.27	4.22	4.42
	_	ions reflect	_	-	0	1	0	0	3	9	13	4.40	636/1595	4.40	4.25	4.20	4.21	4.40
5. Did ass	signed read	dings contribu	ite to wha	t 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 wri	itten assi	nments contri	bute to w	hat 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	e grading s	system clearly	explaine	d	0	0	0	1	4	8	13	4.27	803/1623	4.27	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.27
8. How mar	ny times wa	as class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	9	17	4.65	1048/1646	4.65	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.65
9. How wor	uld you gra	ade the overal	l teachin	g effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	11	9	4.45	456/1621	4.45	3.97	4.06	4.02	4.45
		Lecture	2															
1. Were th	he instruct	or's lectures	well pre	pared	1	0	0	0	1	8	16	4.60	731/1568	4.60	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.60
		or seem intere			2	0	0	0	0	5	19	4.79	858/1572	4.79	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.79
				ained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	8	14	4.50	651/1564	4.50	4.24	4.28	4.25	4.50
		contribute to		2	0	0	1	2	4	17	4.54	651/1559	4.54	4.17	4.29	4.23	4.54	
5. Did aud	diovisual t	techniques enh	understanding	4	4	1	3	9	3	2	3.11	1204/1352	3.11	3.48	3.98	3.97	3.11	
		Discuss																
1. Did cla	ass discuss	sions contribu	t 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 al	ll students	s actively end	couraged t	o participate	3	0	0	1	3	4	15	4.43	686/1382	4.43	4.34	4.29	4.37	4.43
		_		pen discussion	3	0	0	0	2	2	19	4.74	449/1368	4.74	4.47	4.30	4.39	4.74
4. Were sp	pecial tech	nniques succes	sful		3	11	2	1	4	4	1	3.08	837/ 948	3.08	3.87	3.95	4.00	3.08
		Laborat	cory															
5. Were re	equirements	s for lab repo	orts clear	ly specified	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	***	2.30	4.29	4.22	***
		Seminar																
				nounced theme	25	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 88	****	4.32	4.54	4.63	***
				dual attention	25	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 85	****	4.46	4.47	4.55	****
_		s contribute t	_	u learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 92	****	4.22	4.35	4.46	****
5. Were cı	riteria for	grading made	clear		23	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 288	***	3.35	3.68	3.58	***
		Field V	Jork															
5. Did cor	nferences h	nelp you carry	out fiel	d activities	24	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 312	***	2.70	3.68	3.60	***
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utior	ı									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3	
00 27	0	A 8											·	 Mo ≓ :		11		
00-27 28-55	0 1	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	A 8 B 11		кес	quir	ed fo	Jr. M	ajor	ä	2	Graduat	E	0	Majo	ŊĽ.	11	
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	4	C 2		Ger	nera	1				4	Under-g	rad 2	26	Non-	-major	15
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0									5	_			3	-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enou	_j h	
				P 0									respons				_	
				I 0		Otl	her				1	7	-					
	I 0 Other ? 1																	

Course-Section: ENGL 324 0101

Title THEORIES OF COMM TECH

Instructor: SHIPKA, JODY

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 772 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General				_		_	_							
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	6	5		1136/1649			4.28	4.27	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4 0	7	1		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	2	1 6	0 6		****/1375	4.28	4.25	4.27	4.22	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	6	4	2	4.29	782/1595	4.25	4.25	4.20	4.21	4.29 3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	6	5	4.00	1153/1533 883/1512	3.85 4.24	4.00 4.27	4.10	4.05	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	2	3	4	3		1405/1623	3.81	3.89	4.10	4.11	3.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3 7	7	0		1630/1646	3.81	4.46	4.16	4.08	3.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	3	4	4		1240/1621					3.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	U	Т	1	3	4	4	3.09	1240/1621	3.97	3.97	4.00	4.02	3.09
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	0	0	0	0	1	_	_	4 22	612/1204	4 4 5	4 00	4 00	4 11	4 22
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	613/1384		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	U	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		****/ 81	****	4.07	4.43	4.30	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 92	****	4.22	4.35	4.46	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.58	****
o, were drivered for grading made drear		Ü	Ü	ŭ	Ü	_	ŭ	1.00	, 200		3.33	3.00	3.30	
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		****/ 24	****	5.00	4.42	5.00	****
III III III III III III III III		ŭ	Ü	ŭ	ŭ	-	٠	1.00	, 21		3.00	1.12	3.00	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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 0ther 10 0

Course-Section: ENGL 324 0201 University of Maryland
Title THEORIES OF COMM TECH Baltimore County

University of Maryland Page 773
Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009
Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: BURGESS, HELEN
Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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
Fred	uenas	. Die	trib	u+i 01	n									
rieq	nency Distribution													
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades	es Reasons								Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 7		Re	quir	ed fo	or M	 ajor	s	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo		10
28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 5	Required for Majors 0											-		

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	 7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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 enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	13	_			
				2	2						

Course-Section: ENGL 326 0101 University of Maryland Title STRUCTURE OF ENGLISH

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: FITZPATRICK, CA

Enrollment: 31 Questionnaires: 19

Page 774 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questi	onnaire
---------	--------	------------	--------	---------

	Questions						Fr 1	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	1	0	1	0	3	7	7	4.06	1149/1649	4.06	4.01	4.28	4.27	4.06
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	4	6	8	4.22	931/1648	4.22	4.10	4.23	4.18	4.22
3. Did the	e exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	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 oth	her evalı	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	1	3	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	806/1595	4.27	4.25	4.20	4.21	4.27
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute 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 wri	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	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	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	0	1	2	7	8	4.22	849/1623	4.22	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.22
8. How mar	ny times	was class cand	elled		1	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	1037/1646	4.67	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.67
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	2	8	3	3.93	1030/1621	3.93	3.97	4.06	4.02	3.93
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	667/1568	4.65	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.65	
	re the instructor's lectures well prepared d the instructor seem interested in the subjec					0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	355/1572	4.94	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.94
						0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	854/1564		4.24	4.28	4.25	4.33
	lecture material presented and explained cle-					0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	736/1559		4.17	4.29	4.23	4.47
	id the lectures contribute to what you learned id audiovisual techniques enhance your understand					14	1	0	2	0	0		****/1352		3.48	3.98	3.97	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc			what you learned	5	0	2	0	1	6	5	3.86	911/1384	3.86	4.09	4.08	4.11	3.86
				ed to participate	5	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	696/1382		4.34	4.29	4.37	4.43
		_	_	nd open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	5	8	4.43	732/1368		4.47	4.30	4.39	4.43
		echniques succe			4	3	1	0	5	5	1		741/ 948		3.87	3.95	4.00	3.42
		Semina	r															
5. Were ci	riteria 1	for grading mad		•	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	***	3.35	3.68	3.58	****
		Field	Work															
5. Did cor	nferences			field activities	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 312	***	2.70	3.68	3.60	****
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Ea	arnod	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Po	asons				Ty	no			Majors	
				Expected Grades									ту					, . – – – –
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	3	A 7		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 4														
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C 3		Ge	nera	1				3	Under-g	rad 1	.9	Non-	-major	4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D 2														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	ıh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	nt	
				I 0		Ot:	her				1	.5						
				? 0														

Course-Section: ENGL 332 0101 CONTEMP AMERICAN LIT

I

0

1

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 15

20

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 775

University of Maryland Title FEB 11, 2009 Instructor: CORBETT, CHRIS Job IRBR3029

						Fre	equer	ncie	S		Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Question	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	510/1649	4.60	4.01	4.28	4.27	4.60
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	885/1648	4.27	4.10	4.23	4.18	4.27
		uestions reflec			0	5	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	546/1375	4.50	4.25	4.27	4.22	4.50
4. Did ot	her evalı	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	2	1	0	3	3	6	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	4.25	4.20	4.21	4.00
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ate 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 wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute 1	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 th	e gradino	g system clearl	y expla	ained	0	3	1	1	2	2	6	3.92	1164/1623	3.92	3.89	4.16	4.08	3.92
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	10	5	4.33	1340/1646	4.33	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.33
				ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	313/1621	4.57	3.97	4.06	4.02	4.57
		Lectur	_															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	301/1568	4.87	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.87
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1572		4.71	4.70	4.64	5.00
				explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	263/1564		4.24	4.28	4.25	4.80
		es contribute t			0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	143/1559	4.93	4.17	4.29	4.23	4.93
				your understanding	0	2	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	341/1352		3.48	3.98	3.97	
		Discus	zion															
1 Did cl	ass disco			what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	219/1384	4.79	4.09	4.08	4.11	4.79
				ed to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	292/1382		4.34	4.29	4.37	4.86
				nd open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	14		1/1368		4.47	4.30	4.39	5.00
		echniques succe		ia open arboabbien	1	7	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	330/ 948		3.87		4.00	
		Labora	orv															
5. Were r	equiremen		-	learly specified	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	****	2.30	4.29	4.22	****
				Frequ	encv	Dist	tribi	ıtior	า									
				•	.01107	225	0110											
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S 			Ту]	pe 			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 4														
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C 0		Ger	neral	L				6	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non-	major	10
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D 1														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				3	#### - 1					h
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nifican	nt	

Other

4

Course-Section: ENGL 332H 0101 University of Maryland Page 776 Title Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 LITERATURE OF NONFICTI

Instructor: CORBETT, CHRIS

Enrollment: 6 Questionnaires: 4

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

	Questions						Fr 1	equei 2	ncies 3	4	5		tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did voi	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1498/1649	3.50	4.01	4.28	4.27	3.50
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	897/1648		4.10	4.23	4.18	4.25
		estions reflec			1	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	950/1375	4.00	4.25	4.27	4.22	4.00
	_	ations reflect		_	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	321/1595	4.67	4.25	4.20	4.21	4.67
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute 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 wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o 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	e grading	g system clearly	y expla	ined	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.00
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1398/1646	4.25	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.25
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	914/1621	4.00	3.97	4.06	4.02	4.00
		Lectur																
1. Were th	he instru	actor's lecture	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	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	n 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 led	cture mat	erial presente	d and e	xplained 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	e lecture	es contribute t	o 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 aud	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	914/1352	3.75	3.48	3.98	3.97	3.75
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	assions contrib	ute 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 a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d 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	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.47	4.30	4.39	5.00
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	\$			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Red		ed f	or Ma	jors	 S	0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 0						J						5 -		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0									_				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	jh
				P 0									respons				_	
				I 0		Oth	ner					3	-					
				? 1														

Course-Section: ENGL 348 0101 University of Maryland Page 777 Title Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 LITERATURE AND CULTURE

Instructor: OSHEROW, MICHEL

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 9

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	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		4.71	4.43	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	4.71	4.70	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		3.48	3.98	3.97	4.50
3. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2		U	U	_		-	1.50	303/1332	4.50	3.40	3.70	3.71	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
Theory		. D			_									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	9	Non-major	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				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			Fre	equei 2	ncie:	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	٥	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		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		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		4.25	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		4.00	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		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		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		4.47	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		4.32	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		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		4.07	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		4.22	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	****
Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	n									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l 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	В	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	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other					
				2	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 351 0101

STUDIES IN SHAKESPEARE

Title FALCO, RAPHAEL

Instructor:

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 779 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	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	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		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		4.36	822/1564	4.36	4.24	4.28		4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	9		434/1559	4.73	4.17	4.29		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		****/ 948	****	3.87	3.95	4.00	****
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5		U	U	U	4	3.07	7 940		3.07	3.93	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 -	0	0	•	•	0	-	F 00	****	ate ate ate ate	4 20	4 5 4	4 62	****
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		****/ 85	****	4.46	4.47	4.55	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 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		****/ 39	****	4.05	4.47	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	4.08	4.38	4.32	****
1. 10 what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	U	O	O	O	O	_	3.00	, 33		1.00	1.50	1.52	
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

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other		-		_	
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 364 0101

