Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 01		Term - Fall 2012							Enrollment: 24				
Title:	Composition									Questionnaires: 20				
Instructor:	McGurrin,Anthon													

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	3	3	4	4	5	3.26	1544/1589	3.68	4.11	4.32	4.20	3.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	3	2	7	5	3.53	1466/1589	4.01	4.23	4.29	4.28	3.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	18	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1391	4.36	4.39	4.34	4.29	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	5	9	4.21	889/1552	4.09	4.28	4.25	4.16	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	0	5	5	4	3.16	1422/1495	3.58	4.04	4.14	4.07	3.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	326/1457	4.20	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	3	1	2	11	3.89	1197/1572	3.76	4.00	4.21	4.18	3.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1589	4.52	4.55	4.66	4.59	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	0	1	6	5	3	3.67	1277/1569	3.91	4.09	4.13	4.08	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	2	4	5	4	3.41	1481/1530	4.17	4.38	4.49	4.45	3.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	1245/1533	4.67	4.77	4.75	4.69	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	3	6	3	5	3.59	1391/1528	4.12	4.33	4.35	4.31	3.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	4	1	4	5	3.24	1462/1529	3.98	4.25	4.36	4.31	3.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	12	3	0	0	0	1	2.00	****/1393	3.40	3.72	4.06	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	4	1	2	1	2	2.60	1313/1337	3.80	4.22	4.17	4.01	2.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	6	1	1	0	3	2.36	1325/1331	3.97	4.41	4.35	4.18	2.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	1	2	3	2	3.00	1300/1333	4.35	4.54	4.40	4.22	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	7	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/1014	3.83	4.04	4.05	3.91	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 01			Term - Fall 2012							Enrollment: 24			
Title:	Composition										Questionnaires: 20			
Instructor:	McGurrin,Anthon													

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/194	4.20	3.95	4.17	4.36	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/62	****	4.35	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/65	3.40	4.33	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/63	3.20	4.28	4.29	4.12	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/61	****	4.17	4.19	3.98	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/40	2.60	2.60	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/40	3.20	3.20	3.89	3.11	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/39	2.80	2.80	4.00	3.52	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 24
Title:	Composition			Questionnaires: 20
Instructor:	McGurrin,Anthon			

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.12	3.23	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	3	A	9	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	10	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 02		Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 24
Title:	Composition				Questionnaires: 18
Instructor:	Burns,Margie				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	5	8	4.06	1146/1589	3.68	4.11	4.32	4.20	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	9	4.22	975/1589	4.01	4.23	4.29	4.28	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1162/1391	4.36	4.39	4.34	4.29	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	1	5	8	4.19	921/1552	4.09	4.28	4.25	4.16	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	5	7	3.83	1086/1495	3.58	4.04	4.14	4.07	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	400/1457	4.20	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	5	5	6	3.78	1277/1572	3.76	4.00	4.21	4.18	3.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	9	8	4.39	1231/1589	4.52	4.55	4.66	4.59	4.39
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	3	6	6	4.06	910/1569	3.91	4.09	4.13	4.08	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	3	3	11	4.28	1153/1530	4.17	4.38	4.49	4.45	4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	1012/1533	4.67	4.77	4.75	4.69	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	0	5	10	4.35	883/1528	4.12	4.33	4.35	4.31	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	4	10	4.17	1081/1529	3.98	4.25	4.36	4.31	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	2	7	6	4.13	720/1393	3.40	3.72	4.06	3.99	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	788/1337	3.80	4.22	4.17	4.01	4.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	2	6	4	3.92	1063/1331	3.97	4.41	4.35	4.18	3.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	733/1333	4.35	4.54	4.40	4.22	4.46
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	554/1014	3.83	4.04	4.05	3.91	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 02		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 24			
Title:	Composition										Questionnaires: 18			
Instructor:	Burns,Margie													

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/194	4.20	3.95	4.17	4.36	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/165	5.00	5.00	4.12	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/62	****	4.35	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/65	3.40	4.33	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/63	3.20	4.28	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/61	****	5.00	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/61	****	4.17	4.19	3.98	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/40	2.60	2.60	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/40	3.20	3.20	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	3.86	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 02	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment:	24
Title:	Composition			Questionnaires:	18
Instructor:	Burns,Margie				

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/39	2.80	2.80	4.00	3.52	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	8	Under-grad	18	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 03			Term - Fall 2012							Enrollment: 24		
Title:	Composition										Questionnaires: 22		
Instructor:	Bloom,Ryan I												

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	6	3.77	1377/1589	3.68	4.11	4.32	4.20	3.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	15	4	3.95	1209/1589	4.01	4.23	4.29	4.28	3.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/1391	4.36	4.39	4.34	4.29	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	3	4	12	4.24	868/1552	4.09	4.28	4.25	4.16	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	7	7	6	3.68	1203/1495	3.58	4.04	4.14	4.07	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	6	12	4.27	659/1457	4.20	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	8	6	7	3.86	1218/1572	3.76	4.00	4.21	4.18	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	882/1589	4.52	4.55	4.66	4.59	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	11	6	4.15	816/1569	3.91	4.09	4.13	4.08	4.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	610/1530	4.17	4.38	4.49	4.45	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	293/1533	4.67	4.77	4.75	4.69	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	6	13	4.41	817/1528	4.12	4.33	4.35	4.31	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	8	11	4.32	945/1529	3.98	4.25	4.36	4.31	4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	5	3	4	3	1	2.50	1367/1393	3.40	3.72	4.06	3.99	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	3	5	10	4.15	738/1337	3.80	4.22	4.17	4.01	4.15
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	1	5	13	4.50	623/1331	3.97	4.41	4.35	4.18	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	559/1333	4.35	4.54	4.40	4.22	4.65
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	1	3	8	7	4.11	507/1014	3.83	4.04	4.05	3.91	4.11

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 03				Term - Fall 2012									Enrollment: 24	
Title:	Composition													Questionnaires: 22	
Instructor:	Bloom,Ryan I														

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/180	4.60	4.31	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/194	4.20	3.95	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/178	4.80	4.90	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/181	****	4.88	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/165	5.00	5.00	4.12	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/62	****	4.35	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/65	3.40	4.33	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/63	3.20	4.28	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/61	****	5.00	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/61	****	4.17	4.19	3.98	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/40	2.60	2.60	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/40	3.20	3.20	3.89	3.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/39	2.80	2.80	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.12	3.23	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 03	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 24
Title:	Composition		Questionnaires: 22
Instructor:	Bloom,Ryan I		

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.30	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	15	Under-grad	22	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 100 04	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 25
Title: Composition		Questionnaires: 19
Instructor: Brofman,Margare		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	5	6	5	2	1	2.37	1584/1589	3.68	4.11	4.32	4.20	2.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	2	4	7	1	2.84	1566/1589	4.01	4.23	4.29	4.28	2.84
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	1	0	3	4	2	3.60	1280/1391	4.36	4.39	4.34	4.29	3.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	3	3	3	7	3.42	1459/1552	4.09	4.28	4.25	4.16	3.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	4	2	7	1	2	2.69	1477/1495	3.58	4.04	4.14	4.07	2.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	5	4	4	3.11	1401/1457	4.20	4.32	4.15	3.99	3.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	4	2	2	8	3.42	1432/1572	3.76	4.00	4.21	4.18	3.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	493/1589	4.52	4.55	4.66	4.59	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	6	3	5	2	1	2.35	1557/1569	3.91	4.09	4.13	4.08	2.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	4	3	5	2	3	2.82	1519/1530	4.17	4.38	4.49	4.45	2.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	2	2	4	8	3.94	1490/1533	4.67	4.77	4.75	4.69	3.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	4	3	9	1	0	2.41	1519/1528	4.12	4.33	4.35	4.31	2.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	9	2	6	0	0	1.82	1526/1529	3.98	4.25	4.36	4.31	1.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	12	4	0	1	0	0	1.40	1389/1393	3.40	3.72	4.06	3.99	1.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	9	2	1	1	0	1.54	1336/1337	3.80	4.22	4.17	4.01	1.54
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	8	2	0	1	1	1.75	1330/1331	3.97	4.41	4.35	4.18	1.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	6	1	3	2	0	2.08	1326/1333	4.35	4.54	4.40	4.22	2.08
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	4	0	2	1	0	2.00	1006/1014	3.83	4.04	4.05	3.91	2.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 100 04	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 25
Title: Composition		Questionnaires: 19
Instructor: Brofman,Margare		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/180	4.60	4.31	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/194	4.20	3.95	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/178	4.80	4.90	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/181	****	4.88	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/165	5.00	5.00	4.12	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/62	****	4.35	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/65	3.40	4.33	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/63	3.20	4.28	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/61	****	5.00	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/61	****	4.17	4.19	3.98	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/40	2.60	2.60	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/40	3.20	3.20	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/39	2.80	2.80	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/22	****	****	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.30	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 04	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment:	25
Title:	Composition			Questionnaires:	19
Instructor:	Brofman,Margare				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	4	A	3	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	14	Under-grad	19	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 100 05	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 24
Title: Composition		Questionnaires: 18
Instructor: McGurrin,Anthon		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	8	6	1	3.22	1548/1589	3.68	4.11	4.32	4.20	3.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	7	4	3.78	1348/1589	4.01	4.23	4.29	4.28	3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1391	4.36	4.39	4.34	4.29	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	4	3	4	6	3.71	1334/1552	4.09	4.28	4.25	4.16	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	6	3	3	2.94	1447/1495	3.58	4.04	4.14	4.07	2.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	7	8	4.28	659/1457	4.20	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.28
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	4	8	4.06	1050/1572	3.76	4.00	4.21	4.18	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	280/1589	4.52	4.55	4.66	4.59	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	9	2	4.08	894/1569	3.91	4.09	4.13	4.08	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	6	5	3	3.56	1460/1530	4.17	4.38	4.49	4.45	3.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	1127/1533	4.67	4.77	4.75	4.69	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	7	4	5	3.76	1328/1528	4.12	4.33	4.35	4.31	3.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	6	6	3	3.69	1362/1529	3.98	4.25	4.36	4.31	3.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	14	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/1393	3.40	3.72	4.06	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	1	5	2	0	2.55	1314/1337	3.80	4.22	4.17	4.01	2.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	2	3	4	2	0	2.55	1320/1331	3.97	4.41	4.35	4.18	2.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	1069/1333	4.35	4.54	4.40	4.22	3.91
4. Were special techniques successful	7	8	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/1014	3.83	4.04	4.05	3.91	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 05		Term - Fall 2012				Enrollment: 24					
Title:	Composition						Questionnaires: 18					
Instructor:	McGurrin,Anthon											

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/194	4.20	3.95	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/178	4.80	4.90	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/181	****	4.88	4.40	4.54	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/62	****	4.35	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/65	3.40	4.33	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/63	3.20	4.28	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/61	****	5.00	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/61	****	4.17	4.19	3.98	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/40	2.60	2.60	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/40	3.20	3.20	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/39	2.80	2.80	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.30	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 05		Term - Fall 2012			Enrollment: 24
Title:	Composition					Questionnaires: 18
Instructor:	McGurrin,Anthon					

				Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	13	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 06		Term - Fall 2012			Enrollment: 24
Title:	Composition					Questionnaires: 19
Instructor:	Pekarske,Nicole					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	8	6	3.89	1300/1589	3.68	4.11	4.32	4.20	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	7	9	4.16	1044/1589	4.01	4.23	4.29	4.28	4.16
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	874/1391	4.36	4.39	4.34	4.29	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	10	4	3.79	1281/1552	4.09	4.28	4.25	4.16	3.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	8	2	5	3.39	1364/1495	3.58	4.04	4.14	4.07	3.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	593/1457	4.20	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	4	2	10	4.11	995/1572	3.76	4.00	4.21	4.18	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	18	0	4.00	1500/1589	4.52	4.55	4.66	4.59	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	1	1	3	12	1	3.61	1312/1569	3.91	4.09	4.13	4.08	3.61
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	4	6	6	4.00	1319/1530	4.17	4.38	4.49	4.45	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	942/1533	4.67	4.77	4.75	4.69	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	3	5	6	3.76	1328/1528	4.12	4.33	4.35	4.31	3.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	4	1	5	7	3.88	1263/1529	3.98	4.25	4.36	4.31	3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	3	5	3	5	3.47	1157/1393	3.40	3.72	4.06	3.99	3.47
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	2	9	2	3.56	1112/1337	3.80	4.22	4.17	4.01	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	3	7	6	4.19	880/1331	3.97	4.41	4.35	4.18	4.19
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	4	2	9	4.13	965/1333	4.35	4.54	4.40	4.22	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	1	1	2	7	5	3.88	654/1014	3.83	4.04	4.05	3.91	3.88

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 06		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment:	24
Title:	Composition										Questionnaires:	19
Instructor:	Pekarske,Nicole											

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/180	4.60	4.31	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/194	4.20	3.95	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/178	4.80	4.90	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/181	****	4.88	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/165	5.00	5.00	4.12	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/62	****	4.35	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/65	3.40	4.33	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/63	3.20	4.28	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/61	****	5.00	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/61	****	4.17	4.19	3.98	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/40	2.60	2.60	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	3.20	3.20	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 06		Term - Fall 2012			Enrollment: 24
Title:	Composition					Questionnaires: 19
Instructor:	Pekarske,Nicole					

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	**NR**	**NA**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/39	2.80	2.80	4.00	3.52	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		**Cum. GPA**		**Expected Grades**		**Reasons**		**Type**		**Majors**	
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	4	A	7	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	6	General	12	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 100 07	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 24
Title: Composition		Questionnaires: 17
Instructor: Carillo,John P		

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | 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	4	1	3	6	3	3.18	1553/1589	3.68	4.11	4.32	4.20	3.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	1	3	2	7	3.41	1494/1589	4.01	4.23	4.29	4.28	3.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1391	4.36	4.39	4.34	4.29	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	976/1552	4.09	4.28	4.25	4.16	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	5	4	5	3.47	1322/1495	3.58	4.04	4.14	4.07	3.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	3	3	9	4.00	886/1457	4.20	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	4	7	2	3.44	1429/1572	3.76	4.00	4.21	4.18	3.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	14	2	4.06	1483/1589	4.52	4.55	4.66	4.59	4.06
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	2	3	6	5	3.88	1107/1569	3.91	4.09	4.13	4.08	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	1	1	3	10	4.06	1300/1530	4.17	4.38	4.49	4.45	4.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	814/1533	4.67	4.77	4.75	4.69	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	1	4	9	4.25	992/1528	4.12	4.33	4.35	4.31	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	4	4	7	3.82	1300/1529	3.98	4.25	4.36	4.31	3.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	1	0	3	6	3	3.77	993/1393	3.40	3.72	4.06	3.99	3.77
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	774/1337	3.80	4.22	4.17	4.01	4.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	0	4	2	3	3.36	1241/1331	3.97	4.41	4.35	4.18	3.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	926/1333	4.35	4.54	4.40	4.22	4.18

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 07	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 24
Title:	Composition		Questionnaires: 17
Instructor:	Carillo,John P		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	6	8	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/1014	3.83	4.04	4.05	3.91	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	2	A	6	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	12	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 08		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 24			
Title:	Composition										Questionnaires: 24			
Instructor:	Bloom,Ryan I													

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	3	0	0	0	4	9	8	4.19	1015/1589	3.68	4.11	4.32	4.20	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	1	10	9	4.29	912/1589	4.01	4.23	4.29	4.28	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	18	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1391	4.36	4.39	4.34	4.29	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	4	9	8	4.19	910/1552	4.09	4.28	4.25	4.16	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	5	8	5	3.80	1115/1495	3.58	4.04	4.14	4.07	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	1	8	9	4.20	732/1457	4.20	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	3	1	7	9	4.10	1005/1572	3.76	4.00	4.21	4.18	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	467/1589	4.52	4.55	4.66	4.59	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	11	8	4.42	481/1569	3.91	4.09	4.13	4.08	4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	787/1530	4.17	4.38	4.49	4.45	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	293/1533	4.67	4.77	4.75	4.69	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	9	12	4.57	607/1528	4.12	4.33	4.35	4.31	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	795/1529	3.98	4.25	4.36	4.31	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	2	1	7	4	1	3.07	1303/1393	3.40	3.72	4.06	3.99	3.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	9	11	4.55	415/1337	3.80	4.22	4.17	4.01	4.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	543/1331	3.97	4.41	4.35	4.18	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	438/1333	4.35	4.54	4.40	4.22	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	1	1	11	6	4.16	468/1014	3.83	4.04	4.05	3.91	4.16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 08		Term - Fall 2012				Enrollment: 24				
Title:	Composition						Questionnaires: 24				
Instructor:	Bloom,Ryan I										

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/180	4.60	4.31	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/194	4.20	3.95	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/178	4.80	4.90	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/181	****	4.88	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/165	5.00	5.00	4.12	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/62	****	4.35	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/65	3.40	4.33	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/63	3.20	4.28	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/61	****	5.00	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/61	****	4.17	4.19	3.98	****
Field Work														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/32	****	****	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/39	2.80	2.80	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.30	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 08	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 24
Title:	Composition		Questionnaires: 24
Instructor:	Bloom,Ryan I		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	2	A	3	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	13	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	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 09		Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment:	23
Title:	Composition				Questionnaires:	18
Instructor:	Killgallon,Dona					

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	646/1589	3.68	4.11	4.32	4.20	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	13	4.56	540/1589	4.01	4.23	4.29	4.28	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	517/1391	4.36	4.39	4.34	4.29	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	457/1552	4.09	4.28	4.25	4.16	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	5	9	4.17	784/1495	3.58	4.04	4.14	4.07	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	192/1457	4.20	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.72
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	2	13	4.44	586/1572	3.76	4.00	4.21	4.18	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	882/1589	4.52	4.55	4.66	4.59	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	2	11	3	3.94	1031/1569	3.91	4.09	4.13	4.08	3.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	964/1530	4.17	4.38	4.49	4.45	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	643/1533	4.67	4.77	4.75	4.69	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	768/1528	4.12	4.33	4.35	4.31	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	382/1529	3.98	4.25	4.36	4.31	4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	5	5	8	4.17	674/1393	3.40	3.72	4.06	3.99	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	8	8	4.33	601/1337	3.80	4.22	4.17	4.01	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	583/1331	3.97	4.41	4.35	4.18	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	1	4	12	4.50	702/1333	4.35	4.54	4.40	4.22	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	1	2	7	4	4.00	554/1014	3.83	4.04	4.05	3.91	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 09		Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 23
Title:	Composition				Questionnaires: 18
Instructor:	Killgallon,Dona				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5							
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	40/180	4.60	4.31	4.20	4.25	4.60
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	26/194	4.20	3.95	4.17	4.36	4.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	46/178	4.80	4.90	4.47	4.57	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/181	****	4.88	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/165	5.00	5.00	4.12	4.37	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/62	****	4.35	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/65	3.40	4.33	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/63	3.20	4.28	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/61	****	5.00	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/61	****	4.17	4.19	3.98	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/40	2.60	2.60	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/40	3.20	3.20	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/39	2.80	2.80	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.30	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 09		Term - Fall 2012			Enrollment: 23
Title:	Composition					Questionnaires: 18
Instructor:	Killgallon,Dona					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	12	Under-grad	18	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 100 11		Term - Fall 2012						Enrollment: 25				
Title: Composition								Questionnaires: 23				
Instructor: Sorokin,Anissa												

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	0	2	9	11	4.41	780/1589	3.68	4.11	4.32	4.20	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	8	12	4.45	689/1589	4.01	4.23	4.29	4.28	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	15	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	204/1391	4.36	4.39	4.34	4.29	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	149/1552	4.09	4.28	4.25	4.16	4.84
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	4	6	9	4.05	877/1495	3.58	4.04	4.14	4.07	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	335/1457	4.20	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	1	3	7	9	4.20	913/1572	3.76	4.00	4.21	4.18	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	806/1589	4.52	4.55	4.66	4.59	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	9	9	4.50	369/1569	3.91	4.09	4.13	4.08	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	399/1530	4.17	4.38	4.49	4.45	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	729/1533	4.67	4.77	4.75	4.69	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	479/1528	4.12	4.33	4.35	4.31	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	321/1529	3.98	4.25	4.36	4.31	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	102/1393	3.40	3.72	4.06	3.99	4.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	202/1337	3.80	4.22	4.17	4.01	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	559/1331	3.97	4.41	4.35	4.18	4.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	438/1333	4.35	4.54	4.40	4.22	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	244/1014	3.83	4.04	4.05	3.91	4.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 100 11	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 25
Title: Composition		Questionnaires: 23
Instructor: Sorokin,Anissa		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/180	4.60	4.31	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	4.20	3.95	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/178	4.80	4.90	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/181	****	4.88	4.40	4.54	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	16	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 12		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment:	24		
Title:	Composition										Questionnaires:	20		
Instructor:	Putzel,Diane													

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**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	3	10	7	4.20	1005/1589	3.68	4.11	4.32	4.20	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	8	10	4.35	828/1589	4.01	4.23	4.29	4.28	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	18	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1391	4.36	4.39	4.34	4.29	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	6	9	4.15	954/1552	4.09	4.28	4.25	4.16	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	4	2	3	1	0	2.10	1492/1495	3.58	4.04	4.14	4.07	2.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	258/1457	4.20	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	4	5	8	3.90	1190/1572	3.76	4.00	4.21	4.18	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1589	4.52	4.55	4.66	4.59	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	646/1569	3.91	4.09	4.13	4.08	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	887/1530	4.17	4.38	4.49	4.45	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	1114/1533	4.67	4.77	4.75	4.69	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	756/1528	4.12	4.33	4.35	4.31	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	6	8	4.05	1151/1529	3.98	4.25	4.36	4.31	4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	4	5	4	3	3.24	1257/1393	3.40	3.72	4.06	3.99	3.24
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	5	5	8	3.85	958/1337	3.80	4.22	4.17	4.01	3.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	2	3	3	12	4.25	824/1331	3.97	4.41	4.35	4.18	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	438/1333	4.35	4.54	4.40	4.22	4.75

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 12	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 24
Title:	Composition		Questionnaires: 20
Instructor:	Putzel,Diane		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	0	1	6	2	6	3.87	659/1014	3.83	4.04	4.05	3.91	3.87

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	4	A	15	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	16	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 13		Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment:	24
Title:	Composition				Questionnaires:	21
Instructor:	Carillo,John P					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	9	7	4.00	1182/1589	3.68	4.11	4.32	4.20	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	4	9	6	3.95	1209/1589	4.01	4.23	4.29	4.28	3.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	18	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1391	4.36	4.39	4.34	4.29	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	1	8	9	4.32	782/1552	4.09	4.28	4.25	4.16	4.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	2	8	8	4.00	899/1495	3.58	4.04	4.14	4.07	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	6	11	4.24	701/1457	4.20	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	7	2	1	4	6	1	3.21	1483/1572	3.76	4.00	4.21	4.18	3.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	15	3	4.00	1500/1589	4.52	4.55	4.66	4.59	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	509/1569	3.91	4.09	4.13	4.08	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	8	9	4.24	1185/1530	4.17	4.38	4.49	4.45	4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	729/1533	4.67	4.77	4.75	4.69	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	8	10	4.29	966/1528	4.12	4.33	4.35	4.31	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	4	12	4.29	974/1529	3.98	4.25	4.36	4.31	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	3	0	4	5	7	3.68	1046/1393	3.40	3.72	4.06	3.99	3.68
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	372/1337	3.80	4.22	4.17	4.01	4.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	532/1331	3.97	4.41	4.35	4.18	4.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	202/1333	4.35	4.54	4.40	4.22	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	8	7	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	944/1014	3.83	4.04	4.05	3.91	3.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 13		Term - Fall 2012									Enrollment: 24				
Title:	Composition											Questionnaires: 21				
Instructor:	Carillo,John P															