Title PERSP ON WOMEN IN LIT

Instructor: ORGELFINGER, GA

Enrollment: 27 Questionnaires: 22 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 780 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions			NR	NA	Fre	eque:	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rar	_	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
		 Genera	.1																
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	306/1	1649	4.77	4.01	4.28	4.27	4.77
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	336/1	1648	4.68	4.10	4.23	4.18	4.68
3. Did th	e exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	1	0	1	1	4	15	4.57	488/1	1375	4.57	4.25	4.27	4.22	4.57
4. Did ot	her evalı	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	17	4.64	352/1	1595	4.64	4.25	4.20	4.21	4.64
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	oute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	128/1	1533	4.86	4.00	4.04	4.05	4.86
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	225/1	1512	4.71	4.27	4.10	4.11	4.71
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	0	1	2	6	12	4.38	659/1	1623	4.38	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.38
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	21	0	4.00	1544/1	1646	4.00	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.00
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	356/1	1621	4.53	3.97	4.06	4.02	4.53
		Lectur	·e																
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	442/1	1568	4.77	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.77
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1	1572	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	ed and e	xplained clearly	0	0	1	0	3	2	16	4.45	715/1	1564	4.45	4.24	4.28	4.25	4.45
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	487/1	1559	4.68	4.17	4.29	4.23	4.68
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	2	0	1	1	5	13	4.50	303/1	1352	4.50	3.48	3.98	3.97	4.50
	Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learn																		
				_	6 6	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	673/1	1384	4.25	4.09	4.08	4.11	4.25
	Were all students actively encouraged to participat					0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	686/1	1382	4.44	4.34	4.29	4.37	4.44
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion					0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	609/1		4.56	4.47	4.30	4.39	4.56
4. Were s	. Were special techniques successful					3	0	1	2	7	3	3.92	512/	948	3.92	3.87	3.95	4.00	3.92
		Labora	_																
				ground information		0	1	0	0	0	0				****	3.83	4.12	3.89	****
5. Were r	equiremen	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	18	1	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/	555	****	2.30	4.29	4.22	****
		Semina								•							2 62	0 =0	
5. Were c	riteria 1	for grading mad	le clear		20	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	288	****	3.35	3.68	3.58	****
1 5 1 6 1		Field			0.1	0	-	•	0	0	0	1 00		50	als als als als	2 54	4 06	2 50	****
				hat you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/	52	****	3.54	4.06	3.59	****
_	-			uation criteria	21	-	1	-			-		****/	48		3.74	4.09	4.21	****
		ctor available			21	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/	39	****	4.05	4.47	4.43	****
5. Dia co	nierences	s neip you carr	y out I	ield activities	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	312	****	2.70	3.68	3.60	***
		Self																	
	_	-		what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/	53	****	4.20	4.30	4.32	****
3. Were y	our conta	acts with the i	nstruct	or helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	41	****	5.00	4.43	5.00	****
				Frequ	lency	Dist	trib	utio	n										
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	1	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5				Тур	pe			Majors	;
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2					 Red		ed f	or Ma	 aior	 `s	3	Grad	duate	 e	0	 Мајо	 or	16
28-55 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 9												-			-	-) (-	
56-83 2 2.00-2.99 0 C 4					Gei	nera	1				6	Unde	er-gi	rad 2	22	Non-	-major	6	
84-150 6 3.00-3.49 5 D 0													J-				3		
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 7 F 0					Ele	ecti	ves				2	####	# - I	Means t	here a	are not	enou	ŗh	
	P 0									es to k			_						
				I 0		Otl	her					7	-						
				n 1															

3

Course-Section: ENGL 371 0101 University of Maryland
Title CREATIVE WRITING-FICTI Baltimore County

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: GOODMAN, IVY

Enrollment: 13
Ouestionnaires: 12

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 781 FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 1 1 5 5 4.17 1057/1649 4.17 4.01 4.28 4.27 4.17 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 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 12 5.00 1/1646 5.00 4.46 4.69 4.67 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness $1 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 5 \quad 4 \quad 2 \quad 3.73 \quad 1217/1621 \quad 3.73 \quad 3.97 \quad 4.06 \quad 4.02 \quad 3.73 \quad 3.97 \quad 4.06 \quad 4.02 \quad 3.73 \quad 4.06 \quad 4.02 \quad 4.02$ 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 2 0 0 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 2 8 4.80 369/1368 4.80 4.47 4.30 4.39 4.80 4. Were special techniques successful 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 ****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	С	0	General	5	Under-grad	12	Non-major	5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0			_		-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there a	are not enough	
				P	0	ETCCCTVCS		responses to	be sign	nificant	
				I	0	Other	7	-			
					0						

Course-Section: ENGL 373 0101 University of Maryland Title CREATIVE WRITING-POETR Baltimore County

Instructor: PEKARSKE, NICOL

Enrollment: 13
Questionnaires: 5

Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 782 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fr	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	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	****
Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	5

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	 А	2	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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 t	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to b	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other		_			
				?	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
---------	--------	------------	---------------

				Fr	eque	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General														
1. Did you gain new	v 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
	for make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	8	5	4.20	966/1648		4.10	4.23	4.18	4.20
	estions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	733/1375		4.25	4.27	4.22	4.33
-	ations 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
	adings 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 assi	ignments 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 w	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 gr	rade 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 instruc	ctor'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 instruct	or 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
	erial 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	s 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 discus	ssions 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
	as 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
	or 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 ted		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 fo	or 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
	Fred	uency	7 Dis	trib	utio	า									
	ricq	uciic y	DID	CLID	ac101										
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Tv	pe			Majors	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		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	В	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	С	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: ENGL 382 0101 University of Maryland FEATURE WRITING CORBETT, CHRIS

Page 784 Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 19 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Title

Instructor:

								eque					tructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	om this course	0	0	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	830/1649	4.37	4.01	4.28	4.27	4.37
		ctor make clear			0	0	1	1	3	3			1010/1648		4.10	4.23	4.18	4.16
		uestions reflec			0	16	0	0	1	0	2		****/1375		4.25	4.27	4.22	****
	_	uations reflect		_	0	2	0	0	2	2	13		342/1595		4.25	4.20	4.21	4.65
				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 wr	ritten ass	signments contr	ibute t	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 th	ne grading	g system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	3	2	4	4	6	3.42	1424/1623	3.42	3.89	4.16	4.08	3.42
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	1	0	0	0	17	1	4.06	1525/1646	4.06	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.06
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	3	1	1	0	0	2	12	4.60	288/1621	4.60	3.97	4.06	4.02	4.60
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	uctor's lecture	_	prepared	3	0	2	0	2	4	8	4.00	1279/1568	4.00	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.00
		ctor seem inter			3	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1572		4.71	4.70	4.64	5.00
				explained clearly	4	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	702/1564	4.47	4.24	4.28	4.25	4.47
		es contribute t			4	0	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	662/1559	4.53	4.17	4.29	4.23	4.53
				our understanding	4	12	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1352	***	3.48	3.98	3.97	****
		Discus	gion															
1 Did al	agg digg			what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	489/1384	4.45	4.09	4.08	4.11	4.45
				ed to participate	8	0	0	1	0	1			511/1382		4.34	4.29		4.64
		-	_	nd open discussion	8	0	1	0	1	0		4.45	703/1368		4.47	4.30	4.39	4.45
		echniques succe		a open arbeablen	8	8	0	0	0	1	-		****/ 948			3.95		****
		Labora	tory															
2. Were y	ou provid		_	ground information	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 243	****	3.83	4.12	3.89	****
		Q																
1 Wassa		Semina:		announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 88	++++	4.32	4.54	4.63	++++
		for grading mad			17	1	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 288	****	3.35		3.58	****
5. were c	riteria i	for grading mad	e crear	:	Ι/	Τ	U	1	U	U	U	2.00	****/ 288		3.35	3.08	3.58	
5 P. 1	-	Field			1.0	-	•	0	•	-	0	4 00	**** / 210		0 50	2 60	2 60	de de de de
5. Dia co	nierences	s neip you carr	y out i	field activities	17	1	0	0	0	1	U	4.00	****/ 312	****	2.70	3.68	3.60	***
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27		0.00-0.99	0	 A 5		Re	anir	ed f	 or M	aior		0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo		10
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 10		1,6,	datt.	ca I	JI 11	۱۰۲ م	5	J	Gradat	_	J	ria j	<i>-</i>	10
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C 3		Ger	nera	1				4	Under-g	rad 1	.9	Non-	-major	9
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D 0		ری		-				-	onacr -g			14011		,
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		E.I.	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enoue	rh
J_ 44.	<u>~</u>	3.33 1.00	-	P 0								-	respons				_	,
				I 0		∩+1	her				1	.5	TCCCOID	L	.c bigi			
				5 0		001	LLL				1							
				; U														

Course-Section: ENGL 387 0101

Title WEB DESIGN & AUTHORING

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

			Question	5		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
			Genera	_												4 04	4 00		
			w insights,ski tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0 1	3	13 12	4.81	,		4.01	4.28	4.27	4.81
			estions reflec			0 1	11	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	336/1648 1/1375	4.69 5.00	4.10 4.25	4.23	4.18	4.69 5.00
			ations reflect			0	1	0	0	0	3	12		192/1595	4.80	4.25	4.20	4.21	4.80
					what you learned	1	2	2	2	5	1	3		1428/1533	3.08	4.00	4.04	4.05	3.08
					o what you learned	1	2	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	883/1512	4.00	4.27	4.10	4.11	4.00
			system clearl		-	1	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	803/1623	4.27	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.27
			was class canc			1	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	1166/1646	4.53	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.53
9. 1	How wou	ld you g	rade the overa	ll teac	ching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	159/1621	4.77	3.97	4.06	4.02	4.77
			Lectur	_															
			ctor's lecture			3	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	588/1568		4.22	4.43	4.39	4.69
			tor seem inter			3	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	740/1572		4.71	4.70	4.64	4.85
					explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	326/1564		4.24	4.28	4.25	4.77
			s contribute to			3	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	376/1559	4.77	4.17	4.29	4.23	4.77
5. 1	old aud	liovisual	techniques en	nance y	our understanding	4	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	389/1352	4.42	3.48	3.98	3.97	4.42
			Discus	sion															
1. 1	Did cla	ss discu	ssions contrib	ute 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
					ed to participate	8	0	1	0	1	0		4.25	831/1382	4.25	4.34	4.29	4.37	4.25
					nd open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	3		4.38	771/1368	4.38	4.47			4.38
4. 1	Were sp	ecial te	chniques succe	ssful		7	3	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	310/ 948	4.33	3.87	3.95	4.00	4.33
			Labora	-															
5. 1	Were re	quiremen	ts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	12	0	3	1	0	0	0	1.25	552/ 555	1.25	2.30	4.29	4.22	1.25
г ,	·Taa		Semina: or grading made			14	1	1	0	0	0	0	1 00	****/ 288	****	2 25	3.68	2 50	++++
5. 1	were cr	iteria i	or grading made	e clear		14	1	1	U	U	U	U	1.00	****/ 288		3.35	3.08	3.58	
5 1	oid con	ferences	Field I		ield activities	15	0	Λ	1	0	Ω	0	2 00	****/ 312	****	2.70	3.68	3.60	***
J. 1	J14 COI	ir er eneeb	ncip you carr	y out 1			Ü		_	Ü	Ü	O	2.00	/ 512		2.70	3.00	3.00	
					Frequ	lency	r Dist	trib	ation	1									
Cred	dits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	
00-	-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 11		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	2	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	11
	-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 3														
	-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1		Ger	nera:	l				7	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non-	major	5	
	-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0														,	
Gra	ad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1				_	n
					P 0 I 0		O+1	ner					6	respons	es to £	e sign	ıırıcan	IL.	
					5 0 T 0		OCI	ıet.					U						
					; U														

Course-Section: ENGL 391 0101 University of Maryland Title ADV EXPOS & ARGUMENT

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Frequencies

Instructor

Page 786

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Instructor: MCGURRIN JR, AN Enrollment: 23

Questionnaires: 12 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	om 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	e instruc	tor make clear	the ex	pected 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	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1375	3.50	4.25	4.27	4.22	****
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	3	1	3	5	3.83	1242/1595	3.91	4.25	4.20	4.21	3.83
5. Did as	signed re	adings contrib	ute 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 wr	itten ass	ignments contr	ibute t	o 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	e grading	system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	1	2	1	4	4	3.67	1318/1623	3.76	3.89	4.16	4.08	3.67
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	11	1	4.08	1513/1646	4.46	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.08
9. How wo	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teac	ching effectiveness	0	1	1	0	5	3	2	3.45	1375/1621	3.62	3.97	4.06	4.02	3.45
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lecture	prepared	1	0	1	1	4	2	3	3.45	1470/1568	3.82	4.22	4.43	4.39	3.45	
		n the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	985/1572	4.70	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.73		
		explained clearly	1	0	1	0	5	3	2	3.45	1407/1564	3.76	4.24	4.28	4.25	3.45		
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						1	0	4	4	2	3.55	1359/1559	3.61	4.17	4.29	4.23	3.55
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu			what you learned	4	0	0	2	1	3	2	3.63	1029/1384	3.71	4.09	4.08	4.11	3.63
				ed to participate	4	0	1	0	3	1	3		1165/1382	4.21	4.34	4.29	4.37	3.63
				nd open discussion	4	0	1	0	2	0	5		948/1368	4.45	4.47	4.30	4.39	4.00
		chniques succe			4	7	0	0	1	0	0			3.42	3.87	3.95	4.00	****
		Labora	torv															
5. Were r	equiremen		-	early specified	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 555	****	2.30	4.29	4.22	****
				Freq	iencs	z Dis	trib	utio	n									
				_														
Credits E	arned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	.s			Ту <u>г</u>	e 			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajors	5	0	Graduate	2	0	Majo	r	6
28-55	0	в 7																
56-83	2	C 0		Ge	nera	1				2	Under-gr	rad 1	.2	Non-	major	6		
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		El	ecti	ves				1	#### - N	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0									response	es to k	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her					9						

Course-Section: ENGL 391 0201 University of Maryland Title ADV EXPOS & ARGUMENT

Baltimore County

Instructor: FITZPATRICK, CA

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 20

FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029 Fall 2008

Page 787

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

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General					_	_	_							
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	4	3	5	7		1436/1649	3.63	4.01		4.27	3.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	0	3	6	8		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		****/1375	3.50	4.25	4.27	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	3	5	10		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														
	_	0	1	1	4	_	_	2 02	001/1204	2 71	4 00	4 00	4 11	2 02
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	Ţ	4	6	1 -	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	Ţ	Τ	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	****
									, ===					

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP	A	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	 6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17	-			
				2	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 391 0301

University of Maryland ADV EXPOS & ARGUMENT Baltimore County

Title Instructor: BURNS, MARGIE

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 17

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 788 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

		Ouestions	5		NR	NA		equei 2	ncies 3	3	5		ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
		General																
		w insights,skil			0	0	1	2	3	6	5		1402/1649		4.01		4.27	3.71
		ctor make clear	_	_	0	0	0	0	6	6	5		1187/1648		4.10	4.23	4.18	3.94
	_	estions reflect	_	_	0	1	2	2	5	4	3		1281/1375		4.25	4.27		3.25
		ations reflect			0	0	1	1	3	6			1213/1595			4.20		3.88
		adings contribu			0	-	0	1	7	3			996/1533		4.00			3.82
		-		what you learned	0	0	1	1 1	3 4	4 5			711/1512		4.27	4.10 4.16	4.11	
		g system clearly was class cance	_	lea	0	0	0	0	0				1228/1623 897/1646		3.89 4.46	4.16	4.08 4.67	3.82
	_			ng effectiveness	1	0	0	2	3	8			1192/1621				4.07	
9. HOW WOL	uia you g	grade the overal	ii teaciii	ing effectiveness	1	U	U	۷	3	0	3	3.75	1192/1621	3.02	3.97	4.00	4.02	3.75
		Lecture	2															
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lectures	s well pr	epared	0	0	0	0	1	9	7	4.35	1031/1568	3.82	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.35
2. Did the	e instruc	tor seem intere	ested 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 led	cture mat	erial presented	d and exp	lained 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	e lecture	es contribute to	what yo	u learned	0	1	1	0	5	6	4	3.75	1277/1559	3.61	4.17	4.29	4.23	3.75
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enh	nance you	r understanding	0	10	3	2	1	1	0	2.00	1335/1352	2.59	3.48	3.98	3.97	2.00
		Discuss							_	_								
		ssions contribu		_	1	0	1	2	5	6	2		1137/1384			4.08	4.11	3.38
		nts actively end			1		1	1	3	5			1042/1382		4.34	4.29	4.37	3.88
				open discussion	1	0	0	1	4	3		4.13	910/1368		4.47	4.30	4.39	
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succes	ssiul		2	10	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	811/ 948	3.42	3.87	3.95	4.00	3.20
		Laborat	orv															
5. Were re	equiremen	nts for lab repo	-	rly specified	14	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	****	2.30	4.29	4.22	****
	-	-		• •														
		Seminar	-															
5. Were c	riteria f	for grading made	e clear		11	2	1	2	0	1	0	2.25	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.58	****
E 544		Field W		1.4	1 -	0	1	1	0	^	0	1 50	**** / 210		0 70	2 60	2 60	
5. Dia coi	nierences	s help you carry	out ile	and activities	15	0	1	1	0	0	U	1.50	****/ 312	* * * * *	2.70	3.68	3.60	* * * * *
				Frequ	iency	/ Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits Ea	arned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	; 			Ту]	pe 			Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	A 8		Red	auire	ed fo	or Ma	ior	s	1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 7						J	-		5_ 5.5.5.00	-	-) 0		•
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Ger	nera	l				1	Under-g	rad 1	7	Non-	major	10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0									3				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	her				1	3						
				? 0														

Course-Section: ENGL 391 0401 University of Maryland Title ADV EXPOS & ARGUMENT

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 20

Page 789 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

- ·				
Ctudont	('Ollivea	Evaluation	Ollection	naira

		Ouestion	S		NR	NA	Fre	-	ncies 3	5 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	_															
		ew insights,ski			0	0	0	1	5	9			1272/1649		4.01	4.28	4.27	3.90
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	7	8	4		1347/1648		4.10	4.23	4.18	3.75
		uestions reflec			0	12	0	1	3	1	3		1112/1375		4.25	4.27	4.22	3.75
		ations reflect			1	1	0	2	3	8	5		1213/1595		4.25	4.20	4.21	3.89
				what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	8	5		1065/1533		4.00	4.04	4.05	3.75
		_		o what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	7			687/1512		4.27	4.10		4.25
		g system clearl		ined	0	0	0	1	5	9			1180/1623		3.89	4.16	4.08	3.90
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	2	14			1506/1646		4.46	4.69		4.10
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll tead	hing effectiveness	4	1	0	0	6	7	2	3.73	1209/1621	3.62	3.97	4.06	4.02	3.73
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instru	actor's lecture	s 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	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	n 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 le	cture mat	erial presente	d and e	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	e lecture	es contribute t	o 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 au	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand						1	2	3	4	1	3.18	1183/1352	2.59	3.48	3.98	3.97	3.18
1 Did al-	ann dina	Discus		what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	795/1384	2 71	4.09	4.08	1 11	4.00
				ed to participate	14	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	483/1382		4.34	4.29	4.37	4.67
		_	_	d open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	337/1368		4.47	4.30	4.39	4.83
		echniques succe		d open discussion	14	3	0	1	0	1	1		****/ 948		3.87	3.95	4.00	****
4. Wele s	peciai te	sciniiques succe	ssiui		7.4	3	U	_	U	1	_	3.07	7 940	3.42	3.07	3.93	4.00	
		Semina	r															
5. Were c	riteria f	for grading mad	e clear	•	17	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.58	****
		Field	Work															
5. Did co	nferences	s help you carr	y out f	ield activities	18	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 312	****	2.70	3.68	3.60	****
				Frequ	iency	, Dist	tribu	utio	n									
Credits E	arned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	quire	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 5														
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C 6		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	20	Non-	-major	10
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	oe sign	nificar	nt	
				I 0		Oth	her				1	7	_					
				? 1														

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0101 University of Maryland Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K

Enrollment: 3 Questionnaires: 3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 790

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	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

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-	_		
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0301 University of Maryland TUTORIAL IN WRITING Baltimore County BENSON, LINDA K Instructor:

Title

Enrollment:

3

Page 791 FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 3	Student Course Evaluation Q	Questionnaire
-------------------	-----------------------------	---------------

		Questions	3		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
4. Did other 6. Did writt 7. Was the g 8. How many	nstructor r evaluat: ten assign grading sy times was	r make clear ions reflect nments contri ystem clearly s class cance	lls from the expe the expe ibute to y explain	cted goals cted goals what you learne	0	0 0 2 0 1 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	2 0 0 0 0 0	0 1 0 0 0 0	1 2 1 3 2 3	3.67 4.67 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 4.33	1429/1649 362/1648 1/1595 1/1512 1/1623 1/1646 595/1621	3.98 3.77 4.52 4.58 3.75 4.92 4.14	4.01 4.10 4.25 4.27 3.89 4.46 3.97	4.28 4.23 4.20 4.10 4.16 4.69 4.06	4.27 4.18 4.21 4.11 4.08 4.67 4.02	3.67 4.67 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 4.33
3. Was lectu 4. Did the l 1. Did class 2. Were all 3. Did the i 4. Were spec	nstructor are mater: ectures of s discuss: students .nstructor vial techn	r seem interedial presented contribute to Discussions contribute actively ender encourage faigues successions Laborat	s well prested in d and expowhat your sion ute to who couraged fair and ssful tory	the subject lained clearly	1 1 1 1 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	2 2 3 2 3 1	5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 4.67 5.00 5.00	1/1368 1/ 948	4.57 4.38 4.83 4.81 4.17	4.09 4.34 4.47 3.87	4.08 4.29 4.30 3.95		5.00 5.00 5.00 4.67 5.00 5.00
5. Did confe	erences he	Field Welp you carry		ld activities	2		1	0	0	0	0	1.00	308/ 312	2.00	2.70	3.68	3.60	1.00
Credits Earn	ned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grade	equency	, Dis	trib			2			Туј	ne			Majors	
00-27 28-55 56-83	0 0 0 1 1 0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00	0 0 0 2 0	A 0 B 2 C 0 D 0 F 0 P 0 I 0 ? 0		Reasons Required for Majors 0 General 0 Electives 0 Other 2						0	Graduato Under-g: #### - I	rad Means t		Majo Non- are not	major enoug	3

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0401

TUTORIAL IN WRITING

Title TUTORIAL IN WR Instructor: MABE, MITZI J

Enrollment: 4
Questionnaires: 2

Fall 2008

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Page 792

Control Course Transactor & Control Course Transactor Course Trans														
			Fre	eque	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	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/ 24	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/ 8	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 1.00 50/ 52 1.00 3.54 4.06 3.59 1.00

Self Paced

bell lacea														
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

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0501 University of Maryland Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING Baltimore County Instructor: MABE, MITZI J Fall 2008

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2008

Page 793 FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	3	
Questionnaires:	3	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Ouestions	3		NR	NA	Fr 1	_	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General	-															
		ew insights,skil			0	0	1	0	0	2	0		1603/1649		4.01		4.27	3.00
		ctor make clear	-		0	0	1	0	2	0	0		1642/1648		4.10	4.23	4.18	2.33
		uations reflect	-		0	0	1	0	0	2	0		1537/1595		4.25	4.20	4.21	3.00
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2		595/1512		4.27	4.10	4.11	4.33
		g system clearly		ined	0	0	1	0	1	1	0		1591/1623		3.89	4.16	4.08	2.67
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1646		4.46	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overal	.1 teach	ning effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1261/1621	4.14	3.97	4.06	4.02	3.67
		Lecture																
		uctor's lectures			1	0	0	0	0	2			1279/1568			4.43		4.00
		ctor seem intere		_	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1572		4.71	4.70	4.64	5.00
				plained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	_	4.50	,			4.28		4.50
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute to	what y	ou learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	695/1559	4.57	4.17	4.29	4.23	4.50
		Discuss																
				what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	0		1346/1384		4.09	4.08	4.11	
				d to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1382		4.34	4.29	4.37	5.00
				d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1		4.50	,		4.47	4.30	4.39	4.50
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succes	sful		1	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	936/ 948	4.17	3.87	3.95	4.00	2.00
		Laborat	-															
5. Were r	equiremen	nts for lab repo	rts cle	early 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 c	riteria 1	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 W	Jork															
5. Did co	nferences	s help you carry	out f	leld activities	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	291/ 312	2.00	2.70	3.68	3.60	2.00
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	l		
		Cum. GPA																
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	O	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2		_						•	1	,	_			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0								0			,			,
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		EΊ	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1					n
				Р 0 т 0		0.1	h					2	respons	es to b	e sign	ııııcar	1T	
						Ot	her					3						
				? 0														

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0601

TUTORIAL IN WRITING

Title 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

				_	ncie	s			tructor		Dept		Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	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		63/ 81		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
Exam	0000	. Dia	+ m i b											

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

Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0701 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING Instructor: FALLON, MICHAEL Fall 2008 Enrollment: 3

Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland Page 795 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

		Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	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

Credits Earned Cum. GPA		1	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	3	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0801 University of Maryland
Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING Baltimore County
Instructor: FALLON, MICHAEL Fall 2008

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 3

3

3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion

			Fre	equei	ncies		_		ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	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	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		2	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	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	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	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	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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 796 FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

1/1368 4.81 4.47 4.30 4.39 5.00

Frequency Distribution

0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	Ĺ
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3	_			
				2	Λ						

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0901 University of Maryland Page 797 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: FALLON, MICHAEL

Enrollment:	3				
Questionnaires:	3	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

		Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	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		1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 948	4.17	3.87	3.95	4.00	5.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55 56-83	0 0	1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99	0 0	B C	0 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 P	0	Electives	0	#### - Means responses to		are not enough mificant	
				I	0	Other	3				
				I ?	0 1	Other	3				