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/180	4.60	4.31	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/194	4.20	3.95	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/178	4.80	4.90	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/181	****	4.88	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/165	5.00	5.00	4.12	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/62	****	4.35	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/65	3.40	4.33	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/63	3.20	4.28	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/61	****	5.00	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/61	****	4.17	4.19	3.98	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/40	2.60	2.60	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/40	3.20	3.20	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/32	****	****	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/39	2.80	2.80	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.30	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 13		Term - Fall 2012									Enrollment: 24
Title:	Composition											Questionnaires: 21
Instructor:	Carillo,John P											

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	15	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
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 responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 14		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 24			
Title:	Composition										Questionnaires: 24			
Instructor:	Bloom,Ryan I													

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**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	2	1	4	13	4	3.67	1440/1589	3.68	4.11	4.32	4.20	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	4	4	11	3.79	1333/1589	4.01	4.23	4.29	4.28	3.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	21	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1391	4.36	4.39	4.34	4.29	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	1	2	10	7	3.74	1314/1552	4.09	4.28	4.25	4.16	3.74
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	4	4	4	9	3.61	1251/1495	3.58	4.04	4.14	4.07	3.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	5	4	10	3.78	1104/1457	4.20	4.32	4.15	3.99	3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	4	3	6	3	7	3.26	1472/1572	3.76	4.00	4.21	4.18	3.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	14	4.61	1011/1589	4.52	4.55	4.66	4.59	4.61
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	2	3	11	4	3.71	1241/1569	3.91	4.09	4.13	4.08	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	3	5	15	4.38	1050/1530	4.17	4.38	4.49	4.45	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	527/1533	4.67	4.77	4.75	4.69	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	1	7	14	4.38	856/1528	4.12	4.33	4.35	4.31	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	8	9	3.92	1243/1529	3.98	4.25	4.36	4.31	3.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	2	1	3	6	2	3.36	1214/1393	3.40	3.72	4.06	3.99	3.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	1	6	12	4.24	678/1337	3.80	4.22	4.17	4.01	4.24
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	478/1331	3.97	4.41	4.35	4.18	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	313/1333	4.35	4.54	4.40	4.22	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	1	0	2	7	11	4.29	375/1014	3.83	4.04	4.05	3.91	4.29

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 100 14	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 24
Title: Composition		Questionnaires: 24
Instructor: Bloom,Ryan I		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/180	4.60	4.31	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/194	4.20	3.95	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/178	4.80	4.90	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/181	****	4.88	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/165	5.00	5.00	4.12	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/62	****	4.35	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/65	3.40	4.33	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/63	3.20	4.28	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/61	****	5.00	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/61	****	4.17	4.19	3.98	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/40	2.60	2.60	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/40	3.20	3.20	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/39	2.80	2.80	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/22	****	****	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.30	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 14		Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment:	24
Title:	Composition				Questionnaires:	24
Instructor:	Bloom,Ryan I					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	3	A	6	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	15						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	18	Under-grad	23	Non-major	24
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 15		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 25			
Title:	Composition										Questionnaires: 23			
Instructor:	Kidd,Kathleen A													

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	2	1	5	13	2	3.52	1494/1589	3.68	4.11	4.32	4.20	3.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	1	16	4.43	719/1589	4.01	4.23	4.29	4.28	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	2	0	5	12	4.42	706/1391	4.36	4.39	4.34	4.29	4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	8	8	3.91	1175/1552	4.09	4.28	4.25	4.16	3.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	4	4	12	4.18	764/1495	3.58	4.04	4.14	4.07	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	6	13	4.22	721/1457	4.20	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	3	7	10	3.96	1142/1572	3.76	4.00	4.21	4.18	3.96
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	677/1589	4.52	4.55	4.66	4.59	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	1	4	13	3	3.86	1125/1569	3.91	4.09	4.13	4.08	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	4	8	10	4.17	1230/1530	4.17	4.38	4.49	4.45	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	3	3	15	4.35	1384/1533	4.67	4.77	4.75	4.69	4.35
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	1	9	11	4.26	983/1528	4.12	4.33	4.35	4.31	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	9	9	4.00	1174/1529	3.98	4.25	4.36	4.31	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	2	3	4	4	4	3.29	1237/1393	3.40	3.72	4.06	3.99	3.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	3	6	6	4.06	793/1337	3.80	4.22	4.17	4.01	4.06
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	4	3	9	4.31	780/1331	3.97	4.41	4.35	4.18	4.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	0	7	8	4.38	802/1333	4.35	4.54	4.40	4.22	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	1	0	5	4	5	3.80	686/1014	3.83	4.04	4.05	3.91	3.80

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 15	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 25
Title:	Composition			Questionnaires: 23
Instructor:	Kidd,Kathleen A			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/180	4.60	4.31	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/194	4.20	3.95	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/178	4.80	4.90	4.47	4.57	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	4.35	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/65	3.40	4.33	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/63	3.20	4.28	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/61	****	5.00	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/61	****	4.17	4.19	3.98	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/40	2.60	2.60	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/40	3.20	3.20	3.89	3.11	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/39	2.80	2.80	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.30	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 15		Term - Fall 2012			Enrollment: 25
Title:	Composition					Questionnaires: 23
Instructor:	Kidd,Kathleen A					

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	2	A	13	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	13	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 16			Term - Fall 2012						Enrollment: 24				
Title:	Composition									Questionnaires: 19				
Instructor:	MacDougall,Elai													

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	3	3	8	4	3.58	1476/1589	3.68	4.11	4.32	4.20	3.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	11	5	4.05	1121/1589	4.01	4.23	4.29	4.28	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	482/1391	4.36	4.39	4.34	4.29	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	9	8	4.39	693/1552	4.09	4.28	4.25	4.16	4.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	4	9	4	3.83	1086/1495	3.58	4.04	4.14	4.07	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	381/1457	4.20	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	2	12	4.32	761/1572	3.76	4.00	4.21	4.18	4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	11	4.58	1042/1589	4.52	4.55	4.66	4.59	4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	3	10	3	4.00	957/1569	3.91	4.09	4.13	4.08	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	887/1530	4.17	4.38	4.49	4.45	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	9	9	4.50	1261/1533	4.67	4.77	4.75	4.69	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	9	8	4.39	843/1528	4.12	4.33	4.35	4.31	4.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	8	7	4.17	1081/1529	3.98	4.25	4.36	4.31	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	400/1393	3.40	3.72	4.06	3.99	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1082/1337	3.80	4.22	4.17	4.01	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	824/1331	3.97	4.41	4.35	4.18	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	592/1333	4.35	4.54	4.40	4.22	4.63

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 16	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment:	24
Title:	Composition			Questionnaires:	19
Instructor:	MacDougall,Elai				

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	686/1014	3.83	4.04	4.05	3.91	3.80

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	14	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 17	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 24
Title:	Composition			Questionnaires: 21
Instructor:	Pats,Victoria R			

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	3	4	8	5	3.62	1460/1589	3.68	4.11	4.32	4.20	3.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	11	4.29	912/1589	4.01	4.23	4.29	4.28	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	600/1391	4.36	4.39	4.34	4.29	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	7	9	4.15	954/1552	4.09	4.28	4.25	4.16	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	4	5	8	3.76	1145/1495	3.58	4.04	4.14	4.07	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	7	9	4.19	741/1457	4.20	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	8	6	4	3.48	1416/1572	3.76	4.00	4.21	4.18	3.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	11	4.52	1095/1589	4.52	4.55	4.66	4.59	4.52
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	12	5	4.11	879/1569	3.91	4.09	4.13	4.08	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	951/1530	4.17	4.38	4.49	4.45	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	1047/1533	4.67	4.77	4.75	4.69	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	632/1528	4.12	4.33	4.35	4.31	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	5	11	4.35	904/1529	3.98	4.25	4.36	4.31	4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	2	1	3	7	2	3.40	1195/1393	3.40	3.72	4.06	3.99	3.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	663/1337	3.80	4.22	4.17	4.01	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	736/1331	3.97	4.41	4.35	4.18	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	592/1333	4.35	4.54	4.40	4.22	4.63

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 17	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment:	24
Title:	Composition			Questionnaires:	21
Instructor:	Pats,Victoria R				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	1	1	8	6	4.19	444/1014	3.83	4.04	4.05	3.91	4.19

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	18	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 100 18	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 24
Title: Composition		Questionnaires: 20
Instructor: Macek,Philip M.		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	7	1	5	4	2	2.63	1579/1589	3.68	4.11	4.32	4.20	2.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	4	2	4	4	5	3.21	1534/1589	4.01	4.23	4.29	4.28	3.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	14	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1280/1391	4.36	4.39	4.34	4.29	3.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	3	4	5	4	3.47	1435/1552	4.09	4.28	4.25	4.16	3.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	4	3	6	2	3	2.83	1461/1495	3.58	4.04	4.14	4.07	2.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	3	1	4	7	3.37	1328/1457	4.20	4.32	4.15	3.99	3.37
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	4	3	5	5	3.50	1407/1572	3.76	4.00	4.21	4.18	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	1	0	0	12	5	4.11	1459/1589	4.52	4.55	4.66	4.59	4.11
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	4	6	5	3	3.39	1422/1569	3.91	4.09	4.13	4.08	3.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	4	8	1	4	3.29	1493/1530	4.17	4.38	4.49	4.45	3.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	4	6	9	4.26	1421/1533	4.67	4.77	4.75	4.69	4.26
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	4	3	4	5	3.33	1446/1528	4.12	4.33	4.35	4.31	3.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	5	3	3	5	3.35	1440/1529	3.98	4.25	4.36	4.31	3.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	1	2	4	3	2	3.25	1251/1393	3.40	3.72	4.06	3.99	3.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	3	5	2	3	3.07	1267/1337	3.80	4.22	4.17	4.01	3.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	4	4	6	3.93	1054/1331	3.97	4.41	4.35	4.18	3.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	615/1333	4.35	4.54	4.40	4.22	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	5	11	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	****/1014	3.83	4.04	4.05	3.91	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 100 18	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 24
Title: Composition		Questionnaires: 20
Instructor: Macek,Philip M.		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	****/194	4.20	3.95	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/178	4.80	4.90	4.47	4.57	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	5.00	5.00	4.12	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	1	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/62	****	4.35	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	60/65	3.40	4.33	4.43	4.13	3.40
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	57/63	3.20	4.28	4.29	4.12	3.20
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	1	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/61	****	5.00	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	1	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/61	****	4.17	4.19	3.98	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	1	0	1	1	2.60	34/40	2.60	2.60	3.85	3.17	2.60
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	32/40	3.20	3.20	3.89	3.11	3.20
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	1	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	1	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	1	0	0	2	2.80	34/39	2.80	2.80	4.00	3.52	2.80
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	2	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/22	****	****	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	1	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.30	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	1	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 18		Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 24
Title:	Composition				Questionnaires: 20
Instructor:	Macek,Philip M.				

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	1	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	5	General	12	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 100 19	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 24
Title: Composition		Questionnaires: 22
Instructor: Sneeringer,Holl		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	2	8	10	4.24	976/1589	3.68	4.11	4.32	4.20	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	455/1589	4.01	4.23	4.29	4.28	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	242/1391	4.36	4.39	4.34	4.29	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	274/1552	4.09	4.28	4.25	4.16	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	6	13	4.41	531/1495	3.58	4.04	4.14	4.07	4.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	125/1457	4.20	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	4	12	4.18	931/1572	3.76	4.00	4.21	4.18	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	234/1589	4.52	4.55	4.66	4.59	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	272/1569	3.91	4.09	4.13	4.08	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	610/1530	4.17	4.38	4.49	4.45	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	586/1533	4.67	4.77	4.75	4.69	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	582/1528	4.12	4.33	4.35	4.31	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	14	4.55	689/1529	3.98	4.25	4.36	4.31	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	2	2	4	1	6	3.47	1163/1393	3.40	3.72	4.06	3.99	3.47
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	400/1337	3.80	4.22	4.17	4.01	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	446/1331	3.97	4.41	4.35	4.18	4.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	202/1333	4.35	4.54	4.40	4.22	4.93
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	1	0	0	4	8	4.38	306/1014	3.83	4.04	4.05	3.91	4.38

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 19	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 24
Title:	Composition			Questionnaires: 22
Instructor:	Sneeringer,Holl			

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/65	3.40	4.33	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/63	3.20	4.28	4.29	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	9	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 100 20	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 24
Title: Composition		Questionnaires: 20
Instructor: Sneeringer,Holl		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	9	6	3.95	1238/1589	3.68	4.11	4.32	4.20	3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	11	4.35	828/1589	4.01	4.23	4.29	4.28	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	8	4	4.33	799/1391	4.36	4.39	4.34	4.29	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	11	4.35	731/1552	4.09	4.28	4.25	4.16	4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	7	7	3.90	1019/1495	3.58	4.04	4.14	4.07	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	10	7	4.10	823/1457	4.20	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	3	6	8	3.95	1142/1572	3.76	4.00	4.21	4.18	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	234/1589	4.52	4.55	4.66	4.59	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	2	1	8	4	3.93	1043/1569	3.91	4.09	4.13	4.08	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	5	14	4.60	745/1530	4.17	4.38	4.49	4.45	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	959/1533	4.67	4.77	4.75	4.69	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	10	8	4.30	949/1528	4.12	4.33	4.35	4.31	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	7	11	4.35	904/1529	3.98	4.25	4.36	4.31	4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	1	3	2	8	0	3.21	1264/1393	3.40	3.72	4.06	3.99	3.21
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	8	5	4.06	793/1337	3.80	4.22	4.17	4.01	4.06
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	824/1331	3.97	4.41	4.35	4.18	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	361/1333	4.35	4.54	4.40	4.22	4.81
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	1	0	1	7	6	4.13	483/1014	3.83	4.04	4.05	3.91	4.13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 100 20		Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 24
Title: Composition				Questionnaires: 20
Instructor: Sneeringer,Holl				

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	2	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/180	4.60	4.31	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	170/194	4.20	3.95	4.17	4.36	3.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/178	4.80	4.90	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/181	****	4.88	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	2	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/165	5.00	5.00	4.12	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/62	****	4.35	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/65	3.40	4.33	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/63	3.20	4.28	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/61	****	5.00	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	1	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/61	****	4.17	4.19	3.98	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/40	2.60	2.60	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	****/40	3.20	3.20	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/32	****	****	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/39	2.80	2.80	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/22	****	****	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.30	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 20		Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 24
Title:	Composition				Questionnaires: 20
Instructor:	Sneeringer,Holl				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	2	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 21	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment:	24
Title:	Composition		Questionnaires:	22
Instructor:	Pats,Victoria R			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	5	12	3	3.64	1452/1589	3.68	4.11	4.32	4.20	3.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	12	4.41	765/1589	4.01	4.23	4.29	4.28	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	402/1391	4.36	4.39	4.34	4.29	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	4	13	4.38	693/1552	4.09	4.28	4.25	4.16	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	3	8	7	3.68	1203/1495	3.58	4.04	4.14	4.07	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	5	12	4.23	711/1457	4.20	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	6	6	9	4.05	1059/1572	3.76	4.00	4.21	4.18	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	19	3	4.14	1445/1589	4.52	4.55	4.66	4.59	4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	1	6	3	8	4.00	957/1569	3.91	4.09	4.13	4.08	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	858/1530	4.17	4.38	4.49	4.45	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	3	5	12	4.33	1389/1533	4.67	4.77	4.75	4.69	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	6	12	4.43	792/1528	4.12	4.33	4.35	4.31	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	5	12	4.24	1021/1529	3.98	4.25	4.36	4.31	4.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	5	2	3	5	2	2.82	1345/1393	3.40	3.72	4.06	3.99	2.82
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	2	4	7	4.00	823/1337	3.80	4.22	4.17	4.01	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	543/1331	3.97	4.41	4.35	4.18	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	0	13	4.73	464/1333	4.35	4.54	4.40	4.22	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	1	8	4	4.23	408/1014	3.83	4.04	4.05	3.91	4.23

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 21	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 24
Title:	Composition		Questionnaires: 22
Instructor:	Pats,Victoria R		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/194	4.20	3.95	4.17	4.36	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/40	2.60	2.60	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/40	3.20	3.20	3.89	3.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/39	2.80	2.80	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/22	****	****	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.30	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	3	A	10	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	17	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Run Date: 1/31/2013 12:23:36 PM

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 100 22	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 24
Title: Composition		Questionnaires: 18
Instructor: Maher,Jennifer		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	4	4	5	4	3.39	1525/1589	3.68	4.11	4.32	4.20	3.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	3	7	4	3.50	1471/1589	4.01	4.23	4.29	4.28	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1391	4.36	4.39	4.34	4.29	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	4	8	4	0	2.88	1531/1552	4.09	4.28	4.25	4.16	2.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	8	5	3.94	971/1495	3.58	4.04	4.14	4.07	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	4	2	7	4	3.65	1205/1457	4.20	4.32	4.15	3.99	3.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	7	1	5	2	0	2.13	1562/1572	3.76	4.00	4.21	4.18	2.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	13	4	0	3.17	1579/1589	4.52	4.55	4.66	4.59	3.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	4	8	1	3.53	1352/1569	3.91	4.09	4.13	4.08	3.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	6	8	1	3.47	1472/1530	4.17	4.38	4.49	4.45	3.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	1047/1533	4.67	4.77	4.75	4.69	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	1	7	6	1	3.18	1473/1528	4.12	4.33	4.35	4.31	3.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	7	4	4	3.59	1391/1529	3.98	4.25	4.36	4.31	3.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	3	2	2	5	0	2.75	1353/1393	3.40	3.72	4.06	3.99	2.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	4	3	3	3.64	1078/1337	3.80	4.22	4.17	4.01	3.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	2	2	3	4	3.82	1117/1331	3.97	4.41	4.35	4.18	3.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	810/1333	4.35	4.54	4.40	4.22	4.36
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	1	4	2	3	3.70	734/1014	3.83	4.04	4.05	3.91	3.70

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 100 22	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 24
Title: Composition		Questionnaires: 18
Instructor: Maher,Jennifer		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/62	****	4.35	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/65	3.40	4.33	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/63	3.20	4.28	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/61	****	5.00	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/61	****	4.17	4.19	3.98	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	11	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 100 23	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 24
Title: Composition		Questionnaires: 22
Instructor: Burns,Margie		

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	4	8	6	3.68	1432/1589	3.68	4.11	4.32	4.20	3.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	6	10	4.09	1097/1589	4.01	4.23	4.29	4.28	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	517/1391	4.36	4.39	4.34	4.29	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	4	7	9	4.14	965/1552	4.09	4.28	4.25	4.16	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	2	6	6	4	3.40	1357/1495	3.58	4.04	4.14	4.07	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	4	4	10	4.10	823/1457	4.20	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	3	6	3	6	3.40	1439/1572	3.76	4.00	4.21	4.18	3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	17	4	4.19	1402/1589	4.52	4.55	4.66	4.59	4.19
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	1	5	8	3	3.61	1312/1569	3.91	4.09	4.13	4.08	3.61
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	9	10	4.33	1095/1530	4.17	4.38	4.49	4.45	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	872/1533	4.67	4.77	4.75	4.69	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	8	9	4.24	1009/1528	4.12	4.33	4.35	4.31	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	9	2	8	3.71	1351/1529	3.98	4.25	4.36	4.31	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	1	8	5	4	3.67	1057/1393	3.40	3.72	4.06	3.99	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	3	1	3	3	3.36	1194/1337	3.80	4.22	4.17	4.01	3.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	2	5	2	1	3.20	1264/1331	3.97	4.41	4.35	4.18	3.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	1	4	1	4	3.80	1124/1333	4.35	4.54	4.40	4.22	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	2	1	3	2	1	2.89	971/1014	3.83	4.04	4.05	3.91	2.89

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 23		Term - Fall 2012			Enrollment: 24
Title:	Composition					Questionnaires: 22
Instructor:	Burns,Margie					

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/62	****	4.35	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/65	3.40	4.33	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/63	3.20	4.28	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/61	****	5.00	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/61	****	4.17	4.19	3.98	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/40	2.60	2.60	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/40	3.20	3.20	3.89	3.11	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/39	2.80	2.80	4.00	3.52	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	17	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 01		Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 24
Title: Composition				Questionnaires: 17
Instructor: Dunnigan,Brian				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	10	6	4.29	919/1589	3.88	4.11	4.32	4.20	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	5	11	4.47	659/1589	4.16	4.23	4.29	4.28	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	402/1391	4.11	4.39	4.34	4.29	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	652/1552	4.08	4.28	4.25	4.16	4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	450/1495	3.79	4.04	4.14	4.07	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	326/1457	4.17	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	7	4	3.88	1211/1572	4.01	4.00	4.21	4.18	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	15	2	4.12	1459/1589	4.34	4.55	4.66	4.59	4.12
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	312/1569	4.04	4.09	4.13	4.08	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	3	13	4.65	677/1530	4.26	4.38	4.49	4.45	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	814/1533	4.66	4.77	4.75	4.69	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	509/1528	4.28	4.33	4.35	4.31	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	714/1529	4.16	4.25	4.36	4.31	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	1	1	5	3	3	3.46	1163/1393	3.40	3.72	4.06	3.99	3.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	5	9	4.31	616/1337	3.79	4.22	4.17	4.01	4.31
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	1	2	11	4.31	780/1331	4.19	4.41	4.35	4.18	4.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	177/1333	4.39	4.54	4.40	4.22	4.94
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	1	6	4	3	3.64	768/1014	3.52	4.04	4.05	3.91	3.64

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 24
Title: Composition		Questionnaires: 17
Instructor: Dunnigan,Brian		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/180	3.33	4.31	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	3.33	3.95	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/178	****	4.90	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/181	4.75	4.88	4.40	4.54	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	4.17	4.19	3.98	****
Field Work														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	3.86	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	3	A	9	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	10	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 04	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 24
Title:	Composition		Questionnaires: 22
Instructor:	Dunnigan,Brian		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	8	7	6	3.82	1351/1589	3.88	4.11	4.32	4.20	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	12	4.45	689/1589	4.16	4.23	4.29	4.28	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	679/1391	4.11	4.39	4.34	4.29	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	5	11	4.18	921/1552	4.08	4.28	4.25	4.16	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	6	11	4.24	713/1495	3.79	4.04	4.14	4.07	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	6	12	4.23	711/1457	4.17	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	6	12	4.32	761/1572	4.01	4.00	4.21	4.18	4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	4	16	2	3.91	1545/1589	4.34	4.55	4.66	4.59	3.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	2	9	7	4.11	879/1569	4.04	4.09	4.13	4.08	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	694/1530	4.26	4.38	4.49	4.45	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	293/1533	4.66	4.77	4.75	4.69	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	7	15	4.68	449/1528	4.28	4.33	4.35	4.31	4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	14	4.50	739/1529	4.16	4.25	4.36	4.31	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	2	4	8	6	3.76	993/1393	3.40	3.72	4.06	3.99	3.76
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	8	4	9	4.05	803/1337	3.79	4.22	4.17	4.01	4.05
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	424/1331	4.19	4.41	4.35	4.18	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	425/1333	4.39	4.54	4.40	4.22	4.76
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	1	1	9	4	1	3.19	928/1014	3.52	4.04	4.05	3.91	3.19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 04	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 24
Title: Composition		Questionnaires: 22
Instructor: Dunnigan,Brian		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/180	3.33	4.31	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/194	3.33	3.95	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/178	****	4.90	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/181	4.75	4.88	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/165	****	5.00	4.12	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/62	****	4.35	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/65	****	4.33	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/63	****	4.28	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/61	****	5.00	4.47	4.61	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/40	****	2.60	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/40	****	3.20	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/39	****	2.80	4.00	3.52	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 04		Term - Fall 2012			Enrollment: 24
Title:	Composition					Questionnaires: 22
Instructor:	Dunnigan,Brian					

				Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
Self Paced														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.12	3.23	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	17	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 07		Term - Fall 2012			Enrollment: 24
Title: Composition					Questionnaires: 20
Instructor: Brofman,Margare					

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	2	8	5	1	2.85	1571/1589	3.88	4.11	4.32	4.20	2.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	6	9	2	3.40	1497/1589	4.16	4.23	4.29	4.28	3.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	3	7	3	3.86	1171/1391	4.11	4.39	4.34	4.29	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	1	8	5	3	3.32	1487/1552	4.08	4.28	4.25	4.16	3.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	4	8	2	0	2.30	1487/1495	3.79	4.04	4.14	4.07	2.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	1	5	5	5	3.42	1303/1457	4.17	4.32	4.15	3.99	3.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	4	8	5	3.70	1313/1572	4.01	4.00	4.21	4.18	3.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	234/1589	4.34	4.55	4.66	4.59	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	3	8	6	0	3.06	1501/1569	4.04	4.09	4.13	4.08	3.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	3	1	5	6	4	3.37	1487/1530	4.26	4.38	4.49	4.45	3.37
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	1	7	11	4.35	1378/1533	4.66	4.77	4.75	4.69	4.35
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	6	8	3	3.55	1398/1528	4.28	4.33	4.35	4.31	3.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	2	8	4	1	2.70	1504/1529	4.16	4.25	4.36	4.31	2.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	14	4	2	0	0	0	1.33	1390/1393	3.40	3.72	4.06	3.99	1.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	4	4	6	1	2.70	1308/1337	3.79	4.22	4.17	4.01	2.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	6	3	5	6	0	2.55	1320/1331	4.19	4.41	4.35	4.18	2.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	3	8	6	2	3.25	1284/1333	4.39	4.54	4.40	4.22	3.25

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 07	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 24
Title:	Composition		Questionnaires: 20
Instructor:	Brofman,Margare		

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	0	9	2	3	5	0	1	2.55	995/1014	3.52	4.04	4.05	3.91	2.55

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	3	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	16	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 10			Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 23	
Title: Composition											Questionnaires: 20	
Instructor: Dunnigan,Brian												

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**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	9	7	4.15	1057/1589	3.88	4.11	4.32	4.20	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	10	8	4.30	891/1589	4.16	4.23	4.29	4.28	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	2	1	4	2	3.67	1250/1391	4.11	4.39	4.34	4.29	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	7	8	4.10	1009/1552	4.08	4.28	4.25	4.16	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	9	5	3.95	971/1495	3.79	4.04	4.14	4.07	3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	5	10	4.26	670/1457	4.17	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.26
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	5	4	9	4.11	1005/1572	4.01	4.00	4.21	4.18	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	16	2	4.11	1459/1589	4.34	4.55	4.66	4.59	4.11
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	149/1569	4.04	4.09	4.13	4.08	4.81
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	816/1530	4.26	4.38	4.49	4.45	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	959/1533	4.66	4.77	4.75	4.69	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	4	12	4.35	883/1528	4.28	4.33	4.35	4.31	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	6	13	4.55	677/1529	4.16	4.25	4.36	4.31	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	2	6	6	3	3.44	1173/1393	3.40	3.72	4.06	3.99	3.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	6	8	4.22	686/1337	3.79	4.22	4.17	4.01	4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	3	4	1	10	4.00	989/1331	4.19	4.41	4.35	4.18	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	1	15	4.72	477/1333	4.39	4.54	4.40	4.22	4.72
4. Were special techniques successful	3	7	0	3	4	1	2	3.20	925/1014	3.52	4.04	4.05	3.91	3.20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 10	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 23
Title: Composition		Questionnaires: 20
Instructor: Dunnigan,Brian		

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/180	3.33	4.31	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/194	3.33	3.95	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/178	****	4.90	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/181	4.75	4.88	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/165	****	5.00	4.12	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	4.35	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/65	****	4.33	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/63	****	4.28	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/61	****	5.00	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/61	****	4.17	4.19	3.98	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/40	****	2.60	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/40	****	3.20	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/39	****	2.80	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.30	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 10	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment:	23
Title:	Composition			Questionnaires:	20
Instructor:	Dunnigan,Brian				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	14	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 13		Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 24
Title:	Composition				Questionnaires: 20
Instructor:	Pekarske,Nicole				

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	4	7	8	4.10	1110/1589	3.88	4.11	4.32	4.20	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	8	7	4.00	1151/1589	4.16	4.23	4.29	4.28	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	1010/1391	4.11	4.39	4.34	4.29	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	9	9	4.42	636/1552	4.08	4.28	4.25	4.16	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	7	8	4.10	844/1495	3.79	4.04	4.14	4.07	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	5	11	4.35	569/1457	4.17	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	4	12	4.40	647/1572	4.01	4.00	4.21	4.18	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	20	0	4.00	1500/1589	4.34	4.55	4.66	4.59	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	6	7	5	3.94	1031/1569	4.04	4.09	4.13	4.08	3.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	7	10	4.37	1061/1530	4.26	4.38	4.49	4.45	4.37
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	1	15	4.63	1140/1533	4.66	4.77	4.75	4.69	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	6	10	4.32	935/1528	4.28	4.33	4.35	4.31	4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	5	9	4.16	1089/1529	4.16	4.25	4.36	4.31	4.16
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	0	2	2	5	4	3.85	943/1393	3.40	3.72	4.06	3.99	3.85
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	694/1337	3.79	4.22	4.17	4.01	4.21
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	696/1331	4.19	4.41	4.35	4.18	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	817/1333	4.39	4.54	4.40	4.22	4.36
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	5	4	4	3.92	623/1014	3.52	4.04	4.05	3.91	3.92

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 13	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 24
Title:	Composition		Questionnaires: 20
Instructor:	Pekarske,Nicole		

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	3.33	3.95	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/178	****	4.90	4.47	4.57	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	17	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 16		Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 24
Title: Composition				Questionnaires: 21
Instructor: Killgallon,Dona				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	7	10	4.19	1015/1589	3.88	4.11	4.32	4.20	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	8	11	4.38	790/1589	4.16	4.23	4.29	4.28	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	1	0	1	5	8	4.27	865/1391	4.11	4.39	4.34	4.29	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	7	9	4.15	954/1552	4.08	4.28	4.25	4.16	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	8	7	3.81	1115/1495	3.79	4.04	4.14	4.07	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	1	7	10	4.20	732/1457	4.17	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	4	13	4.29	801/1572	4.01	4.00	4.21	4.18	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	3	17	4.67	956/1589	4.34	4.55	4.66	4.59	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	2	9	6	4.11	866/1569	4.04	4.09	4.13	4.08	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	2	5	13	4.38	1038/1530	4.26	4.38	4.49	4.45	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	1029/1533	4.66	4.77	4.75	4.69	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	4	12	4.35	883/1528	4.28	4.33	4.35	4.31	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	5	13	4.50	739/1529	4.16	4.25	4.36	4.31	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	1	3	6	6	3.72	1021/1393	3.40	3.72	4.06	3.99	3.72
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	2	9	6	3.80	991/1337	3.79	4.22	4.17	4.01	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	1	7	11	4.40	715/1331	4.19	4.41	4.35	4.18	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	1	8	10	4.35	817/1333	4.39	4.54	4.40	4.22	4.35

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 16	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 24
Title:	Composition		Questionnaires: 21
Instructor:	Killgallon,Dona		

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	1	2	5	1	5	3.50	823/1014	3.52	4.04	4.05	3.91	3.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	3	A	15	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	12	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 22	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 24
Title: Composition		Questionnaires: 17
Instructor: Walters,April I		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	3	6	2	4	3.18	1553/1589	3.88	4.11	4.32	4.20	3.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	1	5	3	4	3.12	1547/1589	4.16	4.23	4.29	4.28	3.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	3	7	2	0	2.77	1379/1391	4.11	4.39	4.34	4.29	2.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	7	2	4	3.38	1475/1552	4.08	4.28	4.25	4.16	3.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	1	5	3	3	2.88	1456/1495	3.79	4.04	4.14	4.07	2.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	5	5	4	3.47	1281/1457	4.17	4.32	4.15	3.99	3.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	5	2	5	1	4	2.82	1539/1572	4.01	4.00	4.21	4.18	2.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	280/1589	4.34	4.55	4.66	4.59	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	2	3	2	2	3	3.08	1496/1569	4.04	4.09	4.13	4.08	3.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	3	2	4	5	3.44	1478/1530	4.26	4.38	4.49	4.45	3.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	1323/1533	4.66	4.77	4.75	4.69	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	4	2	4	4	3.25	1461/1528	4.28	4.33	4.35	4.31	3.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	3	4	4	3.25	1459/1529	4.16	4.25	4.36	4.31	3.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	4	1	4	5	1	2.87	1340/1393	3.40	3.72	4.06	3.99	2.87
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	4	0	4	0	3	2.82	1294/1337	3.79	4.22	4.17	4.01	2.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	989/1331	4.19	4.41	4.35	4.18	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	3	3	4	3.82	1118/1333	4.39	4.54	4.40	4.22	3.82

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 22	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment:	24
Title:	Composition			Questionnaires:	17
Instructor:	Walters,April I				

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	1	0	3	1	4	3.78	700/1014	3.52	4.04	4.05	3.91	3.78

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	15	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 25	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 24
Title:	Composition		Questionnaires: 19
Instructor:	MacDougall,Elai		

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	3	7	8	4.16	1057/1589	3.88	4.11	4.32	4.20	4.16
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	8	10	4.42	734/1589	4.16	4.23	4.29	4.28	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	552/1391	4.11	4.39	4.34	4.29	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	457/1552	4.08	4.28	4.25	4.16	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	6	9	4.35	587/1495	3.79	4.04	4.14	4.07	4.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	8	9	4.44	465/1457	4.17	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	329/1572	4.01	4.00	4.21	4.18	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	13	5	4.28	1331/1589	4.34	4.55	4.66	4.59	4.28
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	534/1569	4.04	4.09	4.13	4.08	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	728/1530	4.26	4.38	4.49	4.45	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	1100/1533	4.66	4.77	4.75	4.69	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	8	9	4.44	768/1528	4.28	4.33	4.35	4.31	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	739/1529	4.16	4.25	4.36	4.31	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	409/1393	3.40	3.72	4.06	3.99	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	3	0	7	5	3.75	1021/1337	3.79	4.22	4.17	4.01	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	687/1331	4.19	4.41	4.35	4.18	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	592/1333	4.39	4.54	4.40	4.22	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	1	0	3	5	6	4.00	554/1014	3.52	4.04	4.05	3.91	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 25	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 24
Title: Composition		Questionnaires: 19
Instructor: MacDougall,Elai		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/180	3.33	4.31	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	3.33	3.95	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/178	****	4.90	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/181	4.75	4.88	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	5.00	4.12	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	4.35	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/65	****	4.33	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	4.28	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	5.00	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	4.17	4.19	3.98	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	2.60	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	3.20	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/39	****	2.80	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.30	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 25		Term - Fall 2012			Enrollment: 24
Title:	Composition					Questionnaires: 19
Instructor:	MacDougall,Elai					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	12	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 28	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 24
Title: Composition		Questionnaires: 16
Instructor: Pats,Victoria R		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	8	6	4.19	1026/1589	3.88	4.11	4.32	4.20	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	163/1589	4.16	4.23	4.29	4.28	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	402/1391	4.11	4.39	4.34	4.29	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	3	2	9	4.20	900/1552	4.08	4.28	4.25	4.16	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	2	8	4.00	899/1495	3.79	4.04	4.14	4.07	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	308/1457	4.17	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	7	4	3.94	1161/1572	4.01	4.00	4.21	4.18	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	2	4.13	1452/1589	4.34	4.55	4.66	4.59	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	596/1569	4.04	4.09	4.13	4.08	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	2	3	10	4.31	1118/1530	4.26	4.38	4.49	4.45	4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	1154/1533	4.66	4.77	4.75	4.69	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	122/1528	4.28	4.33	4.35	4.31	4.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	397/1529	4.16	4.25	4.36	4.31	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	1	3	4	4	3.69	1041/1393	3.40	3.72	4.06	3.99	3.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	1	9	4.29	639/1337	3.79	4.22	4.17	4.01	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	269/1331	4.19	4.41	4.35	4.18	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	490/1333	4.39	4.54	4.40	4.22	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	1	1	2	3	6	3.92	623/1014	3.52	4.04	4.05	3.91	3.92

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 28
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Pats,Victoria R

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	1	2	0	0	3	3.33	170/180	3.33	4.31	4.20	4.25	3.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	2	0	0	2	2	3.33	179/194	3.33	3.95	4.17	4.36	3.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	4	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/178	****	4.90	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	40/181	4.75	4.88	4.40	4.54	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/165	****	5.00	4.12	4.37	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	9	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100H 01		Term - Fall 2012						Enrollment:	10		
Title:	Composition								Questionnaires:	9		
Instructor:	McCarthy,Lucill											

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	4	5	4.56	582/1589	4.56	4.11	4.32	4.20	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	540/1589	4.56	4.23	4.29	4.28	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1391	****	4.39	4.34	4.29	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	436/1552	4.57	4.28	4.25	4.16	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	1	4	3.88	1047/1495	3.88	4.04	4.14	4.07	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	169/1457	4.75	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	1	3	0	3	3.71	1307/1572	3.71	4.00	4.21	4.18	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	825/1589	4.75	4.55	4.66	4.59	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	328/1569	4.56	4.09	4.13	4.08	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	452/1530	4.78	4.38	4.49	4.45	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.77	4.75	4.69	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	322/1528	4.78	4.33	4.35	4.31	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	924/1529	4.33	4.25	4.36	4.31	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	1	1	2	0	0	2.25	1381/1393	2.25	3.72	4.06	3.99	2.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	530/1337	4.43	4.22	4.17	4.01	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1331	5.00	4.41	4.35	4.18	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1333	5.00	4.54	4.40	4.22	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100H 01		Term - Fall 2012			Enrollment: 10
Title:	Composition					Questionnaires: 9
Instructor:	McCarthy,Lucill					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	180/1014	4.67	4.04	4.05	3.91	4.67

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100P 01		Term - Fall 2012			Enrollment:	18
Title:	**Composition**					**Questionnaires:**	**17**
Instructor:	**Sneeringer,Holl**						

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	766/1589	4.41	4.11	4.32	4.20	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	496/1589	4.59	4.23	4.29	4.28	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	455/1391	4.63	4.39	4.34	4.29	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	556/1552	4.47	4.28	4.25	4.16	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	2	10	4.29	653/1495	4.29	4.04	4.14	4.07	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	381/1457	4.53	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	6	9	4.35	710/1572	4.35	4.00	4.21	4.18	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1589	5.00	4.55	4.66	4.59	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	11	5	4.31	621/1569	4.31	4.09	4.13	4.08	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	381/1530	4.81	4.38	4.49	4.45	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	671/1533	4.88	4.77	4.75	4.69	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	620/1528	4.56	4.33	4.35	4.31	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	664/1529	4.56	4.25	4.36	4.31	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	0	4	3	5	3.85	943/1393	3.85	3.72	4.06	3.99	3.85
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	337/1337	4.67	4.22	4.17	4.01	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	478/1331	4.67	4.41	4.35	4.18	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	547/1333	4.67	4.54	4.40	4.22	4.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100P 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 18
Title:	Composition			Questionnaires: 17
Instructor:	Sneeringer,Holl			

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	460/1014	4.17	4.04	4.05	3.91	4.17

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100Y 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 24
Title:	Composition			Questionnaires: 21
Instructor:	Pekarske,Nicole			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	6	9	4	3.71	1417/1589	3.90	4.11	4.32	4.20	3.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	9	6	3.95	1209/1589	4.12	4.23	4.29	4.28	3.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	3	1	2	3	3.56	1289/1391	4.02	4.39	4.34	4.29	3.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	2	9	6	3.85	1227/1552	4.05	4.28	4.25	4.16	3.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	8	7	4	3.57	1267/1495	3.31	4.04	4.14	4.07	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	3	8	6	3.67	1194/1457	4.15	4.32	4.15	3.99	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	6	10	4.05	1059/1572	3.78	4.00	4.21	4.18	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	19	1	3.95	1522/1589	4.64	4.55	4.66	4.59	3.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	2	0	2	0	6	3	3.91	1081/1569	3.82	4.09	4.13	4.08	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	1288/1530	4.30	4.38	4.49	4.45	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	1350/1533	4.74	4.77	4.75	4.69	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	2	2	5	4	3.85	1288/1528	4.06	4.33	4.35	4.31	3.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	3	5	2	3.50	1406/1529	3.96	4.25	4.36	4.31	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	0	1	2	3	4	1	3.18	1274/1393	3.67	3.72	4.06	3.99	3.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	2	3	1	2	3.11	1263/1337	3.82	4.22	4.17	4.01	3.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	2	4	2	3.67	1176/1331	4.23	4.41	4.35	4.18	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	971/1333	4.42	4.54	4.40	4.22	4.11
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	0	3	4	0	3.57	800/1014	3.99	4.04	4.05	3.91	3.57

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100Y 01		Term - Fall 2012			Enrollment:	24
Title:	Composition					Questionnaires:	21
Instructor:	Pekarske,Nicole						

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/180	****	4.31	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	3.95	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/178	****	4.90	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/181	****	4.88	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	5.00	4.12	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	2.60	4.35	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/65	3.60	4.33	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	3.60	4.28	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	5.00	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	4.17	4.19	3.98	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	2.60	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	3.20	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100Y 01		Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 24
Title:	Composition				Questionnaires: 21
Instructor:	Pekarske,Nicole				

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	5	General	14	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100Y 03	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 24
Title:	Composition			Questionnaires: 20
Instructor:	Mabe,Mitzi			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	13	4	4.00	1182/1589	3.90	4.11	4.32	4.20	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	9	6	4.00	1151/1589	4.12	4.23	4.29	4.28	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	971/1391	4.02	4.39	4.34	4.29	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	11	5	4.00	1081/1552	4.05	4.28	4.25	4.16	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	3	4	3	5	1	2.81	1463/1495	3.31	4.04	4.14	4.07	2.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	5	12	4.30	629/1457	4.15	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	3	10	3	2	3.00	1509/1572	3.78	4.00	4.21	4.18	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	467/1589	4.64	4.55	4.66	4.59	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	4	9	5	3.89	1089/1569	3.82	4.09	4.13	4.08	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	3	9	7	4.05	1300/1530	4.30	4.38	4.49	4.45	4.05
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1533	4.74	4.77	4.75	4.69	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	6	8	6	4.00	1171/1528	4.06	4.33	4.35	4.31	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	1	10	6	3.95	1220/1529	3.96	4.25	4.36	4.31	3.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	1	1	9	5	3.78	986/1393	3.67	3.72	4.06	3.99	3.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	3	9	4	3.50	1145/1337	3.82	4.22	4.17	4.01	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	2	4	5	8	3.85	1101/1331	4.23	4.41	4.35	4.18	3.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	3	2	3	12	4.20	914/1333	4.42	4.54	4.40	4.22	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	0	7	1	0	2	8	2	3.77	705/1014	3.99	4.04	4.05	3.91	3.77

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 100Y 03	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 24
Title: Composition			Questionnaires: 20
Instructor: Mabe,Mitzi			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/180	****	4.31	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/194	****	3.95	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/178	****	4.90	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/181	****	4.88	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/165	****	5.00	4.12	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	2	0	1	2	0	2.60	62/62	2.60	4.35	4.46	4.33	2.60
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	55/65	3.60	4.33	4.43	4.13	3.60
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	51/63	3.60	4.28	4.29	4.12	3.60
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/61	****	5.00	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	****/61	****	4.17	4.19	3.98	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/40	****	2.60	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/40	****	3.20	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/39	****	2.80	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/22	****	****	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.30	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100Y 03		Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 24
Title:	Composition				Questionnaires: 20
Instructor:	Mabe,Mitzi				

				Frequencies				Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	5	A	3	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	12	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	1	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100Y 05	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment:	24
Title:	Composition			Questionnaires:	24
Instructor:	Putzel,Diane				

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	6	11	7	4.04	1153/1589	3.90	4.11	4.32	4.20	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	10	14	4.58	496/1589	4.12	4.23	4.29	4.28	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	19	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1391	4.02	4.39	4.34	4.29	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	14	4.54	467/1552	4.05	4.28	4.25	4.16	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	4	2	5	4	6	3.29	1396/1495	3.31	4.04	4.14	4.07	3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	16	4.54	363/1457	4.15	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	5	13	4.17	949/1572	3.78	4.00	4.21	4.18	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	234/1589	4.64	4.55	4.66	4.59	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	15	8	4.35	584/1569	3.82	4.09	4.13	4.08	4.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	7	17	4.71	577/1530	4.30	4.38	4.49	4.45	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	19	4.79	889/1533	4.74	4.77	4.75	4.69	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	8	15	4.58	595/1528	4.06	4.33	4.35	4.31	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	9	14	4.54	689/1529	3.96	4.25	4.36	4.31	4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	2	3	6	9	4.10	743/1393	3.67	3.72	4.06	3.99	4.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	372/1337	3.82	4.22	4.17	4.01	4.61
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	0	4	13	4.61	532/1331	4.23	4.41	4.35	4.18	4.61
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1333	4.42	4.54	4.40	4.22	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100Y 05	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 24
Title:	Composition			Questionnaires: 24
Instructor:	Putzel,Diane			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	1	9	8	4.39	306/1014	3.99	4.04	4.05	3.91	4.39

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	1	A	19	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	22	Under-grad	24	Non-major	23
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 100Y 07	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 22
Title: Composition			Questionnaires: 20
Instructor: Walters,April I			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	0	3	5	9	3.85	1326/1589	3.90	4.11	4.32	4.20	3.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	4	9	3.95	1209/1589	4.12	4.23	4.29	4.28	3.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	780/1391	4.02	4.39	4.34	4.29	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	5	6	6	3.79	1281/1552	4.05	4.28	4.25	4.16	3.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	2	3	3	8	3.58	1267/1495	3.31	4.04	4.14	4.07	3.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	5	10	4.10	823/1457	4.15	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	3	5	9	3.90	1190/1572	3.78	4.00	4.21	4.18	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	2	17	4.75	825/1589	4.64	4.55	4.66	4.59	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	2	3	3	3	3	3.14	1486/1569	3.82	4.09	4.13	4.08	3.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	4	1	14	4.35	1073/1530	4.30	4.38	4.49	4.45	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	959/1533	4.74	4.77	4.75	4.69	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	6	5	7	3.80	1311/1528	4.06	4.33	4.35	4.31	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	4	7	7	3.85	1282/1529	3.96	4.25	4.36	4.31	3.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	1	6	6	4	3.61	1083/1393	3.67	3.72	4.06	3.99	3.61
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	2	3	7	4.07	788/1337	3.82	4.22	4.17	4.01	4.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	344/1331	4.23	4.41	4.35	4.18	4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	817/1333	4.42	4.54	4.40	4.22	4.36
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	395/1014	3.99	4.04	4.05	3.91	4.25