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

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

Ouestions				NTD	3.7.7		_	10165		_	TIID	D1-		. Debr		телет	Maara	
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
			,															
1 543		Genera			1	0	1	0	0	7	4	2 02	1054/1640	2 50	4 01	4 00	4 07	2 02
_	-	w insights,ski			1	-	1 0	0	2	7 5			1254/1649	3.58		4.28	4.27	3.93
		tor make clear			1	0		1	3				1124/1648	3.77	4.10	4.23	4.18	4.00
		estions reflec			1	1	0	0	4	6			1017/1375	4.10			4.22	
		ations reflect			1	0	0	0	1	5			497/1595				4.21	
	-	-		what you learned	1	1	1	1	1	5							4.05	
				o what you learned	1	0	1	0	0				380/1512				4.11	
		system clearly		ined	1	0	0	0	3	6			936/1623			4.16		4.14
	-	was class canc			1	0	0	0	0	9			1325/1646				4.67	
9. How wo	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	5	0	1	0	2	5	2	3.70	1234/1621	3.57	3.97	4.06	4.02	3.70
		Lectur	<u> </u>															
1 Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture		nrenared	3	0	0	1	2	7	2	3 83	1373/1568	3.99	4.22	4.43	4.39	3.83
		tor seem inter			3	0	0	0	1	1			931/1572				4.64	
				xplained clearly	3	0	0	0	4	5			1209/1564				4.25	
		s contribute t			2	0	1	0	2	4			1088/1559					
				-	4	3	0	0	1	5			616/1352					
5. Did au	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding						U	U	1	5	2	4.13	010/1352	3.02	3.48	3.98	3.97	4.13
	Discussion																	
1. Did cl	1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned							0	1	1	5	4.57	394/1384	3.74	4.09	4.08	4.11	4.57
				d to participate	8	0	0	0	0	3			562/1382				4.37	4.57
				d open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2			472/1368	4.13			4.39	
		chniques succe		a open arbeabbion	8	4	0	1	0	1			****/ 948				4.00	
I. Were b	pecial ce	cinitqueb bucce	DDIGI		O	•	O	_	O	-	_	3.07	, , ,	3.07	3.07	3.75	1.00	
		Labora	tory															
5. Were r	equiremen	ts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	9	0	3	2	1	0	0	1.67	539/ 555	2.47	2.30	4.29	4.22	1.67
		Semina																
5. Were c	riteria f	or grading mad	e clear		12	1	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 288	2.44	3.35	3.68	3.58	****
		Field																
5. Did co	nferences	help you carr	y out f	ield activities	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	2.99	2.70	3.68	3.60	****
	1	Self			1.4	0	-	0	0	0	•	1 00	/ 110	als als als als	F 00	2 00	4 05	als als als als
5. were t	nere enoug	gh proctors for	r all t.	ne students	14	0	1	0	0	0	U	1.00	****/ 110	* * * * *	5.00	3.99	4.05	^ ^ ^ ^
				Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ation	ı									
				_	-													
Credits E	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors				
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 6					Rec	uire	ed fo	or Ma	iors	 3	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	2
	28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 5					2.00				٠ ـ ـ ـ ر	-	-		-	-) (_
56-83 2 2.00-2.99 3 C 1					Ger	neral	l				0	Under-q	rad 1	.5	Non-	major	13	
84-150 3 3.00-3.49 2 D 0					001						-			-		, 0 =		
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0					Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - I	Means t	here a	re not	enoua	h	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0											-	response						
I O					Oth	ner				1	2	T CDPOID	L	o bigi	LLLCAI			
_ *				5 0		061					_	_						
				; U														

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0201 University of Maryland Title TECHNICAL WRITING

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: SIMS, DIANA Enrollment:

24 Questionnaires: 13

Page 799 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Cou	rse Evaluat	ion Question	naire
-------------	-------------	--------------	-------

1. Did you gain new insights from this course			Questions	3		NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	e Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 8. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 9. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 9. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 9. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 9. Did assigned reading system clearly explained reading system clearly explained clearly and reading system clearly explained reading system clearly explained clearly and reading system clearly explained clearly and reading system clearly explained clear																			
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 0 0 4 1 5 1 2.17 317/1375 4.10 4.25 4.27 4.22 2.17 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 4 1 5 1 2.17 317/1375 4.10 4.25 4.20 4.21 2.69 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 4 1 5 1 2.69 1574/1595 4.03 4.25 4.20 4.21 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 6.69 150 150 150 150 150 150 150 150 150 150			0 0	=															
3. bid the exam questions reflect the expected goals 2 5 3 1 0 1 2.17 1371/1375 4.10 4.25 4.27 4.22 2.17 4. bid other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 4 1 4 3 1 2.69 1257/1595 3.03 4.25 4.20 2.21 5. bid 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 5. bid assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 6 1 3 2 2.99 1487/1533 3.66 4.00 4.04 4.05 2.92 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 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 1 1.73 1616/1621 3.57 3.97 4.06 4.02 1.73 Lecture Lec																			
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 4 1 5 4 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 5 1 2 2.69 1497/1533 3.66 4.00 4.0 4 0.0 2.69 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 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 0 8 3 0 0 2 1.85 1681/1623 3.76 3.89 4.10 4.08 1517/1646 4.26 4.64 4.69 4.07 4.08 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 6 3 1 1 0 0 1.73 1616/1621 3.57 3.97 4.06 4.02 1.73 1616/1621 3.57 3.97 4.06 4.02 1.73 1616/1621 3.57 3.97 4.06 4.02 1.73 1616/1621 3.57 3.97 4.06 4.07 4.08 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 6 3 1 1 0 0 1.73 1616/1621 3.57 3.97 4.06 4.02 1.73 1616/1621 3.57 3.97 4.06 4.07 4.08 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 6 3 1 1 0 0 1.73 1616/1621 3.57 3.97 4.06 4.02 1.73 1616/1621 3.57 3.97 4.06 4.07 4.08 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 6 3 1 1 0 0 1.73 1616/1621 3.57 3.97 4.06 4.02 1.73 1616/1621 3.57 3.97 4.06 4.07 4.08 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 6 3 1 1 0 0 1.73 1616/1621 3.57 3.97 4.06 4.02 1.73 1616/1621 3.57 3.97 4.06 4.07 4.08 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 6 3 1 0 0 0 1 0 1.55 151564 3.99 4.22 4.43 4.39 2.60 1.05 1.05 1.05 1.05 1.05 1.05 1.05 1.0					_			_	-		_	_							
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 4 1 5 1 2 2.69 1497/1533 3.66 4.00 4.04 4.05 2.69 6. Did written assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 6 1 5 1 2 2.69 1497/1513 3.66 4.00 4.04 4.05 2.69 7.00 2.00 0 0 1 6 1 0 1 6 1 1 2.92 1452/1512 4.11 4.27 4.10 4.11 2.92 7.00 8.00 8.00 0 0 0 0 0 12 1 4.08 1517/1646 4.06 4.67 4.08 9.00 8.00 0 0 0 0 0 12 1 4.08 1517/1646 4.06 4.69 4.67 4.08 9.00 0 0 0 0 0 12 1 4.08 1517/1646 4.06 4.69 4.67 4.08 9.00 0 0 0 0 0 12 1 4.08 1517/1646 4.06 4.09 4.07 4.08 9.00 0 0 0 0 0 1 1.07 1616/1621 3.57 3.97 4.06 4.02 1.73 1.00 0.00 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0																			
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 2 1.85 1618/1622 3.76 3.89 4.16 4.08 1.85 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 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 6.6 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 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** 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 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 **Eminar** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear** 12 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0.00 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0							-	_	_	_	-	Τ							
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 8 3 0 0 1 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 1 2 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 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 2.01 dthe 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 3.00 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 4.01 dthe lectures contribute to what you learned 3 0 4 3 0 1 2 2.40 1534/1595 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 2.00 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 0 2 0 2 5 4 23 3.67 1297/1386 4.13 4.77 4.30 4.39 3.67 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.0							-	_	_		_	2							
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How many times was class cancelled 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 4.69 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 Lacture 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 1335/1344 3.74 4.09 4.08 4.11 2.67 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 2 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 0 1 0 2 4 2 3.67 1129/1368 4.13 4.47 4.30 4.39 3.67 4. 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 Major On-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3 8 Required for Majors On-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 B 8 8 6-83 3 2.00-2.99 2 C 1 General 0 Under-grad 13 Non-major 13 84-150 3 3.00-3.49 3 D 0 84-1							-	_	-	_	_	2							
How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2					ined	-	•	_	-	•	•	2							
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						-	-	-	-	-									
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2. Did the lectures material presented and explained clearly 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8. Did audiovisual techniques contribute to what you learned 8. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8. Were special techniques successful 8. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 8. Were criteria for grading made clear 8. Were criteria for grading made clear 8. Were criteria for grading made clear 8. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 8. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 8. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 8. Required for Majors 8. Required for Majors 8. Required for Majors 9. Credits Earned 9. Cum. GPA Expected Grades 9. Required for Majors 9. Required for Majors 9. Credits Earned 1. Double Policy Pol	9. How wor	ıld you gi	rade the overa.	II teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	6	3	Т	1	0	1.73	1616/162	L 3.57	3.97	4.06	4.02	1.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 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 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7 3 0 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 2 0 0 2 0 0 1.57 1349/1352 3.62 3.48 3.98 3.97 1.57 Discussion 3 0 4 3 0 1 2 2.40 1534/1559 3.78 4.17 4.29 4.23 2.40 5. 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 4.74 4.30 4.39 3.67 4. Were special techniques successful 4 4 3 1 1 0 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 OD-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3 3 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 2.50 2.50 2.50 2.50 2.50 2.50 2.50 2.																			
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 4.01 dthe 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 5.01 daudiovisual 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 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.0							-	-			-	2		,					
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 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 0 1 0 2 4 2 3.67 1129/1368 4.13 4.47 4.30 4.39 3.67 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 O0-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 B 8 8					_		-					5							
Discussion Dis			_		-							_							
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 3.87 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 0 B 8 8 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 2 C 1 General 0 Under-grad 13 Non-major 13 84-150 3 3.00-3.49 3 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant											_	_							
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 0 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 O 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 8 8 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 2 C 1 General 0 Under-grad 13 Non-major 13 84-150 3 3.00-3.49 3 D 0 Gradu. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques en	nance y	our understanding	3	3	5	0	2	0	0	1.57	1349/135	2 3.62	3.48	3.98	3.97	1.57
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 4.00 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 0 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 8 8 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 8 8 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 2 C 1			Discus	sion															
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 4.00 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 0 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 8 8 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 8 8 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 2 C 1	1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ite to	what vou learned	4	0	3	2	1	1	2	2.67	1335/138	1 3.74	4.09	4.08	4.11	2.67
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 O 27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 8 8 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 2 C 1 General 0 Under-grad 13 Non-major 13 84-150 3 3.00-3.49 3 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant						4	0	0		0	2	5	4.11	917/138	2 3.99	4.34	4.29	4.37	4.11
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 0 A 3 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 8 8 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 2 C 1 General 0 Under-grad 13 Non-major 13 84-150 3 3.00-3.49 3 D 0 Graduate 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant							0	1	0	2	4	2	3.67					4.39	3.67
Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 12 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 555 2.47 2.30 4.29 4.22 **** 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 0 A 3 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 8 8 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 2 C 1 General 0 Under-grad 13 Non-major 13 84-150 3 3.00-3.49 3 D 0 Graduate 0 William Non-major 13 84-150 3 3.00-3.49 3 D 0 Graduate 0 William Non-major 13 84-150 3 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives Description Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant							4	3	1	1	0	0				3.87	3.95	4.00	1.60
Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 12 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 555 2.47 2.30 4.29 4.22 **** 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 0 A 3 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 8 8 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 2 C 1 General 0 Under-grad 13 Non-major 13 84-150 3 3.00-3.49 3 D 0 Graduate 0 William Non-major 13 84-150 3 3.00-3.49 3 D 0 Graduate 0 William Non-major 13 84-150 3 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives Description Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			Labora	corv															
Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities Trequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 Major 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 Major 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 Ma	5. Were re	equiremen			early specified	10	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 55	2.47	2.30	4.29	4.22	****
Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities Trequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 Major 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 Major 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 Ma			Semina	r															
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 0 A 3 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 8 8 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 2 C 1 General 0 Under-grad 13 Non-major 13 84-150 3 3.00-3.49 3 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	5. Were c	riteria fo				12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	3 2.44	3.35	3.68	3.58	****
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 0 A 3 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 8 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 2 C 1 General 0 Under-grad 13 Non-major 13 84-150 3 3.00-3.49 3 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	J	1100110 1					Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	Ü	1.00	, 20		3.33	3.00	3.33	
Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 8 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 2 C 1 General 0 Under-grad 13 Non-major 13 84-150 3 3.00-3.49 3 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	E Did gov	forongog			iold pativition	7	2	2	0	0	2	0	2 50	270 / 21		2 70	2 60	2 60	2 50
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 8 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 2 C 1 General 0 Under-grad 13 Non-major 13 84-150 3 3.00-3.49 3 D 0 Type William William 14 Major 0 Major 0 0 Major 0 0 0 Major 0 <	5. Dia coi	irerences	neip you carry	y out I	ieid activities	,	2	4	U	U	4	U	2.50	2/9/ 31	2.99	2.70	3.00	3.00	2.50
00-27					Frequ	iency	Dist	cribu	ution	n									
28-55	Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			T	ype			Majors	;
28-55	00-27		0 00-0 99		Д 2		Dec	 miir			ior	 2		Gradua					0
56-83 3 2.00-2.99 2 C 1 General 0 Under-grad 13 Non-major 13 84-150 3 3.00-3.49 3 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 ### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		-		-			rec	1u T f	EU I	⊃⊥ I ^ν Ic	1 J O L S	5	U	Gradua		U	Ma JC) <u> </u>	U
84-150 3 3.00-3.49 3 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant				-			Cer	nera	1				0	IInder-	rad .	13	Non-	maior	13
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant							GCI	.c. a.	-				0	OHACL -	₅ _ aa .		14011		10
P 0 responses to be significant					- *		E] e	activ	zes				0	#### -	Means	there a	re not	enone	rh
	0144.	Ü	2.30 1.00					,==											
I 0 Other 11					I O		Oth	ner				1	1					-	
? 0					? 0														

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2008

Page 800

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 20 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0301

TECHNICAL WRITING

HARRIS, LINDA R

Title

Instructor:

		Questions	5		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	cies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	ı gain new	insights,ski	lls fro	m 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	e instruct	or make clear	the ex	pected 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	e exam que	estions reflect	t the e	xpected goals	0	15	0	2	0	0	3	3.80	1087/1375	4.10	4.25	4.27	4.22	3.80
		tions reflect			1	0	4	1	4	5	5	3.32	1478/1595	4.03	4.25	4.20	4.21	3.32
				what you learned	0	11	2	0	2	1	4	3.56	1214/1533	3.66	4.00	4.04	4.05	3.56
				o what you learned	1	0	3	1	5	4	6	3.47	1282/1512	4.11	4.27	4.10	4.11	3.47
		system clearly		ined	0	1	3	2	9	0			1523/1623		3.89	4.16	4.08	3.11
	-	as class cance			1	0	2	1	6	6			1632/1646		4.46	4.69	4.67	3.47
9. How wou	ıld you gr	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	5	1	2	3	6	2	1	2.79	1557/1621	3.57	3.97	4.06	4.02	2.79
		Lecture	е															
1. Were th	ne instruc	ctor's lectures	s well	prepared	2	0	0	2	3	6	7	4.00	1279/1568	3.99	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.00
		or seem inter			2	0	0	1	4	6	7	4.06	1456/1572		4.71	4.70	4.64	4.06
				xplained clearly	2	0	0	0	7	4	7		1127/1564	3.96	4.24	4.28	4.25	4.00
		contribute to			1	0	3	4	5	2			1468/1559		4.17	4.29	4.23	3.11
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enl	nance y	our understanding	1	3	1	3	6	1	5	3.38	1113/1352	3.62	3.48	3.98	3.97	3.38
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discus	sions contrib	ute 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 al	ll student	s actively end	courage	d to participate	13	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	812/1382	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.37	4.29
				d 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 sp	pecial ted	chniques succes	ssful		13	2	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	578/ 948	3.67	3.87	3.95	4.00	3.80
		Labora	tory															
1. Did the	e lab incr	ease understar	nding c	f the material	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were yo	ou provide	ed with adequat	te back	ground information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	3.83	4.12	3.89	****
3. Were ne	ecessary n	naterials avai:	lable f	or lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.21	****
4. Did the	e lab inst	ructor provide	e assis	tance	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.12	****
5. Were re	equirement	s for lab repo	orts cl	early specified	18	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 555	2.47	2.30	4.29	4.22	****
		Semina	r															
5. Were cr	riteria fo	or grading made			17	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	2.44	3.35	3.68	3.58	****
		Field V	work.															
5. Did cor	nferences			ield activities	17	0	1	2	0	0	0	1.67	****/ 312	2.99	2.70	3.68	3.60	****
				Frequ	ency	. Diet	trih	ıtior	1									
				11040	cricy	DIS	CIID	20101										
Credits Ea	arned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons	; 			Ту]	pe 			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 15		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors		2	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	1
28-55 56-93	0 3	1.00-1.99	0 1	B 2 C 0		Con	nera:	1				0	IIndon	rad 2	Λ	Nor	maiar	19
56-83 84-150	8	2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	3	D 0		Ger	nera.	L				U	Under-g	rau 2	U	MOI1-	major	13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				1	#### - 1				_	ŗh
				P 0							_	2	respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				3 0 I 0		Oth	her				1	3						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2008

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0401 Title TECHNICAL WRITING HARRIS, LINDA R Instructor:

Enrollment: 24 Ouestionnaires: 13

I	age	801
FEB	11,	2009
Job	IRBI	R3029

			F	requ	enci	es			Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	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	5	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	5	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	Į.	3	4	3.62	1365/1595	4.03	4.25	4.20	4.21	3.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learne	0 b	6	1	1	2	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 lear	ned 0	1	0	2	1	L .	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	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	Į.	5	0	2.92	1646/1646	4.26	4.46	4.69	4.67	2.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiven	ess 1	1	2	2	4	1	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	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	1	7	4.08	1453/1572	4.42	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.08
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	y 0	0	1	1	5	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	3	4	2	3.08	1471/1559	3.78	4.17	4.29	4.23	3.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi	ng 0	3	0	2	0)	3	5	4.10	633/1352	3.62	3.48	3.98	3.97	4.10

2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 1 1 2.50 1363/1382 3.99 4.34 4.29 4.37 2.50 0 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 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 948 3.67 3.87 3.95 4.00 ****

0

Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified

Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned

11 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 555 2.47 2.30 4.29 4.22 ****

0 1 1 2.75 1322/1384 3.74 4.09 4.08 4.11 2.75

Frequency Distribution

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	1	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	12	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	С	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be sid	nificant	
				I	0	Other	8	-			
				2	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Questions		NR	NA		eque 2	ncie 3		5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General															
1. Did you	ı gain ne		s from this course	0	0	1	1	2	6	11	4.19	1027/1649	3.58	4.01	4.28	4.27	4.19
		ctor make clear th		0	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	216/1648	3.77	4.10	4.23	4.18	4.81
3. Did the	e exam qu	uestions reflect t	the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	296/1375	4.10	4.25	4.27	4.22	4.75
		ations reflect th		0	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	227/1595	4.03	4.25	4.20	4.21	4.76
			e 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
		_	ate to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	12		380/1512	4.11	4.27	4.10	4.11	4.50
		g system clearly e	-	1	0	0	0	1	4	15		284/1623	3.76	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.70
	-	was class cancell		1	0	0	0	0	14	6		1364/1646		4.46	4.69	4.67	
9. How wou	ıld you g	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 th	ne instru	actor's lectures w	well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	554/1568	3.99	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.71
			ted in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	591/1572	4.42	4.71	4.70	4.64	4.90
			and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2			263/1564		4.24	4.28	4.25	4.81
		es contribute to v		0	0	0	0	1	6		4.62	,	3.78	4.17	4.29		4.62
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques enhar	nce your understanding	0	2	1	0	3	8	7	4.05	661/1352	3.62	3.48	3.98	3.97	4.05
		Discussio	on														
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contribute	e 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 al	ll studer	nts actively encou	raged 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	e instruc	ctor encourage fai	ir 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 sp	pecial te	echniques successf	Eul	12	2	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	179/ 948	3.67	3.87	3.95	4.00	4.57
		Laborato	CY														
5. Were re	equiremer	nts for lab report	s clearly specified	19	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	2.47	2.30	4.29	4.22	****
		Seminar															
5. Were cr	riteria f	for grading made of	clear	18	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 288	2.44	3.35	3.68	3.58	****
		Field Wor	rk														
5. Did cor	nferences		out field activities	17	0	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	****/ 312	2.99	2.70	3.68	3.60	****
			Frequ	iency	7 Dis	trib	utio	n									
			_	-													
Credits Ea	arned 	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	ason	.s 			Ту:	pe 			Majors	
00-27	0		A 12		Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	0) B 2														
56-83	0		2 C 1		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	21	Non-	-major	21
84-150	11		5 D 0								_						_
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5 F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	h
			P 0		0.	1				-	_	respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
			I 0		Ut	her				1	-6						
			? 1														

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0501

Title TECHNICAL WRITING

Instructor: ROCKETT, DANIKA
Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 21

Page 802 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029 University of Maryland Page 803
Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009
Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	equer	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA		2		4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1 Did voi	ı gəin ne	General w insights,skil		this course	0	0	4	3	1	6	4	2 17	1580/1649	3 50	4.01	4.28	4.27	3.17
_	_	w insignes,ski tor make clear			0	0	1	3	6	4			1532/1648		4.10		4.18	3.39
		estions reflect				14	0	0	0	2			****/1375		4.25		4.22	****
		ations reflect			0	0	1	1	2	6			1038/1595			4.20		
				at you learned	0	6	2	2	1	4			1338/1533		4.00	4.04		3.33
				what you learned		0	1	1	2	4	-		826/1512		4.27	4.10		
					0	0	0	3		10								
		system clearly		iea	0	0	0	3 0	0				1287/1623		3.89	4.16	4.08	
		was class cance		55	-	1	1	3	•	13 6			1384/1646		4.46	4.69	4.67	
9. How wol	ila you g	rade the overal	ll teachi	ng effectiveness	4	Τ	Τ	3	3	6	U	3.08	1492/1621	3.57	3.97	4.06	4.02	3.08
		Lecture	2															
1. Were th	ne instru	ctor's lectures	s well pr	repared	2	0	1	0	2	5	8	4.19	1176/1568	3.99	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.19
		tor seem intere	_	_	2	0	0	2	4	4			1498/1572		4.71	4.70	4.64	3.88
				lained clearly		0		1	4	7			1235/1564			4.28		
		s contribute to			2	0	-	0	2	5			1452/1559				4.23	
				r understanding	3	1		1	2	4			1210/1352					
J. Dia aac	210115441	cccinitqueb ein	idilee you	ar under beariaring	3	_	-	_	-	-	5	3.07	1210/1332	3.02	5.10	3.70	3.57	3.07
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contribu	ite to wh	at 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 al	ll studen	ts actively end	couraged	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	e instruc	tor encourage f	air 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 sp	pecial te	chniques succes	ssful		11	2	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	431/ 948	3.67	3.87	3.95	4.00	4.00
		Tabaaa																
E Wome me	and waman	Laborat ts for lab repo	-	wlr aposified	14	0	2	2	0	0	0	1 50	****/ 555	2 47	2 20	4 20	4 22	****
5. were re	equiremen	ts for lab repo	orts clea	iriy specilled	14	U	2	2	U	U	U	1.50	****/ 555	2.4/	2.30	4.29	4.22	* * * *
		Seminar	<u>-</u>															
5. Were cr	riteria f	or grading made	e clear		11	2	2	1	0	2	0	2.40	260/ 288	2.44	3.35	3.68	3.58	2.40
	_	Field V																
5. Did cor	nferences	help you carry	out fie	eld activities	13	2	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 312	2.99	2.70	3.68	3.60	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	ation	า									
				-	-													
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 14		Rec	mire	 ed fo	or Ma	iors	 5	0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3		1000	1411	- A - L	J_ 1·10	- ,	-	-	Gradac	-	-	٥	-	J
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C 0		Ger	neral	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	8	Non-	-major	18
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D 0		Gei	····a	-				-	onder -g	-uu 1		14011-) 🗆	±0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		ធារ⊲	ectiv	760				3	#### -	Meane +	here =	re not	enoua	h
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	ے	P 0		T- T- C	L I \	v CD				J	respons				_	11
				I 0		O+1	ner				1	2	respons	CD LO L	c argi	ıııcaı	10	
				5 0		ULI	.1CT				1	۷.						
				; U														

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0701

Title TECHNICAL WRITING Instructor: HARRIS, LINDA R

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 18

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0801 University of Maryland TECHNICAL WRITING