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 100Y 07	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 22
Title: Composition		Questionnaires: 20
Instructor: Walters,April I		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/180	****	4.31	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/194	****	3.95	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/178	****	4.90	4.47	4.57	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	5.00	4.12	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/62	2.60	4.35	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/65	3.60	4.33	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/63	3.60	4.28	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/61	****	5.00	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/61	****	4.17	4.19	3.98	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/40	****	2.60	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/40	****	3.20	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/39	****	2.80	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.30	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100Y 07		Term - Fall 2012			Enrollment:	22
Title:	Composition					Questionnaires:	20
Instructor:	Walters,April I						

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	4	A	7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	11	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 110 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 20
Title: Composition ESL Students		Questionnaires: 18
Instructor: Ware,Olga G		

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	3	2	1	6	6	3.56	1483/1589	3.99	4.11	4.32	4.20	3.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	4	5	6	3.67	1419/1589	4.10	4.23	4.29	4.28	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	0	5	3	5	3.79	1201/1391	3.96	4.39	4.34	4.29	3.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	4	4	7	3.88	1202/1552	4.16	4.28	4.25	4.16	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	3	10	4.00	899/1495	4.17	4.04	4.14	4.07	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	3	8	3.89	1015/1457	4.08	4.32	4.15	3.99	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	3	5	2	5	3.17	1490/1572	3.71	4.00	4.21	4.18	3.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	13	4	4.17	1423/1589	4.29	4.55	4.66	4.59	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	1	1	2	4	3	3.64	1298/1569	3.85	4.09	4.13	4.08	3.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	3	3	7	5	3.78	1426/1530	4.19	4.38	4.49	4.45	3.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	3	4	9	4.11	1464/1533	4.40	4.77	4.75	4.69	4.11
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	1	3	6	6	3.72	1346/1528	4.06	4.33	4.35	4.31	3.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	5	5	6	3.72	1347/1529	3.91	4.25	4.36	4.31	3.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	2	5	1	8	3.76	993/1393	3.73	3.72	4.06	3.99	3.76
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	3	2	6	3.71	1045/1337	3.99	4.22	4.17	4.01	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	2	1	2	8	4.00	989/1331	4.27	4.41	4.35	4.18	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	2	1	3	8	4.21	908/1333	4.37	4.54	4.40	4.22	4.21
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	1	2	2	2	6	3.77	705/1014	3.92	4.04	4.05	3.91	3.77

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 110 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 20
Title:	Composition ESL Students			Questionnaires: 18
Instructor:	Ware,Olga G			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/180	****	4.31	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/194	****	3.95	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/178	****	4.90	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/181	****	4.88	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/165	****	5.00	4.12	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/62	****	4.35	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/65	****	4.33	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/63	****	4.28	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/61	****	5.00	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/61	****	4.17	4.19	3.98	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/40	****	2.60	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/40	****	3.20	3.89	3.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 110 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment:	20
Title:	Composition ESL Students			Questionnaires:	18
Instructor:	Ware,Olga G				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/39	****	2.80	4.00	3.52	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	8						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 110 04	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 20
Title: Composition ESL Students		Questionnaires: 19
Instructor: Wowk,Tymofey E		

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	6	11	4.42	753/1589	3.99	4.11	4.32	4.20	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	584/1589	4.10	4.23	4.29	4.28	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	10	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	971/1391	3.96	4.39	4.34	4.29	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	4	2	12	4.44	604/1552	4.16	4.28	4.25	4.16	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	8	8	4.33	609/1495	4.17	4.04	4.14	4.07	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	7	9	4.26	670/1457	4.08	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.26
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	5	10	4.26	829/1572	3.71	4.00	4.21	4.18	4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	1	0	0	6	10	4.41	1203/1589	4.29	4.55	4.66	4.59	4.41
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	0	11	3	4.07	910/1569	3.85	4.09	4.13	4.08	4.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	728/1530	4.19	4.38	4.49	4.45	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	1073/1533	4.40	4.77	4.75	4.69	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	4	11	4.39	843/1528	4.06	4.33	4.35	4.31	4.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	2	4	10	4.11	1129/1529	3.91	4.25	4.36	4.31	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	2	4	3	6	3.69	1046/1393	3.73	3.72	4.06	3.99	3.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	655/1337	3.99	4.22	4.17	4.01	4.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	599/1331	4.27	4.41	4.35	4.18	4.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	675/1333	4.37	4.54	4.40	4.22	4.53
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	1	4	2	7	4.07	521/1014	3.92	4.04	4.05	3.91	4.07

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 110 04	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 20
Title: Composition ESL Students		Questionnaires: 19
Instructor: Wowk,Tymofey E		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/180	****	4.31	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	3.95	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/178	****	4.90	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/181	****	4.88	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	5.00	4.12	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	4.35	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/65	****	4.33	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	4.28	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	5.00	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	4.17	4.19	3.98	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	2.60	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	3.20	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/39	****	2.80	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.30	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 110 04	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 20
Title:	Composition ESL Students			Questionnaires: 19
Instructor:	Wowk,Tymofey E			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	7	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 210 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 50
Title: Introduction To Lit		Questionnaires: 45
Instructor: Rockett,Danika		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	14	29	4.60	519/1589	4.47	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	35	4.76	292/1589	4.76	4.23	4.29	4.30	4.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	11	34	4.76	301/1391	4.67	4.39	4.34	4.36	4.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	2	11	26	4.62	394/1552	4.60	4.28	4.25	4.26	4.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	9	36	4.80	148/1495	4.78	4.04	4.14	4.18	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	7	14	21	4.23	711/1457	4.29	4.32	4.15	4.14	4.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	10	34	4.73	255/1572	4.77	4.00	4.21	4.19	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	25	20	4.44	1174/1589	4.40	4.55	4.66	4.63	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	17	22	4.56	320/1569	4.54	4.09	4.13	4.12	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	40	4.91	224/1530	4.93	4.38	4.49	4.47	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	42	4.98	176/1533	4.98	4.77	4.75	4.78	4.98
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	40	4.93	122/1528	4.94	4.33	4.35	4.35	4.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	5	38	4.88	219/1529	4.86	4.25	4.36	4.39	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	0	3	4	34	4.67	221/1393	4.76	3.72	4.06	4.13	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	30	0	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	601/1337	4.45	4.22	4.17	4.16	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	30	0	1	1	0	3	10	4.33	766/1331	4.42	4.41	4.35	4.32	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	30	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	301/1333	4.80	4.54	4.40	4.39	4.87

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 210 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 50
Title: Introduction To Lit		Questionnaires: 45
Instructor: Rockett,Danika		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	30	5	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	****/1014	4.40	4.04	4.05	4.03	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	28	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	19	Under-grad	45	Non-major	44
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	9						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 210 02	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 50
Title: Introduction To Lit		Questionnaires: 40
Instructor: Rockett,Danika		

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	5	12	21	4.33	871/1589	4.47	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	32	4.77	279/1589	4.76	4.23	4.29	4.30	4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	9	26	4.58	517/1391	4.67	4.39	4.34	4.36	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	3	9	25	4.59	415/1552	4.60	4.28	4.25	4.26	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	33	4.77	176/1495	4.78	4.04	4.14	4.18	4.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	2	11	23	4.36	569/1457	4.29	4.32	4.15	4.14	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	2	34	4.82	168/1572	4.77	4.00	4.21	4.19	4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	25	14	4.36	1258/1589	4.40	4.55	4.66	4.63	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	15	19	4.51	360/1569	4.54	4.09	4.13	4.12	4.51
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	38	4.95	134/1530	4.93	4.38	4.49	4.47	4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	38	4.97	176/1533	4.98	4.77	4.75	4.78	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	38	4.95	104/1528	4.94	4.33	4.35	4.35	4.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	2	36	4.85	270/1529	4.86	4.25	4.36	4.39	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	3	35	4.85	106/1393	4.76	3.72	4.06	4.13	4.85
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	3	3	15	4.57	400/1337	4.45	4.22	4.17	4.16	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	3	5	14	4.50	623/1331	4.42	4.41	4.35	4.32	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	477/1333	4.80	4.54	4.40	4.39	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	18	7	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	293/1014	4.40	4.04	4.05	4.03	4.40

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 210 02	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 50
Title: Introduction To Lit		Questionnaires: 40
Instructor: Rockett,Danika		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/180	****	4.31	4.20	4.50	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	3.95	4.17	4.12	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/178	****	4.90	4.47	4.63	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/181	****	4.88	4.40	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	5.00	4.12	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	4.35	4.46	4.07	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/65	****	4.33	4.43	4.06	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	4.28	4.29	3.83	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	5.00	4.47	4.25	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	4.17	4.19	4.26	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	2.60	3.85	3.77	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	3.20	3.89	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	3.26	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/39	****	2.80	4.00	4.01	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.12	3.93	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.30	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	4.67	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 210 02	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 50
Title:	Introduction To Lit			Questionnaires: 40
Instructor:	Rockett,Danika			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	4.56	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	30	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	15	Under-grad	40	Non-major	35
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	6	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 226 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 40
Title: English Grammar Usage		Questionnaires: 28
Instructor: Sorokin,Anissa		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	7	19	4.67	435/1589	4.67	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	6	21	4.78	266/1589	4.78	4.23	4.29	4.30	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	63/1391	4.96	4.39	4.34	4.36	4.96
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	19	4.63	383/1552	4.63	4.28	4.25	4.26	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	3	5	16	4.22	723/1495	4.22	4.04	4.14	4.18	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	6	4	14	4.33	593/1457	4.33	4.32	4.15	4.14	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	5	18	4.52	484/1572	4.52	4.00	4.21	4.19	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	17	4.63	992/1589	4.63	4.55	4.66	4.63	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	0	2	8	10	4.24	718/1569	4.24	4.09	4.13	4.12	4.24
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	259/1530	4.88	4.38	4.49	4.47	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	469/1533	4.92	4.77	4.75	4.78	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	336/1528	4.76	4.33	4.35	4.35	4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	219/1529	4.88	4.25	4.36	4.39	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	5	4	13	4.36	478/1393	4.36	3.72	4.06	4.13	4.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	452/1337	4.50	4.22	4.17	4.16	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	623/1331	4.50	4.41	4.35	4.32	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	702/1333	4.50	4.54	4.40	4.39	4.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 226 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment:	40
Title:	English Grammar Usage			Questionnaires:	28
Instructor:	Sorokin,Anissa				

				Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	**NR**	**NA**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	20	2	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/1014	****	4.04	4.05	4.03	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	18	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	14	Under-grad	28	Non-major	24
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	8	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 231 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 33
Title: Intro World Lit I		Questionnaires: 25
Instructor: Falco,Raphael		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	303/1589	4.76	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	6	13	4.29	901/1589	4.29	4.23	4.29	4.30	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	10	11	4.24	883/1391	4.24	4.39	4.34	4.36	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	3	4	3	14	4.17	943/1552	4.17	4.28	4.25	4.26	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	18	4.68	237/1495	4.68	4.04	4.14	4.18	4.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	2	5	14	4.12	804/1457	4.12	4.32	4.15	4.14	4.12
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	3	7	5	8	3.78	1272/1572	3.78	4.00	4.21	4.19	3.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	8	11	5	3.88	1548/1589	3.88	4.55	4.66	4.63	3.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	369/1569	4.50	4.09	4.13	4.12	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	7	3	13	4.17	1237/1530	4.17	4.38	4.49	4.47	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.77	4.75	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	4	6	13	4.29	957/1528	4.29	4.33	4.35	4.35	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	5	18	4.67	530/1529	4.67	4.25	4.36	4.39	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	18	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	****/1393	****	3.72	4.06	4.13	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	284/1337	4.74	4.22	4.17	4.16	4.74
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	401/1331	4.74	4.41	4.35	4.32	4.74
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	0	18	4.89	265/1333	4.89	4.54	4.40	4.39	4.89

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 231 01		Term - Fall 2012			Enrollment: 33
Title:	Intro World Lit I					Questionnaires: 25
Instructor:	Falco,Raphael					

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	**NR**	**NA**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	3	0	1	1	8	3.85	668/1014	3.85	4.04	4.05	4.03	3.85

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	6	General	10	Under-grad	25	Non-major	23
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	6	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 241 03	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 34
Title: Currents In British Lit			Questionnaires: 27
Instructor: McKinley,Kathry			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	9	15	4.46	699/1589	4.46	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	7	16	4.50	614/1589	4.50	4.23	4.29	4.30	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	291/1391	4.77	4.39	4.34	4.36	4.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	405/1552	4.61	4.28	4.25	4.26	4.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	7	18	4.58	341/1495	4.58	4.04	4.14	4.18	4.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	3	9	12	4.24	690/1457	4.24	4.32	4.15	4.14	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	5	9	12	4.27	829/1572	4.27	4.00	4.21	4.19	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	8	14	4	3.78	1558/1589	3.78	4.55	4.66	4.63	3.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	1	4	10	6	4.00	957/1569	4.00	4.09	4.13	4.12	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	10	12	4.27	1161/1530	4.27	4.38	4.49	4.47	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	469/1533	4.93	4.77	4.75	4.78	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	11	13	4.37	856/1528	4.37	4.33	4.35	4.35	4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	8	17	4.56	677/1529	4.56	4.25	4.36	4.39	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	4	1	4	7	7	3.52	1131/1393	3.52	3.72	4.06	4.13	3.52
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	1	1	4	13	4.05	803/1337	4.05	4.22	4.17	4.16	4.05
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	3	6	12	4.32	780/1331	4.32	4.41	4.35	4.32	4.32
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	3	9	10	4.32	846/1333	4.32	4.54	4.40	4.39	4.32
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	3	2	4	6	2	3.12	938/1014	3.12	4.04	4.05	4.03	3.12

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 241 03	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 34
Title: Currents In British Lit		Questionnaires: 27
Instructor: McKinley,Kathry		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/180	****	4.31	4.20	4.50	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/194	****	3.95	4.17	4.12	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/178	****	4.90	4.47	4.63	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/181	****	4.88	4.40	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	5.00	4.12	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/62	****	4.35	4.46	4.07	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/65	****	4.33	4.43	4.06	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/63	****	4.28	4.29	3.83	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/61	****	5.00	4.47	4.25	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/61	****	4.17	4.19	4.26	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/40	****	2.60	3.85	3.77	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/40	****	3.20	3.89	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	4.42	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/29	****	****	4.15	3.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/39	****	2.80	4.00	4.01	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/22	****	****	4.12	3.93	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.30	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 241 03		Term - Fall 2012			Enrollment: 34
Title:	Currents In British Lit					Questionnaires: 27
Instructor:	McKinley,Kathry					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/19	****	****	4.44	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/16	****	****	4.25	4.56	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	1	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	9	Under-grad	26	Non-major	24
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	6	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 243 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 50
Title:	Currents In American Lit			Questionnaires: 29
Instructor:	Blumberg,Arnold			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	4	24	4.72	353/1589	4.40	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	20	4.59	496/1589	4.13	4.23	4.29	4.30	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	2	7	16	4.33	799/1391	4.36	4.39	4.34	4.36	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	6	19	4.45	604/1552	4.26	4.28	4.25	4.26	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	26	4.90	109/1495	4.61	4.04	4.14	4.18	4.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	8	19	4.48	421/1457	4.14	4.32	4.15	4.14	4.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	9	16	4.34	723/1572	4.21	4.00	4.21	4.19	4.34
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	6	18	4	3.86	1549/1589	3.96	4.55	4.66	4.63	3.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	1	14	9	4.20	754/1569	4.05	4.09	4.13	4.12	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	3	4	21	4.52	872/1530	4.19	4.38	4.49	4.47	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1533	4.91	4.77	4.75	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	3	24	4.69	449/1528	4.25	4.33	4.35	4.35	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	3	24	4.66	544/1529	4.29	4.25	4.36	4.39	4.66
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	0	4	23	4.71	185/1393	4.34	3.72	4.06	4.13	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	0	4	20	4.58	400/1337	4.21	4.22	4.17	4.16	4.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	3	22	4.81	322/1331	4.31	4.41	4.35	4.32	4.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	101/1333	4.59	4.54	4.40	4.39	4.96
4. Were special techniques successful	3	7	2	0	1	1	15	4.42	283/1014	4.00	4.04	4.05	4.03	4.42

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 243 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 50
Title:	Currents In American Lit		Questionnaires: 29
Instructor:	Blumberg,Arnold		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/194	****	3.95	4.17	4.12	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/40	****	2.60	3.85	3.77	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/40	****	3.20	3.89	3.86	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/39	****	2.80	4.00	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	9	Under-grad	29	Non-major	27
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	11	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 243 02	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 50
Title:	Currents In American Lit		Questionnaires: 37
Instructor:	Metcalf,Greg S		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	10	10	16	4.08	1124/1589	4.40	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	7	4	8	15	3.68	1414/1589	4.13	4.23	4.29	4.30	3.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	4	7	24	4.38	761/1391	4.36	4.39	4.34	4.36	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	2	3	4	5	18	4.06	1037/1552	4.26	4.28	4.25	4.26	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	8	22	4.32	620/1495	4.61	4.04	4.14	4.18	4.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	4	2	7	4	16	3.79	1104/1457	4.14	4.32	4.15	4.14	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	3	3	7	21	4.08	1023/1572	4.21	4.00	4.21	4.19	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	33	3	4.05	1483/1589	3.96	4.55	4.66	4.63	4.05
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	1	2	5	14	9	3.90	1081/1569	4.05	4.09	4.13	4.12	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	3	6	9	16	3.86	1399/1530	4.19	4.38	4.49	4.47	3.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	3	32	4.81	843/1533	4.91	4.77	4.75	4.78	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	4	2	7	7	16	3.81	1311/1528	4.25	4.33	4.35	4.35	3.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	10	4	18	3.92	1243/1529	4.29	4.25	4.36	4.39	3.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	2	1	7	8	14	3.97	842/1393	4.34	3.72	4.06	4.13	3.97
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	2	6	7	14	3.84	964/1337	4.21	4.22	4.17	4.16	3.84
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	3	4	4	6	15	3.81	1117/1331	4.31	4.41	4.35	4.32	3.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	2	3	9	17	4.22	908/1333	4.59	4.54	4.40	4.39	4.22
4. Were special techniques successful	6	17	3	1	1	3	6	3.57	800/1014	4.00	4.04	4.05	4.03	3.57

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 243 02	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 50
Title: Currents In American Lit		Questionnaires: 37
Instructor: Metcalf,Greg S		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	33	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/180	****	4.31	4.20	4.50	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/194	****	3.95	4.17	4.12	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/178	****	4.90	4.47	4.63	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	35	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/181	****	4.88	4.40	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	35	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/165	****	5.00	4.12	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	34	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/62	****	4.35	4.46	4.07	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	35	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/65	****	4.33	4.43	4.06	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	4.28	4.29	3.83	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/61	****	5.00	4.47	4.25	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/61	****	4.17	4.19	4.26	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	34	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/40	****	2.60	3.85	3.77	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	35	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/40	****	3.20	3.89	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	4.42	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	3.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	35	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	34	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/39	****	2.80	4.00	4.01	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	35	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.12	3.93	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	35	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.30	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 243 02	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 50
Title:	Currents In American Lit			Questionnaires: 37
Instructor:	Metcalf,Greg S			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	35	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	4.56	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	15	Under-grad	37	Non-major	34
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	12	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 250 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 35
Title:	Intro To Shakespeare			Questionnaires: 29
Instructor:	Orgelfinger,Gai			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	8	19	4.59	544/1589	4.59	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	10	16	4.45	704/1589	4.45	4.23	4.29	4.30	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	6	18	4.46	653/1391	4.46	4.39	4.34	4.36	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	5	9	13	4.30	805/1552	4.30	4.28	4.25	4.26	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	27	4.90	109/1495	4.90	4.04	4.14	4.18	4.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	9	15	4.31	617/1457	4.31	4.32	4.15	4.14	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	10	13	4.17	940/1572	4.17	4.00	4.21	4.19	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	21	4.72	882/1589	4.72	4.55	4.66	4.63	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	9	17	4.59	296/1569	4.59	4.09	4.13	4.12	4.59
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	22	4.75	488/1530	4.75	4.38	4.49	4.47	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	26	4.89	614/1533	4.89	4.77	4.75	4.78	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	22	4.75	350/1528	4.75	4.33	4.35	4.35	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	4	22	4.74	412/1529	4.74	4.25	4.36	4.39	4.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	1	2	6	1	12	3.95	854/1393	3.95	3.72	4.06	4.13	3.95
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	3	2	12	4.39	564/1337	4.39	4.22	4.17	4.16	4.39
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	4	2	11	4.28	809/1331	4.28	4.41	4.35	4.32	4.28
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	603/1333	4.61	4.54	4.40	4.39	4.61
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	5	0	2	4	3	3.00	944/1014	3.00	4.04	4.05	4.03	3.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 250 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 35
Title:	Intro To Shakespeare		Questionnaires: 29
Instructor:	Orgelfinger,Gai		

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/40	****	2.60	3.85	3.77	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	7	General	17	Under-grad	29	Non-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 271 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 25
Title:	Intro Creat Wrtg-Fiction			Questionnaires: 23
Instructor:	Kenny,Meghan An			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	6	15	4.48	686/1589	4.48	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	16	4.52	584/1589	4.52	4.23	4.29	4.30	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	971/1391	4.14	4.39	4.34	4.36	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	556/1552	4.48	4.28	4.25	4.26	4.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	4	1	4	13	4.18	764/1495	4.18	4.04	4.14	4.18	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	2	4	14	4.48	432/1457	4.48	4.32	4.15	4.14	4.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	6	3	11	3.91	1180/1572	3.91	4.00	4.21	4.19	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	17	6	4.26	1340/1589	4.26	4.55	4.66	4.63	4.26
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	1	2	3	12	4.26	682/1569	4.26	4.09	4.13	4.12	4.26
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	3	7	9	4.32	1118/1530	4.32	4.38	4.49	4.47	4.32
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	614/1533	4.89	4.77	4.75	4.78	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	607/1528	4.58	4.33	4.35	4.35	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	4	13	4.53	714/1529	4.53	4.25	4.36	4.39	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	14	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/1393	****	3.72	4.06	4.13	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	259/1337	4.77	4.22	4.17	4.16	4.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	280/1331	4.85	4.41	4.35	4.32	4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	202/1333	4.92	4.54	4.40	4.39	4.92

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 271 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment:	25
Title:	Intro Creat Wrtg-Fiction			Questionnaires:	23
Instructor:	Kenny,Meghan An				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	1	0	2	1	8	4.25	395/1014	4.25	4.04	4.05	4.03	4.25