Baltimore County

Title Instructor: MEADE, VICKI

Questions

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 16 Fall 2008

Instructor

Rank

Page 804

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Mean Mean Mean Mean

Ctudant	('Ollred	Evaluation	Ollection	naira

Frequencies

NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean

1 Did vo	u gain ne	General w insights,skil		his course	0	0	2	2	6	2	4	3 25	1560/	1640	3 50	4.01	4.28	4.27	3.25
		tor make clear			0	0	1	2	5	2	6		1434/		3.77	4.10	4.23	4.18	3.63
		estions reflect	_	-	0	9	0	1	1	1			888/		4.10	4.25			4.14
	_	ations reflect	_	-	0	0	1	1	6	3			1359/		4.03	4.25	4.20	4.21	3.63
5. Did as	signed re	adings contribu	ıte to wha	t 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 wr	itten ass	ignments contri	bute to w	hat you learned	0	0	1	2	5	2	6	3.63	1191/	1512	4.11	4.27	4.10	4.11	3.63
		system clearly	_	ed	0	0	2	3	3	1	7	3.50	1387/	1623	3.76	3.89	4.16	4.08	3.50
	-	was class cance			1	0	0	1	1	5			1340/			4.46	4.69		4.33
9. How wor	uld you g	rade the overal	l teachin	g effectiveness	4	1	0	3	3	3	2	3.36	1419/	1621	3.57	3.97	4.06	4.02	3.36
		Lecture	2																
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lectures	well pre	pared	1	0	1	0	6	1	7	3.87	1362/	1568	3.99	4.22	4.43	4.39	3.87
		tor seem intere			2	0	1	1	0	4	8		1412/			4.71	4.70	4.64	4.21
3. Was led	cture mat	erial presented	and expl	ained 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	e lecture	s 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 aud	diovisual	techniques enh	nance your	understanding	3	1	1	1	4	3	3	3.50	1049/	1352	3.62	3.48	3.98	3.97	3.50
		Discuss																	
1 Did cl:	acc diccu	ssions contribu		t vou learned	8	0	1	1	1	2	3	3 63	1029/	1384	3.74	4 09	4.08	4.11	3.63
		ts actively end			8	0	1	0	2	2			1098/				4.29		3.75
		tor encourage f			8	0	1	0	1	3			1043/			4.47			3.88
		chniques succes		pen dibedbbion	8	1	1	0	2	2						3.87		4.00	
	-	-																	
		Laborat	_																
		rease understar			14	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/		****	****	4.16	4.07	****
				und information		0	0	0	1	0	0		****/		****	3.83	4.12	3.89	****
5. Were re	equiremen	ts for lab repo	orts clear	ly 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 c	riteria f	or grading made	clear		10	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	288	2.44	3.35	3.68	3.58	****
1 513 61	- 7	Field W			1.5	^	1	^	0	0	0	1 00	/			2 54	1 00	2 50	
		<pre>ience contribut help you carry</pre>			15 11	0 3	1	0 1	0	0 1	0	1.00	****/		****	3.54 2.70	4.06	3.59	****
5. Dia coi	interences	neip you carry	out liei	u activities	11	3	U	_	U	1	U	3.00	/	314	2.33	2.70	3.00	3.00	
				Freq	uency	Dist	tribu	ution	n										
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	s				Тур	ne.			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	3	1	Gra	duate	2	0	Majo	r	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 7		~		,				-	TT. 3			_	37		1.5
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	4	C 2 D 0		Ger	neral	L				1	Und	ler-gr	raa 1	.6	Non-	major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	- *		m7 -						0	шпп	м .		h			.la
Grad.	U	3.50-4.00	2	F 0 P 0		Εle	ectiv	/es				U				here a e sign		_	11
				I 0		O+1	ner				1	1	res	POHSE	s LU L	e sign	TTTCG	I C	
				? 0		OCI	.101					_							
				. •															

University of Maryland Page 805
Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009
Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 393 1101

26

TECHNICAL WRITING

ROCKETT, DANIKA

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 23

							Fr	equei	ncies	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 General																
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,skil		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	e instru	ctor make clear	the exp	ected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	17	4.65	375/1648	3.77	4.10	4.23	4.18	4.65
		uestions reflect			0	5	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	617/1375	4.10	4.25	4.27	4.22	4.44
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the exp	ected goals	0	0	0	2	0	5	16	4.52	474/1595	4.03	4.25	4.20	4.21	4.52
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contribu	te to v	hat 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 wr	itten as	signments contri	bute 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	e grading	g system clearly	explai	ned	0	0	0	1	1	3	18	4.65	333/1623	3.76	3.89	4.16	4.08	4.65
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	lled		0	0	0	0	0	10	13	4.57	1139/1646	4.26	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.57
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overal	l teach	ning 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 th	he instr	uctor's lectures	well p	repared	0	0	0	1	2	4	16	4.52	827/1568	3.99	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.52
2. Did the	e instru	ctor seem intere	sted 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 le	cture mat	terial presented	and ex	plained 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	e lecture	es contribute to	what y	ou learned	0	0	0	0	0	7	16	4.70	475/1559	3.78	4.17	4.29	4.23	4.70
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques enh	ance yo	our understanding	0	1	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	252/1352	3.62	3.48	3.98	3.97	4.59
		Discuss	ion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contribu		hat you learned	16	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	520/1384	3.74	4.09	4.08	4.11	4.43
		nts actively end			16	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	292/1382	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.37	4.86
				l 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 s	pecial te	echniques succes	sful	-	16	2	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	****/ 948	3.67	3.87	3.95	4.00	****
		Laborat	ory															
5. Were re	equireme	nts for lab repo	rts cle	early 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 c	riteria :	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 W	ork															
5. Did co	nference	s help you carry	out fi	eld activities	17	0	1	1	1	3	0	3.00	256/ 312	2.99	2.70	3.68	3.60	3.00
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	S			Туј	oe			Majors	\$
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 13		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	`S	0	Graduate	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 9		_		-					1	, -				
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C 0		Gei	nera	Τ				2	Under-g	rad 2	23	Non-	-major	23
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	5	D 0								0			1			.1-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0 P 0		E⊥€	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	lu
				P 0 I 0		O+1	0.00				_	0	response	es to E	e sigr	ııııcar	1L	
				1 U		Utl	ner				2	0						
				? I														

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2008

Instructor: JAMAL, MAHBUB Enrollment: 22

Title

Questionnaires: 17

Course-Section: ENGL 393 1201

TECHNICAL WRITING

Page 806 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student C	ourse E	valuation	Questionnaire
-----------	---------	-----------	---------------

							Fre	equei	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 1															
1 Did voi	u gain n	ew insights,ski		this course	1	0	1	0	3	6	6	4 00	1183/1649	3.58	4 01	4.28	4.27	4.00
_	_	ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	4	4			897/1648			4.23		
		uestions reflect				10	0	0	0	1			212/1375			4.27		
		uations reflect				0	0	1	1				672/1595			4.20	4.21	
				hat you learned		0	2	0					945/1533			4.04	4.05	
				what you learned		0		1					380/1512		4.27		4.11	
		g system clearly				1		0	5				1134/1623		3.89		4.08	
		was class cance			2	0	0	0	0			5.00	1/1646		4.46		4.67	
				ing effectiveness	6	1		1	1	3			754/1621					
		Lecture	2															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lectures		repared	4	0	1	2	1	3	6	3.85	1369/1568	3.99	4.22	4.43	4.39	3.85
		ctor seem intere				0		0	0				912/1572		4.71		4.64	
				plained clearly	4	0	1	1	1	2			1037/1564		4.24		4.25	4.15
		es contribute to			4	0	1	0	0				851/1559				4.23	
				ur understanding	4	4	3	0					1130/1352				3.97	3.33
		Discus	zion															
1 Did cla	agg diga			hat you learned	12	0	2	0	0	1	2	3 20	1209/1384	3 74	4 09	4 08	4.11	3 20
		nts actively end			12	0	1	1	1	0			1291/1382		4.34		4.37	
				open discussion	12	0	0	1	1	0			948/1368		4.47		4.39	
		echniques succes		open arreassion	12	1		1	_	1			****/ 948					
		Laborat	torv															
5. Were re	equireme	nts for lab repo		arly specified	13	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/ 555	2.47	2.30	4.29	4.22	****
		Semina	r															
5. Were cr	riteria :	for grading made	e clear		12	0	2	0	0	3	0	2.80	244/ 288	2.44	3.35	3.68	3.58	2.80
		Field V	Work															
5. Did cor	nference	s help you carry	y out fi	eld activities	14	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 312	2.99	2.70	3.68	3.60	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	 0	 A 4											0	 Mo ≓ :		0
00-27 28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	A 4 B 11		кес	4uır.	eu I	or Ma	Jor	B	U	Graduat	E	U	Majo	ΣĽ	U
26-33 56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Co	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	7	Non	-major	17
84-150	4	3.00-2.99	4	D 0		Gel	лета.	L				U	onder -g.	Lau I	. 1	IVOII-	ilia JUL	Τ/
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		E14	ecti	7es				0	#### - 1	Means +	here =	re not	enoua	h
SI aa.	J	3.30 1.00	1	P 0		11.0	LT	v CD					respons				_	
				I O		O+1	her				1	4	TCBPOHB		c bigi	cai		
				5 0		001						-						
				. 0														

Course-Section: ENGL 393 1301 University of Maryland TECHNICAL WRITING Baltimore County

Title Instructor: SINGH, YASHODA Fall 2008

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 807 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque: 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect 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			4.06		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		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		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		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	б	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		****/ 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		****/ 81	****	4.07	4.43	4.30	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.30	****/ 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		****/ 48	****	3.74	4.09	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 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 E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	11	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 393 1401 University of Maryland Title TECHNICAL WRITING

Baltimore County SINGH, YASHODA Fall 2008

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 20

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 808 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	cies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	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 E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	2	 А	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16	-		_	
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 393E 0201 University of Maryland Title TECHNICAL WRITING

Baltimore County

Fall 2008

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 14

SLYTHOMPSON, AL

Instructor:

Page 809 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Ctudent	('Ollivea	Evaluation	Olipetion	$n \circ i \circ n \circ a$

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		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		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		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		1231/1595	3.86		4.20	4.21	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	3	2	3		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		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	-		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			531/1646	4.93		4.69	4.67	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	3	3	1			1558/1621				4.02	
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	,	U	_	J	J			2.70	1330/1021	2.70	3.91	1.00	1.02	2.70
Lecture														
	2	0	2	2	2	1	_	2 42	1 470 /1 560	2 40	4 22	4 42	1 20	2 42
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2		2	2	2	1	5		1478/1568	3.42		4.43	4.39	3.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	3	1	7		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		1423/1564			4.28	4.25	3.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	2	1	1	5		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			****	****	4.40	4.21	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	3	0	0	1	2	0		****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.12	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	2	1	0	0	2	1		470/ 555	3.50	2.30	4.29	4.22	3.50
J. Were requirements for tab reports elearly specified	O	2	_	O	U		_	3.30	1707 333	3.30	2.50	1.27	1.22	3.30
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		3.80		3.80	4.46		4.55	3.80
				0								4.47		
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0		2	2		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		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		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		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		****/ 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		****/ 110	****	5.00	3.99	4.05	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	4	U	U	U	۷	Т	4.33			3.00	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 E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		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	В	5						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	1	Under-grad 1	L4	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 t	here are	e not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to b	oe signif	icant	
				I	0	Other	13	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 395 0101

Questions

University of Maryland WRITING INTERNSHIP Baltimore County Fall 2008

Title Instructor: HICKERNELL, MAR (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean

Instructor

Rank

Page 810 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Mean Mean Mean Mean

		General															
		ew insights,skills fro		0	0	0	1	1	8	6		1037/1649				4.27	
		ctor make clear the ex		0	0	0	0	5	4			1043/1648		4.10	4.23	4.18	4.13
		uestions reflect the e			11	0	1	0	2			1112/1375					3.75
		uations reflect the ex		0	0	1	1	2	9			1285/1595					3.75
		eadings contribute to		1	0	1	2	2	7			1180/1533					3.60
		signments contribute		1	0	1	2	5	5			1345/1512			4.10		3.33
		g system clearly expla	ained	1	0	1	3	4	5			1482/1623			4.16		3.27
	-	was class cancelled		1	0	0	0	0				731/1646		4.46		4.67	
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overall tead	ching 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 th	he instr	uctor'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
		ctor seem interested		1	0	0	0	3	4			1365/1572				4.64	
		terial presented and		2	0	0	0	4	7			1200/1564				4.25	
		es contribute to what		2	0	1	1		8			1258/1559				4.23	
		l techniques enhance		1		1	1	2	2			1025/1352					
		Discussion								_							
		ussions contribute to		4	0	1	0	2	4		4.00			4.09	4.08	4.11	
		nts actively encourage		4		1	0	1	3			831/1382				4.37	
		ctor encourage fair a	nd open discussion	4		0	0	2	3			742/1368		4.47	4.30		4.42
4. Were s	pecial t	echniques 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 re	equireme:	nts for lab reports c	learly specified	13	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 555	****	2.30	4.29	4.22	****
		Seminar															
5. Were c	riteria	for grading made clear	<u> </u>	14	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.58	****
		Field Work															
		rience contribute to v		0	0	0	0	1			4.69	23/ 52					4.69
		y understand your eval		0		1	0	3			3.81			3.74			
		ctor available for con		0	6	0	0				4.20			4.05			
		could you discuss you		0	1	0	2				3.87						
5. Did co	nference	s 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
			Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Geraline B		Character CDA	Down and a different				ъ.		_							26	
Credits Ea		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				ке 	ason	s 				pe 			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 4		Red	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	7
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	в 7														
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 0	C 3		Ger	nera	1				8	Under-g	rad :	16	Non-	major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 3	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 9	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### -	Means t	there a	are not	enoug	jh
			P 0									respons	es to 1	be sign	nifican	ıt	
			I 0		Otl	her					7						
			3 0														

Course-Section: ENGL 395 0101 Title

WRITING INTERNSHIP

Instructor: FITZPATRICK, CA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 16

Frequencies

University of Maryland Page 811 Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

								FT	eque:	ncie	5		Ins	tructor	Course	e Dept	OMBC	телет	Sect
		Question	ıs			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	_	Genera																	
		ew insights,ski				0	0	0	1	1	8	6		1037/1649		4.01	4.28	4.27	4.19
		ctor make clear				0	0	0	0	5	4	7		1043/1648		4.10	4.23	4.18	4.13
		estions reflec					11	0	1	0	2	1		1112/1375		4.25	4.27	4.22	3.75
		ations reflect	_	_	,	0	0	1	1	2	9	3		1285/1595		4.25	4.20	4.21	3.75
	_	eadings contrib		_		1	0	1	2	2	7	3		1180/1533		4.00	4.04	4.05	3.60
		signments contr			arned	1	0	1	2	5	5 5	2		1345/1512		4.27	4.10	4.11	3.33
		g system clearl		nea		1	0	0 T	3	4 0	2			1482/1623			4.16	4.08	3.27
		was class cand				1	0	0	0	2	11	13		731/1646		4.46	4.69		
9. HOW WO	ura you g	grade the overa	iii teaciii	ing effective	eness	3	U	U	U	2	TT	U	3.85	1114/1621	. 3.05	3.97	4.06	4.02	3.05
		Lectur	re																
1. Were ti	he instru	actor's lecture		repared		2	0	0	0	3	7	4	4.07	1248/1568	4.00	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.00
		ctor seem inter	_	_		2	0	0	0	3	4	7		1390/1572			4.70	4.64	4.31
		erial presente				3	0	0	0	2	8			1096/1564		4.24	4.28	4.25	4.00
		es contribute t			-	2	0	0	1	0	9			1045/1559		4.17	4.29	4.23	3.96
		techniques er			ding	1	6	1	1	2	2			1025/1352		3.48		3.97	3.56
		-	-																
		Discus																	
		ussions contrib				4	0	1	0	2	4		4.00	795/1384		4.09	4.08	4.11	4.00
		nts actively er				4	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	831/1382		4.34	4.29	4.37	4.25
		ctor encourage		open discus	sion	4	0	0	0	2	3		4.42				4.30	4.39	4.42
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	essful			4	2	0	2	1	4	3	3.80	578/ 948	3.80	3.87	3.95	4.00	3.80
		Labora	atory																
5 Were r	egui remen	nts for lab rep	_	arly specifi	ed	13	0	1	0	1	0	1	3 00	****/ 555	****	2.30	4.29	4.22	****
J. Were I	cquiremen	ics for tab rep	70165 6166	ally specifi	cu	13	U	_	O	_	Ü	_	3.00	, 555	•	2.50	1.20	1.22	
		Semina	ar																
5. Were c	riteria f	for grading mad	ie clear			14	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 288	****	3.35	3.68	3.58	****
		Field									_								
		rience contribu				0	0	0	0	1	3		4.69	23/ 52		3.54	4.06	3.59	4.69
		understand yo			ia	0	0	1	0	3	9		3.81	35/ 48			4.09	4.21	3.81
		ctor available				0	6	0	0	2	4		4.20	26/ 39		4.05	4.47		4.20
	_	could you disc	_			0	1 7	0	2	1	9		3.87	34/ 39			4.38	4.32	3.87
5. Dia co	nierences	s help you carr	y out fie	eld activiti	es	0	7	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	207/ 312	3.67	2.70	3.68	3.60	3.67
					Freque	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
a 1'	arned	Cum. GPA	Ą	Expected G	rades				Re	ason	S			Ty	рe			Majors	5
Credits E																			
		0.00-0.99	0	A 4			Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	.e	0	Majo	or	7
00-27	0		0	в 7					_										
 00-27 28-55	4	1.00-1.99											8	Under-	rrad '	16	Mon.	ma i am	9
00-27 28-55 56-83	4 2	2.00-2.99	0	C 3			Gei	nera	L				O	Ollaci	ırau .		IVOII	-major	,
00-27 28-55 56-83 84-150	4 2 0	2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	0	D 0														-	
 00-27 28-55 56-83	4 2	2.00-2.99	0	D 0 F 0				nera. ecti					1	#### -	Means	there a	are not	enoug	
00-27 28-55 56-83 84-150	4 2 0	2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	0	D 0 F 0 P 0			Ele	ecti					1		Means	there a	are not	enoug	
00-27 28-55 56-83 84-150	4 2 0	2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	0	D 0 F 0			Ele							#### -	Means	there a	are not	enoug	

Course-Section: ENGL 401 0101

Title METHOD OF INTERPRETATI

Instructor: FERNANDEZ, JEAN

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 14

Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 812 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

University of Maryland

								L L	eque	TICTES	•		TIID	LIUCLUI	COULSE	. nebr	OLINDC	пелет	Sec
		Question	S			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mea
		Genera	1																
. Did vo	u gain n	ew insights,ski		this cou	rse	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	644/1649	4.50	4.01	4.28	4.50	4.5
		ctor make clear				0	0	0	1	2	5	6		1021/1648		4.10		4.36	4.1
		uestions reflec				0	0	0	0	1	5			546/1375			4.27	4.48	
		uations reflect				0	0	0	0	0	9			697/1595				4.36	4.3
		eadings contrib				0	0	1	0	0	5			525/1533			4.04	4.14	4.3
	_	signments contr		_		0	0	2	1	2	3	6	3.71	1143/1512	3.71	4.27	4.10	4.26	
		g system clearl				0	0	1	1	4	4			1327/1623			4.16	4.27	
		was class canc				0	0	0	0	0	4			977/1646			4.69	4.71	
	-	grade the overa		ing effect	tiveness	2	1	0	0	3	5			914/1621				4.24	4.0
		Lectur	e																
. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture		repared		0	0	0	0	4	2	8	4.29	1096/1568	4.29	4.22	4.43	4.54	4.2
		ctor seem inter			ect	0	0	0	0	0				715/1572			4.70	4.79	4.8
		terial presente		_		0	0	0	0	6	5			1282/1564			4.28	4.40	
		es contribute t				0	0	0	0	1	4			618/1559			4.29	4.41	
		l techniques en				0	11	1	0	1	0			****/1352			3.98	4.07	
. Dia au	aiovibaa	i ceemiiques en	nance you	ar anacrb	canaing	Ü		_	O	_	O	_	3.00	/ 1332		3.10	3.70	1.07	
רה בים		Discus		hat 1.		_	0	0	0	2	_	2	4 00	705 /1304	4 00	4 00	4 00	4 25	1 1
		ussions contrib				5	-	0	0	2 2	5 2			795/1384		4.09	4.08	4.35	4.0
		nts actively en				5 5	0	0	1	2	3			774/1382			4.29		
		ctor encourage		open also	cussion	5 5	0 8	0	U T	0	0			1039/1368	3.89		4.30	4.58	
. were s	pecial t	echniques succe	SSIUI			5	8	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	****/ 948	* * * *	3.87	3.95	4.31	
		Labora	-																
. Were re	equireme	nts for lab rep	orts clea	arly spec	ified	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	****	2.30	4.29	4.41	***
		Semina																	
. Were c	riteria	for grading mad	e clear			6	4	1	3	0	0	0	1.75	276/ 288	1.75	3.35	3.68	3.71	1.7
		Field																	
. Did com	nference	s help you carr	y out fie	eld activ	ities	11	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 312	***	2.70	3.68	3.95	***
_	_	Self																	
. Were th	here eno	ugh proctors fo	r all the	e students	5	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	5.00	3.99	4.22	***
					Frequ	ıency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
redits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades				Rea	asons	\$			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	 9		Red	guir	ed f	 or Ma	jor	 s	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	 13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						J								
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0		Gen	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad 1	.4	Non-	-major	1
	9	3.00-3.49	3	D	0								-					5	
84-150					0		רם.	ecti [.]	7700				0	#### - 1	Meane t	here a	are not	enouc	rh
	0	3.50-4.00	5	H.															
	0	3.50-4.00	5	F P	-		ET	CCLI	ves				U						,
84-150 Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	P I	0			her	ves				.4	respons					,

Course-Section: ENGL 407 0101 University of Maryland Title LANGUAGE IN SOCIETY

Baltimore County

Instructor: SHIPKA, JODY

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 13 Fall 2008

Page 813 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

Questions					NR	NA	Fr	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean	
_			General						_		_								
			new insights, skil			0	0	0	1	2	6	4		1183/1649	4.00		4.28	4.50	4.00
			uctor make clear			1	0	0	0	4	4	4		1124/1648	4.00	4.10	4.23	4.36	4.00
			questions reflect			0	10 0	0	0	0	1 7	2 5		****/1375	****	4.25	4.27 4.20	4.48	
			luations reflect readings contribu			1 1	0	2	1	3	4	2		622/1595 1366/1533	4.42 3.25	4.25	4.20	4.36 4.14	4.42 3.25
					what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	5	6		687/1512	4.25	4.00	4.10	4.14	4.25
			ng system clearly		_	0	1	1	1	1	4			1164/1623		3.89	4.16	4.27	3.92
			s was class cance		inea	0	0	0	0	1	4			1166/1646		4.46	4.69		4.54
					ning effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	3	8		428/1621				4.24	
		Julu Jou	grade one everal	- 00001	ing crrcocromess	Ü	Ü	ŭ	ŭ	_		Ü		120, 1021	1.10	3.37	1.00		11.10
			Lecture		_														
			ructor's lectures			7	0	0	0	1	3	2		1191/1568	4.17	4.22	4.43	4.54	4.17
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					7 7	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.79	5.00
							0	0	0	1	2		4.33	,	4.33	4.24	4.28	4.40	4.33
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					7	0	0	0	1	1		4.50	695/1559	4.50	4.17	4.29	4.41	4.50
5. L	. 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
			Discuss	ion															
1. [id cl	ass disc	cussions contribu		hat you learned	1	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	437/1384	4.50	4.09	4.08	4.35	4.50
			ents actively end			1	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	831/1382	4.25	4.34	4.29	4.56	4.25
			uctor encourage f			1	0	0	0	1	5		4.42		4.42	4.47		4.58	4.42
			techniques succes		-	1	2	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	203/ 948	4.50	3.87	3.95	4.31	4.50
			T = la = = +																
5 W	lere r	eauireme	Laborat ents for lab repo	-	early specified	10	0	1	0	0	0	2	3 67	****/ 555	****	2 30	4 29	4.41	****
J. 1	CIC I	equirem	ence for tab repo	TCD CIC	arry specified		J	-	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	3.07	, 333		2.50	1.25	1.11	
			Seminar																
5. W	lere c	riteria	for grading made	clear		12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	***	3.35	3.68	3.71	****
			Field W	lork															
5. I	id co	nference	es help you carry		eld activities	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 312	***	2.70	3.68	3.95	****
					Frequ	lency	Dist	trib	utior	1									
Cred	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades								Rea	asons				Тур	pe			Majors	
00-	27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 A 8		Per	mir	ed fo	or Ma	iors		0	Graduate		0	Majo		11
28-		0	1.00-1.99	0	В 4		1000	1411	Cu I)	ء ـ د ر	,	0	Graduate	-	J	1.10	<i>-</i>	
56-		0	2.00-2.99	4	C 1		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad 1	.3	Non-	-major	2
	-150 9 3.00-3.49 4 D 0													5-				3	
Gra						Electives				0			0 #### - Means there are n			are not	enoug	h	
	P 0				EICCUIVCD							response							
I 0					Otl	ner				1	3	_							
3. 0																			

Course-Section: ENGL 419 0101 University of Maryland

SEMINAR IN LIT & SCIEN Baltimore County

Title SEMINAR IN LIT & Instructor: MCCARTHY, LUCIL

Enrollment: 16
Questionnaires: 14

Fall 2008

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 814 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