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	4	Under-grad	23	Non-major	15
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	13	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 273 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 25
Title:	Int Creative Wtg-Poetry			Questionnaires: 11
Instructor:	McGurrin,Anthon			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	3	1	1	2	2.45	1581/1589	2.45	4.11	4.32	4.33	2.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	4	1	1	2.64	1573/1589	2.64	4.23	4.29	4.30	2.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1250/1391	3.67	4.39	4.34	4.36	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	3	3	1	2	3.22	1497/1552	3.22	4.28	4.25	4.26	3.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	5	2	1	3.00	1437/1495	3.00	4.04	4.14	4.18	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	1087/1457	3.80	4.32	4.15	4.14	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	4	1	0	0	2	2.29	1559/1572	2.29	4.00	4.21	4.19	2.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1589	5.00	4.55	4.66	4.63	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	2	2	2	1	3.00	1508/1569	3.00	4.09	4.13	4.12	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	3	0	4	0	3	3.00	1512/1530	3.00	4.38	4.49	4.47	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	586/1533	4.90	4.77	4.75	4.78	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	1	3	0	3	3.11	1478/1528	3.11	4.33	4.35	4.35	3.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	2	2	1	2	0	2	2.86	1501/1529	2.86	4.25	4.36	4.39	2.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1393	****	3.72	4.06	4.13	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1337	5.00	4.22	4.17	4.16	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1331	5.00	4.41	4.35	4.32	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1333	5.00	4.54	4.40	4.39	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	554/1014	4.00	4.04	4.05	4.03	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 273 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 25
Title:	Int Creative Wtg-Poetry			Questionnaires: 11
Instructor:	McGurrin,Anthon			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/40	****	2.60	3.85	3.77	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/40	****	3.20	3.89	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	3.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.60	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	11	Non-major	10
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 291 01		Term - Fall 2012							Enrollment: 24				
Title:	Intro Wrtg Creat Essays									Questionnaires: 17				
Instructor:	Carillo,John P													

| | | | **Frequencies** | | | | | **Instructor** | | **Course** | **Org** | **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	2	6	9	4.41	766/1589	4.65	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	8	5	4.13	1072/1589	4.56	4.23	4.29	4.30	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	14	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1391	4.73	4.39	4.34	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	731/1552	4.62	4.28	4.25	4.26	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	148/1495	4.69	4.04	4.14	4.18	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	125/1457	4.82	4.32	4.15	4.14	4.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	5	4	1	5	0	2	2.58	1548/1572	3.66	4.00	4.21	4.19	2.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	11	5	4.24	1367/1589	4.55	4.55	4.66	4.63	4.24
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	369/1569	4.61	4.09	4.13	4.12	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	887/1530	4.70	4.38	4.49	4.47	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	410/1533	4.96	4.77	4.75	4.78	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	935/1528	4.60	4.33	4.35	4.35	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	739/1529	4.67	4.25	4.36	4.39	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	2	1	3	2	1	2.89	1337/1393	3.56	3.72	4.06	4.13	2.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	131/1337	4.83	4.22	4.17	4.16	4.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	623/1331	4.70	4.41	4.35	4.32	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	438/1333	4.88	4.54	4.40	4.39	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	224/1014	4.70	4.04	4.05	4.03	4.56

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 291 01		Term - Fall 2012			Enrollment: 24
Title:	Intro Wrtg Creat Essays					Questionnaires: 17
Instructor:	Carillo,John P					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/194	****	3.95	4.17	4.12	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/178	****	4.90	4.47	4.63	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/181	****	4.88	4.40	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/165	****	5.00	4.12	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/62	****	4.35	4.46	4.07	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/65	****	4.33	4.43	4.06	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/63	****	4.28	4.29	3.83	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/61	****	5.00	4.47	4.25	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/61	****	4.17	4.19	4.26	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/40	****	2.60	3.85	3.77	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/40	****	3.20	3.89	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	4.42	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	3.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/39	****	2.80	4.00	4.01	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.30	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 291 01		Term - Fall 2012			Enrollment: 24
Title:	Intro Wrtg Creat Essays					Questionnaires: 17
Instructor:	Carillo,John P					

				Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	**NR**	**NA**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	4.67	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	17	Non-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 291 02	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 24
Title:	Intro Wrtg Creat Essays			Questionnaires: 16
Instructor:	Sawyers,Seth A			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	491/1589	4.65	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	525/1589	4.56	4.23	4.29	4.30	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1391	4.73	4.39	4.34	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	446/1552	4.62	4.28	4.25	4.26	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	496/1495	4.69	4.04	4.14	4.18	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	169/1457	4.82	4.32	4.15	4.14	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	3	7	4	3.93	1161/1572	3.66	4.00	4.21	4.19	3.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	703/1589	4.55	4.55	4.66	4.63	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	3	10	4.50	369/1569	4.61	4.09	4.13	4.12	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	488/1530	4.70	4.38	4.49	4.47	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	410/1533	4.96	4.77	4.75	4.78	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	539/1528	4.60	4.33	4.35	4.35	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	502/1529	4.67	4.25	4.36	4.39	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	1089/1393	3.56	3.72	4.06	4.13	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	309/1337	4.83	4.22	4.17	4.16	4.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	322/1331	4.70	4.41	4.35	4.32	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	253/1333	4.88	4.54	4.40	4.39	4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	224/1014	4.70	4.04	4.05	4.03	4.56

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 291 02		Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 24
Title: Intro Wrtg Creat Essays				Questionnaires: 16
Instructor: Sawyers,Seth A				

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/180	****	4.31	4.20	4.50	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/194	****	3.95	4.17	4.12	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/178	****	4.90	4.47	4.63	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/181	****	4.88	4.40	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/165	****	5.00	4.12	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/62	****	4.35	4.46	4.07	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/65	****	4.33	4.43	4.06	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/63	****	4.28	4.29	3.83	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/61	****	5.00	4.47	4.25	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/61	****	4.17	4.19	4.26	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/40	****	2.60	3.85	3.77	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/40	****	3.20	3.89	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	4.42	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	3.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/39	****	2.80	4.00	4.01	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.12	3.93	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.30	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 291 02	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 24
Title:	Intro Wrtg Creat Essays			Questionnaires: 16
Instructor:	Sawyers,Seth A			

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	4.56	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 291 03	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 25
Title:	Intro Wrtg Creat Essays			Questionnaires: 22
Instructor:	Flanigan,Sean			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	21	4.91	156/1589	4.65	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1589	4.56	4.23	4.29	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	330/1391	4.73	4.39	4.34	4.36	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	54/1552	4.62	4.28	4.25	4.26	4.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	143/1495	4.69	4.04	4.14	4.18	4.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	80/1457	4.82	4.32	4.15	4.14	4.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	540/1572	3.66	4.00	4.21	4.19	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	13	4.59	1021/1589	4.55	4.55	4.66	4.63	4.59
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	134/1569	4.61	4.09	4.13	4.12	4.84
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	311/1530	4.70	4.38	4.49	4.47	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1533	4.96	4.77	4.75	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	227/1528	4.60	4.33	4.35	4.35	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	321/1529	4.67	4.25	4.36	4.39	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	2	1	1	4	13	4.19	640/1393	3.56	3.72	4.06	4.13	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	170/1337	4.83	4.22	4.17	4.16	4.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	311/1331	4.70	4.41	4.35	4.32	4.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1333	4.88	4.54	4.40	4.39	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 291 03	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 25
Title:	Intro Wrtg Creat Essays			Questionnaires: 22
Instructor:	Flanigan,Sean			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1014	4.70	4.04	4.05	4.03	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	22	Non-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 300 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 27
Title: Comm/Tech - Analysis		Questionnaires: 22
Instructor: Burgess,Helen J		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	8	11	4.38	806/1589	4.52	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	6	14	4.57	511/1589	4.29	4.23	4.29	4.26	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	204/1391	4.86	4.39	4.34	4.30	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	108/1552	4.68	4.28	4.25	4.24	4.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	176/1495	4.52	4.04	4.14	4.11	4.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	200/1457	4.43	4.32	4.15	4.13	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	5	12	4.38	672/1572	4.58	4.00	4.21	4.18	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	1001/1589	4.56	4.55	4.66	4.67	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	1	6	11	4.42	481/1569	4.41	4.09	4.13	4.10	4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	434/1530	4.75	4.38	4.49	4.49	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	757/1533	4.92	4.77	4.75	4.75	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	524/1528	4.53	4.33	4.35	4.33	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	4	14	4.63	572/1529	4.64	4.25	4.36	4.34	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	14	1	2	1	1	0	2.40	****/1393	4.50	3.72	4.06	4.10	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	601/1337	4.67	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	543/1331	4.65	4.41	4.35	4.35	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	301/1333	4.89	4.54	4.40	4.41	4.87
4. Were special techniques successful	7	6	1	0	2	4	2	3.67	756/1014	4.13	4.04	4.05	4.04	3.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 300 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 27
Title:	Comm/Tech - Analysis			Questionnaires: 22
Instructor:	Burgess,Helen J			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/40	****	2.60	3.85	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/40	****	3.20	3.89	4.16	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	4.48	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.15	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.25	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 300 02			Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 24		
Title:	Comm/Tech - Analysis											Questionnaires: 15		
Instructor:	Shipka,Jody L.													

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	435/1589	4.52	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	3	6	4.00	1151/1589	4.29	4.23	4.29	4.26	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1391	4.86	4.39	4.34	4.30	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	2	11	4.47	572/1552	4.68	4.28	4.25	4.24	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	663/1495	4.52	4.04	4.14	4.11	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	786/1457	4.43	4.32	4.15	4.13	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	198/1572	4.58	4.00	4.21	4.18	4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	1116/1589	4.56	4.55	4.66	4.67	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	509/1569	4.41	4.09	4.13	4.10	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	559/1530	4.75	4.38	4.49	4.49	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1533	4.92	4.77	4.75	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	792/1528	4.53	4.33	4.35	4.33	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	558/1529	4.64	4.25	4.36	4.34	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	349/1393	4.50	3.72	4.06	4.10	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1337	4.67	4.22	4.17	4.20	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	446/1331	4.65	4.41	4.35	4.35	4.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	202/1333	4.89	4.54	4.40	4.41	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	212/1014	4.13	4.04	4.05	4.04	4.58

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 300 02	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 24
Title:	Comm/Tech - Analysis			Questionnaires: 15
Instructor:	Shipka,Jody L.			

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	4.35	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/65	****	4.33	4.43	4.58	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/63	****	4.28	4.29	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/61	****	5.00	4.47	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	4.17	4.19	4.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 301 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 27
Title: Analysis Literary Lang		Questionnaires: 17
Instructor: Farabaugh,Robin		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	544/1589	4.35	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	659/1589	4.34	4.23	4.29	4.26	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	363/1391	4.54	4.39	4.34	4.30	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	425/1552	4.28	4.28	4.25	4.24	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	273/1495	4.41	4.04	4.14	4.11	4.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	208/1457	4.39	4.32	4.15	4.13	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	221/1572	4.29	4.00	4.21	4.18	4.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	519/1589	4.73	4.55	4.66	4.67	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	571/1569	4.22	4.09	4.13	4.10	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	470/1530	4.70	4.38	4.49	4.49	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1533	4.88	4.77	4.75	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	336/1528	4.52	4.33	4.35	4.33	4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	0	15	4.65	558/1529	4.61	4.25	4.36	4.34	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	2	0	5	1	4	3.42	1189/1393	3.81	3.72	4.06	4.10	3.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	186/1337	4.59	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	269/1331	4.73	4.41	4.35	4.35	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	313/1333	4.83	4.54	4.40	4.41	4.86

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 301 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 27
Title:	Analysis Literary Lang			Questionnaires: 17
Instructor:	Farabaugh,Robin			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	2	0	1	2	7	4.00	554/1014	4.18	4.04	4.05	4.04	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 301 03		Term - Fall 2012				Enrollment: 25
Title:	Analysis Literary Lang						Questionnaires: 10
Instructor:	Stevens,Jason W						

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	6	3	4.10	1110/1589	4.35	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	891/1589	4.34	4.23	4.29	4.26	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	799/1391	4.54	4.39	4.34	4.30	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	1081/1552	4.28	4.28	4.25	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	834/1495	4.41	4.04	4.14	4.11	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	886/1457	4.39	4.32	4.15	4.13	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	1095/1572	4.29	4.00	4.21	4.18	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	1240/1589	4.73	4.55	4.66	4.67	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	866/1569	4.22	4.09	4.13	4.10	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	887/1530	4.70	4.38	4.49	4.49	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	1047/1533	4.88	4.77	4.75	4.75	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	817/1528	4.52	4.33	4.35	4.33	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	7	4.40	852/1529	4.61	4.25	4.36	4.34	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	629/1393	3.81	3.72	4.06	4.10	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	337/1337	4.59	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	478/1331	4.73	4.41	4.35	4.35	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	277/1333	4.83	4.54	4.40	4.41	4.89

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 301 03	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 25
Title:	Analysis Literary Lang			Questionnaires: 10
Instructor:	Stevens,Jason W			

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	**NR**	**NA**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	375/1014	4.18	4.04	4.05	4.04	4.29

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 301 04		Term - Fall 2012							Enrollment: 30				
Title:	Analysis Literary Lang									Questionnaires: 21				
Instructor:	Farabaugh,Robin													

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**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	2	0	0	1	1	7	10	4.37	832/1589	4.35	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	2	6	10	4.26	933/1589	4.34	4.23	4.29	4.26	4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	9	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	482/1391	4.54	4.39	4.34	4.30	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	4	3	11	4.26	837/1552	4.28	4.28	4.25	4.24	4.26
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	6	12	4.47	450/1495	4.41	4.04	4.14	4.11	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	4	13	4.47	432/1457	4.39	4.32	4.15	4.13	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	6	2	10	4.11	1005/1572	4.29	4.00	4.21	4.18	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	280/1589	4.73	4.55	4.66	4.67	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	779/1569	4.22	4.09	4.13	4.10	4.19
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	346/1530	4.70	4.38	4.49	4.49	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	352/1533	4.88	4.77	4.75	4.75	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	0	8	9	4.39	843/1528	4.52	4.33	4.35	4.33	4.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	366/1529	4.61	4.25	4.36	4.34	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	7	1	1	3	0	6	3.82	959/1393	3.81	3.72	4.06	4.10	3.82
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	5	6	4.25	663/1337	4.59	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	478/1331	4.73	4.41	4.35	4.35	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	0	0	11	4.75	438/1333	4.83	4.54	4.40	4.41	4.75

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 301 04		Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment:	30
Title:	Analysis Literary Lang				Questionnaires:	21
Instructor:	Farabaugh,Robin					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	1	3	0	8	4.25	395/1014	4.18	4.04	4.05	4.04	4.25

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	4	Under-grad	21	Non-major	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 302 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 26
Title: Lit Methodologies Resear		Questionnaires: 21
Instructor: DiCuirci,Lindsa		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	78/1589	4.95	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	279/1589	4.76	4.23	4.29	4.26	4.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	204/1391	4.86	4.39	4.34	4.30	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	299/1552	4.70	4.28	4.25	4.24	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	105/1495	4.90	4.04	4.14	4.11	4.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	169/1457	4.75	4.32	4.15	4.13	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	10	10	4.50	495/1572	4.50	4.00	4.21	4.18	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1589	5.00	4.55	4.66	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	2	4	11	4.33	596/1569	4.33	4.09	4.13	4.10	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	112/1530	4.95	4.38	4.49	4.49	4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	293/1533	4.95	4.77	4.75	4.75	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	1	17	4.75	350/1528	4.75	4.33	4.35	4.33	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	257/1529	4.85	4.25	4.36	4.34	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	4	3	12	4.42	417/1393	4.42	3.72	4.06	4.10	4.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	259/1337	4.77	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	367/1331	4.77	4.41	4.35	4.35	4.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	202/1333	4.92	4.54	4.40	4.41	4.92

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 302 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 26
Title: Lit Methodologies Resear		Questionnaires: 21
Instructor: DiCuirci,Lindsa		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	460/1014	4.17	4.04	4.05	4.04	4.17

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	6
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 304 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 34
Title:	Brit Lit:Medieval/Renais			Questionnaires: 22
Instructor:	McKinley,Kathry			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	2	8	10	4.24	976/1589	4.24	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	6	11	4.24	964/1589	4.24	4.23	4.29	4.26	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	1	6	12	4.45	666/1391	4.45	4.39	4.34	4.30	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	1	2	5	10	4.33	756/1552	4.33	4.28	4.25	4.24	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	0	2	17	4.70	219/1495	4.70	4.04	4.14	4.11	4.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	8	9	4.10	829/1457	4.10	4.32	4.15	4.13	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	4	6	10	4.14	968/1572	4.14	4.00	4.21	4.18	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	17	3	4.10	1470/1589	4.10	4.55	4.66	4.67	4.10
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	10	3	4.07	910/1569	4.07	4.09	4.13	4.10	4.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	0	3	15	4.63	694/1530	4.63	4.38	4.49	4.49	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	0	1	18	4.75	959/1533	4.75	4.77	4.75	4.75	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	1	6	11	4.25	992/1528	4.25	4.33	4.35	4.33	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	3	14	4.53	714/1529	4.53	4.25	4.36	4.34	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	13	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	****/1393	****	3.72	4.06	4.10	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	655/1337	4.27	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	2	0	2	4	7	3.93	1054/1331	3.93	4.41	4.35	4.35	3.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	832/1333	4.33	4.54	4.40	4.41	4.33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 304 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 34
Title:	Brit Lit:Medieval/Renais		Questionnaires: 22
Instructor:	McKinley,Kathry		

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	1	1	5	1	3	3.36	884/1014	3.36	4.04	4.05	4.04	3.36

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	7
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 306 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment:	33
Title:	Brit Lit: Victorian-Mod			Questionnaires:	22
Instructor:	Fernandez,Jean				

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	4	15	4.55	595/1589	4.55	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	5	12	4.23	975/1589	4.23	4.23	4.29	4.26	4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	13	4.45	666/1391	4.45	4.39	4.34	4.30	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	556/1552	4.48	4.28	4.25	4.24	4.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	17	4.64	282/1495	4.64	4.04	4.14	4.11	4.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	2	16	4.55	363/1457	4.55	4.32	4.15	4.13	4.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	8	4	10	4.09	1014/1572	4.09	4.00	4.21	4.18	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	18	3	4.14	1438/1589	4.14	4.55	4.66	4.67	4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	3	6	8	4.11	866/1569	4.11	4.09	4.13	4.10	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	541/1530	4.73	4.38	4.49	4.49	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	700/1533	4.86	4.77	4.75	4.75	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	9	12	4.50	695/1528	4.50	4.33	4.35	4.33	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	443/1529	4.73	4.25	4.36	4.34	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	16	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/1393	****	3.72	4.06	4.10	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	0	3	3	6	3.79	1003/1337	3.79	4.22	4.17	4.20	3.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	1	2	3	7	4.00	989/1331	4.00	4.41	4.35	4.35	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	2	2	2	7	3.86	1096/1333	3.86	4.54	4.40	4.41	3.86

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 306 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 33
Title:	Brit Lit: Victorian-Mod		Questionnaires: 22
Instructor:	Fernandez,Jean		

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	8	10	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/1014	****	4.04	4.05	4.04	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	9
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 308 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 35
Title:	Am Lit After Civil War			Questionnaires: 27
Instructor:	Stevens,Jason W			

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	2	8	15	4.30	919/1589	4.30	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	4	7	14	4.27	933/1589	4.27	4.23	4.29	4.26	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	1	4	5	10	4.20	921/1391	4.20	4.39	4.34	4.30	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	4	8	12	4.12	998/1552	4.12	4.28	4.25	4.24	4.12
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	9	16	4.54	383/1495	4.54	4.04	4.14	4.11	4.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	9	13	4.35	581/1457	4.35	4.32	4.15	4.13	4.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	1	0	3	11	9	4.13	986/1572	4.13	4.00	4.21	4.18	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	20	5	4.20	1395/1589	4.20	4.55	4.66	4.67	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	2	0	0	6	9	4	3.89	1089/1569	3.89	4.09	4.13	4.10	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	23	4.81	381/1530	4.81	4.38	4.49	4.49	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	25	4.89	643/1533	4.89	4.77	4.75	4.75	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	6	17	4.50	695/1528	4.50	4.33	4.35	4.33	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	22	4.67	530/1529	4.67	4.25	4.36	4.34	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	2	2	6	1	5	3.31	1230/1393	3.31	3.72	4.06	4.10	3.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	6	11	4.42	530/1337	4.42	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	1	4	13	4.47	650/1331	4.47	4.41	4.35	4.35	4.47
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	525/1333	4.68	4.54	4.40	4.41	4.68
4. Were special techniques successful	8	11	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	244/1014	4.50	4.04	4.05	4.04	4.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 308 01	**Term - Fall 2012**
Title: Am Lit After Civil War	
Instructor: Stevens,Jason W	

Enrollment: 35

Questionnaires: 27

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/194	****	3.95	4.17	4.05	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	3	Under-grad	27	Non-major	14
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 317 01	Term - Fall 2012										Enrollment: 27			
Title:	Lit And The Sciences											Questionnaires: 23			
Instructor:	Rudacille,Debor														

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	2	6	15	4.57	569/1589	4.57	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	10	11	4.39	777/1589	4.39	4.23	4.29	4.26	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	1061/1391	4.00	4.39	4.34	4.30	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	13	4.39	680/1552	4.39	4.28	4.25	4.24	4.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	8	14	4.57	351/1495	4.57	4.04	4.14	4.11	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	10	10	4.30	629/1457	4.30	4.32	4.15	4.13	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	8	6	4	3.41	1439/1572	3.41	4.00	4.21	4.18	3.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	234/1589	4.96	4.55	4.66	4.67	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	3	0	0	1	12	5	4.22	730/1569	4.22	4.09	4.13	4.10	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	8	14	4.57	801/1530	4.57	4.38	4.49	4.49	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	527/1533	4.91	4.77	4.75	4.75	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	11	12	4.52	670/1528	4.52	4.33	4.35	4.33	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	9	14	4.61	615/1529	4.61	4.25	4.36	4.34	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	4	4	4	7	3.60	1089/1393	3.60	3.72	4.06	4.10	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	19	4.77	250/1337	4.77	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	1	2	18	4.68	457/1331	4.68	4.41	4.35	4.35	4.68
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	1	1	19	4.73	477/1333	4.73	4.54	4.40	4.41	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	0	0	6	6	4	3.88	654/1014	3.88	4.04	4.05	4.04	3.88

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 317 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 27
Title: Lit And The Sciences		Questionnaires: 23
Instructor: Rudacille,Debor		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	3.95	4.17	4.05	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/62	****	4.35	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/65	****	4.33	4.43	4.58	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	4.28	4.29	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	5.00	4.47	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	4.17	4.19	4.80	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	2.60	3.85	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	3.20	3.89	4.16	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	4.48	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.15	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 317 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment:	27
Title:	Lit And The Sciences		Questionnaires:	23
Instructor:	Rudacille,Debor			

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/39	****	2.80	4.00	4.49	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	4	Under-grad	23	Non-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	6	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 324 01		Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 30
Title: Theories Of Comm Tech				Questionnaires: 19
Instructor: Maher,Jennifer				

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	5	4	10	4.26	948/1589	4.30	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	8	8	4.33	853/1589	4.29	4.23	4.29	4.26	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	6	8	4.11	1005/1391	4.00	4.39	4.34	4.30	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	556/1552	4.47	4.28	4.25	4.24	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	5	10	4.21	733/1495	4.13	4.04	4.14	4.11	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	4	9	3.89	1006/1457	4.09	4.32	4.15	4.13	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	6	8	4.16	959/1572	4.25	4.00	4.21	4.18	4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	4	11	2	3.88	1547/1589	4.22	4.55	4.66	4.67	3.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	3	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	369/1569	4.54	4.09	4.13	4.10	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	990/1530	4.47	4.38	4.49	4.49	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	994/1533	4.75	4.77	4.75	4.75	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	4	11	4.37	869/1528	4.35	4.33	4.35	4.33	4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	714/1529	4.36	4.25	4.36	4.34	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	4	7	7	4.17	674/1393	3.68	3.72	4.06	4.10	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	783/1337	4.45	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	623/1331	4.57	4.41	4.35	4.35	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	632/1333	4.62	4.54	4.40	4.41	4.58
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	554/1014	4.13	4.04	4.05	4.04	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 324 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 30
Title: Theories Of Comm Tech		Questionnaires: 19
Instructor: Maher,Jennifer		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/180	****	4.31	4.20	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	3.95	4.17	4.05	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/178	****	4.90	4.47	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/181	****	4.88	4.40	4.31	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	5.00	4.12	3.94	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	4.35	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/65	****	4.33	4.43	4.58	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	4.28	4.29	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	5.00	4.47	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	4.17	4.19	4.80	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	2.60	3.85	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	3.20	3.89	4.16	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	4.48	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.15	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.25	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/39	****	2.80	4.00	4.49	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.12	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.25	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 324 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 30
Title: Theories Of Comm Tech		Questionnaires: 19
Instructor: Maher,Jennifer		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 324 02	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 25
Title:	Theories Of Comm Tech			Questionnaires: 21
Instructor:	Shipka,Jody L.			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	6	11	4.33	871/1589	4.30	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	10	8	4.24	964/1589	4.29	4.23	4.29	4.26	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1158/1391	4.00	4.39	4.34	4.30	3.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	13	4.48	556/1552	4.47	4.28	4.25	4.24	4.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	2	7	9	4.05	877/1495	4.13	4.04	4.14	4.11	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	6	11	4.29	649/1457	4.09	4.32	4.15	4.13	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	6	11	4.33	735/1572	4.25	4.00	4.21	4.18	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	1063/1589	4.22	4.55	4.66	4.67	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	312/1569	4.54	4.09	4.13	4.10	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	2	15	4.52	858/1530	4.47	4.38	4.49	4.49	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	1	18	4.76	942/1533	4.75	4.77	4.75	4.75	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	5	4	12	4.33	909/1528	4.35	4.33	4.35	4.33	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	8	10	4.19	1057/1529	4.36	4.25	4.36	4.34	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	0	3	3	3	1	3.20	1268/1393	3.68	3.72	4.06	4.10	3.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	210/1337	4.45	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	0	3	13	4.65	500/1331	4.57	4.41	4.35	4.35	4.65
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	0	3	13	4.65	570/1333	4.62	4.54	4.40	4.41	4.65
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	388/1014	4.13	4.04	4.05	4.04	4.27

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 324 02		Term - Fall 2012			Enrollment: 25
Title:	Theories Of Comm Tech					Questionnaires: 21
Instructor:	Shipka,Jody L.					

				Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/62	****	4.35	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/65	****	4.33	4.43	4.58	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	4.28	4.29	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/61	****	5.00	4.47	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/61	****	4.17	4.19	4.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	11
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	7						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 326 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 35
Title: Structure Of English		Questionnaires: 25
Instructor: Fitzpatrick,Car		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	7	14	4.46	713/1589	4.46	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	9	11	4.25	943/1589	4.25	4.23	4.29	4.26	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	18	4.71	350/1391	4.71	4.39	4.34	4.30	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	5	5	13	4.35	744/1552	4.35	4.28	4.25	4.24	4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	9	11	4.25	693/1495	4.25	4.04	4.14	4.11	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	3	8	9	3.83	1060/1457	3.83	4.32	4.15	4.13	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	5	5	13	4.25	843/1572	4.25	4.00	4.21	4.18	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1589	5.00	4.55	4.66	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	4	12	3	3.80	1170/1569	3.80	4.09	4.13	4.10	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	2	3	17	4.46	951/1530	4.46	4.38	4.49	4.49	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	527/1533	4.92	4.77	4.75	4.75	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	0	3	6	12	4.13	1088/1528	4.13	4.33	4.35	4.33	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	7	14	4.52	714/1529	4.52	4.25	4.36	4.34	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	17	0	2	1	2	2	3.57	1104/1393	3.57	3.72	4.06	4.10	3.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	616/1337	4.31	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.31
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	2	0	2	2	10	4.13	938/1331	4.13	4.41	4.35	4.35	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	0	3	3	8	3.94	1050/1333	3.94	4.54	4.40	4.41	3.94
4. Were special techniques successful	9	8	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	313/1014	4.38	4.04	4.05	4.04	4.38

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 326 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 35
Title: Structure Of English		Questionnaires: 25
Instructor: Fitzpatrick,Car		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/180	****	4.31	4.20	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/194	****	3.95	4.17	4.05	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/178	****	4.90	4.47	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/181	****	4.88	4.40	4.31	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/165	****	5.00	4.12	3.94	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/62	****	4.35	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/65	****	4.33	4.43	4.58	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/63	****	4.28	4.29	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/61	****	5.00	4.47	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/61	****	4.17	4.19	4.80	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/40	****	2.60	3.85	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/40	****	3.20	3.89	4.16	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	4.48	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.15	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.25	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/39	****	2.80	4.00	4.49	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.12	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.25	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 326 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 35
Title:	Structure Of English		Questionnaires: 25
Instructor:	Fitzpatrick,Car		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	25	Non-major	9
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 351 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 26
Title:	Studies In Shakespeare			Questionnaires: 21
Instructor:	Osherow,Michele			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	156/1589	4.90	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	584/1589	4.52	4.23	4.29	4.26	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	184/1391	4.88	4.39	4.34	4.30	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	341/1552	4.67	4.28	4.25	4.24	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	4	15	4.60	309/1495	4.60	4.04	4.14	4.11	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	80/1457	4.90	4.32	4.15	4.13	4.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	4	1	14	4.53	473/1572	4.53	4.00	4.21	4.18	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	12	4.60	1011/1589	4.60	4.55	4.66	4.67	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	194/1569	4.74	4.09	4.13	4.10	4.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	434/1530	4.79	4.38	4.49	4.49	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.77	4.75	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	524/1528	4.63	4.33	4.35	4.33	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	206/1529	4.89	4.25	4.36	4.34	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	8	10	4.47	374/1393	4.47	3.72	4.06	4.10	4.47
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1337	5.00	4.22	4.17	4.20	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1331	5.00	4.41	4.35	4.35	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1333	5.00	4.54	4.40	4.41	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 351 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 26
Title:	Studies In Shakespeare			Questionnaires: 21
Instructor:	Osherow,Michele			

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	288/1014	4.42	4.04	4.05	4.04	4.42

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	21	Non-major	11
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	1			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 360 01		Term - Fall 2012			Enrollment: 30	
Title:	Literature Of Minorities					Questionnaires: 14	
Instructor:	Fruscione,Josep						

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	607/1589	4.54	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	674/1589	4.46	4.23	4.29	4.26	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	828/1391	4.30	4.39	4.34	4.30	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	693/1552	4.38	4.28	4.25	4.24	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	0	11	4.62	300/1495	4.62	4.04	4.14	4.11	4.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	498/1457	4.42	4.32	4.15	4.13	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	555/1572	4.46	4.00	4.21	4.18	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	373/1589	4.92	4.55	4.66	4.67	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	754/1569	4.20	4.09	4.13	4.10	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	593/1530	4.69	4.38	4.49	4.49	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	942/1533	4.77	4.77	4.75	4.75	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	554/1528	4.62	4.33	4.35	4.33	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	784/1529	4.46	4.25	4.36	4.34	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	0	5	1	4	3.64	1073/1393	3.64	3.72	4.06	4.10	3.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	379/1337	4.60	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	623/1331	4.50	4.41	4.35	4.35	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	373/1333	4.80	4.54	4.40	4.41	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	672/1014	3.83	4.04	4.05	4.04	3.83

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 360 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 30
Title:	Literature Of Minorities			Questionnaires: 14
Instructor:	Fruscione,Josep			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/180	****	4.31	4.20	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	3.95	4.17	4.05	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/178	****	4.90	4.47	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/181	****	4.88	4.40	4.31	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	5.00	4.12	3.94	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	4.35	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/65	****	4.33	4.43	4.58	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	4.28	4.29	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	5.00	4.47	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	4.17	4.19	4.80	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/39	****	2.80	4.00	4.49	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.12	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.25	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 360 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment:	30
Title:	Literature Of Minorities			Questionnaires:	14
Instructor:	Fruscione,Josep				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 364 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 25
Title:	Persp On Women In Lit			Questionnaires: 18
Instructor:	DiCuirci,Lindsa			

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	505/1589	4.61	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	540/1589	4.56	4.23	4.29	4.26	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	468/1391	4.61	4.39	4.34	4.30	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	556/1552	4.47	4.28	4.25	4.24	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	169/1495	4.78	4.04	4.14	4.11	4.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	298/1457	4.61	4.32	4.15	4.13	4.61
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	1	2	12	4.41	631/1572	4.41	4.00	4.21	4.18	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	10	4.56	1063/1589	4.56	4.55	4.66	4.67	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	596/1569	4.33	4.09	4.13	4.10	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	259/1530	4.89	4.38	4.49	4.49	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.77	4.75	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	391/1528	4.72	4.33	4.35	4.33	4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	282/1529	4.83	4.25	4.36	4.34	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	282/1393	4.59	3.72	4.06	4.10	4.59
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	267/1337	4.75	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	195/1331	4.92	4.41	4.35	4.35	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	438/1333	4.75	4.54	4.40	4.41	4.75

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 364 01		Term - Fall 2012			Enrollment: 25
Title:	Persp On Women In Lit					Questionnaires: 18
Instructor:	DiCuirci,Lindsa					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	6	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1014	****	4.04	4.05	4.04	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 375 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 19
Title:	Masterworks For Writers		Questionnaires: 15
Instructor:	Shivnan,Sally A		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	2	8	4.07	1138/1589	4.07	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	853/1589	4.33	4.23	4.29	4.26	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	954/1391	4.17	4.39	4.34	4.30	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	0	2	10	4.13	976/1552	4.13	4.28	4.25	4.24	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	3	7	4.00	899/1495	4.00	4.04	4.14	4.11	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	0	9	4.07	841/1457	4.07	4.32	4.15	4.13	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	0	3	9	4.36	710/1572	4.36	4.00	4.21	4.18	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	1001/1589	4.62	4.55	4.66	4.67	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	0	1	2	7	4.00	957/1569	4.00	4.09	4.13	4.10	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	1319/1530	4.00	4.38	4.49	4.49	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	1229/1533	4.55	4.77	4.75	4.75	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	974/1528	4.27	4.33	4.35	4.33	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	2	0	6	3.64	1378/1529	3.64	4.25	4.36	4.34	3.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	8	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1393	****	3.72	4.06	4.10	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	0	2	7	4.09	778/1337	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	311/1331	4.82	4.41	4.35	4.35	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	872/1333	4.27	4.54	4.40	4.41	4.27

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 375 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment:	19
Title:	Masterworks For Writers			Questionnaires:	15
Instructor:	Shivnan,Sally A				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	2	1	2	1	3	3.22	919/1014	3.22	4.04	4.05	4.04	3.22

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	5
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 380 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 18
Title:	Intro To News Writing			Questionnaires: 14
Instructor:	Weiss,Kenneth N			

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	5	4	3.86	1326/1589	3.86	4.11	4.32	4.33	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	5	4	3.93	1243/1589	3.93	4.23	4.29	4.26	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	3	4	1	2	3.20	1341/1391	3.20	4.39	4.34	4.30	3.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	4	2	4	3	3.46	1440/1552	3.46	4.28	4.25	4.24	3.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	5	3	3.43	1347/1495	3.43	4.04	4.14	4.11	3.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	1	2	8	4.07	841/1457	4.07	4.32	4.15	4.13	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	6	1	2	3	3.00	1509/1572	3.00	4.00	4.21	4.18	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	768/1589	4.79	4.55	4.66	4.67	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	4	7	0	3.42	1411/1569	3.42	4.09	4.13	4.10	3.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	1288/1530	4.08	4.38	4.49	4.49	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	1341/1533	4.42	4.77	4.75	4.75	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	5	2	4	3.75	1333/1528	3.75	4.33	4.35	4.33	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	3	1	2	5	3.82	1306/1529	3.82	4.25	4.36	4.34	3.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	629/1393	4.20	3.72	4.06	4.10	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	2	2	2	1	3.29	1221/1337	3.29	4.22	4.17	4.20	3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	1252/1331	3.29	4.41	4.35	4.35	3.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1171/1333	3.71	4.54	4.40	4.41	3.71
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1014	****	4.04	4.05	4.04	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 380 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 18
Title:	Intro To News Writing			Questionnaires: 14
Instructor:	Weiss,Kenneth N			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/194	****	3.95	4.17	4.05	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/178	****	4.90	4.47	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	4.35	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/65	****	4.33	4.43	4.58	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	2.60	3.85	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	3.20	3.89	4.16	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/39	****	2.80	4.00	4.49	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.25	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 382 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 25
Title: Feature Writing		Questionnaires: 19
Instructor: Corbett,Christo		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	753/1589	4.42	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	511/1589	4.58	4.23	4.29	4.26	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1391	****	4.39	4.34	4.30	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	425/1552	4.59	4.28	4.25	4.24	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	1	4	10	4.11	834/1495	4.11	4.04	4.14	4.11	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	335/1457	4.58	4.32	4.15	4.13	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	2	6	8	4.11	995/1572	4.11	4.00	4.21	4.18	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	1032/1589	4.59	4.55	4.66	4.67	4.59
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	634/1569	4.30	4.09	4.13	4.10	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	677/1530	4.64	4.38	4.49	4.49	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.77	4.75	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	336/1528	4.77	4.33	4.35	4.33	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	270/1529	4.85	4.25	4.36	4.34	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	10	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1393	****	3.72	4.06	4.10	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	202/1337	4.83	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	195/1331	4.92	4.41	4.35	4.35	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1333	5.00	4.54	4.40	4.41	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 382 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 25
Title:	Feature Writing			Questionnaires: 19
Instructor:	Corbett,Christo			

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	7	7	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	554/1014	4.00	4.04	4.05	4.04	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	19	Non-major	17
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 384 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 26
Title:	Topics in Journalism			Questionnaires: 19
Instructor:	Rudacille,Debor			

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	5	13	4.58	557/1589	4.58	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	433/1589	4.63	4.23	4.29	4.26	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	204/1391	4.86	4.39	4.34	4.30	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	373/1552	4.63	4.28	4.25	4.24	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	5	9	4.05	871/1495	4.05	4.04	4.14	4.11	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	110/1457	4.84	4.32	4.15	4.13	4.84
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	4	2	9	3.79	1272/1572	3.79	4.00	4.21	4.18	3.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	651/1589	4.83	4.55	4.66	4.67	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	495/1569	4.41	4.09	4.13	4.10	4.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	858/1530	4.53	4.38	4.49	4.49	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	352/1533	4.95	4.77	4.75	4.75	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	524/1528	4.63	4.33	4.35	4.33	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	502/1529	4.68	4.25	4.36	4.34	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	1	0	2	4	5	4.00	796/1393	4.00	3.72	4.06	4.10	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	491/1337	4.46	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.46
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	446/1331	4.69	4.41	4.35	4.35	4.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	325/1333	4.85	4.54	4.40	4.41	4.85

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 384 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 26
Title:	Topics in Journalism			Questionnaires: 19
Instructor:	Rudacille,Debor			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	341/1014	4.33	4.04	4.05	4.04	4.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	6	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 391 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 21
Title: Adv Expos & Argument		Questionnaires: 19
Instructor: Wilkinson,Rache		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	341/1589	4.49	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	433/1589	4.75	4.23	4.29	4.26	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	679/1391	4.72	4.39	4.34	4.30	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	201/1552	4.81	4.28	4.25	4.24	4.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	255/1495	4.33	4.04	4.14	4.11	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	248/1457	4.77	4.32	4.15	4.13	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	6	7	4.06	1050/1572	4.36	4.00	4.21	4.18	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	9	4.50	1116/1589	4.71	4.55	4.66	4.67	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	241/1569	4.52	4.09	4.13	4.10	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	276/1530	4.82	4.38	4.49	4.49	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	410/1533	4.90	4.77	4.75	4.75	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	270/1528	4.76	4.33	4.35	4.33	4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	502/1529	4.67	4.25	4.36	4.34	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	1	4	2	7	4.07	758/1393	4.20	3.72	4.06	4.10	4.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	202/1337	4.94	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	478/1331	4.80	4.41	4.35	4.35	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	337/1333	4.88	4.54	4.40	4.41	4.83

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 391 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 21
Title:	Adv Expos & Argument			Questionnaires: 19
Instructor:	Wilkinson,Rache			

				Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	**NR**	**NA**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	244/1014	4.78	4.04	4.05	4.04	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	15
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	1	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 391 02	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 24
Title:	Adv Expos & Argument		Questionnaires: 18
Instructor:	Fallon,Michael		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	5	11	4.39	806/1589	4.49	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	266/1589	4.75	4.23	4.29	4.26	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1391	4.72	4.39	4.34	4.30	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	121/1552	4.81	4.28	4.25	4.24	4.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	3	3	10	4.06	871/1495	4.33	4.04	4.14	4.11	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	115/1457	4.77	4.32	4.15	4.13	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	7	8	4.28	815/1572	4.36	4.00	4.21	4.18	4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	519/1589	4.71	4.55	4.66	4.67	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	352/1569	4.52	4.09	4.13	4.10	4.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	610/1530	4.82	4.38	4.49	4.49	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	700/1533	4.90	4.77	4.75	4.75	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	308/1528	4.76	4.33	4.35	4.33	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	558/1529	4.67	4.25	4.36	4.34	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	13	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1393	4.20	3.72	4.06	4.10	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1337	4.94	4.22	4.17	4.20	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	413/1331	4.80	4.41	4.35	4.35	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	361/1333	4.88	4.54	4.40	4.41	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1014	4.78	4.04	4.05	4.04	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 391 02	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 24
Title: Adv Expos & Argument		Questionnaires: 18
Instructor: Fallon,Michael		

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/180	****	4.31	4.20	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/194	****	3.95	4.17	4.05	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	4.35	4.46	5.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	5.00	4.47	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	4.17	4.19	4.80	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/40	****	2.60	3.85	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	3.20	3.89	4.16	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	4.48	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	2	A	10	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	18	Non-major	11
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 391 03	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 24
Title:	Adv Expos & Argument			Questionnaires: 20
Instructor:	Terhorst II,Ray			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	4	13	4.35	845/1589	4.49	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	182/1589	4.75	4.23	4.29	4.26	4.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1391	4.72	4.39	4.34	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	262/1552	4.81	4.28	4.25	4.24	4.74
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	2	2	13	4.26	683/1495	4.33	4.04	4.14	4.11	4.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	131/1457	4.77	4.32	4.15	4.13	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	233/1572	4.36	4.00	4.21	4.18	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	825/1589	4.71	4.55	4.66	4.67	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	0	8	8	4.35	571/1569	4.52	4.09	4.13	4.10	4.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	241/1530	4.82	4.38	4.49	4.49	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	614/1533	4.90	4.77	4.75	4.75	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	449/1528	4.76	4.33	4.35	4.33	4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	502/1529	4.67	4.25	4.36	4.34	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	3	2	12	4.33	510/1393	4.20	3.72	4.06	4.10	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1337	4.94	4.22	4.17	4.20	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1331	4.80	4.41	4.35	4.35	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1333	4.88	4.54	4.40	4.41	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	14	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	102/1014	4.78	4.04	4.05	4.04	4.83

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 391 03		Term - Fall 2012							Enrollment: 24			
Title:	Adv Expos & Argument									Questionnaires: 20			
Instructor:	Terhorst II,Ray												

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	3.95	4.17	4.05	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/178	****	4.90	4.47	4.42	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/65	****	4.33	4.43	4.58	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	4.28	4.29	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	5.00	4.47	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	4.17	4.19	4.80	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	2.60	3.85	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	3.20	3.89	4.16	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	4.48	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.15	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.25	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/39	****	2.80	4.00	4.49	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.12	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.25	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 391 03		Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment:	24
Title:	Adv Expos & Argument				Questionnaires:	20
Instructor:	Terhorst II,Ray					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	3						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	14
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 4
Title:	Tutorial In Writing			Questionnaires: 3
Instructor:	Fitzpatrick,Car			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1182/1589	4.05	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	853/1589	4.22	4.23	4.29	4.26	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.39	4.34	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	341/1552	4.20	4.28	4.25	4.24	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1457	4.47	4.32	4.15	4.13	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	735/1572	4.10	4.00	4.21	4.18	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1589	4.72	4.55	4.66	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	957/1569	3.97	4.09	4.13	4.10	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1319/1530	4.31	4.38	4.49	4.49	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1533	4.75	4.77	4.75	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1171/1528	4.33	4.33	4.35	4.33	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	739/1529	4.15	4.25	4.36	4.34	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	452/1337	4.72	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1331	4.85	4.41	4.35	4.35	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1231/1333	4.69	4.54	4.40	4.41	3.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 4
Title:	Tutorial In Writing			Questionnaires: 3
Instructor:	Fitzpatrick,Car			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	554/1014	4.80	4.04	4.05	4.04	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 392 02	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 3
Title: Tutorial In Writing		Questionnaires: 2
Instructor: Fitzpatrick,Car		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1589	4.05	4.11	4.32	4.33	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1589	4.22	4.23	4.29	4.26	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1552	4.20	4.28	4.25	4.24	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1457	4.47	4.32	4.15	4.13	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1572	4.10	4.00	4.21	4.18	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1589	4.72	4.55	4.66	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	369/1569	3.97	4.09	4.13	4.10	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1530	4.31	4.38	4.49	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1533	4.75	4.77	4.75	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1528	4.33	4.33	4.35	4.33	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1529	4.15	4.25	4.36	4.34	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1337	4.72	4.22	4.17	4.20	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1331	4.85	4.41	4.35	4.35	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 02	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 3
Title:	Tutorial In Writing			Questionnaires: 2
Instructor:	Fitzpatrick,Car			

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1333	4.69	4.54	4.40	4.41	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 03	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 3
Title:	Tutorial In Writing		Questionnaires: 3
Instructor:	Fitzpatrick,Car		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1589	4.05	4.11	4.32	4.33	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1589	4.22	4.23	4.29	4.26	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.39	4.34	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1552	4.20	4.28	4.25	4.24	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1495	4.03	4.04	4.14	4.11	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1457	4.47	4.32	4.15	4.13	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1572	4.10	4.00	4.21	4.18	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1276/1589	4.72	4.55	4.66	4.67	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1569	3.97	4.09	4.13	4.10	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1530	4.31	4.38	4.49	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1533	4.75	4.77	4.75	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1528	4.33	4.33	4.35	4.33	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1529	4.15	4.25	4.36	4.34	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1337	4.72	4.22	4.17	4.20	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1331	4.85	4.41	4.35	4.35	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1333	4.69	4.54	4.40	4.41	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1014	4.80	4.04	4.05	4.04	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/180	5.00	4.31	4.20	4.08	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 03		Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 3
Title:	Tutorial In Writing				Questionnaires: 3
Instructor:	Fitzpatrick,Car				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/194	4.00	3.95	4.17	4.05	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/178	5.00	4.90	4.47	4.42	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/181	5.00	4.88	4.40	4.31	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/62	5.00	4.35	4.46	5.00	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/65	4.50	4.33	4.43	4.58	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/63	5.00	4.28	4.29	4.53	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/61	5.00	4.17	4.19	4.80	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 04		Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 3
Title:	Tutorial In Writing				Questionnaires: 3
Instructor:	Mabe,Mitzi				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	1585/1589	4.05	4.11	4.32	4.33	2.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	1583/1589	4.22	4.23	4.29	4.26	2.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	1550/1552	4.20	4.28	4.25	4.24	2.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1340/1457	4.47	4.32	4.15	4.13	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	1572/1572	4.10	4.00	4.21	4.18	1.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	956/1589	4.72	4.55	4.66	4.67	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	1558/1569	3.97	4.09	4.13	4.10	2.33

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 392 05	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 3
Title: Tutorial In Writing		**Questionnaires: 3**
Instructor: Mabe,Mitzi		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1565/1589	4.05	4.11	4.32	4.33	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1512/1589	4.22	4.23	4.29	4.26	3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1518/1552	4.20	4.28	4.25	4.24	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	1495/1495	4.03	4.04	4.14	4.11	1.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	886/1457	4.47	4.32	4.15	4.13	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1572	4.10	4.00	4.21	4.18	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1589	4.72	4.55	4.66	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1508/1569	3.97	4.09	4.13	4.10	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1490/1530	4.31	4.38	4.49	4.49	3.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1100/1533	4.75	4.77	4.75	4.75	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1482/1528	4.33	4.33	4.35	4.33	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1506/1529	4.15	4.25	4.36	4.34	2.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	796/1393	4.50	3.72	4.06	4.10	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	823/1337	4.72	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1331	4.85	4.41	4.35	4.35	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1333	4.69	4.54	4.40	4.41	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 05	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 3
Title:	Tutorial In Writing		Questionnaires: 3
Instructor:	Mabe,Mitzi		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1014	4.80	4.04	4.05	4.04	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 392 06	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 3
Title: Tutorial In Writing		Questionnaires: 3
Instructor: Mabe,Mitzi		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	871/1589	4.05	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1589	4.22	4.23	4.29	4.26	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.39	4.34	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	341/1552	4.20	4.28	4.25	4.24	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1495	4.03	4.04	4.14	4.11	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	248/1457	4.47	4.32	4.15	4.13	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1095/1572	4.10	4.00	4.21	4.18	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1589	4.72	4.55	4.66	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	957/1569	3.97	4.09	4.13	4.10	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1095/1530	4.31	4.38	4.49	4.49	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1533	4.75	4.77	4.75	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1528	4.33	4.33	4.35	4.33	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	924/1529	4.15	4.25	4.36	4.34	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1393	4.50	3.72	4.06	4.10	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1337	4.72	4.22	4.17	4.20	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1331	4.85	4.41	4.35	4.35	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1333	4.69	4.54	4.40	4.41	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1014	4.80	4.04	4.05	4.04	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 06	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 3
Title:	Tutorial In Writing			Questionnaires: 3
Instructor:	Mabe,Mitzi			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	184/194	4.00	3.95	4.17	4.05	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 07	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 3
Title:	Tutorial In Writing			Questionnaires: 2
Instructor:	Fallon,Michael			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1589	4.05	4.11	4.32	4.33	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	614/1589	4.22	4.23	4.29	4.26	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1552	4.20	4.28	4.25	4.24	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1495	4.03	4.04	4.14	4.11	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1457	4.47	4.32	4.15	4.13	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	495/1572	4.10	4.00	4.21	4.18	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1116/1589	4.72	4.55	4.66	4.67	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1569	3.97	4.09	4.13	4.10	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	887/1530	4.31	4.38	4.49	4.49	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1533	4.75	4.77	4.75	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1528	4.33	4.33	4.35	4.33	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1529	4.15	4.25	4.36	4.34	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1337	4.72	4.22	4.17	4.20	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1331	4.85	4.41	4.35	4.35	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 07		Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 3
Title:	Tutorial In Writing				Questionnaires: 2
Instructor:	Fallon,Michael				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1333	4.69	4.54	4.40	4.41	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 08
Title:	Tutorial In Writing
Instructor:	Fallon,Michael

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment: 3
Questionnaires: 2

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	646/1589	4.05	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1589	4.22	4.23	4.29	4.26	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1081/1552	4.20	4.28	4.25	4.24	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1457	4.47	4.32	4.15	4.13	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	495/1572	4.10	4.00	4.21	4.18	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1500/1589	4.72	4.55	4.66	4.67	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	369/1569	3.97	4.09	4.13	4.10	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1337	4.72	4.22	4.17	4.20	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1331	4.85	4.41	4.35	4.35	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1333	4.69	4.54	4.40	4.41	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 392 09		Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 3
Title: Tutorial In Writing				Questionnaires: 3
Instructor: Fallon,Michael				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1589	4.05	4.11	4.32	4.33	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1589	4.22	4.23	4.29	4.26	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1552	4.20	4.28	4.25	4.24	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1495	4.03	4.04	4.14	4.11	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1457	4.47	4.32	4.15	4.13	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	329/1572	4.10	4.00	4.21	4.18	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1589	4.72	4.55	4.66	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1569	3.97	4.09	4.13	4.10	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1530	4.31	4.38	4.49	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1533	4.75	4.77	4.75	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1528	4.33	4.33	4.35	4.33	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1529	4.15	4.25	4.36	4.34	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1337	4.72	4.22	4.17	4.20	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1331	4.85	4.41	4.35	4.35	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1333	4.69	4.54	4.40	4.41	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 09		Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 3
Title:	Tutorial In Writing				Questionnaires: 3
Instructor:	Fallon,Michael				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1014	4.80	4.04	4.05	4.04	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 392 10		Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 3
Title: Tutorial In Writing				Questionnaires: 3
Instructor: Hickernell,Mary				

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	1585/1589	4.05	4.11	4.32	4.33	2.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1571/1589	4.22	4.23	4.29	4.26	2.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1483/1552	4.20	4.28	4.25	4.24	3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1478/1495	4.03	4.04	4.14	4.11	2.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	1447/1457	4.47	4.32	4.15	4.13	2.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1545/1572	4.10	4.00	4.21	4.18	2.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	956/1589	4.72	4.55	4.66	4.67	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	1558/1569	3.97	4.09	4.13	4.10	2.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1490/1530	4.31	4.38	4.49	4.49	3.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1524/1533	4.75	4.77	4.75	4.75	3.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	1509/1528	4.33	4.33	4.35	4.33	2.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	1527/1529	4.15	4.25	4.36	4.34	1.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	823/1337	4.72	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1176/1331	4.85	4.41	4.35	4.35	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1190/1333	4.69	4.54	4.40	4.41	3.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 10		Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 3
Title:	Tutorial In Writing				Questionnaires: 3
Instructor:	Hickernell,Mary				

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	50/65	4.50	4.33	4.43	4.58	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 01		Term - Fall 2012						Enrollment: 22				
Title:	Technical Communication								Questionnaires: 18				
Instructor:	Rabinowitz,Jenn												

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**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	5	4	7	3.83	1338/1589	3.89	4.11	4.32	4.33	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	8	4.28	922/1589	4.12	4.23	4.29	4.26	4.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	902/1391	4.38	4.39	4.34	4.30	4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	756/1552	4.28	4.28	4.25	4.24	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	3	7	4	3.50	1307/1495	3.71	4.04	4.14	4.11	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	6	7	4.18	759/1457	4.16	4.32	4.15	4.13	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	3	6	6	3.94	1152/1572	3.95	4.00	4.21	4.18	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	1032/1589	4.68	4.55	4.66	4.67	4.59
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	4	7	2	3.71	1241/1569	3.94	4.09	4.13	4.10	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	577/1530	4.24	4.38	4.49	4.49	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	643/1533	4.64	4.77	4.75	4.75	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	670/1528	4.22	4.33	4.35	4.33	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	965/1529	4.04	4.25	4.36	4.34	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	532/1393	3.99	3.72	4.06	4.10	4.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	550/1337	3.79	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	543/1331	4.44	4.41	4.35	4.35	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	2	0	0	3	3.80	1124/1333	4.36	4.54	4.40	4.41	3.80

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 22
Title:	Technical Communication		Questionnaires: 18
Instructor:	Rabinowitz,Jenn		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	554/1014	4.03	4.04	4.05	4.04	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	5	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 02	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 24
Title:	Technical Communication			Questionnaires: 18
Instructor:	Porter,Jane			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	8	5	3.89	1306/1589	3.89	4.11	4.32	4.33	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	2	11	4.22	975/1589	4.12	4.23	4.29	4.26	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	402/1391	4.38	4.39	4.34	4.30	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	556/1552	4.28	4.28	4.25	4.24	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	4	1	5	5	3.41	1352/1495	3.71	4.04	4.14	4.11	3.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	4	8	4.00	886/1457	4.16	4.32	4.15	4.13	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	3	4	8	4.06	1050/1572	3.95	4.00	4.21	4.18	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1589	4.68	4.55	4.66	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	7	3	4.08	894/1569	3.94	4.09	4.13	4.10	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	677/1530	4.24	4.38	4.49	4.49	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	352/1533	4.64	4.77	4.75	4.75	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	695/1528	4.22	4.33	4.35	4.33	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	5	9	4.24	1021/1529	4.04	4.25	4.36	4.34	4.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	764/1393	3.99	3.72	4.06	4.10	4.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	0	1	0	4	3.57	1106/1337	3.79	4.22	4.17	4.20	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	424/1331	4.44	4.41	4.35	4.35	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	313/1333	4.36	4.54	4.40	4.41	4.86

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 02	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 24
Title:	Technical Communication			Questionnaires: 18
Instructor:	Porter,Jane			

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	729/1014	4.03	4.04	4.05	4.04	3.71

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 393 03		Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 25
Title: Technical Communication				Questionnaires: 20
Instructor: Walters,April I				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	2	5	6	5	3.50	1502/1589	3.89	4.11	4.32	4.33	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	7	6	3	3.30	1519/1589	4.12	4.23	4.29	4.26	3.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	4	5	4	4.00	1061/1391	4.38	4.39	4.34	4.30	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	6	7	4	3.68	1343/1552	4.28	4.28	4.25	4.24	3.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	7	5	4	3.53	1295/1495	3.71	4.04	4.14	4.11	3.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	6	7	4	3.60	1228/1457	4.16	4.32	4.15	4.13	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	6	4	2	6	3.32	1461/1572	3.95	4.00	4.21	4.18	3.32
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	12	4.60	1011/1589	4.68	4.55	4.66	4.67	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	2	4	8	1	3.53	1352/1569	3.94	4.09	4.13	4.10	3.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	4	6	7	3.95	1358/1530	4.24	4.38	4.49	4.49	3.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	1140/1533	4.64	4.77	4.75	4.75	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	9	6	4.05	1141/1528	4.22	4.33	4.35	4.33	4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	4	7	5	3.68	1362/1529	4.04	4.25	4.36	4.34	3.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	5	3	10	4.16	686/1393	3.99	3.72	4.06	4.10	4.16
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	823/1337	3.79	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	623/1331	4.44	4.41	4.35	4.35	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	802/1333	4.36	4.54	4.40	4.41	4.38

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 03	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 25
Title:	Technical Communication			Questionnaires: 20
Instructor:	Walters,April I			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	491/1014	4.03	4.04	4.05	4.04	4.13

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 393 04	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 24
Title: Technical Communication		Questionnaires: 20
Instructor: Hess,Laurie		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	0	6	12	4.35	845/1589	3.89	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	12	4.60	467/1589	4.12	4.23	4.29	4.26	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	679/1391	4.38	4.39	4.34	4.30	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	488/1552	4.28	4.28	4.25	4.24	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	5	11	4.25	693/1495	3.71	4.04	4.14	4.11	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	278/1457	4.16	4.32	4.15	4.13	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	4	10	4.21	899/1572	3.95	4.00	4.21	4.18	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	863/1589	4.68	4.55	4.66	4.67	4.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	4	7	4	4.00	957/1569	3.94	4.09	4.13	4.10	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	1	4	4	8	3.79	1424/1530	4.24	4.38	4.49	4.49	3.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	3	13	4.53	1245/1533	4.64	4.77	4.75	4.75	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	3	3	10	4.00	1171/1528	4.22	4.33	4.35	4.33	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	4	2	8	3.61	1384/1529	4.04	4.25	4.36	4.34	3.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	1	2	3	5	4	3.60	1089/1393	3.99	3.72	4.06	4.10	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1090/1337	3.79	4.22	4.17	4.20	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	766/1331	4.44	4.41	4.35	4.35	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	547/1333	4.36	4.54	4.40	4.41	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	460/1014	4.03	4.04	4.05	4.04	4.17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 04	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 24
Title:	Technical Communication		Questionnaires: 20
Instructor:	Hess,Laurie		

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/40	****	2.60	3.85	3.93	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 393 05	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 24
Title: Technical Communication		Questionnaires: 18
Instructor: Brown,Laura L		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	8	7	4.22	986/1589	3.89	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	455/1589	4.12	4.23	4.29	4.26	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1391	4.38	4.39	4.34	4.30	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	156/1552	4.28	4.28	4.25	4.24	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	6	7	3.94	971/1495	3.71	4.04	4.14	4.11	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	154/1457	4.16	4.32	4.15	4.13	4.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	267/1572	3.95	4.00	4.21	4.18	4.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	10	4.56	1063/1589	4.68	4.55	4.66	4.67	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	481/1569	3.94	4.09	4.13	4.10	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	610/1530	4.24	4.38	4.49	4.49	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	959/1533	4.64	4.77	4.75	4.75	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	539/1528	4.22	4.33	4.35	4.33	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	739/1529	4.04	4.25	4.36	4.34	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	697/1393	3.99	3.72	4.06	4.10	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	400/1337	3.79	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	424/1331	4.44	4.41	4.35	4.35	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	641/1333	4.36	4.54	4.40	4.41	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	110/1014	4.03	4.04	4.05	4.04	4.80

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 05		Term - Fall 2012						Enrollment: 24
Title:	Technical Communication								Questionnaires: 18
Instructor:	Brown,Laura L								

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/194	****	3.95	4.17	4.05	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	4.35	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/65	****	4.33	4.43	4.58	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/63	****	4.28	4.29	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	5.00	4.47	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	4.17	4.19	4.80	****
Field Work														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	4.48	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 393 06	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 24
Title: Technical Communication		Questionnaires: 17
Instructor: Brown,Laura L		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	5	6	3.94	1249/1589	3.89	4.11	4.32	4.33	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	901/1589	4.12	4.23	4.29	4.26	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	733/1391	4.38	4.39	4.34	4.30	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	488/1552	4.28	4.28	4.25	4.24	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	0	4	10	4.24	713/1495	3.71	4.04	4.14	4.11	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	344/1457	4.16	4.32	4.15	4.13	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	540/1572	3.95	4.00	4.21	4.18	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	806/1589	4.68	4.55	4.66	4.67	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	9	2	3.87	1116/1569	3.94	4.09	4.13	4.10	3.87
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	1259/1530	4.24	4.38	4.49	4.49	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	1181/1533	4.64	4.77	4.75	4.75	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	9	6	4.40	817/1528	4.22	4.33	4.35	4.33	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	852/1529	4.04	4.25	4.36	4.34	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	0	1	7	4	4.00	796/1393	3.99	3.72	4.06	4.10	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1204/1337	3.79	4.22	4.17	4.20	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	766/1331	4.44	4.41	4.35	4.35	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	702/1333	4.36	4.54	4.40	4.41	4.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 06	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 24
Title:	Technical Communication		Questionnaires: 17
Instructor:	Brown,Laura L		

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	293/1014	4.03	4.04	4.05	4.04	4.40

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	17	Non-major	16
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 responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 07		Term - Fall 2012									Enrollment: 25		
Title:	Technical Communication											Questionnaires: 18		
Instructor:	Walters,April I													

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	2	5	7	3	3.65	1448/1589	3.89	4.11	4.32	4.33	3.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	5	2	5	5	3.59	1451/1589	4.12	4.23	4.29	4.26	3.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	2	1	3	5	4.00	1061/1391	4.38	4.39	4.34	4.30	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	4	2	3	6	3.56	1397/1552	4.28	4.28	4.25	4.24	3.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	3	2	6	2	2.94	1447/1495	3.71	4.04	4.14	4.11	2.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	10	3	3.76	1121/1457	4.16	4.32	4.15	4.13	3.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	2	1	7	4	3.41	1435/1572	3.95	4.00	4.21	4.18	3.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	974/1589	4.68	4.55	4.66	4.67	4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	7	5	1	3.33	1438/1569	3.94	4.09	4.13	4.10	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	711/1530	4.24	4.38	4.49	4.49	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	671/1533	4.64	4.77	4.75	4.75	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	5	3	8	4.19	1050/1528	4.22	4.33	4.35	4.33	4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	4	4	5	3.56	1395/1529	4.04	4.25	4.36	4.34	3.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	2	2	2	10	4.25	586/1393	3.99	3.72	4.06	4.10	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	4	2	3	3.60	1090/1337	3.79	4.22	4.17	4.20	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	543/1331	4.44	4.41	4.35	4.35	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	615/1333	4.36	4.54	4.40	4.41	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	244/1014	4.03	4.04	4.05	4.04	4.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 393 07	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 25
Title: Technical Communication		Questionnaires: 18
Instructor: Walters,April I		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/180	****	4.31	4.20	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	3.95	4.17	4.05	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/178	****	4.90	4.47	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/181	****	4.88	4.40	4.31	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	5.00	4.12	3.94	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	4.35	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/65	****	4.33	4.43	4.58	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	4.28	4.29	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	5.00	4.47	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	4.17	4.19	4.80	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	2.60	3.85	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/40	****	3.20	3.89	4.16	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	4.48	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.15	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.25	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/39	****	2.80	4.00	4.49	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.12	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.25	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 07	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 25
Title:	Technical Communication			Questionnaires: 18
Instructor:	Walters,April I			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 393 08	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 24
Title: Technical Communication		Questionnaires: 17
Instructor: Carbone,Christo		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	3	1	7	4	3.80	1358/1589	3.89	4.11	4.32	4.33	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	1	6	6	4.00	1151/1589	4.12	4.23	4.29	4.26	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	11	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1391	4.38	4.39	4.34	4.30	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	7	6	4.20	900/1552	4.28	4.28	4.25	4.24	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	4	3	5	3.67	1215/1495	3.71	4.04	4.14	4.11	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	2	7	4	3.87	1033/1457	4.16	4.32	4.15	4.13	3.87
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	4	0	2	2	7	3.53	1394/1572	3.95	4.00	4.21	4.18	3.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	863/1589	4.68	4.55	4.66	4.67	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	3	7	2	3.69	1256/1569	3.94	4.09	4.13	4.10	3.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	1	5	2	5	3.64	1450/1530	4.24	4.38	4.49	4.49	3.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	1205/1533	4.64	4.77	4.75	4.75	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	3	2	1	7	3.71	1350/1528	4.22	4.33	4.35	4.33	3.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	3	5	4	3.64	1375/1529	4.04	4.25	4.36	4.34	3.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	4	0	3	3	3	3.08	1302/1393	3.99	3.72	4.06	4.10	3.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	3	0	0	3	3.14	1257/1337	3.79	4.22	4.17	4.20	3.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	1101/1331	4.44	4.41	4.35	4.35	3.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	765/1333	4.36	4.54	4.40	4.41	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	672/1014	4.03	4.04	4.05	4.04	3.83

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 08	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 24
Title:	Technical Communication			Questionnaires: 17
Instructor:	Carbone,Christo			

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/194	****	3.95	4.17	4.05	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/40	****	2.60	3.85	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/40	****	3.20	3.89	4.16	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	4.48	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.15	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.25	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/39	****	2.80	4.00	4.49	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 393 09		Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 25
Title: Technical Communication				Questionnaires: 17
Instructor: Bozic,Patricia				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	6	5	5	3.76	1384/1589	3.89	4.11	4.32	4.33	3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	6	5	3.71	1401/1589	4.12	4.23	4.29	4.26	3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	799/1391	4.38	4.39	4.34	4.30	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	3	3	8	4.06	1037/1552	4.28	4.28	4.25	4.24	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	3	5	5	3.63	1239/1495	3.71	4.04	4.14	4.11	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	6	8	4.19	750/1457	4.16	4.32	4.15	4.13	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	6	2	7	3.88	1211/1572	3.95	4.00	4.21	4.18	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	1032/1589	4.68	4.55	4.66	4.67	4.59
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	4	6	4	3.69	1263/1569	3.94	4.09	4.13	4.10	3.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	1	2	2	8	3.87	1399/1530	4.24	4.38	4.49	4.49	3.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	1	1	2	10	4.27	1421/1533	4.64	4.77	4.75	4.75	4.27
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	2	4	6	3.80	1311/1528	4.22	4.33	4.35	4.33	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	4	2	7	3.80	1313/1529	4.04	4.25	4.36	4.34	3.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	560/1393	3.99	3.72	4.06	4.10	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	4	1	3.57	1106/1337	3.79	4.22	4.17	4.20	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	989/1331	4.44	4.41	4.35	4.35	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1296/1333	4.36	4.54	4.40	4.41	3.14
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	925/1014	4.03	4.04	4.05	4.04	3.20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 393 09	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 25
Title: Technical Communication		Questionnaires: 17
Instructor: Bozic,Patricia		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/180	****	4.31	4.20	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/194	****	3.95	4.17	4.05	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/178	****	4.90	4.47	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/181	****	4.88	4.40	4.31	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/165	****	5.00	4.12	3.94	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/62	****	4.35	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/65	****	4.33	4.43	4.58	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/63	****	4.28	4.29	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/61	****	5.00	4.47	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/61	****	4.17	4.19	4.80	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/40	****	2.60	3.85	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/40	****	3.20	3.89	4.16	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	4.48	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.15	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.25	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/39	****	2.80	4.00	4.49	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.12	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.25	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 09	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 25
Title:	Technical Communication			Questionnaires: 17
Instructor:	Bozic,Patricia			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 393 10	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 22
Title: Technical Communication		Questionnaires: 12
Instructor: James,Annie D		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	1	4	4	3.58	1472/1589	3.89	4.11	4.32	4.33	3.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	3	2	5	3.67	1419/1589	4.12	4.23	4.29	4.26	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	402/1391	4.38	4.39	4.34	4.30	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	826/1552	4.28	4.28	4.25	4.24	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	1	2	5	3.50	1307/1495	3.71	4.04	4.14	4.11	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	3	5	3.92	986/1457	4.16	4.32	4.15	4.13	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	2	1	4	3.27	1470/1572	3.95	4.00	4.21	4.18	3.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	420/1589	4.68	4.55	4.66	4.67	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	2	2	2	3	3	3.25	1462/1569	3.94	4.09	4.13	4.10	3.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	1	4	0	5	3.42	1481/1530	4.24	4.38	4.49	4.49	3.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	786/1533	4.64	4.77	4.75	4.75	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	1	1	2	5	3.42	1430/1528	4.22	4.33	4.35	4.33	3.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	3	5	3.75	1334/1529	4.04	4.25	4.36	4.34	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	1	3	1	3	3.44	1173/1393	3.99	3.72	4.06	4.10	3.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	0	2	2	3.33	1204/1337	3.79	4.22	4.17	4.20	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	899/1331	4.44	4.41	4.35	4.35	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	939/1333	4.36	4.54	4.40	4.41	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	1	2	1	0	2	3.00	944/1014	4.03	4.04	4.05	4.04	3.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 393 10			Term - Fall 2012						Enrollment: 22			
Title: Technical Communication									Questionnaires: 12			
Instructor: James,Annie D												