				Fre	equer	ncies	\$		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
		Questions	\$		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 Did 110	aain na	General i insights,skil	=	thia govern	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	372/1649	4.71	4.01	4.28	4.50	4.71
		or make clear			0	0	0	0	2	0	12	4.71	300/1648		4.10	4.23	4.36	4.71
		estions reflect			0	13	0	0	0	1	0		****/1375	****	4.25	4.27	4.48	****
		tions reflect			0	1	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	168/1595	4.85	4.25	4.20	4.36	4.85
			_	hat you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.00	4.04		5.00
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	•	12	4.71	225/1512	4.71	4.27	4.10	4.26	4.71
		system clearly			0	0	1	0	0	2	11			4.57	3.89	4.16	4.27	4.57
		as class cance		iied	2	0	0	0	0	0	12		1/1646	5.00	4.46	4.69	4.71	5.00
				ing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	234/1621		3.97	4.06		
		Lecture	.															
1 Were t	he instruc	tor's lectures		repared	4	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	588/1568	4.70	4.22	4.43	4.54	4.70
		or seem intere			5	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.79	5.00
				plained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	1	7		473/1564		4.24	4.28	4.40	4.67
		contribute to			5	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	227/1559	4.89	4.17	4.29	4.41	4.89
					5	7	0	0	1	0	-		****/1352		3.48	3.98	4.07	****
J. Dia aa	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding						Ü	Ü	-	Ü	-	1.00	71332		3.10	3.70	1.07	
1 Did al	Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned							0	1	1	8	4.70	302/1384	4.70	4.09	4.08	4.35	4.70
				to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.34	4.29	4.56	5.00
				open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	264/1368	4.90	4.47	4.30	4.58	4.90
		chniques succes		open discussion	4	1	0	0	2	0	7		186/ 948	4.56	3.87	3.95	4.31	
	-	_																
F 17		Laborat	_		12 0 0 1 0						1 3.	2 50	**** / FFF	****	0 20	4 00	4 41	
5. were r	requirement	s for lab repo	orts cle	arly specified	12	U	U	1	U	0	1	3.50	****/ 555	***	2.30	4.29	4.41	
		Seminar																
				announced theme	7	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	41/ 88	4.71	4.32	4.54	4.66	4.71
				vidual attention	7	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	38/ 85	4.67	4.46	4.47	4.54	4.67
				hat you learned	7	4	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 81	****	4.07	4.43	4.57	****
_		s contribute t		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 c	riteria fo	or 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 W				1												
5. Did co	. Did conferences help you carry out field activities						0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	2.70	3.68	3.95	****
	Fre							utior	1									
Credits E				Rea	asons	;			Ту	pe			Majors	3				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Red	 quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	 s	0	Graduat	 e	 1	Majo	 or	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 8			`			J								
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C 0		Ger	nera:	L				2	Under-g	rad 1	3	Non-	-major	3
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	5	D 0									3				-	
Grad.					Electives							1	#### - Means there are not enough				jh	
	P 0												respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	nt	
I 0				Oth	her				1	1	-		_					
				? 0														

Course-Section: ENGL 448 0101 University of Maryland Title SEMINAR IN LIT & CULTU

Baltimore County

Page 815

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: STEWART, CAROLE Fall 2008 Enrollment: 11

Questionnaires: 9 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	_	ncies 3	4	5	Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_		Level Mean	Sec Mea
		Genera:	 1															
. Did you	gain ne	ew insights,skil	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	723/1649	4.44	4.01	4.28	4.50	4.4
. Did the	instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	931/1648	4.22	4.10	4.23	4.36	4.2
. Did the	exam qu	uestions reflect	t the e	xpected goals	0	4	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	855/1375	4.20	4.25	4.27	4.48	4.2
. Did othe	er evalī	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	722/1595	4.33	4.25	4.20	4.36	4.3
				what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	241/1533	4.67	4.00	4.04	4.14	4.6
				o what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	465/1512	4.44	4.27	4.10	4.26	4.4
		g system clearly			0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	720/1623		3.89	4.16	4.27	4.3
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.46	4.69	4.71	5.0
-	•			hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	835/1621	4.13	3.97	4.06	4.24	4.1
. Were the	e instru	uctor's lectures	s well :	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	636/1568	4.67	4.22	4.43	4.54	4.6
. Did the	instruc	ctor seem intere	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	640/1572	4.89	4.71	4.70	4.79	4.8
. Was lect	ture mat	terial presented	d and e	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	854/1564	4.33	4.24	4.28	4.40	4.3
. Did the	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	5	4	4.44	777/1559	4.44	4.17	4.29	4.41	4.4
. Did audi	our understanding	0	3	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	690/1352	4.00	3.48	3.98	4.07	4.0			
. Did clas	ss disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	359/1384	4.63	4.09	4.08	4.35	4.6
. Were all	l studer	nts actively end	courage	d to participate	1	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	911/1382	4.13	4.34	4.29	4.56	4.1
. Did the	instruc	ctor encourage i	fair an	d open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0		4.75		4.75	4.47	4.30	4.58	4.
. Were spe	ecial te	echniques succes	ssful		1	1	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	555/ 948	3.86	3.87	3.95	4.31	3.8
		Semina																
				announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 88		4.32	4.54	4.66	5.0
				ividual attention	4	0	0	0	1	1		4.40	56/ 85			4.47	4.54	
	_	-		what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	0	3		63/ 81			4.43	4.57	
		ons contribute t			4	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	64/ 92			4.35	4.44	
. Were cri	iteria 1	for grading made	e clear		4	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.35	3.68	3.71	4.0
D444	c	Field V			0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	**** / 210		0 70	2 60	2 05	
. Dia coni	rerences	s nelp you carry	y out I	ield activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	2.70	3.68	3.95	***
				Frequ	iency	Dist	rib	utio	n									
redits Ear	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ty	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	s	0	Graduat	e	1	Majo	or	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 4														
56-83	0 2.00-2.99 1 C 1					Ger	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	-major	1
4-150 3 3.00-3.49 2 D 0																		
Grad. 1 3.50-4.00 1 F 0						$El\epsilon$	ecti	ves				0	#### -				_	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Oth	ner					8						
				? 0														

Course-Section: ENGL 471 0101

Title ADV CREATIVE WRTNG:FIC

Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY

Enrollment: 10
Questionnaires: 7

Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 816 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			MD	NA		_	encie 3	s 4	_	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course	-		Level Mean	Sect Mean	
		Questions									Mean	Raiik		Mean	Mean	Mean	
		General															
1. Did y	ou gain n	ew insights, skill	s 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 t	he instru	ctor make clear t	he 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 o	ther eval	uations reflect t	he 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 a	ssigned r	eadings contribut	e 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 w	ritten as	signments contrib	ute 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 t	he gradin	g 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 m	any times	was class cancel	led	0	0	-	-	-	6	1	4.14	1476/1646	4.14	4.46	4.69	4.71	4.14
9. How w	ould 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	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared					0	0	0	1	2	4.67	636/1568	4.67	4.22	4.43	4.54	4.67
2. Did t	he instru	ctor seem interes	ted in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.79	5.00
			and explained clearly	5	0	0			0	2	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.24	4.28	4.40	5.00
		es contribute to		5	0	0	-	-	0	2	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.17	4.29	4.41	5.00
5. Did a	. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding						0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1352	****	3.48	3.98	4.07	****
	Discussion																
1. Did c	lass disc	ussions contribut	e 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
			uraged 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 t	he instru	ctor encourage fa	ir and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	522/1368	4.67	4.47	4.30	4.58	4.67
		Laborato	ry														
5. Were	requireme	nts for lab repor	ts 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 Wo	rk														
5. Did c	onference	s help you carry	out field activities	6	0	1	. 0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 312	****	2.70	3.68	3.95	****
		uency	y Di	stri	buti	on											
Credits	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades							eason	s			Ty	pe			Majors	
													- 				
00-27	1	0.00 0.33	0 A 4		R	equi	red	for M	ajor	s	U	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	1
28-55	0		0 B 3				,				4		,	-			_
56-83	84-150 0 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0				G	ener	al				4	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	-major	6
					_	7					0		N	1			1-
Grad.					E	rect	ives				2	#### -				_	11
				Other					responses to be signifi		ıırıcar	ficant					
		I 0				uner					1						
? 0																	

Course-Section: ENGL 490 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County Fall 2008

ADV TOPICS IN ENGL LAN

Instructor: MCKINLEY, KATHE

Enrollment: 7 Questionnaires: 5

Page 817 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Evaluation	

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from	this course	0	0	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 exp		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 ex	pected 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 exp	ected 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 w	hat 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 explai	ned	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 teach	ing 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 p	repared	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	-	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 ex	_	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 y	ou 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 yo	ur understanding	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1352	***	3.48	3.98	4.07	****
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to w	hat 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	_	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 fi	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 312	****	2.70	3.68	3.95	****	
	Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors		

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENGL 493 0101

10

SEMINAR IN CT

MAHER, JENNIFER

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 9

Page 818 FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				Fre	equer	ncies	;		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
		v insights,ski			0	0	1	3	3	0	2	2.89	1621/1649	2.89	4.01	4.28	4.50	2.89
		or make clear			0	0	1	3	2	3	0		1615/1648	2.78	4.10	4.23	4.36	2.78
3. Did t	the exam que	estions reflec	t the ex	spected goals	0	8	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1375	****	4.25	4.27	4.48	****
		ations reflect			0	0	1	5	1	0	2	2.67	1576/1595	2.67	4.25	4.20	4.36	2.67
5. Did a	assigned rea	adings contrib	ute to v	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 v	written assi	ignments contr	ibute 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 t	the grading	system clearl	y explai	ined	0	0	4	3	0	1	1	2.11	1614/1623	2.11	3.89	4.16	4.27	2.11
8. How r	many times w	vas class canc	elled		0	0	0	2	0	7	0	3.56	1629/1646	3.56	4.46	4.69	4.71	3.56
9. How v	would you gr	rade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	1	0	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	1345/1621	3.50	3.97	4.06	4.24	3.50
		Lectur	e															
1. Were	the instruc	ctor's lecture	s well r	prepared	1	0	2	4	1	0	1	2.25	1561/1568	2.25	4.22	4.43	4.54	2.25
		or seem inter			1	0	0	2	3	1			1544/1572	3.38	4.71		4.79	3.38
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	4	3	0			1532/1564		4.24		4.40	2.75
		contribute t			1 1	0	1	5	1	1			1541/1559		4.17			2.25
				our understanding	1	0	0	1	4	2			1113/1352					3.38
3. 214 0	adarovibuar	_	Ū	Ü	_	-	_	_	3.30	1113, 1332	3.30	3.10	3.70	2.07	3.30			
	Discussion																	
	1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned							1	2	3			1105/1384		4.09	4.08	4.35	3.44
	2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate						1	2	2	1			1306/1382	3.13	4.34		4.56	3.13
		_		d open discussion	1	0	0	4	2	1			1316/1368	2.88	4.47		4.58	2.88
4. Were	special ted	chniques succe	ssful		1	3	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	811/ 948	3.20	3.87	3.95	4.31	3.20
		Labora	torv															
5. Were	requirement		-	early specified	7	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 555	****	2.30	4.29	4.41	****
		Semina		2 2	•			_		_	_		0.51		4 00			
				announced theme	0	0	1	2	2	2		3.22	86/ 88	3.22	4.32	4.54	4.66	3.22
				lvidual attention	0	0	0	4	0	3		3.33	84/ 85	3.33	4.46	4.47	4.54	3.33
				what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	2		3.78	72/ 81	3.78		4.43	4.57	3.78
		ns contribute		you learned	0	0	0	1	3	3		3.67	79/ 92	3.67		4.35		3.67
5. Were	criteria fo	or grading mad	e 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 carr	y out fi	ield activities	6	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	2.70	3.68	3.95	****
	Frequ								1									
Credita				Pes	sons				Туј	20			Majors					
CIECUICS	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades									, . – – – –								,
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors		0	Graduat	е	1	Majo	or	7
28-55 56-83	0 1	1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99	0 0	B 2 C 0		Ger	neral					1	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	-major	2
84-150		3.00-3.49	5	D 0		Gel	ıcıal	_				_	onder -g.	Luu	J	INOII-	a JUI	4
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	Б 0 F 0	Electives						0	#### - Means there are not end		enous	rh			
Grau.	Τ.	3.30-4.00	J	P 0		БТ	\	, CD				J	response				_	111
I 0						Otł	ner					8	T CPDOIIS	LD LU L	c argii	Cal	10	
? 0					0.01						J							
	3 0																	