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/180	****	4.31	4.20	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/194	****	3.95	4.17	4.05	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/178	****	4.90	4.47	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/181	****	4.88	4.40	4.31	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	5.00	4.12	3.94	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/62	****	4.35	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/65	****	4.33	4.43	4.58	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/63	****	4.28	4.29	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/61	****	5.00	4.47	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/61	****	4.17	4.19	4.80	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/40	****	2.60	3.85	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/40	****	3.20	3.89	4.16	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	4.48	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.15	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.25	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/39	****	2.80	4.00	4.49	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.12	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.25	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 393 10	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 22
Title: Technical Communication		Questionnaires: 12
Instructor: James,Annie D		

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 11	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 24
Title:	Technical Communication			Questionnaires: 16
Instructor:	Meade,Vicki L			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	0	3	4	6	3.63	1456/1589	3.89	4.11	4.32	4.33	3.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	0	5	7	3.75	1363/1589	4.12	4.23	4.29	4.26	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	1171/1391	4.38	4.39	4.34	4.30	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	1	3	7	3.93	1165/1552	4.28	4.28	4.25	4.24	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	2	5	4	3.64	1227/1495	3.71	4.04	4.14	4.11	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	2	3	6	3.44	1298/1457	4.16	4.32	4.15	4.13	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	3	2	7	3.69	1323/1572	3.95	4.00	4.21	4.18	3.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1589	4.68	4.55	4.66	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	0	5	3	4.11	866/1569	3.94	4.09	4.13	4.10	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	0	2	2	8	4.00	1319/1530	4.24	4.38	4.49	4.49	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	1	2	5	5	3.86	1505/1533	4.64	4.77	4.75	4.75	3.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	2	4	6	3.93	1238/1528	4.22	4.33	4.35	4.33	3.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	2	0	4	5	3.43	1424/1529	4.04	4.25	4.36	4.34	3.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	2	0	4	2	6	3.71	1028/1393	3.99	3.72	4.06	4.10	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	2	2	5	3.82	984/1337	3.79	4.22	4.17	4.20	3.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	543/1331	4.44	4.41	4.35	4.35	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	702/1333	4.36	4.54	4.40	4.41	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	1	2	5	2	3.80	686/1014	4.03	4.04	4.05	4.04	3.80

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 393 11	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 24
Title: Technical Communication		Questionnaires: 16
Instructor: Meade,Vicki L		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	3.95	4.17	4.05	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	4.35	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/65	****	4.33	4.43	4.58	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	4.28	4.29	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	5.00	4.47	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	4.17	4.19	4.80	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	2.60	3.85	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	3.20	3.89	4.16	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	4.48	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.15	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.25	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/39	****	2.80	4.00	4.49	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.12	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.25	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 11	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 24
Title:	Technical Communication		Questionnaires: 16
Instructor:	Meade,Vicki L		

				Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	**NR**	**NA**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 393 12	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 25
Title: Technical Communication		Questionnaires: 22
Instructor: Rockett,Danika		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	5	12	4.38	806/1589	3.89	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	182/1589	4.12	4.23	4.29	4.26	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	552/1391	4.38	4.39	4.34	4.30	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	6	15	4.59	415/1552	4.28	4.28	4.25	4.24	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	5	11	4.29	663/1495	3.71	4.04	4.14	4.11	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	381/1457	4.16	4.32	4.15	4.13	4.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	19	4.73	267/1572	3.95	4.00	4.21	4.18	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	956/1589	4.68	4.55	4.66	4.67	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	453/1569	3.94	4.09	4.13	4.10	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	20	4.86	294/1530	4.24	4.38	4.49	4.49	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	729/1533	4.64	4.77	4.75	4.75	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	281/1528	4.22	4.33	4.35	4.33	4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	17	4.71	458/1529	4.04	4.25	4.36	4.34	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	4	6	11	4.33	510/1393	3.99	3.72	4.06	4.10	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1337	3.79	4.22	4.17	4.20	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1331	4.44	4.41	4.35	4.35	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1333	4.36	4.54	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	18	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1014	4.03	4.04	4.05	4.04	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 12				Term - Fall 2012						Enrollment: 25
Title:	Technical Communication										Questionnaires: 22
Instructor:	Rockett,Danika										

Questions	NR	NA	**Frequencies**					**Instructor**		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/180	****	4.31	4.20	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/194	****	3.95	4.17	4.05	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/178	****	4.90	4.47	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/181	****	4.88	4.40	4.31	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/165	****	5.00	4.12	3.94	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/62	****	4.35	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/65	****	4.33	4.43	4.58	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/63	****	4.28	4.29	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/61	****	5.00	4.47	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/61	****	4.17	4.19	4.80	****
Field Work														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	4.48	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.15	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.25	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/39	****	2.80	4.00	4.49	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 12	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 25
Title:	Technical Communication			Questionnaires: 22
Instructor:	Rockett,Danika			

					Frequencies				Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.25	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	6						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 393 13		Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 23
Title: Technical Communication				Questionnaires: 19
Instructor: Porter,Jane				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	2	5	5	4	3.39	1525/1589	3.89	4.11	4.32	4.33	3.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	6	8	4.11	1082/1589	4.12	4.23	4.29	4.26	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	15	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1391	4.38	4.39	4.34	4.30	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	6	9	4.22	879/1552	4.28	4.28	4.25	4.24	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	4	2	4	5	3.22	1411/1495	3.71	4.04	4.14	4.11	3.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	4	4	8	4.06	854/1457	4.16	4.32	4.15	4.13	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	6	7	2	3.33	1456/1572	3.95	4.00	4.21	4.18	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	7	10	4.39	1231/1589	4.68	4.55	4.66	4.67	4.39
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	682/1569	3.94	4.09	4.13	4.10	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	7	8	4.29	1137/1530	4.24	4.38	4.49	4.49	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	2	3	11	4.41	1341/1533	4.64	4.77	4.75	4.75	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	1009/1528	4.22	4.33	4.35	4.33	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	3	10	4.24	1021/1529	4.04	4.25	4.36	4.34	4.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	2	3	6	5	3.88	927/1393	3.99	3.72	4.06	4.10	3.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1337	3.79	4.22	4.17	4.20	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1331	4.44	4.41	4.35	4.35	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1333	4.36	4.54	4.40	4.41	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 393 13	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 23
Title: Technical Communication		Questionnaires: 19
Instructor: Porter,Jane		

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	17	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1014	4.03	4.04	4.05	4.04	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	3	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 393 14	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 24
Title: Technical Communication		Questionnaires: 21
Instructor: Miller,Brittany		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	3	15	4.52	620/1589	3.89	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	400/1589	4.12	4.23	4.29	4.26	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	8	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1391	4.38	4.39	4.34	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	225/1552	4.28	4.28	4.25	4.24	4.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	2	4	10	4.17	784/1495	3.71	4.04	4.14	4.11	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	18	4.76	161/1457	4.16	4.32	4.15	4.13	4.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	18	4.76	221/1572	3.95	4.00	4.21	4.18	4.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	12	8	4.40	1213/1589	4.68	4.55	4.66	4.67	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	194/1569	3.94	4.09	4.13	4.10	4.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	399/1530	4.24	4.38	4.49	4.49	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	293/1533	4.64	4.77	4.75	4.75	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	174/1528	4.22	4.33	4.35	4.33	4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	18	4.76	382/1529	4.04	4.25	4.36	4.34	4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	2	17	4.62	258/1393	3.99	3.72	4.06	4.10	4.62
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	4	11	4.50	452/1337	3.79	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	311/1331	4.44	4.41	4.35	4.35	4.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	1	14	4.75	438/1333	4.36	4.54	4.40	4.41	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	120/1014	4.03	4.04	4.05	4.04	4.79

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 14	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 24
Title:	Technical Communication			Questionnaires: 21
Instructor:	Miller,Brittany			

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/180	****	4.31	4.20	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/194	****	3.95	4.17	4.05	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/178	****	4.90	4.47	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/181	****	4.88	4.40	4.31	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	5.00	4.12	3.94	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/62	****	4.35	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/65	****	4.33	4.43	4.58	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/63	****	4.28	4.29	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/61	****	5.00	4.47	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/61	****	4.17	4.19	4.80	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/40	****	2.60	3.85	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/40	****	3.20	3.89	4.16	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	4.48	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.15	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.25	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/39	****	2.80	4.00	4.49	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.12	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.25	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 14	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 24
Title:	Technical Communication			Questionnaires: 21
Instructor:	Miller,Brittany			

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	18	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 395 01		Term - Fall 2012							Enrollment: 15			
Title:	Internship in Tutoring W									Questionnaires: 12			
Instructor:	Hickernell,Mary												

| | | | **Frequencies** | | | | | **Instructor** | | **Course** | **Org** | **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	0	0	5	3	3	3.82	1351/1589	3.82	4.11	4.32	4.33	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	1015/1589	4.18	4.23	4.29	4.26	4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	1081/1552	4.00	4.28	4.25	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	1175/1495	3.73	4.04	4.14	4.11	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	750/1457	4.18	4.32	4.15	4.13	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	0	2	3	2	3.10	1497/1572	3.10	4.00	4.21	4.18	3.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	703/1589	4.82	4.55	4.66	4.67	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	3	6	0	3.50	1367/1569	3.50	4.09	4.13	4.10	3.50
Lecture													
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	1319/1530	4.00	4.38	4.49	4.49	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	1261/1533	4.50	4.77	4.75	4.75	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	1112/1528	4.10	4.33	4.35	4.33	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	1313/1529	3.80	4.25	4.36	4.34	3.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	3	0	1	1	0	2.00	1384/1393	2.00	3.72	4.06	4.10	2.00
Discussion													
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	379/1337	4.60	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	322/1331	4.80	4.41	4.35	4.35	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1333	5.00	4.54	4.40	4.41	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 395 01		Term - Fall 2012			Enrollment: 15
Title:	Internship in Tutoring W					Questionnaires: 12
Instructor:	Hickernell,Mary					

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	429/1014	4.20	4.04	4.05	4.04	4.20

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 401 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment:	20
Title:	Method Of Interpretation			Questionnaires:	16
Instructor:	Fernandez,Jean				

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	739/1589	4.44	4.11	4.32	4.46	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	444/1589	4.63	4.23	4.29	4.35	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	320/1391	4.73	4.39	4.34	4.46	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	668/1552	4.40	4.28	4.25	4.37	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	609/1495	4.33	4.04	4.14	4.25	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	248/1457	4.67	4.32	4.15	4.30	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	4	5	4	3.86	1226/1572	3.86	4.00	4.21	4.28	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	12	2	4.14	1438/1589	4.14	4.55	4.66	4.68	4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	5	7	1	3.69	1256/1569	3.69	4.09	4.13	4.22	3.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	787/1530	4.57	4.38	4.49	4.56	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	469/1533	4.93	4.77	4.75	4.76	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	966/1528	4.29	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	652/1529	4.57	4.25	4.36	4.44	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	10	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1393	****	3.72	4.06	4.18	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	0	2	0	5	3.67	1066/1337	3.67	4.22	4.17	4.36	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	2	2	2	2	3.22	1261/1331	3.22	4.41	4.35	4.56	3.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	0	2	2	3	3.44	1247/1333	3.44	4.54	4.40	4.63	3.44

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 401 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 20
Title:	Method Of Interpretation			Questionnaires: 16
Instructor:	Fernandez,Jean			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	7	7	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1014	****	4.04	4.05	4.32	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 407 01		Term - Fall 2012							Enrollment: 18				
Title:	Language In Society									Questionnaires: 14				
Instructor:	Shipka,Jody L.													

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	3	4	7	4.29	929/1589	4.29	4.11	4.32	4.46	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	1053/1589	4.14	4.23	4.29	4.35	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	482/1391	4.60	4.39	4.34	4.46	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	847/1552	4.25	4.28	4.25	4.37	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	462/1495	4.46	4.04	4.14	4.25	4.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	593/1457	4.33	4.32	4.15	4.30	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	1	8	3.93	1171/1572	3.93	4.00	4.21	4.28	3.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	1193/1589	4.43	4.55	4.66	4.68	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	546/1569	4.38	4.09	4.13	4.22	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	541/1530	4.73	4.38	4.49	4.56	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.77	4.75	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	1	2	6	4.09	1117/1528	4.09	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.09
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	0	2	7	4.27	984/1529	4.27	4.25	4.36	4.44	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	1	0	2	7	4.18	651/1393	4.18	3.72	4.06	4.18	4.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	452/1337	4.50	4.22	4.17	4.36	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	478/1331	4.67	4.41	4.35	4.56	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	337/1333	4.83	4.54	4.40	4.63	4.83

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 407 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 18
Title:	Language In Society			Questionnaires: 14
Instructor:	Shipka,Jody L.			

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	293/1014	4.40	4.04	4.05	4.32	4.40

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	3
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 409 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 20
Title:	Ad Top: Genre Studies			Questionnaires: 11
Instructor:	Fernandez,Jean			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	0	3	6	4.18	1026/1589	4.18	4.11	4.32	4.46	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	2	5	3.82	1320/1589	3.82	4.23	4.29	4.35	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1061/1391	4.00	4.39	4.34	4.46	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	668/1552	4.40	4.28	4.25	4.37	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	282/1495	4.64	4.04	4.14	4.25	4.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	3	6	4.18	750/1457	4.18	4.32	4.15	4.30	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	697/1572	4.36	4.00	4.21	4.28	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	2	4.20	1395/1589	4.20	4.55	4.66	4.68	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	754/1569	4.20	4.09	4.13	4.22	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	0	9	4.45	951/1530	4.45	4.38	4.49	4.56	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	0	10	4.73	1012/1533	4.73	4.77	4.75	4.76	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	1	8	4.36	869/1528	4.36	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	893/1529	4.36	4.25	4.36	4.44	4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1311/1393	3.00	3.72	4.06	4.18	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	624/1337	4.30	4.22	4.17	4.36	4.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	715/1331	4.40	4.41	4.35	4.56	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	1	1	0	7	4.10	978/1333	4.10	4.54	4.40	4.63	4.10

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 409 01		Term - Fall 2012			Enrollment: 20
Title:	Ad Top: Genre Studies					Questionnaires: 11
Instructor:	Fernandez,Jean					

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	1	8	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1014	****	4.04	4.05	4.32	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 442 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 16
Title:	Visual Literacy			Questionnaires: 15
Instructor:	Burgess,Helen J			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	435/1589	4.67	4.11	4.32	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	317/1589	4.73	4.23	4.29	4.35	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	223/1391	4.83	4.39	4.34	4.46	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	142/1552	4.86	4.28	4.25	4.37	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	148/1495	4.80	4.04	4.14	4.25	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	131/1457	4.80	4.32	4.15	4.30	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	255/1572	4.73	4.00	4.21	4.28	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	572/1589	4.87	4.55	4.66	4.68	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	134/1569	4.85	4.09	4.13	4.22	4.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	644/1530	4.67	4.38	4.49	4.56	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	527/1533	4.92	4.77	4.75	4.76	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	156/1528	4.92	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	639/1529	4.58	4.25	4.36	4.44	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	221/1393	4.67	3.72	4.06	4.18	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1337	5.00	4.22	4.17	4.36	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1331	5.00	4.41	4.35	4.56	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1333	5.00	4.54	4.40	4.63	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	196/1014	4.63	4.04	4.05	4.32	4.63

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 442 01		Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment:	16
Title:	Visual Literacy				Questionnaires:	15
Instructor:	Burgess,Helen J					

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/62	****	4.35	4.46	4.56	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/65	****	4.33	4.43	4.54	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/63	****	4.28	4.29	4.31	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/61	****	5.00	4.47	4.49	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/61	****	4.17	4.19	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 448 01		Term - Fall 2012							Enrollment: 15			
Title:	Seminar In Lit & Culture									Questionnaires: 13			
Instructor:	Berman,Jessica												

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	214/1589	4.85	4.11	4.32	4.46	4.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	367/1589	4.69	4.23	4.29	4.35	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	402/1391	4.67	4.39	4.34	4.46	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	225/1552	4.77	4.28	4.25	4.37	4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	94/1495	4.92	4.04	4.14	4.25	4.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	278/1457	4.64	4.32	4.15	4.30	4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	555/1572	4.46	4.00	4.21	4.28	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	373/1589	4.92	4.55	4.66	4.68	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	658/1569	4.29	4.09	4.13	4.22	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1530	5.00	4.38	4.49	4.56	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.77	4.75	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	156/1528	4.92	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	270/1529	4.85	4.25	4.36	4.44	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	2	1	1	0	4	3.38	1206/1393	3.38	3.72	4.06	4.18	3.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	202/1337	4.83	4.22	4.17	4.36	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1331	5.00	4.41	4.35	4.56	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	227/1333	4.92	4.54	4.40	4.63	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	1	7	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1014	5.00	4.04	4.05	4.32	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 448 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 15
Title:	Seminar In Lit & Culture		Questionnaires: 13
Instructor:	Berman,Jessica		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/62	5.00	4.35	4.46	4.56	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/65	5.00	4.33	4.43	4.54	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/63	5.00	4.28	4.29	4.31	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/61	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.49	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	50/61	3.50	4.17	4.19	4.12	3.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 451 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 13
Title: Seminar In Major Writers		Questionnaires: 12
Instructor: Falco,Raphael		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	646/1589	4.50	4.11	4.32	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	1151/1589	4.00	4.23	4.29	4.35	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	1016/1391	4.08	4.39	4.34	4.46	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	1023/1552	4.08	4.28	4.25	4.37	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1495	5.00	4.04	4.14	4.25	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	400/1457	4.50	4.32	4.15	4.30	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	4	2	5	3.83	1240/1572	3.83	4.00	4.21	4.28	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	4.00	1500/1589	4.00	4.55	4.66	4.68	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	596/1569	4.33	4.09	4.13	4.22	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1385/1530	3.90	4.38	4.49	4.56	3.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.77	4.75	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	1035/1528	4.20	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	956/1529	4.30	4.25	4.36	4.44	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	1	2	2	0	0	2.20	1383/1393	2.20	3.72	4.06	4.18	2.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	452/1337	4.50	4.22	4.17	4.36	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	623/1331	4.50	4.41	4.35	4.56	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	615/1333	4.60	4.54	4.40	4.63	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	823/1014	3.50	4.04	4.05	4.32	3.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 451 01		Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment:	13
Title:	Seminar In Major Writers				Questionnaires:	12
Instructor:	Falco,Raphael					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	27/62	4.80	4.35	4.46	4.56	4.80
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/65	5.00	4.33	4.43	4.54	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	24/63	4.60	4.28	4.29	4.31	4.60
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/61	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.49	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	42/61	4.00	4.17	4.19	4.12	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 473 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 11
Title:	Adv Creative Wrtg:Poetry			Questionnaires: 9
Instructor:	Fallon,Michael			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	435/1589	4.67	4.11	4.32	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	266/1589	4.78	4.23	4.29	4.35	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.39	4.34	4.46	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1552	5.00	4.28	4.25	4.37	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	255/1495	4.67	4.04	4.14	4.25	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1457	5.00	4.32	4.15	4.30	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	233/1572	4.75	4.00	4.21	4.28	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1063/1589	4.56	4.55	4.66	4.68	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	113/1569	4.89	4.09	4.13	4.22	4.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	644/1530	4.67	4.38	4.49	4.56	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.77	4.75	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.33	4.35	4.41	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	257/1529	4.86	4.25	4.36	4.44	4.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1337	5.00	4.22	4.17	4.36	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1331	5.00	4.41	4.35	4.56	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1333	5.00	4.54	4.40	4.63	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 473 01		Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 11
Title:	Adv Creative Wrtg:Poetry				Questionnaires: 9
Instructor:	Fallon,Michael				

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	**NR**	**NA**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	710/1014	3.75	4.04	4.05	4.32	3.75

Frequency Distribution

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

Run Date: 1/31/2013 12:23:48 PM

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 486 01		Term - Fall 2012							Enrollment: 13			
Title:	Seminar In Teaching Comp									Questionnaires: 10			
Instructor:	McCarthy,Lucill												

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	10	5.00	1/1589	5.00	4.11	4.32	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	228/1589	4.80	4.23	4.29	4.35	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	402/1391	4.67	4.39	4.34	4.46	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	213/1552	4.78	4.28	4.25	4.37	4.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	105/1495	4.90	4.04	4.14	4.25	4.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	208/1457	4.70	4.32	4.15	4.30	4.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	495/1572	4.50	4.00	4.21	4.28	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	467/1589	4.90	4.55	4.66	4.68	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	241/1569	4.67	4.09	4.13	4.22	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	990/1530	4.43	4.38	4.49	4.56	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	729/1533	4.86	4.77	4.75	4.76	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	607/1528	4.57	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	974/1529	4.29	4.25	4.36	4.44	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1393	****	3.72	4.06	4.18	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	162/1337	4.89	4.22	4.17	4.36	4.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	238/1331	4.89	4.41	4.35	4.56	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	277/1333	4.89	4.54	4.40	4.63	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	196/1014	4.63	4.04	4.05	4.32	4.63

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 486 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment:	13
Title:	Seminar In Teaching Comp			Questionnaires:	10
Instructor:	McCarthy,Lucill				

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	4.35	4.46	4.56	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/65	****	4.33	4.43	4.54	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	4.28	4.29	4.31	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	5.00	4.47	4.49	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/61	****	4.17	4.19	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 490 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 22
Title:	Adv Topics In Engl Lang			Questionnaires: 18
Instructor:	McKinley,Kathry			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	4	12	4.44	726/1589	4.44	4.11	4.32	4.46	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	1	4	10	4.18	1024/1589	4.18	4.23	4.29	4.35	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	4	12	4.53	576/1391	4.53	4.39	4.34	4.46	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	805/1552	4.29	4.28	4.25	4.37	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	351/1495	4.56	4.04	4.14	4.25	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	228/1457	4.69	4.32	4.15	4.30	4.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	1	4	10	4.38	685/1572	4.38	4.00	4.21	4.28	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	13	3	4.12	1459/1589	4.12	4.55	4.66	4.68	4.12
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	0	4	9	4.43	481/1569	4.43	4.09	4.13	4.22	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	1	2	13	4.53	858/1530	4.53	4.38	4.49	4.56	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	671/1533	4.88	4.77	4.75	4.76	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	0	3	12	4.41	804/1528	4.41	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	1	13	4.41	840/1529	4.41	4.25	4.36	4.44	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	796/1393	4.00	3.72	4.06	4.18	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	0	4	9	4.20	702/1337	4.20	4.22	4.17	4.36	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	0	0	5	8	4.13	928/1331	4.13	4.41	4.35	4.56	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	2	0	0	1	12	4.40	781/1333	4.40	4.54	4.40	4.63	4.40

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 490 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment:	22
Title:	Adv Topics In Engl Lang			Questionnaires:	18
Instructor:	McKinley,Kathry				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	1	1	2	2	3	3.56	807/1014	3.56	4.04	4.05	4.32	3.56

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	1	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	6
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						